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ABSTRACT

This study is a qualitative case study of the first year experience of a novice supervisor in a Professional Development School (PDS) context. It describes the experiences of a classroom teacher who assumed the role of Professional Development Associate (university supervisor) as seen from four perspectives, mentors, interns, self and researcher. The portrait that evolved resulted in a beginning conceptual model for understanding supervision in a PDS context that served as both a methodological finding and a tool for analysis. This case provided a detailed description of the implications of supervision on mentors and interns, and it also showed how a novice supervisor learned in a PDS context as a community of practice. The findings have implications for understanding supervision in a PDS context and supporting meaningful professional learning of supervisors.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Educational reform is not a new concept. In fact, historically education has always been under the political reform microscope. When Sputnik was launched in the 1950s, the focus of reform rested on students’ learning and curriculum. Thirty years later, when *A Nation at Risk* was released in 1983, the spotlight shifted to consider teachers’ practices. Fast-forward another thirty years and the focus is shifting once more. With the release of the Blue Ribbon Panel Report (2010) and the release of the National Council for Teacher Quality’s (NCTQ) report (2011), a privately funded group with a more conservative reform agenda, teacher education has now come under scrutiny. It will not be long before teacher educators feel that same pressure of the limelight.

Politicians and scholars can agree that reform is essential, but they differ on mechanisms for creating reform. Professional Development Schools (PDSs) were seen as vehicles of reform for both schools and universities, but for reform to occur, both institutions would need to renew simultaneously rather than individually. PDSs are intentional partnerships between schools and universities, and at present, opportunities exist for understanding more deeply and more intimately the structures and roles that create this kind of comprehensive reform. By examining the teacher educators and more specifically the teacher educators as supervisors in this context, this research aims to be proactive and reframe the current educational reform narrative.

The purpose of this introductory chapter is to orient the reader to the broader landscape that situates this study. The journey begins with the challenges teacher education faces. An important component of teacher education is the field experience, and this study is focused on a role-taking experience within this practicum experience. For that reason, I then offer a rationale for the importance of the practicum experience in the teacher preparation curriculum, and a
particular kind of practicum occurs in a PDS context. Since this role-taking experience is situated in this specific field experience setting, I define and describe PDSs as a unique yet critical context for a practicum. Then I talk broadly about the structures and roles of PDSs before specifically describing and defining one role—the hybrid educator. After that, I define supervision and provide a rationale for understanding hybrid educators as supervisors. Finally, I offer a conceptual framework for understanding supervision in the PDS context. Since no model currently exists to understand supervision in a PDS, I draw upon the works of Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) and Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001), who offered frameworks to understand supervision in school settings. Using their ideas as a foundation, I created an initial model for understanding the supervisory practices of school-based hybrid educators—or reassigned classroom teachers who assume the role of teacher educator temporarily—in the PDS context. The purpose of this study was to understand supervision in a PDS context and more specifically the supervisory practices of a novice school-based hybrid educator; therefore, it is important to understand how the hybrid educator role fits into the bigger picture of supervision, PDS, field experiences, and teacher education.

**The Troubles of Teacher Education**

As the pauper of scholarly fields, teacher education has always struggled with its status within and outside of institutions of higher education; therefore, programs have faced many barriers. Several factors have contributed to its continued struggles, and these factors are related to the evolution of postsecondary education. Three specific factors—a historical shift in institutional focus, gender bias, and a lack of shared vision—have been parasitic to the efforts of teacher education to elevate their professional reputation among other scholarly fields.
**Shift in Institutional Foci**

The preparation of teachers began as the central mission of some institutions of higher education (Goodlad, 1990a), but it did not remain that way. Originally, Normal Schools were the main source of teacher preparation. As these institutions evolved, their desire for prestige entailed a shift in institutional foci. They began to include more and varied disciplines into their missions and focused more on research because this alternate focus brought with it an elevated status among other institutions (Soder & Sirotnik, 1990). Science and other academic fields were more prestigious than teacher preparation. As the foci changed, teacher education moved from the institutional core towards its periphery. No longer the sole academic field, teacher education soon found itself competing for resources and attention, but it was fighting a losing battle to the arts and sciences. This shift in institutional foci was the beginning of troubles for teacher education. As its status inter-institutionally and intra-institutionally waned, the inclusion of other disciplines was not the only factor in teacher education’s loss of status; gender bias also contributed to its lowly status among academic fields.

**Gender Bias**

Normal Schools created occupational opportunities for women (Eisenmann, 1990), and these opportunities would begin a trend of feminine abundance in teaching. Women dominated and continue to dominate the teaching force, especially at the elementary level (Goodlad, 1990b). However, this feminine predominance was perceived negatively as many of the scholarly fields were male-dominated. Women have typically been seen as inferior to males and therefore anything marked or associated with femininity received a negative connotation (Belenky & Stanton, 2000). Moreover, teacher education served and continues to serve this marked cliental. In addition to the predominance of women as practicing teachers, those entering the profession continued to be predominately women. Therefore, the continuing stigma of femininity prevailed.
Lanier & Little (1986) also noted that teacher educators typically were either female or males from lower class families. It was this feminine dominance and the negative associations of femininity that contributed to the overall disrespect of the public for teaching and teacher education (Soder & Sirotnik, 1990). As a feminine profession, gender bias marked it as lowly and inferior to other more male-dominated disciplines.

**Lack of a Shared Vision**

A shift in institutional focus and gender bias were two external factors to the troubles of teacher education, but teacher education also experienced internal troubles. First, teacher education has been criticized as “intellectually weak” (The Holmes Group, 1986). The preparatory curriculum for teacher candidates is not seen as rigorous or intellectually challenging as compared to other academic fields like math and science. It is perceived that those who were unable to be successful in those fields could enter and be successful in the teaching profession. Second, the task of preparing the next generation of teachers typically included and still includes a series of coursework and a brief field experience. This preparatory curriculum is inadequate for educating the next generation of teachers (Goodlad, 1990b) when the two institutions responsible for implementing this curriculum are disconnected. Historically, schools and universities have not collaborated with regard to teacher preparation, creating a lack of communication and disconnect in the teacher education curriculum (Feimnan-Nemser, 2001). Universities felt that teacher candidates learned best practices through them and then implemented best practices in their field placements regardless of whether their cooperating teachers used those practices. On the other hand, school districts maintained the perspective of helping teachers acclimate from the university setting to the realities of the school system. Instead of being one continuous curriculum of lifelong learning throughout a teacher's career, the curriculum was disjointed with teacher preparation happening at the university setting and professional development occurring in the
school system. Neither institution communicated with one another, which resulted in ineffective and poor professional learning practices (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). The lack of intellectual rigor and disconnect in curriculum contributed to the troubles of teacher education.

The troubles of teacher education were rooted in its lowly status, which is a result of a shift in institutional focus from teaching and teacher education to research and other disciplines, the scarlet letter of femininity, and a lack of intellectual rigor and curricular coherence. In order to professionalize teaching, the field of teacher education required a shared vision that was boundary-spanning by nature (Schlechty & Whitford, 1988). Shared vision needs to begin by attending to, and reconsidering, the field experience as a critical component of the teacher education curriculum.

The Importance of Field Experiences

As part of the teacher preparation program, teacher candidates engage in coursework consisting of social foundations, educational psychology, child development, methods courses and at least one clinical experience with one of those experiences being their capstone experience (Goodlad, 1990). The ability to apply the theoretical information learned during coursework is the intention of these experiences. Field experiences are valued but insufficient in creating professionals prepared to work in the complexity of classrooms when the teacher education curriculum remains disjointed. Instead, collaboration can unite this curriculum and create robust field experiences.

Highly Valued

Teacher candidates find great value in these practical experiences (Darling-Hammond & Hammerness, 2005; Goodlad, 1990b; The Holmes Group, 1986). The Holmes Group (1986)
noted, “Virtually every evaluator of the traditional teacher education program finds that the graduates attribute their success as teachers to their student teaching experience or to their first years in the classroom” (p. 54). Practical experiences allow teacher candidates to be immersed in their profession and learn practical skills through experience.

A Disconnect in Practicum Preparation

It is no doubt then that the practical experience has value, but often the opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge—the intention of the clinical experience—and analyze practice systemically occurs less than desired. In fact, because universities and schools—the location of the practicum experiences—often have not collaborated, teacher candidates are caught in between two different sets of expectations for their preparation. Candidates feel this disconnect and struggle to balance these conflicting demands. Since teacher candidates are students, they are automatically cast in subordinate roles to their university teachers and their cooperating teachers, and they have limited power. Therefore, they should not be the vehicles for connecting schools and universities in teacher education. Instead, universities and schools need to collaborate and create boundary-spanning roles that result in a more robust and coherent teacher education curriculum.

The critique that the teacher education curriculum is intellectually weak is actualized when it is assumed that a disjointed curriculum with limited and weak practicum experiences is adequate preparation for teacher candidates. Goodlad (1990) commented, “It is unlikely that mere exposure to a few courses in education and a brief immersion as a student teacher will suffice” (p. 50). This assumption that two years of coursework and a clinical experience are sufficient in establishing a competent and specialized knowledge base as well as the dispositions necessary to work daily in the complexity of classrooms is flawed. Developing the kinds of teachers for whom The Holmes Group (1986) advocated—teachers who possess extensive knowledge about
children, curriculum, schooling, and the world, who demonstrate critical thinking, and who exude a stance towards inquiry – require more than the disconnected, mechanically focused, and cursory preparation. Instead, the preparation of teachers should be more comprehensive. Goodlad (1990) suggested,

The epistemology of teaching must encompass a pedagogy that goes far beyond the mechanics of teaching. It must combine generalizable principles of teaching, subject-specific instruction, sensitivity to the pervasive human qualities and potentials always involved, and full awareness of what it means to simultaneously ‘draw out’ and enculturate. (pp. 50-51)

Goodlad’s comments about teaching are a step towards improving teacher preparation while simultaneously impacting both schools and universities. Creating a robust and coherent teacher education curriculum requires collaboration between schools and universities.

Teacher candidates typically favor the practical aspects of their preparation over the theoretical portions of the teacher education curriculum. They cite them as being the most valuable learning experiences (Darling-Hammond & Hammerness, 2005; Goodlad, 1990b). Practicum experiences are valuable; ideally they provide candidates with a laboratory of practice to apply their theoretical knowledge. However, in reality the student teaching experience is quite varied with regard to the amount of support a teacher candidate receives both from the cooperating teacher and a university supervisor (Darling-Hammond & Hammerness, 2005). As the capstone and most critical component of the teacher education curriculum, the practicum component or components need to support both theory and practice. Supporting theory and coursework through practicum experiences enhances teacher candidates’ learning (Darling-Hammond & Hammerness, 2005). As a critical component of the teacher education curriculum, the field-based experience should be collaboratively constructed in order to create an appropriate context for learning. However, uniting schools and universities is quite a complex task.
Professional Development Schools

Professional development schools (PDSs), boundary-spanning ideological constructs, are seen as the solution to the concerns of teacher education. PDSs are also vehicles for advancing the professional status of teaching (Smith, 2010). The Holmes Group (1986) expressed a vision for the classroom teacher. They stated,

Central to the vision are competent teachers empowered to make principled judgments and decisions on their students' behalf. They possess broad and deep understanding of children, the subjects they teach, the nature of learning and schooling, and the world around them. They exemplify the critical thinking they strive to develop in students, combining tough-minded instruction with a penchant for inquiry. Students admire and remember them many years after leaving school, since such competence and dedication in teaching are unfortunately not as common as they should be. (The Holmes Group, 1986, pp. 28-29)

Teachers prepared in this spirit require a thoughtful preparation program whose purpose is to cultivate dispositions towards problematizing the teaching practice. Such a stance towards inquiry is a frame of reference, a worldly view, a disposition, or a lens through which teachers view and approach their practice.

The Origin of PDSs

Portal schools, laboratory schools, and professional practice schools—the ancestors of PDSs—were the first attempts at uniting schools and universities, but the catalyst for collaboration stemmed from four organizations: the Ford Foundation’s Academy for Education Development, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy and the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, the Holmes Group, and the National Network for Educational Renewal that were responding to the National Commission on Excellence in Education’s report (1983), *A Nation at Risk* (Rutter, 2011). While these four reform efforts were not completely united in their description of a future agenda, they did have two congruent themes: (1) creating partnerships
would elevate the status of teacher education, and (2) both institutions needed to renew
themselves simultaneously (Rutter, 2011). These four reform efforts shaped the collaborative
agenda of partnership work between schools and universities.

As reform agendas were implemented, interpretation of concept resulted in a disparity of
implementation and a lack of fidelity to the innovation. Meaning, the idea of collaborating was
loosely interpreted and, therefore, implemented unequally—a PDS in one context did not
necessarily mean the same kind of PDS in another context. Agreements of the partnership
characteristics and responsibilities varied among institutions, and evolutionary versions strayed
further from their ideological origins. Contributing to this diversion was the struggle over
defining a PDS. In fact, no common definition existed and the struggle remains today over two
decades later (Fields, 2009; Nolan, Mark, Grove, & Leftkowicz, 2011). Goodlad & Sirotnik
(1988) commented on this dilemma by stating,

> Any one of these terms - 'partnership,' for example - has been used to denote linking
efforts ranging from mostly symbolic, 'on paper' arrangements, to relationships based
upon patronage and small monetary grants, to one-sided, noblesse oblige, service
agreements, to information-sharing systems, to mutually collaborative arrangements
between equal partners working together to meet self-interests while solving common
problems. (p. viii)

Ideally the definition of partnership should be the last in the aforementioned list—“…a mutually
collaborative arrangement between equal partners working together to meet self-interests while
solving common problems” (p. viii), but a partnership of such existence is ideal and rarely, if
ever, exists. Goodlad & Sirotnik (1988) point out a key problem in PDS work—what is a PDS?

**Defining PDSs**

Defining a partnership is difficult. Goodlad & Sirotnik (1988) describe a range of
relationships from merely paper agreements to, what Schlechty & Whitford (1988) have
described as, organic collaboratives—two institutions who work together for a common good. In
reality, partnerships themselves were also falling somewhere into this spectrum. Some were simply partnerships merely because they used that term, but they truly were not embracing the ideals or spirit of collaboration while other partnerships were equal partners fully emerged in collaborative problem solving, but both kinds and all of the “kinds-in-between” were calling themselves PDSs. It was this disparity in definition that sparked a reaction.

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) worked exhaustively to produce standards for PDS hoping that the creation of standards would provide a framework for PDS and more fidelity to the innovation of PDS. In 2001, eighteen partnerships agreed to field test the standards and provide data and feedback for revisions over a period of three years. In addition, the standards were published on the NCATE web site inviting input from the broader PDS community. The data from the field tests and the input from the community were then used to make revisions to the standards. Ultimately, NCATE (2001) identified five main standards for PDSs: (1) Learning community; (2) Accountability and quality assurance; (3) Collaboration; (4) Diversity and equity; and (5) Structures, resources, and roles. Within each of those standards, a PDS can be at one of four levels: the beginning level, the developing level, the standard level, or the leading level. The NCATE standards describe specific criteria for each of these levels for each of the five standards. NCATE (2001) also defined PDSs by describing them as “…innovative institutions formed through partnerships between professional education programs and P-12 schools” (p. 2). By creating standards and defining PDSs, NCATE (2001) was hoping to restore fidelity to PDSs and eliminate those institutions that were not truly partnerships according to the NCATE standards.

In addition to NCATE, another national organization also hoped to restore fidelity to PDSs. Instead of using standards, however, the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS) identified principles to assist institutions in determining whether their preparation programs were, in fact, a PDS (NAPDS, 2008). They gathered twenty-two
educators representing the P-20 continuum and several educational professional organizations, who were previously involved in PDS work, to discuss this issue during a two-day summit. As an outcome of this summit, these educators agreed that in order to be characterized as a PDS, the partnership must exhibit these nine essentials:

1. A comprehensive mission that recognizes both individual needs and a shared focus to produce renewal beyond the immediacy of the institutions
2. A commitment to the preparation of highly qualified teachers
3. Engagement in professional development for all parties including personnel from both school districts and universities
4. Participation in self-reflection and an inclination towards innovation
5. Development of a stance towards inquiry through the problematization of the teaching practice
6. An articulated agreement outlining the intricate details of roles and responsibilities of both institutions
7. An ongoing governance structure
8. The creation and implementation of boundary-spanning roles
9. Shared resources and celebrations

In order to be considered a PDS, a partnership must exhibit these nine essentials, which are based upon the NCATE standards (2001). However, overseeing this process still remains the responsibility of the individual partnerships.

PDSs are charged with an ambitious mission. According to NCATE (2001), “Their mission is the professional preparation of candidates, faculty development, inquiry directed at the improvement of practice, and enhanced student learning” (p.1). In essence, in order for the PDS model to accomplish its task of improving teacher education and schooling in general, its focus cannot merely be teacher preparation. Instead, it must have a commitment to teacher candidates,
school- and university-based faculty, the administrations of both schools and institutions of higher education, the public, and ultimately the students they serve. PDSs are more than just collaborations; they are purposeful and intentional partnerships. They are a deliberate attempt to unite two institutions in an effort to work together towards a common goal: the betterment of children through teacher preparation. Such collaboration between schools and universities could be seen as an institutional shift from previous practice.

**Structures and Roles**

Partnerships require certain support structures in order to function. Those structures, as well as the roles within them, are implied in both the NCATE Standards and the NAPDS Essentials. Because partnership settings have unique characteristics, roles and structures of a PDS are unique as well.

Prior to the creation of the NCATE Standards and NAPDS Essentials, Stallings, Wiseman, & Knight (1995) presented a model for understanding PDSs as the next generation of partnership work. At the core of the model was the shared vision of the partnership. In addition to the shared vision and context, the authors included organizational structures, shared processes and products, and collaborative inquiry as required elements for a partnership to become a PDS. Their model provided a framework for understanding some critical elements of partnership work, but the authors identify one key characteristic that must be present for a partnership to become a PDS—a commitment to parity. The structures and roles in PDSs must have this commitment as well.

The foundation of the Stallings, Wiseman, & Knight (1995) model was the context; they recognize that changes in the context will affect any of the other parts of the model. However, the context of partnership work is shared. Therefore, factors that influence one institution will
ultimately influence the partnership, and factors that influence the partnership will influence the institutions. For example, changes in the school district’s budget could eventually affect its availability, resources, and/or willingness to participate in the partnership, and the same could be said for an adjustment in the university’s budget. That means that the structures and roles in the partnership are dependent upon and subject to changes in either institution that form the partnership and the partnership itself. Because the context is so critical, partnership work requires individuals who can navigate the individual cultures of both institutions by engaging in boundary-spanning work.

Goodlad (1990b) recognized that structures and roles in the partnership must transcend the boundaries of both institutions. If simultaneous renewal of schools and universities were to occur, it would need individuals from both institutions whose knowledge and dispositions were not bound by one institution. Having representation from only one institution would perpetuate the historical tensions between schools and universities because one voice would be silenced. Therefore, in true collaborative spirit, roles that represented both institutions would be a necessity. He envisioned a role that would span across the institutional borders of schools and universities in the hopes of uniting these two institutions; hybrid educators are the reality of his vision.

**Hybrid Educators Defined**

One critique of PDS work is that there is a lack of common nomenclature (Teitel, 1998), and unfortunately the same could be said for the term hybrid educator. Terms for boundary-spanning roles are often used and not clearly defined. Their meanings are inferred from the context described in the work. Synonymous terms for boundary-spanning roles include boundary or border spanners, university liaisons, teachers-on-special assignment, and clinical faculty.
While in the same family, these terms are slightly different, and the distinguishing characteristics seem to be regarding the original occupational home of the person engaging in the boundary-spanning role and the location in which the role occurs. Meaning, terms are differentiated based on whether they are university faculty or classroom teachers engaging in the boundary spanning role or whether the work takes place primarily in the university or school setting. For example, Morris, Taylor, Harrison, & Wasson (2000) and Teitel (1998) define university liaisons typically as university faculty who work in a PDS site, but Morris et al. (2000) also state that they can be experienced teachers working for the university. School liaisons are classroom teachers who maintain the same responsibilities as university liaisons in addition to their teaching responsibilities (Teitel, 1998). While not explicitly defined, Thoma, Kiger, & Thacker (2010) used the term clinical faculty to describe a classroom teacher removed from his classroom duties to work for the university. Unlike the hybrids in this study whose home base is the school district, clinical faculty—at least as described in the Thoma, Kiger, & Thacker study—were located primarily on the university campus. The Holmes Group (1986) also used the term clinical faculty to describe school-based personnel who would engage in boundary-spanning roles in a PDS setting, but again, this term was inferred and not explicitly defined.

Even more nebulous was Goodlad’s (1990b) use of the terms academic and clinical faculty. It could be assumed that his use of the term clinical faculty was to describe individuals in boundary-spanning roles working in the school-based setting, but again that definition was not explicitly stated. Abdal-Haqq (1998) used the terms clinical educator and residential clinical faculty to describe this role and offered two additional qualifying characteristics for classroom teachers engaging in boundary-spanning work: (1) the teachers would be reassigned temporarily for a two year term, and (2) the teachers must be exemplary. This qualification assumes that an exemplary classroom teacher equates to a quality hybrid educator. Miller (2008) used the term boundary spanner as a general term to describe individuals in boundary-spanning roles and did
not distinguish between school and university titles or contexts. As shown, all of these terms refer to a boundary-spanning role, but their differences are minute.

Despite the variety in terms, what is uncontested is the critical role these kinds of individuals play in boundary-spanning work; they are major actors in a PDS. John Goodlad is credited with coining the term “hybrid educator.” Goodlad’s initial use of the term hybrid educator was in reference to the critical personnel who make possible simultaneous renewal through their partnership work (Clark, et al., 2005). Hybrid educators are, “…people who work across the organizational boundaries of schools and universities” (Clark, et al., 2005, p. 1). Although Goodlad’s initial definition of the term was with regard to partnership work, Clark, et al. (2005) broadened the term hybrid educator to include individuals who cross borders within either of those institutions. While the distinctions among the terms border spanner, university and school liaisons, and clinical faculty are nuanced, the term hybrid educator would be all encompassing. Therefore, it is the evolved Goodladian definition of hybrid educator—a person, either school or university based, whose work spans across borders either inter-institutionally or intra-institutionally – that was used in this study. Figure 1-1 below more clearly depicts the concept of hybrid educator in a partnership setting.
Figure 1-1 shows a graphic representation of the role identities of hybrid educators in a PDS context. In this setting, hybrids come from two home-base contexts—universities and schools. University-based hybrid educators can be university faculty or graduate students. School-based hybrid educators can be reassigned classroom teachers or mentor teachers. Reassigned teachers are classroom teachers who voluntarily leave their classroom responsibilities to assume this role of hybrid educator for a period of one to three years. When their tenure concludes, they may return to their same school, same classroom if they choose. The other kind of hybrid educator from the school context is the mentor teacher. Mentor teachers are classroom teachers who voluntarily agree to open their doors and mentor a teacher candidate during the yearlong teacher preparation experience. All of these individuals—university faculty, graduate students, reassigned teachers, and mentor teachers—are all considered hybrid educators because their responsibilities traverse the boundaries of schools and universities.
In the context of this study, a special term is used to denote those hybrid educators who are removed from classroom and university spaces in order to work across these borders. These individuals are called Professional Development Associates (PDAs) and include university faculty, graduate students, and reassigned teachers. This particular study focuses on one specific subset of these PDAs—reassigned teachers. Throughout this study, they are sometimes referred to as school-based hybrid educators or PDAs, but they really are a specific subset of these larger terms. Part of the work of hybrid educators involves supervision. In order to understand this work of hybrid educators, it is essential to have a common understanding of supervision.

**Defining Supervision**

The scholarly field of supervision offers a variety of definitions of supervision, but scholars agree that supervision is primarily concerned with the improvement of classroom practice (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992). That concern is quite narrow for the scope of supervision is much broader and encompassing. In a PDS context, the focus of learning is not only on children, but it is also on teachers, administrators, university faculty, teacher candidates, and any other staff that work in schools because all stakeholders are invested ultimately in supporting student learning. Supervision is the means through which this learning comes to fruition.

Often a role in supervision is used interchangeably with the function of supervision, but the two are not synonymous. One common role in supervision is that of the supervisor—a person who enacts the function of supervision. Common titles in schools for those who enact this role are principals and other administrators. In universities, a commonly used term is the university supervisor who is responsible for observing and evaluating teacher candidates in their field placements. However, the literature in supervision would argue that there are more collegial forms of supervision and that teachers do partake in the role of supervisor when they enact
collegial forms of supervision like peer coaching (Nolan & Hoover, 2005). In the context of this study, the school-based hybrid educator is a supervisory role; it is a person who enacts the function of supervision. PDAs are individuals in the role of supervisor because they are the individuals who perform the function of supervision. When mentor teachers perform the function of supervision with their interns, they are engaging in a supervisory role, but they are distinguished from the PDAs because they work with only one teacher candidate in one classroom. The PDA role involves working directly with multiple teacher candidates, teachers, administrators, and others as they perform the function of supervision. Therefore, the person who enacts supervision is the supervisor, but supervision itself is not a role; it is a process or a set of functions (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001).

Supervisors are often required to perform the function of evaluation as part of their role, but supervision and evaluation are fundamentally different (Nolan, 1997). According to Nolan & Hoover (2005), supervision and evaluation have some key distinctions; they differ on purpose, rationale, scope, nature of data collection, relationship, location of expertise, and teacher perspective.

Unlike supervision whose purpose is to foster teacher growth, the purpose of evaluation is to determine minimum competence. Supervision is aimed at improving classroom practice in order to improve student learning; supervision is aimed at determining competence so that children are not hurt. Teachers and supervisors participate in supervision because teaching is a complex task. If teachers are to improve their practice, then they need a mechanism aimed at problematizing the nature of teaching in order to make sense of that complexity. On the other hand, supervisors engage in evaluation to ensure that children are protected. In order to make sense of the complexity, the scope of direct assistance in supervision is focused, selecting specific behaviors on which to collect data and analyze collaboratively. This means that the data collected for supervision are individualized based on the teacher’s needs and desires. Evaluation, on the
other hand, is more comprehensive in an attempt to gather a broader picture of a teacher’s practice, which means that the data collected, is standardized in order to compare teachers and their practices to a minimum competence level. The relationship between supervisors and teachers in supervision is aimed towards collegiality, where both participants are focused on supporting professional learning, whereas the relationship in evaluation is very hierarchical in nature; the delineation between roles is obvious with the supervisor as superior and the teacher as subordinate. In supervision, expertise is shared and recognized among the participants; both supervisors and teachers hold knowledge that each one values in the other. In evaluation, only the supervisor holds power. Finally, when teachers are participants in supervision, they are encouraged to take risks in order to understand, learn from, and improve their practice. However, when teachers are recipients of evaluation, they feel that they need to give their best effort for the evaluation. This leads to “dog and pony shows” and continues to perpetuate tensions between teachers and supervisors (Blumberg, 1980). These distinctions between supervision and evaluation demonstrate the two are fundamentally different, but the fact that supervisors are often required to perform evaluation complicates supervisor’s role and places her often in a position of conflict as she is expected to perform one function aimed at supporting teacher learning while also performing another function aimed at ensuring a teacher’s competence. Evaluation must be recognized so that the distinction between these two concepts can be understood, but for this study, supervision and evaluation are separate entities with fundamental differences.

The ultimate purpose of the function of supervision is to impact student achievement through improving instruction (Kosmoski, 2006; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) state, “The purpose of supervision is to help schools contribute more effectively to student achievement” (p. 3). When described in this manner, supervision is about leadership whose ultimate goal is to positively impact student learning, and student learning is influenced and impacted by those who work with them. Therefore, this leadership needs to be aimed at
supporting the learning of all of the individuals in the community and the learning community itself.

The Learning Community

While the ultimate product of supervision may be student achievement, the process of supervision must include a commitment to the learning community. In a learning community, all stakeholders including administrators, teachers, children, staff, and community members (e.g. parents, school board members, other politicians) learn, but individuals are not the only members. In fact, the learning community is composed of multiple learning communities as communities of practice. Lave & Wenger (1998) define communities of practice as “...a set of relations among persons, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice” (p. 98). Communities of practice contain members who participate at various and multiple levels and bring diverse interests, perspectives, and activities to the community of practice. Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) state, “Communities of practice are formed as teachers come together in a common effort to help each other teach and learn, to care for each other, and to work together in advancing student academic achievement” (p. 5). In a PDS context, communities of practice can constitute more than just teachers; they can include a combination of any of the stakeholders in the collaborative space between schools and universities. Therefore, I am defining a learning community as a collective of individuals connected through relationships and activities who compose various communities of practice and these multiple communities of practice; the learning community is both the individuals of the communities of practice and the communities of practices themselves.
Understanding Sources of Authority and Power Bases

Supervision in a learning community should involve a commitment to collegiality, and collegiality exists through dialogue. Regarding this kind of supervision, Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) state, “This supervision will be concerned with promoting a dialogue that makes professional and community values and beliefs explicit” (p. 213). To foster this kind of learning community, supervision must be enacted through moral authority.

Hybrid educators, as supervisors, bring to their work belief systems and practices that influence how they supervise. Embedded in these beliefs and practices are sources of authority and notions of power that contribute to their enactment of supervision. Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) describe five kinds of authority: bureaucratic, personal, technical-rational, professional, and moral. Each kind of authority operates with certain power bases and has implications for supervision and the learning community. Levin & Nolan (2010) describe four kinds of power bases: coercive, legitimate, expert, and referent. While no particular kind of authority uses a particular power base, individuals enacting these kinds of authority could have a tendency to utilize certain power bases. In order to understand these kinds of authorities and power bases, I draw upon the work of Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) and Levin & Nolan (2010).

Bureaucratic authority is based on coercive and legitimate power bases. Coercive power means that individuals conform because of rewards or punishments, and legitimate power means that individuals conform because they view the person in a leadership position as having the authority to do so (Levin & Nolan, 2010). Therefore, with bureaucratic authority, teachers are expected to behave in accordance with the rules and regulations or they will experience consequences (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). While this kind of authority is not always adversarial, it has a tendency to create that kind of environment.

Personal authority is based on referent power. Referent power means that individuals conform because they like the authority figure as a person (Levin & Nolan, 2010). Sergiovanni &
Starratt (2007) explain that personal authority exists when, “…teachers are expected to respond to our personality and the pleasant environment we provide, behaving appropriately for the rewards we make available in exchange” (p. 204). Teachers in these contexts respond because they like the authority figure and have a congenial relationship with the individual.

Technical-rational authority exists "in the form of evidence derived from logic and scientific research. When we base supervisory practice on the authority of technical rationality, teachers are expected to respond in light of what is considered to be truth” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007, p. 204). Therefore, technical-rational authority operates with legitimate and expert power bases. Expert power means that individuals conform because of the person of authority’s extensive and respected knowledge (Levin & Nolan, 2010). Therefore, when this kind of authority exists, individuals operate because of data and evidence rather than out of a fondness for each other or the person of authority.

Professional authority recognizes that all individuals in the learning community have valued expertise. Teachers under this authority respond out of socialization to the community and the individual expertise present among the individual members of the community. In some ways, professional authority operates with expert power, but expert power is not to one individual of authority, but rather each individual has authority because of their valued knowledge and expertise in the community. Because teachers conform through socialization, referent power is most likely also in operation, meaning that teachers under professional authority respond out of a fondness for other members of the community.

Finally, moral authority exists not in response to an individual but rather to the expected norms and the ideals of the community. Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) explain that moral authority exists "…in the form of obligations and duties derived from widely shared values, ideas, and ideals. When we base supervisory practice on moral authority, teachers are expected to respond to shared commitments and interdependence” (p. 205). Teachers, therefore, are not
responding because of extrinsic rewards or punishments, expertise, individual status, or a fondness for others, they are instead responding out of commitment to a community rather than an individual. This kind of authority operates under a power base that I call communal power, which would be an addition to the Levin & Nolan (2010) power bases. With communal power, the power lies not with an individual but with the collective whole; individuals respond because of their shared values, beliefs, and norms and out of the collective good rather than for individual profit. When defined in this manner, supervision is not one individual but rather an idea of leadership governed by the collective members of the community who are interdependent and functioning out of communal power from the shared values, norms, and ideas of the community.

The first three kinds of authority—bureaucratic, personal, and technical-rational—present more hierarchical forms of supervision. A power dynamic exists between the individual or individuals who have the authority and choose to operate through these kinds of hierarchical authority. With professional and moral authority, the power is more equalized and exists not in an individual but rather in the community. While learning can occur in contexts that function with all of these kinds of authority, some tend to be more adversarial than others. That is not to say that conflict does not exist in all kinds of authority. In fact, just the opposite is true. Conflict exists in all, but it is the manner in which the members of the community respond and operate that determines the source of authority. When individuals respond because of norms, expectations, and interdependence rather than to a single, named authority, they engage in dialogue that addresses conflicting ideas and opinions; they are motivated by their role, relationship, and commitment to the learning community rather than an individual of authority.

When Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) described the existence of these sources of authority, they described them by indicating how teachers would respond in the community. The learning community, however, is much broader than just teachers. It includes administrators, teachers, staff, children, and community members. This definition of learning community is situated in a
school district context, but when it is applied to a professional development school context, the learning community extends beyond the school and district community to include the university community. Therefore, university faculty and administration would also have to be included as members of the learning community. This inclusion means that teachers are not the sole responders to the source of authority, but all members of the learning community respond or conform based upon the sources of authority and power bases employed. Therefore, when enacting supervision, hybrid educators have the opportunity to impact or influence the learning community and the members of the learning community depending upon the sources of authority and the notions of power that influence their practices. These constructs provide structures for understanding the beliefs that influence the practices of supervisors.

**An Operational Definition**

In order to define supervision, it is essential to understand the sources of authority and the kinds of power bases present in the community. Supervision as leadership means that authority must come from a source albeit an individual or the community, and this source of authority operates with certain power bases. Experts have defined supervision as leadership whose ultimate goal is to positively impact student learning (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007), but I would extend the ultimate goal as not simply student learning but rather the learning of all members in the learning community. Therefore, supervision is complex leadership aimed at positively impacting the learning of the individuals, the communities of practice, and collective whole of the learning community. The work of hybrid educators is to enact this complex leadership.
Hybrid Educators as Supervisors

Hybrid educators in the learning community enact supervision. How they choose to function and through what kind of power and source of authority they choose to employ determines the kind of impact on the learning community. Those who enact supervision are in the role of supervisor, and hybrid educators are supervisors in a professional development school context because they engage in leadership practices in a context aimed at renewing, or positively impacting, schools and universities. The roles and responsibilities of hybrid educators are connected to field based experiences, and these individuals are the connecting individuals between schools and universities for these practicum experiences.

In the professional development school context, hybrid educators can be university faculty, graduate students, or reassigned classroom teachers. As supervisors, they perform many supervisory tasks. Kosmoski (2006) describes supervisors’ tasks as including: (A) preliminary tasks—developing curriculum, finding appropriate staff, and providing necessary facilities; (B) developmental tasks—coordinating inservice activities and evaluating staff, and (C) operational tasks—organizing the environment for instruction, acting as a resource by providing materials, orienting new staff, relating special services for students, and supporting public relations. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) identify supervisors’ tasks as direct assistance, group development, professional development, curriculum development, and action research. Both Kosmoski’s (2006) and Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) identification of supervisory tasks are intended for school systems, but they can be applied to professional development school contexts with some modification; those models alone are not adequate for describing the supervisory work of hybrid educators. In the next section, I describe a conceptual framework for understanding supervision in this context.
A Conceptual Framework for Studying Supervision in a PDS Context

Glickman, Gordan, & Ross-Gordan, (2001) created a framework for understanding the process of supervision. Their framework, as shown in Figure 1-2, includes a series of prerequisite skills of the supervisor in order for the supervisor to engage in the function of supervision; their function of supervision is developmental. Therefore, the process of supervision is to meet the developmental needs of teachers. This function of supervision is met through a series of five tasks that work towards the unification of two goals, which result in one final product—improved student achievement—their ultimate purpose of supervision.

Prerequisites

Prerequisites are the required skills the supervisor needs in order to carry out the function of supervision successfully. The authors identify three prerequisite skills: (1) knowledge, (2)
interpersonal skills, and (3) technical skills. Supervisors must have knowledge about schools, school effectiveness and the research related to school effectiveness, adult and teacher development, effective teaching and instructional practices, and supervision. Supervisors must have an understanding of the complexity of interpersonal behaviors among individuals and groups and how their interpersonal behaviors affect those individuals and groups. Supervisors must also possess the technical skills involved in fostering professional growth. These others include skills such as observing, planning, assessing, and evaluating instructional performance. These three prerequisites must be present in order for the function of supervision to be carried out as defined in this model.

**Function**

In this model, the function of supervision is developmental; meaning as the process of supervision is enacted, it is not uniform. One of the prerequisites of supervisors is knowledge about teachers as adults and adult learners. Supervision is differentiated to meet the varying developmental needs of the individual teachers in the school building. To apply that same concept to field experiences, developmental supervision in field experiences is differentiated to meet the different needs of teacher candidates as they are placed in their various contexts; it is not uniform across all placements. Essentially, developmental supervision is differentiated based on the needs of its participants; it is teacher-centered or teacher candidate-centered.

**Tasks**

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon identify five tasks as the functions of developmental supervision. They are: (1) direct assistance, (2) group development, (3) professional development, (4) curriculum development, and (5) action research. All of these tasks are focused on improving instruction and are not necessarily mutually exclusive; they may overlap.
Direct assistance provides feedback or facilitates feedback opportunities. These encounters between supervisors and teachers can range from more supervisor-directed to more collaborative or teacher-directed. Therefore, concepts such as scientific supervision (McNeil, 1980), artistic supervision (Eisner, 1980), clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969), and peer coaching (Nolan & Hoover, 2005) would all fit into this task of direct assistance.

Supervisors may improve instruction through group meetings and group development. In these encounters, supervisors bring teachers together to solve common problems. Group dynamics, leadership styles, and individual roles affect how well the group functions. In group development, one responsibility of supervisors is to resolve conflict. Faculty meetings could be one example of a group meeting in a school context. Therefore, the second task of the supervisor is group development.

A third task of supervision is professional development. Professional development can be more uniform or individualized. If supervision is developmental, then professional development needs to also meet the readiness (Thompson, 1997) and developmental needs of teachers (Glickman, 2004; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001; Long, 2004). There are also alternative formats to professional development. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) consider the following to be alternative formats: mentoring, skill development workshops, teacher centers, weeklong teacher institutes, collegial support groups, networks, teacher leadership, teacher as writer, individually planned professional development, and partnerships between schools and universities. Supervisors engage in tasks that facilitate the professional learning experiences of themselves and others; they determine the extent to which the professional development experience is more uniformly based or more individually based. Examples in school settings could include in-service days, whereas examples in field experience contexts could include after school seminars as part of their coursework. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) include PDS contexts in this category, but I would argue that this placement
oversimplifies this construct and does not recognize its full potential; this placement demonstrates the authors’ limited understanding of partnership work. Instead, I argue that PDS contexts should be the example that illuminates and explains supervision in ways that have the opportunity to renew both schools and universities – a much more complex and tenacious reform agenda than simply schools and school districts.

A fourth task of supervision is curriculum development to improve instruction. Supervisors must determine the extent to which they involve teachers in the process. They must assess the commitment their staff has with regard to making curricular change, their ability to thinking about curricular change, and their expertise in understanding how to write curriculum. They also must decide to what extent the curriculum will be developed internally or externally and to what extent the curriculum is open to review, discussion, adaption, and development with teacher involvement. An example of curriculum development with a higher degree of teacher involvement in a school context would be a unit planning meeting where teams of teachers gather to discuss the upcoming unit of instruction and make curricular decisions and revisions on the unit.

The fifth task of supervision identified in the framework is action research. In this model, the school is the center of inquiry and all of the tasks of supervision can be united under this one. Some have called action research teacher inquiry. Teacher inquiry is the systematic study of one’s own practice (Dana & Yendol-Silva, 2009). As such, it addresses the teacher’s readiness because it meets the teacher’s individual needs; it addresses her questions. Supervisors can support teacher inquiry, engage in inquiry themselves, or collaborate in inquiries. Engaging in action research works toward solving meaningful problems.
**Unification and Product**

The process of supervision in this model is developmental. It is carried out through five tasks. These tasks bring together both teacher needs and organizational goals. When supervision is differentiated, it meets teachers’ needs while simultaneously meeting the organizational goals. These goals then work towards the product of student achievement, which is the ultimate purpose of supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).

**Adding to the Framework**

The Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) framework for supervision was envisioned for schools, not for field experiences. At present, no framework exists for understanding supervision in teacher education nor supervision in professional development school contexts. However, with some adjustments, I argue that this framework can be an acceptable beginning model for explaining supervision in a PDS context because supervision in schools and supervision in field experiences has many similarities.

Figure 1-3 shows the Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon framework for supervision for schools but with some modifications. All changes are in red, and there are changes in all categories of the framework. I will describe each of the changes in this next section.
**Personal characteristics.** Glikman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) identify certain categories—knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills—as the required skills supervisors need to have in order to perform supervision. I would argue that supervisors bring to their work more than simply a set of skills; they also bring a set of values, beliefs, and dispositions to their work. For this reason, I argue that the heading of personal characteristics is more encompassing to consider these additional facets of supervisors as complex beings.

**Knowledge.** Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) identify a knowledge base for supervisors claiming that supervisors need to have knowledge about schools, school systems, school effectiveness, and current research about school effectiveness. They also must have an understanding of adult and teacher development, effective teaching and instructional practices,
and supervision. For supervision in PDS contexts, supervisors must have knowledge about the aforementioned topics, partnerships as organizations, building and sustaining relationships, partnerships, and learning communities, and knowledge about teacher education and effective pedagogy for teacher education.

Loughran (2006) argued that teacher education has a specific knowledge base. A teacher educator must not only have knowledge about teaching, but she must also have knowledge about teaching about teaching or what he called a pedagogy of teacher education. Hybrid educators are teacher education supervisors, and, therefore, they must have this additional knowledge base. Teacher education does not simply apply to teacher candidates, but rather teacher education encompasses the professional learning of teachers beginning with their preparation and continuing throughout their careers. Since traditional school supervisors also work with teachers and work to foster their professional learning, they are in essence teaching about teaching; therefore, it could be argued that knowledge about a pedagogy of teacher education should be part of supervisors’ prerequisites.

Interpersonal skills. In Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) model, they state that supervisors must have the skills to understand and foster relationships with teachers and among teachers. They also must understand how the interpersonal behaviors affect the teachers as individuals and the teachers collectively. Supervisors in a PDS context must not only possess these skills, but they also must have the interpersonal skills to foster relationships among teachers, teacher candidates, university faculty, administrators, and children. For example, supervisors must create triadic relationships. One common example of this kind of relationship is among teacher, teacher candidate, and supervisor, but other possible configurations could include: (1) teacher, teacher candidate, and student; (2) teacher, teacher candidate, and class; (3) teacher, teacher, and teacher candidate; (4) teacher candidate, university faculty, and teacher; (5) teacher, teacher candidate, and school curriculum; and (6) teacher, supervisor, and teacher education
curriculum. These are just some of the many possible triadic configurations that supervisors facilitate among and between entities in the learning community.

The nature of supervision in this context is quite complex. Relationships are at the heart of partnership work, and in order to build and sustain this kind of robust learning community, supervisors must have the skills to do so. They must be able to forge relationships among all members and entities of the learning community.

**Technical skills.** In Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) model, they claim that supervisors must have technical skills in order to perform the developmental function of supervision. Those skills include observing, planning, assessing, and evaluating instructional performance. Hybrid educators engage in all of these skills, and they sometimes do them collaboratively. In other words, hybrid educators may observe a teacher candidate, and they may also observe a teacher with the teacher candidate sitting alongside of the supervisor as the supervisor points to specific pedagogical practices of the teacher. This kind of co-observation allows teacher candidates to see the intricacies and complexities of teaching-in-action.

Hybrid educators also plan. They plan with other hybrids for teacher candidates’ coursework, meetings, teacher professional development opportunities, and other teacher education functions. They also may collaboratively plan with a teacher candidate or even a teacher candidate and the teacher regarding an upcoming lesson.

Hybrid educators also assess. In particular, they assess teacher candidates’ performance both in the classroom and in their coursework. If requested, they may also support a teacher in engaging in self-assessment.

While hybrid educators do not evaluate teachers, they do evaluate teacher candidates’ performance. However, they often do not engage in this process alone. Whereas some teacher preparation models may ask for limited input from the cooperating teacher, oftentimes hybrid educators will sit alongside of the teacher and evaluate the candidates’ performance together.
In addition to the skills of observing, planning, assessing, and evaluating, supervisors must have the technical skills of communicating, conferencing, listening, and inquiry. Supervisors must be excellent communicators in order to understand and foster the interpersonal behaviors and the relationships among entities in a professional development school context. They must also be able to conference. Meaning, they must be able to discuss performance and data with another individual, and they conference with teacher candidates’ about their performance, with teachers about teacher candidates’ performance, and sometimes with teachers and teacher candidates about either one’s performance. Supervisors must be excellent listeners. They need to listen to teachers, teacher candidates, administrators, university faculty, staff, and students regarding their learning needs as members of the community. Supervisors must be adept at inquiry. They must be able to problematize practice or have an understanding of what it means to examine problems of the teaching practice to support others in this endeavor. They must be able to identify appropriate mechanisms for gathering data to examine these problems as inquiring questions. They must be able to analyze data and, beyond that, facilitate the conversation so that others can appropriately, adequately, and effectively analyze data to draw conclusions about their own practice. Finally, they must be reflective and be able to support others’ reflective practices. Supervisors in a PDS context must have extensive technical skills.

**Beliefs.** While supervision is a process, the supervisor is a role—a role enacted by a human, a person who espouses beliefs and assumptions and enacts them in practice sometimes in alignment with her beliefs and sometimes not in alignment with those beliefs. What is missing from the Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon framework is an understanding of the beliefs of the supervisor who engages in the function of supervision. In addition to knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills, supervisors also must possess belief systems about their practice. For that reason, I placed beliefs under the prerequisite category in their framework.
Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) offer four extreme images of the supervisor. They call them Supervisor A, B, C, & D, and I have added subtitles as descriptors to help distinguish among them. I also added potential sources of authority and power bases to each caricature in order to depict a more complete description of the image. Table 1-1 shows a visual representation of the combination of these models and my own additions. While a supervisor will most likely not exclusively exist as one of the four caricatures, these depictions create images of supervision that demonstrate potential belief systems, and these belief systems are part of the conceptual framework for understanding the process of supervision.

Table 1-1: A Visual Representation of the Revised Images of Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Burns, 2012)</th>
<th>(Sergiovanni &amp; Starratt, 2007)</th>
<th>(Levin &amp; Nolan, 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source of Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Monitor</td>
<td>Scientific Management Era</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency &amp; Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring, Telling,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating, Hierarchical &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delineated Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Congeniality</td>
<td>Human Relations Model</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships Above All Else!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congeniality &amp; Comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Critical Friend</td>
<td>Relationships &amp; Discomfort</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Dissatisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Organic Member</td>
<td>Indiscernible Learning Community &amp;</td>
<td>Moral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Garman, 1982)</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Values &amp; Norms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Supervisor A: The monitor.* This archetype stems from the industrial revolution era when the focus on schools was efficiency. This era in supervision was called the scientific management era (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992; McNeil, 1980; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The belief was that
the system was not the issue, but rather it was the workers within the system that were the problem. In order to make the system better and more efficient, the workers needed better training. To apply this notion to schools and supervision, teachers are the issue. Teachers will be held accountable for their actions and trained appropriately. They need better training in order to produce better students. Therefore, Supervisor A is a monitor. She is concerned with monitoring the behaviors of the teachers and evaluating their performance. She will tell teachers what they are doing wrong in order to better train them, fix them, and make them more efficient. The monitor has great control over the supervisory process and the teachers have very little voice and power. The relationship is very hierarchical and delineated; it is obvious who is supervisor and who is teacher—who is manager and who is subordinate. This supervisor tends to draw upon bureaucratic sources of authority and legitimate and reward/coercive power bases. Meaning, teachers respond to this supervisor because she is in a position of power.

*Supervisor B: Ms. Congeniality.* The heart of this caricature is the relationships, for they matter above all else in this image of supervision, which stems from the human relations model of supervision. Unlike the monitor whose focus was mostly on the behavior, this supervisor truly has an interest in the teachers as individuals and as people. She is concerned about their interests, their happiness, and their wellbeing. She is also concerned with her relationship with them and their relationships among each other. Ms. Congeniality wants to make sure that teachers are involved and participating, so she involves them in the process hoping that this voice will give them happiness. They spend time together as a staff and they socialize after hours recognizing the value that these gatherings have on maintaining relationships. There is a true fondness and congeniality for one another and their relationship is nonthreatening, but there is no dedication to the learning community. Discord is quickly remedied because everything is sacrificed at the expense of the relationship since the relationship must be preserved above all else. This
supervisor tends to draw upon personal authority and referent power; teachers respond to this supervisor because they like her as a person.

*Supervisor C: The critical friend.* There are many similarities between Supervisor B: Ms. Congeniality and Supervisor C: The Critical Friend. Supervisor C also recognizes the value of the relationships and cares about the teachers as individuals, but there is one key difference. This image of supervision has an element of mutual dissatisfaction – a key ingredient that connects both the supervisor and the teachers to the learning community. Supervisor C maintains the integrity and worthiness of the teacher while creating a feeling of collaborative problem solving. In this image, there is authentic participation in the decision-making process. Supervisor C is focused on creating an environment that fosters teacher learning. Her belief is best summed up by the statement, “Give people the responsibility and authority to make decisions about how they are to work, and they respond with increased motivation” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007, p. 13).

Teachers in this model feel a sense of importance and are more empowered than the other images presented so far. This supervisor tends to draw upon professional authority and referent and expert power bases. Meaning, teachers respond to this supervisor because of the supervisory environment she creates and because they care about the individuals in the community. Both the supervisor and the teachers hold expertise, and that expertise is recognized and valued among all participants in the community.

*Supervisor D: The organic member.* This title of Organic Member comes from Garman’s (1982) work around collegiality in supervision. She describes collegiality as a frame of mind—a mindset that supervisors bring to their work with teachers—and her one frame of mind is the organic member. In her description, an organic member as supervisor is indiscernible from the teacher as participant. Since I could see parallels between Garman’s (1982) description of collegiality and Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) images of supervision, I decided to use Garman’s label for this image.
While this image builds upon Supervisor C, it adds an additional layer by addressing commitment to the learning community. This supervisor recognizes the shared values of the community and actuates them in professional and/or community norms. Supervision becomes a way of being—a norm—and it is embedded in the culture. The power differential between supervisor and teacher is the lowest in this image as the two are indistinguishable among the participants in the community because the participants are engaging in various supervisory roles with the common agenda as the ultimate goal. The Organic Member sees her role as helping others to find the leadership potential in themselves and in others in order to better the learning community rather than coming to the rescue of the individual; she is known as a transformational leader (Nolan, Badiali, McDonough, & Bauer, 2007). The learning community is moving forward because of its dedicated participants who are willing to collaboratively problem solve for the betterment of each other and the common good. This supervisor tends to draw upon moral authority and communal power. Meaning, teachers respond because both the supervisor and they are committed to the shared values and norms of the learning community; the power lies in the learning community.

These four images—The Monitor, Ms. Congeniality, The Critical Friend, and The Organic Member—offer extreme depictions of supervisors and their belief systems. The likelihood that a supervisor will align perfectly with a particular image is slim; it is more likely that a supervisor would exhibit predominant behaviors towards one or express beliefs towards one or more and exhibit behaviors towards other images. What these images do provide is a beginning framework for understanding the espoused platforms and the platforms-in-action that supervisors bring to their practice.

**Function: Supervision as professional development.** Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) described the function of supervision as being developmental. Their argument is that supervision needs to be developmentally appropriate in order to meet teacher’s needs. While
I am not arguing against their notions of developmentally appropriate practice, I am proposing that the function of supervision is more accurately portrayed as professional development. This function includes any differentiation that a supervisor must incorporate in order to perform her tasks so that everyone learns. If supervision is complex leadership aimed at positively impacting the learning of all community members, including herself, then learning needs to be the focus of supervision. Professional development of all stakeholders describes the means through which a supervisor can perform her tasks to reach the goal of improved learning.

Professional development exists in all of the tasks. Direct assistance is a form of individual professional development because supervisors are working mostly with teachers, teacher candidates, and other supervisors to improve their practice as teachers, as mentors, as teacher educators, and as supervisors. In community development, supervisors bring together groups of people to problem solve. By problem solving, both individuals and groups are expanding their knowledge of the problem at hand, the potential solutions, and the possible problems that could arise. Learning occurs in the task of community development, and learning is professional development. Learning structures are additional strategies for fostering professional learning in all stakeholders. These structures are aimed at both individual learning and group learning. Curriculum development involves not only developing curriculum but supporting others as they engage in this task. In curriculum development, participants are expanding their knowledge about the curriculum and their practice of implementing the curriculum. In action research, supervisors are both exploring problems and supporting others as they delve into this problem-solving process. Action research is aimed at improving instructional practice; therefore, it is a task aimed at professional learning. Finally, supervisors teach, which means that their goal is the stakeholders’—more commonly teachers’ and teacher candidates’—learning. In all of the tasks, the thread of professional learning prevails. It is this recurrent theme that indicates that the function of supervision is professional development.
Beliefs-in-Action. In Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) model, they use arrows to show the implementation of supervision as a function through supervisory tasks. In essence, these arrows indicate practice or rather they should mean beliefs-in-action, which are practices. I have added the category of Beliefs-in-Action to clearly show that as supervisors enact the tasks of supervision as professional development, they are enacting their beliefs through practices. Sometimes these practices are in alignment with their beliefs, and sometimes they are not. The purpose of including this category was to draw attention to the fact that practices are supervisors’ beliefs-in-action.

Tasks. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) identified five tasks to perform supervision as developmental. They included direct assistance, group development, professional development, curriculum development, and action research. In a professional development school context, some of these tasks remain the same and some are altered slightly. The tasks in a professional development school context include direct assistance, community development, learning structures, curriculum development, action research, and teaching—a sixth task.

Direct assistance. As outlined by Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001), the task of direct assistance involves giving feedback or facilitating feedback opportunities. Included in this task is a range of technical-helping models to support the improvement of teacher practices, and these models range from more supervisor-directed to more collaborative or teacher-directed. In a PDS context, supervisors must engage in direct assistance not only with teachers but also primarily with teacher candidates. For example, this means that supervisors may engage in clinical supervision with the teacher candidate as participant, the teacher as participant, or both the teacher candidate and the teacher simultaneously as participants. Supervision in a PDS context adds an additional layer of direct assistance practices by including teacher candidates as additional participants. Supervision in teacher education has a reputation for being evaluative and isolated in nature. Meaning, supervisors would visit sporadically, maybe two or three times in a
fifteen-week period, and observe and evaluate the teacher candidate. In a PDS context, while supervision as evaluation exists and would fit under this category of direct assistance, the practices in this context are much more connected and complex. They can involve both mentor and teacher candidate and occur on a much more frequent basis, even as often as on a weekly basis.

**Community development.** Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) describe group development as a task of supervision. They claim that group development involves bringing teachers together to problem solve. Supervisors in this setting are facilitators of these groups and resolvers of conflict in order to foster productive and functioning groups. Instead of being group development in a PDS context, I am calling this task community development. Hybrid educators bring together many groups of individuals and they do so in order to build, sustain, and foster the learning community and the various micro communities within that learning community. For example, hybrid educators can bring together teachers, teacher candidates, administrators, or a combination of stakeholders to discuss and problem solve concerns in the learning community. Since hybrid educators are charged with building, supporting, sustaining, and improving the learning community and its members, they engage in tasks that are aimed at this broader mission.

**Learning structures.** Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) third task is professional development. They include a great variety of formats that fit into this task. These formats of professional development range from individual ones such as individualized learning plans to group-oriented ones such as collegial support groups. In their model, professional development is a task and not the function. However, in this new model, the function becomes professional development rather than developmental.

Learning structures would address the readiness and developmental needs of teachers like research suggests regarding professional development (Glickman, 2004; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001; Long, 2004; Thompson, 1997). These learning structures are kinds of groups
or strategies that foster professional learning either individually or in a group, which is similar to
the original conceptual model. If the function of supervision is professional development, then it
was important to rename this task to avoid confusion. Learning structures are specific and
individual strategies for fostering individual, group, and community learning.

**Curriculum development.** In the conceptual model for understanding supervision in a
professional development school context, the task of curriculum development remains largely the
same. In schools, supervisors can write curriculum and they can decide the extent to which
teachers will be involved in this process. In professional development school contexts,
supervisors collaboratively engage in negotiating the teacher preparation curriculum so that it will
be more meaningful, relevant, and coherent, and it will contain a shared vision for both schools
and universities. Either way, various stakeholders are involved in the curriculum development
process and their learning is altered by participating in these experiences.

**Action research.** Like curriculum development, the task of action research is relatively
unaltered to the task Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) outlined. Hybrids engage in
inquiry themselves and they also support others—other hybrids, teacher candidates, teachers,
administrators, or inquiry teams consisting of a combination of these individuals—in action
research. Since action research is aimed at improving the professional learning of the individuals
engaging in the research; the function of professional development is at work.

**Teaching as task.** Teaching was not listed as one of Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) model, but it is a task that hybrid educators perform. Supervision in field
experiences is part of a university preparation program for teacher candidates. Therefore,
supervisors are required to teach coursework. For example, hybrid educators teach methods
coursework and seminars in pedagogy, professionalism, inquiry, and cultural proficiency for
teacher candidates as well as coursework like mentoring or discipline-specific pedagogical
courses for teachers. These examples, though, are more formalized aspects of teaching; hybrid educators also teach through modeling in classrooms.

Hybrids can teach in classrooms. For example, they might teach a station alongside their teacher candidate, they might teach a station so that their teacher candidate can observe the teacher, or they may even co-teach with the teacher depending on the situation. These more informal roles of teaching show that teaching is a task. Hybrids teach both pedagogy and pedagogy of teacher education.

It could be argued that teaching as a task is also appropriate for schools. In fact, Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) argued that one of the tasks of supervisory leadership was to engage in the teaching of demonstration lessons. While these demonstration lessons are not the same as teaching coursework to teacher candidates or teaching in classrooms alongside teachers and teacher candidates, the concepts could fall under the umbrella task of teaching. This task of teaching was missing from the framework for supervision for schools. By adding it to this framework, the Glickman, Gordon, Ross-Gordon (2001) framework of supervision for schools is a more appropriate conceptual framework for studying supervision in a PDS context.

**Unification.** Like the Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) model, the tasks work towards unifying organizational goals and teacher needs. In the amended model, the unification is of the organizational goals and the needs of the community members rather than just teacher needs. With regard to organizational goals, they include the school’s goals, the district’s goals, the university’s goals, and the partnership’s goals. Each organizational goal should be valued, discussed, negotiated, and understood in the supervisory process. When the purpose of supervision is defined as impacting the learning community, then it is essential that all stakeholders’ needs and not just teachers’ needs are addressed. For these reasons, the unification labels included more organizations’ goals in the organizational goals label and community members’ needs in place of teachers’ needs.
Outcomes. In the Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) model, they saw student learning as the ultimate product of supervision. The word product is rooted in industrial terms; its definition means the result of manufacturing. Conceptualizing the results of supervision in this manner recreates the historical notions of supervision as being a process-product focused on efficiency. While supervision will have results, I feel that the word “outcomes” is a more appropriate term for describing these results. Instead of the product being the improved learning of students, this modified model focuses on outcomes and incorporates the learning of all community members and the learning community itself. Students are considered part of the learning community. Therefore, by renaming this grouping to include both students and the learning community more broadly, the new grouping is more encompassing and aligns with the broader mission of supervision in this context.

Combining the Models

Figure 1-3 shows a beginning conceptual framework for understanding supervision in a PDS context. This model combines Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) images of supervision and Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon’s (2001) framework of supervision for successful schools. Since no previous model exists, together they create a conceptual framework for studying supervision in a professional development school context. This combined model includes the influence of the beliefs and practices of the supervisor during the process of supervision. It shows how the influence of those beliefs enacted through the caricatures of supervision influence the supervisory process. The function of supervision is professional development rather than developmental because professional learning is at the core of all of the supervisor’s tasks. Supervision as professional development is a process enacted through the supervisor’s beliefs and practices as beliefs-in-action as she engages in the supervisory tasks. The caricatures appear in the diagram as arrows because they are the supervisor’s beliefs in practice. Essentially they are
the implementation of the supervisor’s beliefs, and her actions will determine whether an alignment exists between those espoused beliefs and their practices. These six tasks, which includes the additional task of teaching—a necessary supervisory task in a PDS context—work towards the unification of the community members’ needs and the various organizations’ goals, which ultimately result in the ultimate product of improved learning for the community and its individual members. This combined model acts as a beginning conceptual framework for this study, which examines more closely the supervisory practices of two school-based novice supervisors in a professional development school context.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to orient the reader to the broader context in which this study is situated, offer a rationale for the need for this study, and provide a conceptual framework for understanding supervision in a professional development school context. The political climate for educational reform is evolving. Historically, students’ learning, curriculum, and teachers’ practices have been scrutinized as areas for reform. The focus is shifting, and teacher education is coming under this microscope. Studying teacher educators and more specifically those teacher educators who are supervisors in a context aimed at simultaneous renewal of two educational institutions is a proactive approach for reframing the narrative of educational reform. At present, little has been written about the intersection of supervision, teacher education, and professional development schools. This study aimed to contribute to that opportunity in the literature.

The purpose of this study was to understand the supervisory practices of a school-based hybrid educator in a PDS context. As a boundary-spanning role, the school-based hybrid educator is a PDS construct and is a critical role in partnership work. PDSs are intentional partnerships created to bring about simultaneous renewal for teaching and teacher education. They are
catalysts for change, and they are envisioned as one of the solutions to the woes of teacher education as being intellectually weak and lacking a coherent curriculum, shared vision, and rigor. The next section will describe more specifically the scholarly literature that informed this study.
CHAPTER 2
A REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

The lives of teachers are not their own. Schedules determine their classes and bells signal the start and end of their days. Others evaluate their performance and control their professional learning. These feelings of loss of control dis-empower teachers and de-professionalize teaching. Scholars and politicians alike can agree that attracting and retaining teachers is a problem, and the mechanisms for accomplishing such tasks are even less in accordance. What are needed are structures and roles that empower teachers and foster their professional learning.

In the previous chapter, I outlined the need for the research and offered a conceptual framework for studying supervision in a professional development school (PDS) context. This next section is dedicated to reviewing the scholarly literature that informed this study. As a case study examining the supervisory practices of two school-based hybrid educators in a PDS context, the bodies of knowledge that informed this study included professional development schools and more specifically the role of the hybrid educator, supervision, and professional development.

The PDS Movement

“A PDS is a place where the wisdom of practice joins the wisdom of practitioners in such a way that no one claims to have superior expertise simply by virtue of his or her credentials or by their years in the classroom.”
(Nolan, Badiali, Bauer, & McDonough, 2007, p. 116)

A Brief History

Building relationships between schools and universities is not a new concept. In fact, the genesis of collaborative work began with the meeting of the Committee of Ten, a convening body
of 47 university faculty and 42 school staff in 1892 whose intentions were to discuss the improvement of teacher preparation (Clark, 1988). But similar to current experience, this gathering was not free of apprehension and anxiety. Historically, a tension has existed between schools and universities with regard to teacher preparation (Bernson & Breault, 2000; Teitel, 2003), and this tension dates back to the 1880s during the creation of entrance examinations into post-secondary education (Clark, 1988). These tensions contributed to the stressed relationships between two institutions that held responsibility for the teaching profession – schools and universities. Tense relationships inhibited communication between them and consequently contributed to the disjointed and unconnected curriculum of teacher education (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

Rutter (2011) examined the reform catalysts and the subsequent movement that led to the creation of PDSs, their purpose, and their vision. She found that in the 1980s, society was frustrated and dissatisfied with the state of education and the quality of teaching. Consequently, as a call for reform, four organizations were created to address these issues; they were the Ford Foundation’s Academy for Education Development, a blue ribbon panel supported by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy and the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession; the Holmes Group; and the National Network for Educational Renewal. Different funding sources supported all of these groups, which created slightly different agendas in their reform initiatives. Rutter (2011) found that despite this diversity, two main commonalities existed—the professional status of teaching needed to be elevated and schools would need to be restructured in order to accommodate and support teachers as professionals. These reform efforts determined the purpose and vision for partnership work. More formalized versions of partnership work could be seen in the laboratory school movement, the portal school movement, and the professional development school (PDS) movement, which were also termed professional practice schools (Levine, 1992), in

Abraham Flexner is credited as the father of PDS with his vision of applying the model of the medical school hospital to teacher preparation (Levine, 1992). In the 1980s, a nationwide consortium of leaders from major research universities gathered together to rethink teacher education. Known as The Holmes Group, their mission was to improve the quality of teacher education and raise the status of the teaching profession. They advocated for the creation of PDSs as a means through which their reform could be actualized (The Holmes Group, 1986).

The Holmes Group built from Flexner’s work when they stated, “Professional Development Schools, the analogue of medical education's teaching hospitals, would bring practicing teachers and administrators together with university faculty in partnerships that improve teaching and learning on the part of their respective students” (p. 56). Just as medical hospitals served the public by engaging in top-notch and cutting-edge medical techniques based on the blending of research and practice, PDSs would produce the same results with regard to teaching and teacher preparation. Abdal-Haqq (1998) commented, “Because PDSs would be designed and implemented by school-college partnerships, they were envisioned as institutional settings that would be both models of best P-12 practice and optimum sites for clinical preparation of novice teachers” (p. 2). PDSs, then, should be exemplars of teaching, research, and disposition because they serve as the practical setting for teacher candidates’ clinical experiences.

The Holmes Group (1986) added,

(PDSs) would provide superior opportunities for teachers and administrators to influence the development of their profession, and for university faculty to increase the professional relevance of their work, through (1) mutual deliberation on problems with student learning and their possible solutions; (2) shared teaching in the university and schools; (3) collaborative research on the problems of educational practice; and (4) cooperative supervision of prospective teachers and administrators. (p. 56)
Described in this manner, The Holmes Group outlined the potential outcomes of PDS work and the means through which these processes would occur. Lieberman (1998) noted,

As part of a five-point agenda, the idea of a professional development school is to create a partnership between a given number of schools and a university; rethink the preparation of preservice education students; provide professional development for the experienced teachers from whom novices will learn; model exemplary practices that will lead to student achievement of a high order; and provide sustained, applied inquiry for both students and faculty in both institutions. (p. vi)

The reach of PDS work is wide, encompassing teacher preparation and professional development. As vehicles of renewal, their purpose is to elevate the status of teacher education while simultaneously professionalizing the teaching practice. PDSs are a collaborative model; they are partnerships between schools and universities whose common agenda are the aforementioned goals. Collaboration is the interwoven theme around which everything else depends; it is the heart of PDS work.

**The Challenge of Culture**

Collaboration seems like an easy proposition, but the reality of engaging in this kind of work is much more difficult. Tension has traditionally thwarted previous collaborative attempts, and novice teachers are often caught in the middle of the dissonance between universities and school districts (Bernson & Breault, 2000). Fundamental differences in cultures and values have interfered with the construction of harmonious relationships. On the outside, it appears that schools and universities are very complementary and should be working towards the same goal making organic collaboration possible; however, this perception is not accurate. In fact, the situation is much more complex.

Both schools and universities have distinct and almost incompatible cultures. While it may appear that schools and universities have complementary cultures, they can be quite incompatible (Clark, 1988). Schools have an orientation towards practice; universities, on the
other hand, have an orientation towards theory. That is not to say that schools are a-theoretical or universities are a-practical; it just implies that there is a tendency to lean towards these orientations. Schools have a tendency towards action; universities have a tendency towards dialogue and reflection. Therefore, when teacher preparation programs include both practical and theoretical components, there can be discord due to the incompatibility of cultures.

Each has different values—schools value practical knowledge while universities value theoretical knowledge and schools value action while universities value reading, reflection, and dialogue (Clark, 1988; Goodlad, 1988). These values can be in direct conflict with one another. For example, engaging in reflection and dialogue can sometimes delay action. Moreover, each knows little about what the other one does. In fact, because all teachers have been students of higher education in teacher preparation programs, they believe that they, meaning teachers, know how other teachers should be prepared (Clark, 1988). This same phenomenon, known as the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) is more commonly associated with teacher candidates and the public when they believe that teaching requires very little preparation. This misguided belief stems from participation as a student for at least twelve years with the idea that they observed and learned how to be an effective teacher as a student of many teachers. In reality, teaching is much more complex and this complexity becomes evident when an individual engages in the practice of teaching.

This notion of the apprenticeship of observation becomes apparent on a different level with regard to teacher preparation. Since teachers were once students of colleges of education, they believe that they know how teachers and teacher educators should be prepared when in fact, just like teaching, the preparation of teachers and teacher educators is much more complex. In fact, Loughran (2006, 2007) argues that teacher education has a specific knowledge base and a set of skills and practices and that these knowledge, skills, and practices are learned through specialized study and practice. The apprenticeship of observation contributes to the tension
between schools and universities because universities feel as if schools are undermining their theoretical preparation and schools feel that the university preparation is unrealistic and impractical. Both institutions contribute to the tension when one imposes their beliefs and culture on the other. These differing values and cultures act as barriers and hinder communication in relationship work, and since schools and universities struggle to communicate with each other in a compatible language that bridges the divergent cultures and values (Clark, 1988), their relationship has suffered and will continue to suffer. This breakdown in communication has contributed to the tension between schools and universities.

Addressing this inability to communicate is one critical component to establishing effective partnerships, and it can occur through collaboration. Although it seems logical that collaboration would be dependent upon the resolution of the tension, researchers have found that collaboration is actually part of the solution in addressing the divide between theory and practice (Bernson & Breault, 2000; Teitel, 2003). Partnerships massage the tension between these two institutional entities by helping school districts value and implement theory in their practice and universities in seeing the connection of how practice can contribute to theoretical development (Bernson & Breault, 2000). Understanding fundamental differences occurs through conversation.

When engaging in conversation, the purpose should not be to change or eliminate the other institution’s culture. In fact, survival of a partnership depends upon the preservation of each institution's individual cultural identity. Partnerships need to celebrate and retain the differences while still evolving. Change is not the merging of cultures into one identity; instead it is the alterations that progress while retaining the differences (Goodlad & Sirotnik, 1988). The lesson learned is that partnerships require communication and an understanding of and appreciation for each partner’s individual identity and role in order for the partnership to be successful.
The Nature of Partnership Work

The nature of partnership work can be described differently. Some have used the adjective symbiotic to describe the nature of the potential relationship between schools and universities. Goodlad (1988) commented, “Symbiosis is a provocative concept. Viewed positively, it refers to unlike organisms (or institutions) joined intimately in mutually beneficial relationships” (p. 14). These beneficial relationships are more than just collaborating; they involve a union whose intention is to satisfy the self-interests of each partner. Clark (1988) added, “This symbiotic mutualism is more than 'working with'; it is working with in order to satisfy the mutual self-interests of the two (or more) agencies involved. It is not enough that the agencies are equal in the relationship; they need to be mutually benefiting each other” (p. 40). In a symbiotic relationship, the goal is the satisfaction of self-interest through the use of the partner. Therefore, the outcome is more selfish than selfless, but both aspects must be present for a successful relationship. Goodlad (1988) discussed maintaining the balance between these two concepts when he said,

The agenda of collaboration grows out of the points of overlap. For a partnership to be successful, each partner must see satisfaction of the self-interests of the other(s) as essential to the satisfaction of its own. Consequently, to see to it that the self-interests of the others(s) are met is to be both selfless and self-serving. It is realistic, not cynical, to suggest that partnerships lacking this balance of selflessness and selfishness are short-lived. (p. 24)

Successful symbiotic partnerships must involve the participants working together harmoniously in order to benefit each individual institution. Their ultimate goal is self-satisfaction through the vehicle of collaboration.

Cultivating a symbiotic relationship takes effort and the presence of certain criteria. Goodlad (1988) addressed these needs when he stated,

For there to be a symbiotic partnership, presumably three minimum conditions must prevail: dissimilarity between or among the partners; mutual satisfaction of self-interests; and sufficient selflessness on the part of each member to assure the satisfaction of self-interests on the part of all members. Regarding partnerships between schools and
universities, the first condition is clearly present. The others must be created and require resolve, commitment, planning, creativity, leadership, sacrifice, and endurance. A steady flame requires continuous replenishment of the lamp oil. (p. 14)

Partnerships require sustained effort, work, and commitment from both parties. Each institution must be committed enough to the other in order to ensure that the partner’s needs are met while simultaneously advocating for the satisfaction of personal needs. The constant tension between balancing selfish and selflessness in the relationship requires self-reflection, attention, monitoring, and effort in order to preserve and sustain the symbiotic partnership.

While symbiotic partnerships sound appealing, they place the emphasis on the individual while neglecting a potentially powerful aspect of partnership work: the common agenda. Schlechty & Whitford (1988) advocate a movement away from symbiotic relationships, whose emphasis is on the individual, and towards an organic relationship, whose emphasis is on the collective good. The rallying point of organic collaboratives is focusing on the collective without sacrificing the attainment of self-interest, which inevitably strengthens the union. Schlechty & Whitford (1988) commented,

Our problem is that symbiotic relationships are inherently fragile, temporary, and even given to fickleness. Furthermore, symbiotic relationships call upon each party to spend considerable energy on attracting and holding an appropriate partner long enough to produce the desired effects. (p. 191)

The purpose of a symbiotic partnership between schools and universities would include spending enormous energy finding a suitable partner and then, once the individual needs are met, the relationship would dissolve without regard to the other’s needs or a worldlier agenda.

Creating a lasting relationship requires more than fulfilling individual needs; it requires a shared focus, and all energies should be directed towards that focus rather than spent on the attainment of the individual’s needs. Schlechty & Whitford (1988) stated,

Put differently, in the areas of the recruitment, selection, preparation, and continuing development of public school personnel, universities and public schools are not independent agencies that could better achieve their tasks if they understood their mutual self-interests. They are interdependent agencies that could better serve the public if they
are concentrated on a common agenda. Serving the common good rather than self-interest should be the unifying theme around which collaborative efforts between universities and public schools are organized. (p. 193)

Organic collaboratives require a movement beyond symbiotic relationships. They require the individuals to work towards the common good, a missing characteristic when the focus is on preserving and advocating for self-interests. In organic collaborative relationships, individual needs are met, but the distinguishing characteristic between these relationships and symbiotic relationships is that the individual needs are not the driving force; the shared focus or common agenda is.

Understanding the nature of the relationship is the foundation for building and sustaining a partnership. Each member must maintain a balance of personal and partner’s needs and a focus on a common agenda. Collaborative efforts are partnerships whose responsibility is complex—each partner must preserve the self-interest and promote the other’s needs while simultaneously working towards a common agenda. Theoretically, both partners would work together harmoniously, but in reality relationships between schools and universities have contained dissonance.

The nature of collaborative work is complex and messy. Forging relationships that satisfy both partner’s needs—a symbiotic relationship—while working towards a common agenda—an organic collaborative relationship—require effort and understanding of each other’s culture and values. Yet, despite these barriers, collaborative work is seen as the vehicle through which change in the status of teacher education and education in general can occur. Goodlad & Sirotnik (1988) stated,

We are proposing, then, not just a project in the reform of schooling or teacher education, but a way of life: a joining of schools and schools of education in a permanent partnership similar to those now imperfectly forged between most other professional schools and the settings where their graduates intern and practice. (p. 210)
Living this lifestyle requires individuals who understand both cultures and who can work in the complexities of partnership work. These individuals must be able to cross the borders of the institutions seamlessly and act as intermediaries; these individuals are known as hybrid educators.

**Hybrid Educators**

The literature on hybrid educators is in its infancy, which is not surprising considering that it is a PDS construct and the PDS movement is relatively young as well. Studies about hybrid educators typically do not use this term. Instead, they use related terms such as boundary-spanners, clinical faculty, or university liaisons to give a few examples. Studies so far have commented on the transitions both into and out of these boundary-spanning roles and the personal and professional characteristics of these individuals. Some of the related studies are described below.

School-based hybrids must temporarily leave their roles as classroom teachers to assume other responsibilities as teacher educators. As classroom teachers, they may or may not have experience with teacher preparation and teacher education. If they were previously a mentor teacher, then they do have some experience in these areas. Mentor teachers are also another kind of hybrid because their work is also spanning the borders of universities and schools. Through their mentoring experiences, they generate knowledge about pedagogy and andragogy—or the art and science of teaching adults (Knowles, 1984)—from those roles. Even though mentor teachers’ pedagogical practices were similar to supervisory practices, they did not conceive of themselves as teacher educators (Nolan & Parks, 2010), which also means that they would not consider themselves to be hybrid educators. This study is one example showing how mentor teachers act as teacher educators even while simultaneously assuming their classroom responsibilities. While this study is not specifically about the hybrid role, it is connected in that hybrids may bring with them
to their hybrid role experiences as teacher educators when they were classroom teachers. Therefore, it is important to know how they could conceive of their roles as mentor teachers. In this case, however, their classroom teacher identity is fore-grounded over their identity as a teacher educator. The hybrid would reverse that orientation by fore-grounding their roles as teacher educators while drawing upon their experiences as classroom teachers.

Dinkleman, Margolis, & Sikkenga (2006) examined the transition from classroom teacher to teacher educator and found that these individuals struggle with identity formation during the transition. However, they were studying individuals who were assuming the teacher educator role permanently and from a university-based perspective. The participant in this study transitioned to the primary role of teacher educator temporarily and will be required to return to her former identity of classroom teacher when her tenure as a supervisor is over. Moreover, even though she will be primarily acting as a teacher educator, she is still maintaining a school-based rather than university-based perspective in that she is still under a contractual agreement from the school district.

Morris, Taylor, Harrison, & Wasson (2000) described characteristics of university liaisons. They must have a desire and willingness to work in schools, they must be enthusiastic and persistent, they must be interested in change, and they must be able to work with individuals from P-16 levels. Other characteristics include being trustworthy, diplomatic, non-judgmental, open-minded, and flexible. Miller (2008) also identified the personal and professional characteristics of those assuming boundary-spanning roles, and Miller (2002) commented on their abilities as change agents. They found that boundary-spanners possess social capital, act as mediums of information exchange, and possess boundary-spanning knowledge meaning that they have intimate knowledge of both institutions, which enables them to successfully accomplish tasks.
In their re-entry process, Burns (2010) noted that hybrids struggle as well with their identity formation but that the transformative nature of the hybrid role was worth the struggles encountered upon re-entry (Burns, 2011). This researcher studied a hybrid at the end of her tenure; it was a retrospective examination of her experience.

The research on the hybrid or similar role is emerging. Studies have examined mentor teachers’ knowledge as teacher educators (Nolan & Parks, 2010), the transition to teacher educator (Dinkleman, Margolis, & Sikkenga, 2006), the characteristics of hybrid educators (Miller, 2002; Miller, 2008), and the re-entry into classroom teaching (Burns, 2010). Part of the hybrid role is to supervise teacher candidates. What is unknown in the literature is not only how hybrids supervise but also how that supervision occurs in a PDS context. This study examined a novice supervisor during her first year in this boundary-spanning role, which fulfills a critical gap in the research about hybrid educators.

Supervision

Hybrid educators are supervisors in PDS work; therefore, it is important to understand this body of literature as it relates to supervision. This next section will examine the literature surrounding environments for supervision, relationships between supervisors and teachers, supervisor learning, and supervision in teacher education as these bodies of knowledge informed this study.

An Environment for Supervision

Creating a productive environment for supervision is essential. The literature regarding the supervisory environment has yielded its characteristics. Functional supervisory environments must encourage risk taking, innovation, and conversation (Wolfe, Murphy, Phelps, & McGrath,
Both supervisors and teachers must feel safe in order to take risks regarding their own learning, and trust is required in order to create safety. Both supervisors and teachers must have mutual trust (Cogan, 1973), and trust is created through confidentiality. When mutual trust is present, the environment becomes trusting and encourages risk taking. Innovation is the result of risk taking and an environment that supports, encourages, and fosters those kinds of creative risks. When the supervisory environment contains these elements of mutual trust, risk taking, and innovation, it is ripe for supporting supervision.

The supervisor and her beliefs influence how she supervises, which then influences the supervisory environment. This environment, even when it contains the aforementioned characteristics, can look differently. The supervisory environment can range from being supervisor-centered to teacher-centered (McNergney & Carrier, 1981). A supervisor-centered environment places the supervisor and her wishes at the center of the supervision. Teachers are more passive participants and the supervisor becomes the primary acting agent. A teacher-centered environment would place the focus on solely the teacher where she determines the focus of her supervision. In this kind of environment, the teacher is the active participant and the supervisor is in more of a supportive role. Finally, a third kind of environment exists. McNergney & Carrier (1981) called this kind of environment a shared/negotiated environment. In this shared space, both supervisor and teacher collectively determine the focus for supervision. Both have agendas and interests, but through conversation and negotiation, the focus becomes jointly determined.

The supervisory environment is a critical space for the existence of supervision. While many factors contribute to the supervisory environment, it must have certain characteristics in order to exist. The supervisor’s beliefs, values, attitudes, and actions as well as the relationships that she holds with her teachers create the supervisory environment. Understanding novice supervision in a PDS context requires an understanding of the supervisory environment. Novice
supervisors will behave in ways that impact the supervisory environment, so it is essential to understand the literature around supervisory environments in order to understand the ones that they create.

**Relationships between Supervisors and Teachers: A Historical Examination**

Understanding the history of supervision offers insight into the poor relationships between supervisors and teachers and shows the evolution of supervision as an oppressive practice to a mechanism of teacher empowerment. Many accounts of the history of supervision have offered chronological explanations, but Glanz (1998) suggested that such attempts were flawed and that instead scholars should be focusing on thematic trends to explain the evolution of supervision. Re-examining the history in this manner revealed a trend regarding the issues of control and hierarchy with regard to the relationships between supervisors and teachers.

In post-Civil War times through the late 1800s, schools were in their earliest stages of development since most schooling was the responsibility of parents and religious institutions. Those that attended school were the elite, and the gap between the elite and poor was beginning (Karrier, 1982). Horace Mann’s call for the Common School in order to develop an educated public in an attempt to end poverty increased school enrollment, and society soon found itself in a situation of needing teachers to fulfill this responsibility (Karrier, 1982). "Teachers (mostly female and disenfranchised) were seen as a bedraggled troop – incompetent and backward in outlook” (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992, p. 33). The poor perception of teachers and their capabilities warranted an overseer whose primary purpose was to examine and evaluate both the teacher’s performance and the school culture. Consequently supervisors—who had no formal training and preparation with regard to supervision (Glanz, 1998)—were synonymous with inspectors, examining the school culture, student behavior, the teacher’s instruction, and the school facilities (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992). Supervision as inspection is a controlling model—the supervisors
retain the knowledge and power and determine the supervisory experience; they were the predominant actors and teachers were the passive recipients. This relationship between the teacher and the supervisor was greatly distanced and very hierarchical—the supervisor having tremendous power over the teacher’s evaluation. The separation between supervisor and teacher was beginning.

At the turn of the century, the industrialization of America was brimming. Bolin & Panaritis (1992) commented, "Education seemed the obvious answer to the needs of an industrial and increasingly multicultural society, and the public began to favor secondary education for all” (pp. 32-33). The influence of a booming industrial nation left an impression on education. The perception of schools at this time was not very favorable, so in order to improve the quality of schooling, industrial models were applied to education hoping to make the system more efficient and more productive. Teachers were the objects of supervision, and supervisors became evaluators in this scientific management approach to supervision. Teachers were not seen as thinking, capable individuals; instead they were to mindlessly carry out the behaviors of teaching in order to ensure effectiveness (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). In order to closely monitor teachers’ behavior, supervisors, who were primarily superintendents and males, used rating scales and checklists (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992) to note the presence and, by default, absence of observable concrete behaviors. This practice of behavioralist (Darling-Hammond & Schlan, 1992) or scientific (McNeil, 1982) supervision—the whittling of teaching to concrete behaviors and monitoring them using rating scales and checklists—was prevalent during this time. Such practices oversimplify the complex nature of teaching. These continual practices of controlling forms of supervision—the use of formal and evaluative instruments and the sporadic interactions between supervisors and teachers—separated supervisors and teachers with regard to their relationships and impacted them negatively. The gap between supervisors and teachers, although slightly closer than when supervisors were seen as inspectors, was still very wide, laying the
foundation of hostile feelings between these two parties that would remain over the next hundred years.

By the 1940s, American society had survived one world war, was emerging from a great depression, and was entering a second world war. Consequently the focus shifted towards democracy and democratic classrooms as the solution for society’s woes (McNeil, 1982). The focus became improving instruction rather than simply inspecting the conditions of schools (Glanz, 1998). Education was not free of these political and social forces of this time (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992). Some supervisors began to focus on the curriculum, and the emergence of teachers as contributors began (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992); the gaze began switching from the evaluation of teachers to the support of instructional growth (Fehr, 2001). The distance between supervisors and teachers with regard to their relationships was still large and estranged; however, these thoughts of including teachers brought light to the dark and ignorant views of supervision from the previous decades. This shift from controlling forms of supervision to collegial forms of supervision offered glimmers of hope for the relationships between supervisors and teachers.

Although the conception of supervision was one of collegiality, practical supervision continued to be just the opposite—very cold and very distant. Part of this response was a reflection of societal pressures. Increased accountability continued to place greater burdens on schools and supervisors as the leaders of schools. Supervisors, as central management, were charged with answering to greater parental demands and a return to the basics movement (Fehr, 2001). While some supervisors were still using checklists and rating scales of the past, many preferred systematic observational instruments—devices used to capture the reality of classroom activity in the form of data—found in the seminal text Mirrors of Behavior III (Fehr, 2001; Simon & Boyer, 1974). The notion of supervision as evaluation throughout history has caused tension, misconceptions, and misperceptions between supervisors and teachers hindering attempts
at collegiality and collaboration. The brewing hostility between supervisors and teachers throughout the past decades resulted in what Blumberg (1980) termed a cold war.

Despite the glimmers of hope, supervision continued to be practiced as an administrative task through evaluation rather than as a mechanism for empowerment in teacher learning (Fehr, 2001); therefore, the scope of the supervisor was outside of classrooms focusing on administrative tasks rather than student learning (Cogan, 1973). The supervisor’s roles and responsibilities were quite nebulous during this era forcing the supervisor to wear many hats: evaluator, superintendent, curriculum specialist, principal, staff developer, teacher of teachers, public relations person, change agent, peacekeeper, advocate, mediator, visionary, accountant (budget manager), problem solver, cheerleader, role model, mentor, reviewer of research, and manager (Fehr, 2001). Occupational survival forced supervisors to broaden their focus by including all of these roles into their repertoire, thereby distancing themselves further and further from the work of teachers in classrooms. Since supervisors’ time was consumed by these multiple responsibilities, it left very little time, space, and energy for working with teachers. Consequently, supervision-in-practice was synonymous with evaluation (Fehr, 2001) with supervisors visiting classrooms sporadically. The enactment of supervision as evaluation bred mistrust between teachers and supervisors and, therefore, distanced their relationships. These misinformed practices were detrimental to the empowerment movement and continued to perpetuate oppressive hierarchical structures that situate supervisors as superior and teachers as inferior.

The enactment of supervision as evaluation caused differing perspectives of supervision. Teachers and supervisors perceived the purpose of supervision and the role of the supervisor very differently. Teachers saw supervisors as inspectors, and they showed such perceptions through the enactment of warning systems to let other teachers know that the supervisor was present in the building and was “walking around” (Blumberg, 1980). The notion of supervision as inspection has persisted since the 1890s when supervisors, typically superintendents, were charged with
critiquing teachers’ pedagogical practices and evaluating student behavior, the school culture, and
the school facilities (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992). Supervisors, on the other hand, saw their role as
one of helper—helping the teacher to improve her instruction and grow personally and
professionally. The manner in which this “help” was being provided contributed to the negative
perceptions of supervisors. Supervisors told teachers what to do, and yet they wondered why
teachers did not listen to them (Blumberg, 1980). By practicing supervision as telling, supervisors
were passing judgment on the teachers’ behavior and instruction. Passing judgment created an
atmosphere of evaluation, which implied the notions of inspection and fostered detrimental
hierarchical relationships of power.

In addition to differing perceptions of supervision, school structures of leadership situated
supervisors and teachers in very different places. Supervisors were typically principals, but they
could also be others in administrative roles. Teachers viewed principals as non-practitioners,
removed and distant from the classroom, therefore, unable to understand the complexities of
teaching (Blumberg, 1980). This occupational separation created a hierarchy in the relationship,
placing teachers in a subordinate role even if that was not the intention of the supervisor. It was a
structural flaw in the organization of school leadership. When one person was viewed as superior
to the other, the relationship suffered because the feelings of inferiority led to insecurity; and
insecurity resulted in feelings of judgment. The contestation of the presence or absence of
judgment was irrelevant; it was the perception of its presence that mattered. As long as a teacher
perceived her role and that of the supervisor in this manner, then the relationship was doomed.

Historically teachers were primarily seen as objects and their performance could be
described through the oversimplification of teaching to discrete, concrete behaviors devoid of
context and measured using checklists and rating scales. The supervisor as inspector and
evaluator created a hierarchical relationship between teachers and supervisors, and this
relationship pervaded for decades and continues to exist. Dispelling these controlling forms of
supervision would require a paradigmatic shift towards the inclusion of teachers as partners in the supervisory process. Changing epistemological beliefs to empowering teachers required a re-envisionment of supervision. In the late 1960s and early 70s, Morris Cogan and his doctoral student, Robert Goldhammer, constructed the notion of clinical supervision—an initial form of collegial supervision—out of their need and desire to better support their students’ growth in becoming teachers.

Supervision of the past was done to teachers; Cogan’s clinical supervision, theoretically, was done with teachers. In order to work with teachers, however, the lens of supervision required adjustment. The scope of supervision needed to be more narrowly defined. In order for teacher involvement to occur, Cogan would also have to address the relationship between supervisors and teachers. The past supervisory practices empowered supervisors and enslaved teachers. The hierarchical relationships of superior and inferior created hostility between the two parties and sabotaged any genuine effort towards collegiality (Blumberg, 1980). Clinical supervision, on the other hand, ideally flattened those relationships into a colleagueship.

In colleagueship the teacher and clinical supervisor work together as associates and equals, and they are bound together by a common purpose. This purpose is the improvement of students’ learning through the improvement of the teacher’s instruction, and it does not diminish the autonomy and independence the teacher should have. (Cogan, 1973, p. 68)

The process of clinical supervision united supervisors and teachers towards the common purpose of student learning and, through that unification, eliminated the hierarchical roles of the past—in theory. However, the archaic and hierarchical perceptions of the relationships between supervisors and teachers would be a barrier that clinical supervision would someday have to face.

Cogan also recognized that collaborative and collegial relationships were the heart of clinical supervision; however, how clinical supervision was actualized in practice was not fostering those kinds of relationships. In fact, clinical supervision, although intended to be teacher-centered, was applied very differently. Gordon (1997) described this bastardization of this
approach to collegial supervision when he said, "While functioning as intended by Cogan and
Goldhammer in a very small number of schools, [clinical supervision] has been stripped of its
underlying principles and co-opted by teacher evaluation systems in a very large number of
schools" (p. 116). This bastardization of clinical supervision was apparent as supervisors talked
of “doing” the cycle (Garman, 1982)—in essence going through the motions of the process and
not truly embracing the spirit of supervision. The essence of clinical supervision should be
beyond simply applying its cycles of pre-conferencing, observation, analysis, and post-
conferencing (Blumberg, 1969; Cogan, 1973); the process of clinical supervision is far from
linear; it is truly multidimensional (Cogan, 1973) and even dispositional (Garman, 1982).

Most often controlling forms of supervision surfaced in the flawed application of
collegial theoretical constructs, causing academics to revisit and remind themselves and others of
the fundamental principles behind collegial supervision. The goal was to empower teachers, but
supervision-in-practice produced the opposite results; the purpose was to move away from
supervisor-centered supervision to teacher-centered supervision, but political and societal
influences inhibited most attempts. The battle between control and empowerment continues to
rage today, as supervision exists in a state of renewal edging closer and closer to the alignment of
collegial theory and practice and flattening the relationships between supervisors and teachers.

The shift from the supervisor-centered to teacher-centered and collegial supervision was
in progress. As time passed, teachers were being recognized as individuals who required
individualized supervisory practices such as differentiated supervision (Fehr, 2001; McNergney
& Carrier, 1981). In the 1980s and 90s academics reconsidered the notions of knowledge, power,
and position and, therefore, the roles of supervisors and teachers, which were radically different
notions from the past. The supervisor was no longer the ultimate source of knowledge and power;
teachers were recognized as having knowledge and power too, so a shift towards peers acting in
supervisory roles persisted. The proximity of relationships could be closed even further than those present in clinical supervision through peer coaching and mentoring (Hill, 1992).

Instead of changing teachers, in the true spirit of promoting individual growth, the purpose of supervision became helping teachers to become self-directed learners (Colton & Sparks-Langley, 1992) through an inquiry stance (Kilbourn, Keating, Murray, & Ross, 2005). To illustrate their point, Colton & Sparks-Langley (1992) stated:

We see the teacher of the future as a self-directed person who is intrinsically motivated to analyze a situation, set goals, plan and monitor actions, evaluate results, and reflect on his own professional thinking. As a part of this process, the teacher also considers the immediate and long-term social and ethical implications of his actions. Such a person explores a variety of possible actions - and their consequences - before choosing one. This person is not afraid to take risks and try new ideas. He is also eager and willing to construct new knowledge by sharing ideas and questions with others as a means of growing professionally. (p. 156)

The radical idea of involving and welcoming teachers as participators was eminent. Ultimately reconceptualizing supervision was in full gear considering and reconsidering the nature, purpose, and conduct of supervision.

These changes towards more collegial forms of supervision saw a shift in the supervisor’s role and the personnel who engaged in supervision; the notion of supervisor as an administrator shifted to a more school-based role. Those engaging in supervision were no longer just administrators; teachers were now engaging in the functions of supervision by acting as peer coaches to one another (Glickman, 1992). Engaging teachers as participants in supervision was not entirely a new idea. As early as the 1940s and 1950s, there were hints of teachers acting in a participatory nature with regard to curriculum development (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992), but it took almost half a century before more collegial forms of supervision would be enacted. Supervisors were also shifting towards the human nature of the role in assisting teachers with instructional growth rather than focusing on the evaluation of their performance (Fehr, 2001). These more
collegial forms of supervision offered hope in terms of equalizing the relationships between teachers and supervisors.

Over time, there was a true shift from hierarchical notions of supervision to more horizontal ones (Hill, 1992). Teachers were no longer seen as simply the objects of supervision, but rather they became actors in the process. Supervision saw a transition in prepositions— supervision as done to teachers became supervision as done with teachers. However, policy was not helping the movement. State mandated policies requiring bi-yearly observations of teachers as evaluation mechanisms counteracted the attempts of redefining supervision (Darling-Hammond & Schlan, 1992). When evaluation observations are considered part of supervision, teachers view the supervisor as a bureaucratic authority (Sergiovanni, 1992) and their role as subordinate. Hierarchical roles involve power dynamics and recreate the notion of supervision being done to teachers rather than with them. For as long as supervision is tied to evaluation and practiced in such a manner, then these oppressive structures will be in place that will hinder the renewal of supervision.

Over time the proximity of the relationship between supervisors and teachers has gotten closer not necessarily in amicable terms but rather with regard to power, which will eventually lead to amicability. Historically, supervisors and teachers have been situated differently—supervisors as the source of knowledge and power. With the movement towards teacher empowerment, that hierarchical gap is closing. However, for as long as the term supervisor is used, some hierarchical notions of power will remain by virtue of its name. Barriers to closing this gap have existed including the continued practice of evaluation as supervision.

Another underlying issue was the relationship between supervisors and teachers concerning gender. Historically, supervisors were male and teachers were female. Females were seen as inferior; thus, anything feminine had and still has a negative connotation. Belenky & Stanton (2000) labeled such actions as “girl stain”—an other-ing resulting from associating with
or being feminine. Therefore, those in feminine occupations, such as teachers, would be tainted as well. Those who believed in the potential of collegial supervision and work towards its implementation have faced and will continue to face barriers rooted in historical gender bias and notions of power. As time progresses, the hopes are that the power differential and the hierarchical relationships between supervisors and teachers will continue to diminish and become extinct.

School-based hybrid educators are former classroom teachers, so in order for them to act in a supervisory role, conceptualizations of supervision would need to shift from the archaic historical controlling notions of supervisor as administrator to a more collegial form where classroom educators could serve in that capacity. When school-based hybrid educators become PDAs, they enact supervision in a PDS context and this partnership context includes conceptualizing supervision beyond the bounds of schools. Supervision also includes that which occurs in teacher education.

**Supervision in Teacher Education**

As previously mentioned, the teacher preparation curriculum includes a field-based component. When teacher candidates are engaged in the field, they need experienced teachers to support their development, as they are still students focused on learning, applying, and practicing skills. In a review of the research from 1995 to 2001, Clift & Brady (2005) found that the nomenclature regarding student teachers, interns, cooperating teachers, and supervisors was relatively consistent. Each teacher candidate is typically assigned a cooperating teacher—a classroom teacher who agrees to oversee the candidate’s practical experience on a daily basis—and a supervisor—a university-based faculty member who oversees the candidate’s practical experience on a less regular basis. Unlike the cooperating teacher who is assigned only one teacher candidate, supervisors are assigned many more. In traditional preparation, teacher
candidates typically have more than one field experience. The supervisor then oversees both field experiences, but the cooperating teacher is specific to the assigned placement; therefore, a traditional teacher candidate would have one supervisor and two separate cooperating teachers—one at each placement—overseeing their practical preparation. It could be argued that the supervisor’s role is irrelevant. After all, supervising so many teacher candidates spreads out the supervisor’s time resulting in infrequent visitations that typically serve as evaluations rather than visitations of the true spirit of supervision—to support teachers (and teacher candidates) and help them develop their pedagogical practices. In fact, the tasks of supervision and evaluation are so fundamentally different that a supervisor cannot simultaneously employ both successfully (Nolan, 1997). Despite this fact, supervision in teacher education is typically practiced in this manner.

The implementations of this dual role coupled with infrequent visitations inhibit the relationship between the supervisor and the teacher candidate and have cast supervision in teacher education as the stepchild of supervision. In the supervision community, it is seen as inferior to that which occurs in schools. Much of the supervision literature is focused on supervision as it occurs in schools; much less has been written about supervision in teacher education. McIntyre & Byrd (1998) reviewed the literature surrounding supervision in teacher education. With regard to understanding supervision in PDS contexts, no studies were present. Limited research has been conducted regarding the professional development of supervisors in teacher education and those that have were focused on training as a form of professional learning. In 2005, Clift & Brady reviewed the research on methods courses and field experiences. They found twenty-nine studies that were focused on field experiences in general supervision. However, these studies were largely atheoretical and focused more on the role of the supervisor rather than the function of supervision. They found no studies that examined the impact of the PDS on supervisors, which is one of the ancillary questions of this study; it aims to understand what experiences impact the novice supervisor in an exemplary PDS context. Despite the fact that the literature in supervision
in teacher education is limited and that it has a lowly status, supervisors have a critical role in teacher preparation with regard to supporting the theoretical preparation of teacher candidates while they are immersed in the field. Therefore, understanding supervision in the PDS context offers an opportunity to elevate the status of supervision in teacher education and even re-conceptualize supervision in both contexts.

**Professional Learning**

Another important knowledge base that informed this study was professional learning. Professional learning is a more broad and encompassing term for understanding the learning of various stakeholders in a PDS context. Professional learning includes understanding those experiences for supervisors and teachers as professionals and teacher candidates as aspiring professionals. This section examines the literature surrounding transformational learning, professional development, and supervisor learning.

**Transformational Learning**

In order to understand transformational learning, I draw upon the work of Mezirow & Associates (2000). Transformational learning occurs when a person encounters a disorienting dilemma and then critically reflects on this dilemma. This reflection causes a shift in the person’s frame of reference.

Disorienting dilemmas are critical incidences in a person’s experience. They can be epochal or incremental. Epochal transformations occur from sudden and dramatic dilemmas as opposed to incremental transformations, which occur from prolonged exposure to many similar critical incidences. A disorienting dilemma is an experience that creates cognitive dissonance and disrupts a person’s intellectual harmony. It is the first step in the transformational process.
After a person encounters the disorienting dilemma, she must then critically reflect on that experience. Critical reflection involves the ability to self assess and evaluate the assumptions she brings and the assumptions that others bring to the situation. Critical reflection is a necessary criteria for transformation to occur; without it, transformation ceases to exist.

The third criterion for transformation is a shift in a person’s frame of reference. A frame of reference is the lens through which a person views the world; essentially it is the person’s perspective. Mezirow & Associates (2000) describe this learning by saying, “Learning occurs in one of four ways: by elaborating existing frames of reference, by learning new frames of reference, by transforming points of view, or by transforming habits of mind (p. 19).” Shifts of this kind occur as a result of employing critical reflection on a disorienting dilemma. Once all of these three criteria are present, transformational learning exists.

Research has shown that the hybrid role is transformative (Burns, 2011), but this study was a retrospective examination of one hybrid’s experiences. Much more research in this area is needed; therefore, understanding transformational learning is essential as it informed the research in this study aimed at understanding novice supervision in a PDS context.

**Professional Development**

In addition to understanding how learning occurs, it is also important to understand the literature surrounding the professional learning of teachers because the hybrid educators as supervisors in this study are reassigned classroom teachers. There is a connection to the woes of supervision and the woes of professional development. Just as supervision was historically done to teachers rather than with them, professional development has suffered from the same illness, mostly because those who are charged with designing and creating those experiences are those who have held the power--supervisor.
Professional development for teachers has typically been done to teachers in that teachers have little voice in the process and are seen as the objects—the recipients of the learning. Despite literature on effective characteristics of professional development (Belzer, 2005; Clement, Enz, & Pawlas, 2000; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Fogarty & Pete, 2007; Galbraith, 2004; Glickman, 2004; Long, 2004; Powers, 2004; Thompson, 1997; Wolfe, Murphy, Phelps, & McGrath, 2000), professional development continues to be practiced inappropriately and ineffectively. This misuse of professional development contributes to teachers’ poor perceptions of such experiences, which is not supporting an environment conducive to learning nor is it creating an environment for supervision.

Research has shown that PDS creates an environment to support teacher learning. In fact in a review of the literature, Abdal-Haqq (1998) found that more teachers in PDS participated in professional development experiences. Teachers’ voices also were more valued in professional development experiences in PDS contexts. These results were not surprising considering one of the missions of PDS work is the professional development of all vested parties, which includes teachers and other school-based faculty, university faculty, and teacher candidates (Abdal-Haqq, 1998; Levine, 1992; Lieberman, 1998). With regard to mentor teachers, Abdal-Haqq’s (1998) review of the literature showed that teachers were receiving quality professional development. In particular, she found two studies—Collinson et al. (1994) and Wiseman & Cooner (1996)—that indicated one of the reasons for such growth was a result of the opportunities afforded to mentors through non-traditional roles. Co-teaching methods coursework was an example of a non-traditional role. The hybrid role is another non-traditional role; however, this type of experience was not included in this research.

In the late 90s, Teitel (1998) commented on the research on professional development in PDS. He noted, "Most of what is reported in the literature about PDS professional development focuses on K-12 teachers, with less attention paid to the professional development of university
faculty and even less to that of administrators at either institution (p. 46)." Over a decade later, Nolan, et al. (2011) reviewed the literature on professional development and PDSs with regard to the impact of the PDS context on parents and the community, veteran teachers, and university faculty. They found that the lack of a conceptual framework for guiding research in the PDS context and the lack of consensus on the definition of a PDS in its implementation made this review and critique difficult. They also called for longitudinal studies and studies that examined processes as they were unfolding rather than examining them retrospectively. This study examined the supervisory practices of a novice hybrid in a PDS context as her practices were unfolding; it is in direct response to Nolan, et al.’s (2011) call for research.

One task of the hybrid role is to co-teach methods coursework alongside university faculty, but that is one of many experiences hybrids have. Since school-based hybrids are removed from their classroom responsibilities for a temporary period of one to three years, they also are afforded opportunities to observe teacher candidates; collaborate with university faculty; participate in and contribute to district-wide meetings that typically include administrative personnel rather than classroom teachers; engage in inquiry; and present at local, state, and national conferences. One critique of the hybrid role is that it removes teachers from their primary responsibility—to teach students. Although these teachers are temporarily removed from their classroom teaching responsibilities, they are still working with children, but the process is more indirect—they work with their student teachers in classrooms with children. Moreover, such experiences are professional development for teachers designed to ultimately positively impact students despite the fact that they are temporarily distanced from children (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Moreover, professional development has typically been focused on improving teacher performance at the classroom level, but Darling-Hammond & Richardson (2009) found that quality professional development had a broader focus of creating school-wide change.
In order to engage teachers in meaningful professional development, Sprintall & Thies-Sprinthall (1983) argued that role-taking experiences were valuable and highly effective means for supporting teachers’ cognitive growth – essentially supporting their professional learning. They defined a role-taking experience as “…the person is expected to perform a new and somewhat more complex interpersonal task than his or her own current preferred mode. The experience is direct and active, as opposed to vicarious and indirect” (p. 28). When teachers were placed into meaningful, role-taking experiences, they would learn more deeply the essential skills of reflection and the ability to teach those skills to others, especially if they were working with teacher candidates. They argued, “Apparently the general educational enterprise rarely teaches anyone how to reflect upon real experience. Vocabulary for reflection seems to vary from the minimal to the nonexistent” (p. 29). Engaging teachers in a meaningful role taking experience is a powerful and meaningful professional learning endeavor.

The literature surrounding professional development for teachers shows that professional development can be meaningful when it meets the readiness of teachers and has them participate in challenging and stimulating role-taking experiences, but these kinds of professional learning opportunities are rare. This study examined the hybrid role as a particular role-taking experience. It sought to understand how a reassigned teacher as supervisor supervised in a PDS context.

**Supervisor Learning**

The main participant in this study was a reassigned classroom teacher who became a supervisor; therefore, we must understand the literature surrounding the professional learning experiences of supervisors as well as those learning experiences of teachers. The professional development of supervisors is a critical piece in order to combat these practices that perpetuate hierarchical relationships and the positioning of teachers in subordinate roles. Unfortunately, this area in the literature is somewhat unexplored. In their summary of research on supervision in
teacher education, McIntyre & Byrd (1998) noted that little is known about the professional
development of supervisors, especially supervisors in teacher education. That which is known has
been with regard to the training of cooperating teachers and graduate students as supervisors. In a
study on supervision in elementary education, Areglado (1998) found that principals had limited
access to supervision as professional development. Their interactions with their supervisors often
focused on details and events and occurred only when issues arose. Any professional
development was a result of their own initiative and typically occurred through the attendance of
conferences. They yearned for support and learning and felt isolated in their positions.

One final study in this genre examined novice supervisor learning. Kilbourn, Keating, Murray, & Ross (2005) conducted a study aimed at understanding how novice supervisors learn
to give feedback. They found that supervisors learned by conducting inquiry into their own
practice. The implications of this study suggest that inquiry could be a powerful mechanism for
supporting both novice supervisor learning and supervisor learning in general. While some
studies exist to understand supervisor learning, there is ample opportunity for further
investigation. This study aims to contribute to this body of literature as it is a closer examination
of novice supervision in a PDS context.

Summary

Understanding how novice supervisors practice and what experiences in a PDS context
influences those practices is the purpose of this study. Its findings have the potential of asking
deeper questions about professional development schools, supervision, and professional learning.
While the literature in these areas is considerate, little is known about supervision in a
professional development school context, supervisor learning in this context and more
specifically the influence of a professional development school context on such learning, and
consequently the professional development of supervisors. What we learn from this case has implications for all of these areas. Hybrid educators, as supervisors, are critical personnel in PDS work, yet the research on this role is emerging. Little is known about the supervisory practices of reassigned teachers or the supervisory practices in a PDS context in general. The research contributes to these spaces in the literature.

The next section is dedicated to describing and supporting a rationale for selecting case study methodology as an appropriate qualitative methodological approach. I also discuss some of the important characteristics of quality research, the researcher’s bias, and the methods for the study.
CHAPTER 3
THE RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the epistemological foundation of a qualitative study that examined supervision in a specific context. In this chapter, I describe the selected methodology and offer a rationale for the selection of case study methodology as an appropriately matched methodological approach. I also disclose the researcher’s bias or the lens through which this research was interpreted. Next, I outline the research design describing the research questions, the purpose, the context of the study, and a rationale for the selection of this particular context. Then I describe the participants including the primary participant—the novice, school-based hybrid educator—and the sixteen other potential participants—the mentors and interns who interacted with the main participant on a daily basis. In that section, I offer a rationale for their selection and discuss the ethical concerns of engaging as a participant observer in this kind of intimate research. After discussing the participants, I describe the data sources—which include interviews, field notes, and documents—as methods. Finally, I explain the analysis procedures for interpreting this research.

Qualitative research is interpretive. Understanding reality through interpretive research offers a unique perspective. Its strengths lie in its connection to context, its socially constructed meanings of the data, and its recognition of the complex nature of reality. Denzin & Lincoln (2003) describe the nature of research and the work of qualitative researchers as being an understanding of the situatedness of reality. They comment, "Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” (p. 13). Understanding reality from a social science perspective means examining culture and how people in that culture make meaning
Corbin & Strauss (2008) define methodology as, “A way of thinking about and studying social phenomena” (p. 1). This approach to research and research design brings with it the histories of the research traditions. All traditions possess the hallmarks of qualitative research—the search for meaning not truth, recognition of the situatedness of reality not detached
objectivity, and focus on the whole rather than distinct parts—but they differ in the intricacies through which the data are gathered and analyzed (Moustakas, 1994). Traditions are not favored over one another, but rather the power in each tradition is understanding its history and context and realizing that each one serves specific functions (Moss, et al., 2009). Understanding the tradition’s historical roots provides guidelines for conducting the research.

Case study research is rooted in the social sciences particularly in political science and sociology (Creswell, 1998). Case studies explore, explain, or describe, and questions that typically begin with how and why lend themselves towards an explanatory case study approach (Yin, 1994). According to Stake (1995), "Case study is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances (p. xi),” and yet despite this attention to the particular, a goal of case study is to engage in theoretical generalization. Yin (2003) states that the goal is to “...expand and generalize theories (p.10),” which he calls analytic generalization. A single case can be one entity, such as an individual or an organization, (Stake, 2003); this case is a case of novice supervision in a PDS context and sought to understand how a novice supervisor supervises in an exemplary PDS context; therefore, the nature of this question suggested that this case was an explanatory case study. The results from this case were used to generate theory regarding supervision in this context.

Case studies must also be bounded systems. Such boundaries act as parameters, which are critical guidelines for understanding the case under examination. Case studies are connected inseparably to the context in which they are situated (Creswell, 1998). This situatedness provides meaning for understanding the case. Understanding the complexity and particularity of a case requires data from multiple sources including documents, interviews, observations, and artifacts (Creswell, 1998), which are all also indicative of qualitative research in general (Borko, Whitcomb, & Burkes, 2008). An in-depth understanding of a particular entity coupled with its bounded nature and connection to context are all signifiers of case study research.
This study was bounded by time—one year and, more specifically the participant’s first year—and by place—the context of a specific PDS. This study provided an in-depth analysis of the supervisory experiences of one novice school-based hybrid educator as supervisor through the collection of multiple sources of data such as interviews, field notes, and documents. For these reasons—the case was bounded, rooted in context, understood through multiple data sources, and analyzed using an interpretive lens—this study is appropriately matched with case study methodology as the methodological approach.

The Researcher’s Perspective

Since all qualitative research is interpretive, it is told through the lens of the researcher because the researcher and her background are inseparable (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). Interpretation is the researcher’s perspective or the lens through which data is given meaning. Since the data are interpreted through the researcher’s lens, it is automatically influenced by that perspective. Denzin & Lincoln (2003) comment, "All research is interpretive; it is guided by a set of beliefs and feelings about the world and how it should be understood and studied” (p. 33). That interpretative nature of qualitative research requires the researcher to disclose any potential bias (Shavelson & Towne, 2002) to make clear the interpretive perspective.

Qualitative research relies on the researcher’s awareness of this subjectivity, known as sensitivity. A researcher must develop a constant awareness of this notion and question it. When she does, she is engaging in self-reflective thought (Corbin & Strauss, 2008) or reflexivity (Glesne, 2006). This awareness strengthens the quality of the research (Stake, 2006). By being cognizant of the perspective the researcher brings to the data, the researcher knowingly points to the bias of her interpretation, recognizing the limitation of the research and the possibility of other interpretations if told through a different researcher’s lens. Awareness demonstrates critical
reflectivity of the data and the research process. Therefore, the reader must know that I bring to this research my own experiences as a female teacher candidate, classroom teacher, and teacher educator. After all, “researchers should be encouraged to ‘have a life’ and to ‘have a dream,’ so their interpretations are enriched by personal experience” (Stake, 2006, p. 87), and it is these life experiences in education and teacher education that have informed my interpretive lens.

Teacher educators often begin as practicing teachers, and my journey was no different. I taught sixth grade for five years in a relatively large suburban district. Although I thoroughly enjoyed teaching, the constraints I felt as an educator to evoke change within and outside of my classroom frustrated me. I felt like more and more structures were being placed on me as a professional at the classroom, school, and district level, and over time, I had less and less decision-making power. These feelings of disempowerment began a motivation for activism, but I felt that in order to create change, I needed to change my role from teacher to teacher educator. Consequently, I saw entering into higher education as not only an opportunity to learn, but also as a means of creating change. As a teacher educator, I hoped to advocate for practices that showcased and developed teachers’ talents and capabilities rather than oppress them. Achieving such a task would involve working towards changing the educational system in schools to one that empowers teachers rather than oppresses them. I also wanted to work with the next generation of teachers hoping to inspire and instill in them a passion for the profession. I recognize that I suffer from the “change the world” syndrome, but I believe that ideology is critical for working towards and achieving goals. Pessimism spawns in the absence of ideology, whereas optimism and motivation germinates from its presence. From my experiences as a teacher and now as a teacher educator for the past five years, I have developed some beliefs about supervision, professional development, and teacher education.

As a supervisor, I bring to the research certain perspectives regarding supervision. First, supervision in teacher education is much broader than supporting teacher candidates’ technical
growth and development. Supervision in teacher education, especially in the PDS context, has the ability to simultaneously renew schools and the education profession. It is a critical role in supporting both teacher candidate and classroom teacher learning, and without it, teacher preparation would be overly practical in nature and dominated by the time constraints imposed by schools structures. The university-based supervisor acts as a balancing force bringing theoretical knowledge to the experience and offering time for dialogue and reflection. Second, supervision is a collegial process that has the potential to minimize hierarchical structures in schooling and empower teachers. Third, relationships are the heart of supervision and make possible a powerful learning environment for teacher learning. Finally, as I described in Chapter 1, I see supervision as complex leadership aimed at supporting the professional learning of the learning community and the individuals who function within it.

My experiences as a classroom teacher and as a teacher educator shaped my beliefs about professional development. As a classroom teacher, many of the district’s professional development experiences seemed irrelevant. Since I had little input into the kinds of professional development experiences, the topics were not always of interest. As a lifelong learner, I craved meaningful learning, and I grew increasingly frustrated by the professional development that was done to me. However, my experiences as a teacher educator were just the opposite. After taking a course on professional development, I was inspired to work with a local principal and her staff to change the nature of professional development experiences from what I had experienced as a teacher to ones that empowered teachers. From these experiences, I believe that professional development should be individualized and differentiated. It requires trusting relationships. Most importantly, teachers’ voices should be valued and incorporated in designing the experiences, which means that the supervisor’s role is one of facilitation and support. Professional development can be a powerful mechanism for fostering learning if it is done with teachers rather than to them.
With regard to teacher education, I believe that professional development schools have the potential to fulfill their mission of simultaneously renewing schools and teacher education programs. These views have been mostly shaped by my experiences as a doctoral candidate and emerging scholar. From my experiences as a hybrid educator, I have seen the power of this possibility. I watched, participated, and contributed to change that has furthered the professional learning of all—teacher educators, administrators, teachers, teacher candidates, and children. I believe the PDS context is truly transformational. Through some of my own research, I have found that it changed a classroom teacher’s knowledge, beliefs, and practice (Burns, 2010) and an aspiring teacher educator’s growth and development (Burns, In press). Teacher education has a broader mission than simply working with teacher candidates or offering classes to current teachers. Instead, teacher education should impact and influence all parties on both the university and school settings. The PDS context is a powerful environment for embarking on and accomplishing this vision.

It is these perspectives that inform my researcher bias or the lens through which I viewed the data. Understanding the perspective of the researcher, her paradigmatic views, the methodology, and traditions of the specific methodology indicates the lens through which the research was conducted and should be viewed. The researcher bias makes the story unique, for it is the researcher’s perspective that gives each story its fingerprint.

The Study

Behind every good study is an even better research design. In fact, “a research design describes a flexible set of guidelines that connect theoretical paradigms first to strategies of inquiry and second to methods for collecting empirical material” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 36). As Denzin & Lincoln point out, a research design is the framework of the study. It is rigid
enough to provide a sturdy foundation and yet flexible enough to accommodate alterations that arise throughout the research process. In this section, I describe the study’s skeletal framework, which includes the research questions, the purpose of the study, and the context in which the research was conducted.

The Research Questions

The research question is the foundation of any study. Its form and function determine the approach and the mechanisms for examining it. "Qualitative studies are usually exploratory and more hypothesis generating rather than hypothesis testing. Therefore, it is necessary to frame the research question(s) in a manner that provides the investigator with sufficient flexibility and freedom to explore a topic in some depth” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 25). Consequently, the framing of the question is critical – it needs to be specific enough for feasibility and yet general enough to afford flexibility in order to examine the topic with appropriate depth. Beyond the tension of rigidity and flexibility in framing the question, the researcher must also consider the significance of the question and its potential theoretical and practical contributions. Shavelson & Towne (2002) outline guiding principles for scientific inquiry beginning with question formation. They advocate ensuring that the question has both a fundamental and a practical purpose. The absence of either one invalidates the question and jeopardizes its ability to be studied empirically. Ultimately, the construction of the research question is essential in laying the foundation for the purpose and validity of the research.

Research questions typically result from discrepancies or gaps in the literature, life experiences of the researcher, or from the research itself (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The impetus for this study is two-fold. First, my personal experience as a novice supervisor evoked questions regarding supervision practices and supervisor experiences, especially during the first year, in the
PDS context. Second, space exists in the literature for commentary on the supervisory practices of hybrid educators in a PDS context.

The literature on supervision is considerable, and even scholars in the field have varying viewpoints on the purpose of supervision (Cogan, 1973; Kosmoski, 2006; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Extensive work has been done on the various models of supervision, which include clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Garman, 1982 & 2010; Goldhammer, 1969), human resources supervision (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988 & 2007), scientific supervision (Darling-Hammond & Schlan, 1992; McNeil, 1982), artistic supervision (Eisner, 1982), developmental supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001; Marray, 2006; McNergney & Carrier, 1981), and collegial supervision (Cogan, 1973; Garman, 1982 & 2010; Gordon, 1997; & Kosmoski, 2006). Scholars have also explored the roles of supervision (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007), the styles of supervision (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939 as cited in Kosmoski, 2006), the tasks of supervision (Kosmoski, 2006), the relationships in supervision (Cogan, 1973), the characteristics and skills of supervisors (Cogan, 1973; Colton & Sparks-Langley, 1992; Loughran, 2007; McNergney & Carrier, 1981), the environment for supervision (Wolfe, et al., 2000), and the behavior of supervisors (Cogan, 1973). While developmental supervision has focused on how to differentiate supervisory practices for teachers and teacher candidates based upon their developmental level, supervisor learning, supervisor development, and supervisor professional development are vastly unexplored especially with regard to the supervisory practices of reassigned teachers, a critical supervisory role in a PDS context.

While the literature on supervisor characteristics exists, understanding how supervisors learn to supervise remains unclear. Cogan (1973) touched upon the required knowledge, skills, and dispositions of supervisors, and McNergney & Carrier (1981) identified the skills of teacher educator supervisors, but understanding how supervisors learn and develop is lacking. What is known is that reflection is a key component in supporting learning (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007)
and inquiry can support supervisor growth (Kilbourn, et al., 2005), but opportunities exist to further explore these areas especially with regard to the supervisory practices of reassigned teachers in a PDS context. This study began to explore this line of research by closely examining the first year of a reassigned teacher as supervisor in a PDS context.

The driving question for this study was: How does a novice hybrid educator supervise in a PDS context? The ancillary questions included: What are her beliefs about supervision? How does she perceive her supervision? How do others perceive her supervision and its impact on themselves? What experiences in the PDS context impact her learning as a supervisor?

The structure of these research questions permits an in depth examination of the conceptualization and operationalization of supervision with a specific subset of supervisors – reassigned teacher as supervisors – and even more specifically novice reassigned teachers as supervisors. By examining her practices in her first year, I created a foundation of research possibilities for future examination. Eventual longitudinal studies of supervisor development in a PDS context as well as comparative studies of supervision in other contexts are potential successive studies.

The Purpose of This Study

As defined in Chapter 1, one kind of school-based hybrid educators are reassigned teachers. These individuals are reassigned from their duties as classroom teachers to primarily be teacher educators for a temporary period of one to three years. The hybrid role is a PDS construct; it was created from the need for individuals to engage in boundary-spanning roles to support the collaborative efforts of schools and universities for simultaneous renewal. While the research on PDS has examined areas such as veteran teachers and university faculty and the research on supervision has focused mostly on the teachers or recipients of supervision, what is unknown in
the literature is the supervisory practices of school-based hybrid educators and the impact of the PDS context on their practice.

Studies have examined teacher career development (Fuller, 1969; McNergney & Carrier, 1981; Steffy, et al., 2000) and professional development, which is a term for describing professional learning. With regard to the research about the professional development of supervisors, the literature is limited. Kilbourn, et al. (2005) noted the importance of supervisors’ ability to have an inquiry stance towards their practice in order to improve their ability to give constructive feedback. McIntyre & Byrd (1998) reviewed the research with regard to supervision in teacher education and found only a few studies on this topic. These studies focused primarily on training—one kind of professional development—and mostly this training was with regard to cooperating teachers and graduate students as supervisors. There were no studies that examined reassigned teachers as supervisors or examined supervision in a PDS context. In a review of the research on the impact of PDS on professional development, Nolan, et al. (2011) found that although there was research on veteran teacher learning, thinking, perception of their roles, and the climate for learning as well as on university faculty roles and perceptions of benefits and drawbacks of engagement in PDS work, there is still much work to be done. These authors called for studies that examine the growth and development as it is unfolding rather than examining it retrospectively in momentary glimpses. While research in Nolan, et al. (2011) does examine veteran teachers and university faculty, there were no studies that examined supervision in a PDS context or how experiences in a PDS context shape the professional learning of novice supervisors.

Moreover, in his research agenda for teacher education, Zeichner (2005) called for the study of teacher educators, and school-based hybrid educators are teacher educators. Bernson & Breault (2000) also recognized the increase in time spent of university teacher educators in the field and suggest further investigation into these practices. Furthermore, with the NCATE (2010)
Blue Ribbon Report emphasis on the practicum experience, the future remains uncertain with regard to how partnerships will change the structures and roles for classroom teachers and supervisors thereby changing the way we see supervision today. Because this study closely examined novice supervision, it is timely, critical, and contributes to the literature on supervision and professional development schools by asking the question: How does a novice school-based hybrid educator supervise in a PDS context?

Understanding Professional Development School Contexts:

Adding to Zeichner’s Framework as a Model

The purpose of this chapter is to understand the methodology and methods that supported this research. Because qualitative research emphasizes the situated nature of research, it is important to understand the specific context in which this study was conducted because the context of study has implications for the research and the research process. Therefore, this section is dedicated to understanding the specific context of this study in expectation that this explanation will help the reader better understand the rationale for the methodological selections and implementations.

In 2006, Ken Zeichner examined the research on teacher education programs between 1985 and 2004. Of the 37 studies identified, he concluded that the lack of common frameworks, nomenclature, and detailed descriptions of programs was a problem and resulted in little solid research. Instead, he recommended that researchers stop solely identifying programs by their structural characteristics (e.g. length of program, type of degree, etc.) and instead include more descriptive characteristics (e.g. substance of the curricula, policy contexts, characteristics of teacher candidates, etc.). By using a more detailed contextual framework, it was his hope that
more robust research would be produced and that relationships between teacher education programs and teacher and student learning would be clearer.

In his framework, Zeichner used lines to represent the connections between the three main components in a teacher candidate’s preparation: (1) her attributes, (2) her theoretical preparation and the contextual elements influencing it, and (3) her practical preparation and the contextual elements influencing it. However, Zeichner focused more on the institutions than on those connecting points, and I would like to turn our attention to one very critical connecting point—the connection between universities and schools, which includes the PDS context. That connecting point is marked in Figure 3-1.

![Figure 3-1: Identifying the Connecting Link in Zeichner’s Framework](image)

When we look at Zeichner’s model, we need to examine more closely the connecting link between teacher preparation programs and schools, which is explained in Figure 3-2. In this figure, the picture on the left is the box from Zeichner’s model. The drawing on the right is my depiction of what the link would look like if the connection were magnified. What I am describing here is an addition in Zeichner’s model; it is a description of the contextually based
factors that contribute to the links between schools and universities—what is called partnership work.

**Professional Development Schools: The Connection Between Universities and Schools**

**Guiding Beliefs & Principles**

**Support Structures**

**Roles & Relationships**

**The Curriculum**

The Magnification

Figure 3-2: A Magnified Depiction of the Connecting Link

Since this study involved a teacher preparation program and more specifically its PDS program, it is important to understand the contextual intricacies of both institutions that form the partnership in addition to the intricacies of the PDS itself, which would include describing the contextual features of the university and its teacher education program, the school district, and the PDS context. However, engaging in such comprehensive description, as Zeichner’s framework suggested, is almost too comprehensive for the purpose of this explanation. Explaining the intricacies of both institutions that form the partnership creates such massive description that the important features of the partnership are lost in the details of each institution. Rather than describing both institutions that inform the partnership individually, I propose instead to focus on the essential characteristics of the connection between the two institutions, which still creates a robust contextual description. In this way, I hope to preserve Zeichner’s focus on descriptive institutional characteristics over structural ones while simultaneously honing in on the critical
contextual aspects. Engaging in this kind of focused yet robust description creates a rich, realistic description of the PDS context.

Zeichner’s initial model called for a movement away from structural characteristics when describing programs. Instead, he proposed the use of more descriptive characteristics, hence the inclusion of policy context, beliefs, and teacher candidate characteristics, for example, in his framework (see Figure 3-1). His suggestion preserved the philosophical beliefs and ideals of the institution rather than casting them as secondary to structural details. Therefore, when describing a context for PDS work, the same should remain true. In order to understand the essence of the PDS under study, descriptive characteristics should be included. Using the proposed framework for describing the connecting space of intentional partnership work between universities and schools, I now describe the contextually based factors of the professional development school in which this study was conducted. The description begins broadly by describing the guiding beliefs and principles and eventually narrows to the smaller details of the curriculum. By beginning broadly, it is my hope that the reader will have a better understanding of the philosophy that informs the curriculum and other aspects of the PDS context.

**Guiding Beliefs and Principles**

PDSs are intentional collaboratives; they are deliberate attempts between schools and universities to work together to not only better prepare teacher candidates but also to renew schools (Goodlad, 1990). As ideological constructs, they reside in no one institution, they are governed by no one institution, and they survive because of no one institution. In true collaborative spirit, PDSs require a joint effort in order for the partnership to be successful. In this section, I demonstrate how this particular intentional partnership truly possesses the defining characteristics of a PDS as prescribed by the National Association of Professional Development Schools (NAPDS). By aligning the characteristics of this context with the NAPDS Essentials
I also show some of the guiding beliefs of this context. In addition to those characteristics, I also describe two more important beliefs—the notions of community and volunteerism—two features not included in the NAPDS Essentials.

**Fidelity to the innovation: Alignment with the NAPDS essentials.** Partnerships and PDSs are different. For a period of time, what distinguished a PDS from a partnership was determined by the particular institutions that created the relationship. This freedom produced great variance in the kinds of relationships that called themselves professional development schools. Even though Stallings, Wiseman, & Knight (1995) identified parity as the distinguishing characteristic between partnerships and PDSs, there still was great variance in the kinds of partnerships. Partnerships ranged from on-paper agreements to true organic collaboratives and both kinds called themselves PDSs. This disparity in the application of terminology caused NCATE (2001) to create standards and the NAPDS (2008) to identify key principles. These principles were to be the guidelines for partnerships in helping them determine whether their partnership was indeed a PDS. It is these nine essential characteristics that I will use to demonstrate the fact that this particular partnership is indeed a PDS.

First, PDSs are to have a comprehensive mission that encompasses both the individual institutions’ needs and a shared agenda whose aim is renewal beyond the immediate needs of those institutions. This PDS has been well established for over fifteen years. It has made a commitment to students, teacher candidates, veteran teachers, university faculty, and graduate students in their mission statement by aiming to improve the students’ educational experiences; produce high-quality teacher candidates; further the professional learning of veteran teachers, administrators, and university faculty; and prepare future teacher educators. Their mission is comprehensive in that it is focused on meeting the individual needs of both institutions while at the same time focusing on a shared agenda. The university’s needs would include the focus on teacher candidate preparation, university faculty development, and teacher educator preparation.
The school district’s needs would include the students’ educational experiences and the professional learning of veteran teachers and administrators. While focusing on the educational experiences of students is a primary need of schools, it should also be a focus for all educators. Children are the heart of education, and, therefore, this particular portion of the mission could be considered the shared focus of the mission. Schlechty & Whitford (1988) argued that partnerships should be focused on a common agenda in order to be considered organic collaboratives. By focusing on children and the betterment of their education, this PDS could be considered an organic collaborative because it has a comprehensive mission that meets the needs of both institutions while simultaneously being dedicated to a larger agenda.

Another qualifying characteristic of a PDS according to NAPDS (2008) is its commitment to teacher preparation. This PDS is committed to the induction of high quality future teachers into the profession. This principle is evident in this PDS’s mission, in its daily implementation of its mission, and in the other aspects described in more detail later in this section. While this PDS has not systematically inquired into its graduates, each year in-state and out-of-state school districts contact them asking them for graduates and send them openings that are available in their district. The reputation of this PDS’s ability to produce high quality teachers is spreading. Through these actions, this PDS shows its commitment to teacher preparation.

In order to be a PDS, the partnership must also engage in professional development for all parties. This PDS makes a commitment to professional learning for veteran teachers, administration, university faculty, and graduate students in its mission. In practice, university faculty offer graduate level courses around the needs of those invested in partnership work. For example, courses have been offered in mentoring, inquiry, classroom learning environments, video analysis practices, and science as inquiry to name a few. Many of the teachers and administrators are enrolled in graduate programs. But these instances are more of the formal nature; learning can also be informal and even incidental. This kind of learning “…is not typically
classroom-based or highly structured, and control of learning rests primarily in the hands of the learner” (Marsick & Watkins, 1990, p. 12), and it is through this kind of learning in the activities, functions, and interactions of and within the PDS that create the professional learning experiences for all parties. Consequently, this PDS is committed to the professional learning of all of its participants.

In addition, PDSs must cultivate a stance towards inquiry, meaning that they must create dispositions that problematize teaching as a practice. Dana & Yendol-Silva (2009) use the term inquiry to mean the intentional and systematic study of one’s practice. By studying one’s own practice, the product often generates more questions, which results in further inquiry rather than absolute resolution of the initial question. This PDS places great emphasis on inquiry. It encourages teacher inquiry for all stakeholders. In fact, as part of the curriculum, teacher candidates are required to conduct a formal teacher inquiry and present their findings at a local conference that the PDS holds to share the work of its teacher candidates and other PDS community participants. Teacher candidates, though, are not the only active inquirers. Mentor teachers must, at a minimum level, support their intern’s inquiry; sometimes they have even participated as co-inquirer’s. Other veteran teachers have conducted teacher inquiries as have university faculty and graduate students, and many times in the true spirit of collaboration, these inquiries are conducted jointly. These inquiries are presented at numerous state and national conferences. Inquiry in this context is more than part of the curriculum; it is a habit of mind.

PDSs must also engage in self-reflection and must be inclined to innovate. Inquiry is one vehicle for engaging in reflection and innovation. By systematically studying one’s own practice, or in this case the innovation of the PDS, one engages in reflection through the analysis process. Therefore, by engaging in inquiry, one would be participating in reflective thought. This PDS’s commitment to inquiry is one example of how it partakes in self-reflection and innovation based on those results. In addition, the PDS that serves as the context for this study also has several
collaborative structures, which will be explained in further detail later in this section, that allow for this process of reflection and innovation. Within these collaborative spaces, school district personnel and university faculty interact. It is in these locales where theory and practice literally intersect. Through these and other more intentional conversations, the PDS reflects on its current practices and considers future directions. Inquiry and dialogue are the catalysts for self-reflection and innovation.

PDSs also should have an articulated agreement. This document should explain the intricate details of roles and responsibilities of both institutions. While this PDS has been in existence for over a decade and a half, they have no formal written agreement. Each institution understands their roles and responsibilities, but their relationship is constantly evolving. Relationships are not static; they are formed, maintained, and preserved by people. As such, they are subject to change as the personnel changes within the institutions, which would jeopardize the partnership; hence, the need for a formalized document. However, to date, this partnership has survived turnover in school district administration including new school board members and the superintendent and in university faculty, and yet no formal agreement exists. The wording of this essentially suggests that an articulated agreement is recommended but not mandatory, and this PDS is an example of a thriving PDS functioning under implied mutual agreements.

PDSs should have an ongoing governance structure. In this PDS, governance is shared in the true spirit of collaboration. The role of co-facilitator is jointly held by university faculty members and school-based hybrid educators, typically one of each. The school-based hybrid role is a rotating role whereas the university role has typically been more stable. The PDAs, or Professional Development Associates, also have a role in the governance. All PDAs, which include the co-facilitators who are considered PDAs, meet weekly to discuss the daily details that maintain the PDS. This space offers freedom to discuss problems, issues, and concerns, and the PDAs, when problem-solving, work to reach consensus. In this PDS, voting is not an acceptable
form of resolution because voting results in winners and losers. Consensus is the accepted protocol of resolution.

PDSs must have boundary-spanning roles. PDSs exist in the space “in between” schools and universities, and, therefore, they require individuals who can navigate the cultures of both institutions (Goodlad, 1990b). The PDS in which this study occurred enacts these hybrid roles in the title of PDAs or Professional Development Associates and are assumed by university faculty, graduate students, reassigned teachers, and classroom teachers. Hardly any PDA has exactly the same role. PDAs differ on the following characteristics: home institution, title, assigned workload, and responsibilities. Some teach courses, some supervise interns, some co-facilitate, and some do a combination of those roles. Table 3-1 gives a profile of individuals in these roles in this PDS at the time that this study was conducted. The home institution is the place where the individual resides. Their title is the term for their role according to their institution.
Table 3-1: Professional Development Associate Profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Assigned Workload</th>
<th># of Interns for Supervision</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Part time: 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Part time: Co-facilitator, 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Co-facilitator, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Part time: co-teaches 2 courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Part time: co-teaches 2 courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Fixed Term Faculty</td>
<td>Full Time: Co-facilitator, 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Co-facilitator, supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Full Time: 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Part Time: co-teaches 2 courses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Part Time: 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Part Time: 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Reassigned Teacher</td>
<td>Full Time: Co-facilitator, 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Co-facilitator, supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Reassigned Teacher</td>
<td>Full Time: 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Supervision, methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Part Time: co-teaches 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Part Time: co-teaches 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>Part Time: co-teaches 1 course – 3 credit hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Methods course instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The assigned workload is designated as either part time or full time, and within each of those designations is the kind of assignment. If a PDA is a supervisor, then the number of interns assigned to him or her will be listed in this category. If the PDA is strictly a methods course instructor, then the teaching load will be described in this category. Part time PDAs, with the exception of the assistant professors, typically are committed to the PDS for 20 hours per week. The final category described in the table is the responsibilities of the PDA. Possible responsibilities include supervision, co-facilitator, and/or methods course instructor. The ultimate responsibility of the PDS is in the hands of the co-facilitators. The co-facilitators include a tenure track faculty member, a fixed term faculty member, and a reassigned teacher. The row that is bolded is the profile of the main participant of this study. All of the individual profiles change on a yearly basis. While none of these roles are permanent, typically there are individuals who assume similar roles as personnel changes.

PDSs must have shared resources and celebrations. One example of how this PDS shares resources is through the school-based hybrid role. At any given time up to three classroom teachers are reassigned to be PDAs. While they remain on the school district’s payroll, the university agrees to pay for the replacement of two long-term substitutes, and the school district agrees to pay for the third. By sharing the financial burden of this role, both institutions show their commitment to the partnership, the role, and the teachers who assume this role.

Celebrations are important moments in recognizing individual and group accomplishments. They help sustain the group’s momentum in what could be very passionate but exhausting work. This PDS has several celebration points throughout the school year. Prior to the beginning of the year, the mentors and interns have a retreat where they meet one another, learn about each other’s likes and dislikes, and share a meal at a picnic. Then to officially begin the year, this PDS has a more formalized ceremony after school for members of the PDS community. At this ceremony, interns make a pledge to adhere to a professional code of ethics. During this
time, mentors stand alongside their interns to support them and show their commitment to them and the teaching profession. In December, the PDS celebrates the end of the fall semester with the interns. They reflect on their accomplishments and look forward to the spring semester. Often there is food, laughter, and even an occasional tear as reflection can be quite an emotionally powerful experience. For mentors, the PDS will hold a retreat specifically for them. This celebration is typically held after school and over dinner. Here mentors are invited to reflect on the fall semester and offer input on improvements for next year. Mentor retreats are spaces where mentors’ voices are recognized, heard, and valued, and when suggestions are implemented the following year, mentors feel empowered. At the end of the year, the PDS has its grand finale—its Pinning Ceremony. This culmination is the most formal ceremony of the year. At this celebration, mentors officially induct their interns into the profession by literally pinning them. Mentors and PDAs typically wear their pins throughout the year, so when interns receive this symbol of achievement at this ceremony, it means a great deal to them and to members of the community. A dinner usually follows this formal induction and then the more light-hearted portion of the evening ensues where buildings come prepared to perform skits commemorating the year. This ceremony is one of the rituals designed to strengthen community, and community—as described later—is a hallmark of this context. Celebrations recognize the emotional and physical energy and effort that individuals dedicate to PDS work. This PDS has celebrations in the beginning, middle, and end of the year.

The purpose of this section was to describe this PDSs’ guiding beliefs and principles as they related to the NAPDS essentials, which were created because of the vast range of partnerships calling themselves PDSs. This partnership is truly a PDS; it is an example of a robust, organic collaborative whose daily realities meet the NAPDS (2008) criteria. However, there are two other key features of this context that are not included in the NAPDS Essentials, and they are community and volunteerism.
One community. PDSs are the joint effort of schools and universities to collaborate in the preparation of teachers. While some PDSs describe their collaboration as a school-wide PDS, this PDS embraces the district’s entire elementary program as one PDS. This language is intentional and expresses a cultural norm—community. Decisions are made jointly in the true spirit of collaboration. Being one community is important because it avoids fragmentation and competition. By being a district-wide PDS, resources can be shared among all of the buildings. For example, if one year a building needed three supervisors because they had more mentor volunteers and another building needed only two supervisors because they had fewer volunteers, then the supervisors would simply be shifted from one building to another. Having the mentality of one community provides togetherness and maintains a sense of unity. Another example of the community ideal is in the intern selection process.

Teacher candidates desiring to enter this program for the following year can choose to attend an informational meeting about the program during the fall semester. By December, those considering the program must complete a written application. Each application is scored on a four-point scale by members of the PDS community. Interview teams composed of mentors, PDAs, former PDAs, curriculum coordinators, and other members of the PDS community then interview the applicants. A PDA and one representative from each interview team then attend the selection meeting. At this time, the interns are selected based on their written and interview scores, and any interns whose scores are debatable are discussed thoroughly until consensus is reached. The expectation during this meeting is that the representatives are selecting the members for the community, and the community trusts in their decision; they agree to accept whatever is decided upon at this meeting. This process is important to the PDS community in that it supports the guiding belief that they are a community, and it gives members voice in the community. The intern selection process is one example of how this PDS engages collaborative problem solving and decision making in order to adhere to their guiding beliefs about community.
Volunteerism: A state of mind. All personnel—university faculty, graduate students, supervisors, principals and other administrative personnel, interns, and mentor teachers—in this PDS are volunteers. Interns, undergraduate seniors, volunteer for their roles in this PDS. Through an extensive application process, the PDS community selects each incoming cohort of approximately sixty students. As volunteers, interns agree to abandon the university calendar for their senior year and adopt the school district’s calendar. Such a commitment means that these interns truly experience an entire academic year. Mentor teachers are also volunteers. They agree to open their doors and work collaboratively with the interns and university personnel throughout the year. They also agree to support their interns in their development as inquiry learners, and some will engage in collaborative inquiry with their interns. University faculty and graduate students are also volunteers. They are not required to work in the PDS context, so when they agree to do so, they must understand and accept this status.

Being a volunteer brings with it a certain state of mind. All parties then are vested and committed to the collaborative; they are dedicated to each other and the work. Approaching the collaborative with this mindset is advantageous in that nothing is forcing anyone to engage in this kind or level of commitment. Those who do it do the work because they want to, which is a different mindset than participating out of requirement.

Support Structures

A PDS has a culture of its own. As an intentional partnership, it requires support structures to ensure its survival. Understanding that support is quite complex, for structures are often connected and interrelated. Nolan, Badiali, Bauer, & McDonough (2007) created a framework for understanding these structures in their PDS, which also is this context of study. Figure 3-3 is copied directly from their text, and their figure is adapted from Newman’s (1998) work (as cited in Nolan, Badiali, Bauer, & McDonough, 2007, p. 105).
The foundation of the support structures is the leadership dispositions. The heart of partnership work is relationships, and relationships require trust and reciprocity. In this PDS, leadership is not about one person; instead it is more distributed among the organization through

Figure 3-3: PDS Support Structures (Nolan, et al., 2007 who adapted from Newman, 1998).
its decision-making process. Dispositions are habits of the mind. Those key leadership dispositions include collaboration and consensus, commitment, shared decision-making, supporting, listening, collegiality, focus on strengths, forgiveness, success breeds success, and a strong sense of optimism (Nolan, et al., 2007). In this context, leadership is thought of not as one person as “boss” but rather as multiple people having a voice in the process. When individuals have voice, then they have ownership and feel vested in the community. Examples of how these leadership dispositions are cultivated occur in many forms; they actuate themselves in the collaborative structures.

Collaborative structures are “…those deliberate experiences in which colleagues engage in a common set of tasks, the accomplishment of which serves their mutual benefit and contributes to meeting common goals” (Nolan, et al., 2007, p. 111). PDSs are comprised of boundary-spanning work, so there needs to be opportunities or meeting points where these institutions collide; where theory and practice meet; where enough trust exists to openly discuss tensions between the two, for that is the power of partnership work. Collaborative structures provide those meetings points and create the space for fostering voice among the community.

For interns. In this PDS, the interns are divided into two groups of approximately 30 students for the fall semester. These are considered their “methods cohorts” and they are named based on the school district’s colors. They remain in this grouping until the spring semester when the two are united into one large cohort and are named using the university’s colors. Interns are also grouped according to building cohorts. The number of interns varies per building based upon the number of willing mentors in that building—usually the numbers range from one to fifteen per building. In addition, they also try to have representation from both methods cohorts in the same building. Interns also meet weekly together as a building with all of the interns in that building and all of the supervisors assigned to that building. Typically, that would include two supervisors, but occasionally there have been three in buildings with more interns. These weekly
gatherings are opportunities for interns to discuss issues and concerns associated with the classroom, their practice, their coursework, and the PDS in general. Supervisors may also use the time for instructional purposes if the need arises, but typically it is a space for the interns’ voice to be heard.

For mentors. Mentors participate in monthly mentor meetings with the other mentors and supervisors in the building. Together they discuss issues and concerns regarding their practice as mentors, the interns’ coursework, and the PDS in general. The time may also be used to communicate informational items about the PDS, and mentor feedback may also be solicited at this time. Another opportunity for mentor feedback occurs at the bi-annual mentor retreats, as described earlier, and on course planning teams. Mentors are invited during the summer months to offer feedback regarding the PDS curriculum in order to ensure that methods coursework, which the interns complete during the fall semester, is more applicable and closely aligned to the district’s curriculum while at the same time preserving the reform-oriented practices advocated at the university. These meeting points invite mentor feedback and create opportunities for mentors’ voices to be heard.

For PDAs as supervisors. For two hours each week, supervisors, also known as Professional Development Associates (PDAs) in this context, gather to discuss issues, concerns, and logistical functions and details of the organization. Sometimes this time is also used to further their professional learning. This particular year, an additional hour was added called PDA Learning, and this time was dedicated to further the professional learning of the group. In the fall, many of the PDAs participated in a study group using a text as the centerpiece of reading, dialogue, and reflection. In the spring, individuals volunteered to bring articles to read or issues to discuss as a collective community. At the weekly PDA meetings, PDAs exchange practical ideas regarding working with teacher candidates in supervision and in the higher education classroom.

In many ways, these weekly meetings seem like the heartbeat of the PDS; the decisions made
here are what keep the PDS functioning on a daily basis, but most importantly they are a space where PDAs can share knowledge and experience as well as share issues and concerns. It is a meeting point for voice empowerment.

For administrators. Principals and the university PDS co-facilitators meet monthly to discuss issues, concerns, and questions regarding PDS-related functions, activities, and general business. These meetings rotate among the various buildings in the district—again showing that this PDS is one community. In addition to these meetings, individuals in a variety of organizational roles throughout the district including curriculum, technology, and administration and the co-facilitators along with some PDAs meet every other month to discuss PDS related business. These meeting points maintain open lines of communication in and provide vision for the organization.

A common theme. These collaborative structures have a common theme—regular points of contact. Relationships are the glue of PDS work, so maintaining the relationships requires constant contact, communication, and trust. Maintenance occurs through these collaborative structures, and the PDAs—the hybrids engaging in the boundary-spanning roles as supervisors—are the key personnel for the vitality of the PDS. Meeting regularly with interns, mentors, PDAs, principals, and other administrators helps keep the lines of communication open. It also establishes routines, and routines foster relationships. Regularly seeing someone and conversing with her creates a common forum for dialogue and lays a foundation for a relationship.

Collaborative structures for vision. In addition to the regular meeting points, it is necessary to convene individuals to evaluate the current state of the PDS and consider its future and direction. One structure is a research group. Composed of primarily university faculty and graduate students, this committee meets as needed to discuss research currently being conducted in and about the PDS and to provide direction for future research projects. Another structure is an advisory group. This group meets semi-annually and is composed of educators, community
members, and PDS representatives. A third structure is parent contact. Parents are surveyed each year regarding their child’s experiences. A final group for providing vision is a steering committee. This committee is created and dissolved on an as needed basis. It is composed of representatives from inside and outside of the PDS community in hopes that the diversity in perspective will create a more informed direction for the PDS community.

This PDS has created various collaborative structures in order to ensure that multiple voices are heard. Collaborative structures create the foundation for relationships and maintain communication throughout the organization. They also provide spaces for sharing and empowering the voices of others in the community. Such participation spreads ownership across both institutions and shows the vested interest and commitment from all stakeholders. In the diagram, these collaborative structures work towards building instructional capacity. Once achieved, instructional quality can also be achieved. The quality of the instruction then impacts the learners’ engagement. All of the elements, as presented in Figure 3-3, work towards meeting the partnerships’ mission.

Roles and Relationships

A functioning PDS requires personnel to carry out the various tasks needed to support this kind of intensive work. In this PDS context, the roles are more flat than hierarchical. A PDS consists of teacher candidates, mentor teachers, administrators, graduate students, and university faculty working together for the betterment of children. The heart of this collaborative effort is the relationships among and between all vested parties. In order to understand the roles and relationships, terminology needs to be addressed. The purpose of this next section is to discuss the intentionality behind the terminology of the three primary roles—teacher candidate as intern, classroom teacher as mentor, and supervisor as Professional Development Associate or PDA—
and to describe one of the critical structures in forming relationships that support PDS work—the triad.

**Changing terminology.** The term preservice is often used to describe undergraduate elementary education majors who have not yet attained their teaching certification or credentials. Sometimes this term can be used synonymously with teacher candidate or student teacher. Traditionally teacher candidates who were in their final semester of coursework and were ready for the capstone field-based experience have been known as student teachers, but the terminology in this PDS is different—and that use is intentional. Teacher candidates in a PDS are undergraduate seniors majoring in elementary education who have been accepted into the PDS community through a formal screening process, as previously mentioned, and who have agreed to devote a year to their practicum experience. They demonstrate immense commitment to the PDS program by agreeing to adopt the school district’s calendar and spending an entire year teaching alongside a certified teacher; hence, the term student teacher became intern. Certified teachers who typically permitted student teachers to come into their classrooms for a period of time were traditionally known as cooperating teachers, but the teachers in the PDS do more than just cooperate—they mentor. They truly induct the teacher candidates into the profession by acting in this advisory capacity, spending a year supporting, nurturing, and mentoring the intern; hence, the term cooperating teacher became mentor.

Supervision in teacher preparation can look very evaluative where the supervisor visits sporadically throughout the semester to “observe,” essentially to evaluate the student teacher’s practice and give feedback—sometimes verbally, sometimes in the written form, and sometimes both—before making the final evaluations at the end of the semester. These practices would be similar to the historical notions of supervision being practiced as evaluation towards practicing teachers (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992; Fehr, 2001; Glickman, 1992; Gordon, 1997; McNergney & Carrier, 1981; McNeil 1982; Sergiovanni, 1992), but in a PDS, observing as evaluation is just one
of the roles and responsibilities of supervisors. These individuals, known as Professional Development Associates or PDAs, work to support both interns and mentors. PDAs are the facilitators of the triad of interns, mentors, and PDAs, helping interns reach their potential and supporting mentors in their professional growth. PDAs also support children and administrators and can contribute to their growth as well. This change of term from supervisor to PDA shows that the conceptualization and operation of the PDA role extends beyond traditional notions of supervision as evaluation to include professional growth for all parties: intern, mentor, PDA, administrator, and child.

Being deliberate about terminology is important because the titles inherently send messages regarding individuals’ roles and responsibilities in the PDS. If those messages are not aligned with the beliefs of the PDS, then dissonance occurs and unravels the threads of trust used to maintain the necessary relationships of PDS work.

The triad. The triad is the inclusion of three types of individuals who work together in support of professional growth and learning for themselves as well as the school community, the classroom community, and the children. A triad consists of the intern, the mentor, and the PDA. Whereas in some supervisory relationships the focus may be solely on the student teacher, that case is not true here. In the triad, the intern’s growth is only one dimension; all three are working together to support each other’s learning for the betterment of children’s learning.

The Curriculum

The teacher preparation curriculum is negotiated. Methods coursework, which is taught during the fall semester, is taught collaboratively between university and school-based faculty. This collaborative approach to instruction means that syllabi are discussed and negotiated in order to merge theory and practice, thereby by making it relevant to both university personnel who are responsible for content and classroom teachers who are responsible for the students in the
classrooms where the methods coursework is implemented. During the fall, the interns are in their classrooms with students and their mentor teachers four out of five days per week. They have one full day of methods coursework and one course after school one day a week. Science, social studies, and math complete the methods coursework; literacy education is completed during their junior year. Interns also take an additional, elective course on classroom learning environments; many of their on-campus peers do not have this class as part of this sequence of preparation. Both types of teacher educators—university and school-based faculty—meet regularly to plan and implement instruction. In the spring, the interns are in their classrooms all day, five days a week. Twice a week, they attend a two-hour seminar related to four big ideas: developing an inquiry stance, planning for teaching and learning, becoming culturally proficient, and entering the teaching profession. These seminars are co-taught by both university and school-based personnel.

The four days that the interns are in their classrooms for an entire year provides a prolonged, comprehensive experience with a particular classroom. Interns have an opportunity to develop strong relationships with their students and mentor teacher. By being with them for an entire year, they develop deep knowledge about their students academically, socially, and emotionally. One critique of a prolonged experience is that the teacher candidate has limited experiences in multiple grade levels—an affordance of brief, multi-part placements. In order to accommodate such a perspective while preserving the richness of depth in a prolonged experience, interns in this PDS have a yearlong partner classroom that is a difference in grade level by a minimum of two years. Therefore, an intern in first grade would be required to have a partner classroom in at least the third grade level. In this situation, the interns have two placements—their primary classroom and a partner classroom—over a period of one academic year. In this case, the teacher candidate has the benefit of developing deep relationships with teachers and students in more than one grade level.
As Darling-Hammond & Hammerness (2005) note, great variety exists in the structure of the student teaching experience. One extreme is a survival technique where the teacher candidate is handed over the classroom and expected to either pass or fail. In this case, the cooperating teacher simply washes her hands of any coaching, and the experience becomes completely evaluative. As an alternative approach to learning, this PDS advocates a co-teaching model where the intern learns literally at the elbow of the mentor teacher. In this situation, the focus is not on evaluation but rather on growth and development through reflective practice. Yendol-Hoppey & Dana (2008) refer to the cycle of co-planning, co-teaching, co-reflecting, and co-problem posing as inquiry oriented mentoring. Developing reflective practitioners requires a shift in focus away from primarily evaluative purposes to an environment that supports risk-taking and reflection in order to promote growth and development over a period of time. This collaborative effort is just another example of how this particular PDS embraces the principles of partnership work.

Summary

Zeichner (2006) critiqued the research on teacher education programs as lacking common frameworks and nomenclature. He presented a framework for researchers to use when describing their programs in hopes of creating more robust descriptions of programs and contexts, which would result in better research by having a better understanding of linking teacher education programs to a variety of outcome factors. However, Zeichner’s framework needed an addition in order to more appropriately fit contexts that involve partnership work. Consequently, I added a component to Zeichner’s framework that was appropriate for describing PDS work. In this section, I used Zeichner’s framework to describe the contextual and descriptive elements of the PDS in which this study occurred.

Zeichner’s framework and my addition are not without flaw. One critique of the model could be the use of boxes. The geometric frame feels rigid and limiting with regard to describing
programs whose borders do not seem so clear-cut, and perhaps the shapes are not as clean as they appear in the figure. Another concern could be the portrayal of partnership work as being a thin line between schools of education and schools. Critics of this representation could argue that partnership work and more specifically PDS work is much more robust and complex to be portrayed in this diminutive fashion. However, one affordance that this thin line demonstrates is the fragility of partnership work and the relationships between these two institutions. Relationships are the heart of this connection, but relationships can unravel. A challenge of collaborative work is maintaining communication to preserve, strengthen, and enhance these critical relationships.

Despite these critiques, the purpose of using such a framework was to paint a robust picture of the context of study. By adhering to Zeichner’s suggestion of using descriptive rather than structural characteristics and by adding the characteristics of PDS work, I was able to fulfill Zeichner’s (2005) call. Moreover, qualitative research and more specifically case study research is grounded in the context of study. Therefore, it was essential to describe the context of study and its complexity in order to understand the situatedness of this study. In the next section, I offer a rationale for the selection of this PDS as the context of study.

**An Exemplary Model for the Context of Study**

This study took place in the context of a PDS. In this case, the partnership is between a large, land grant university and a relatively large semi-rural public school district for its state. One of the struggles of the PDS movement has been its superficiality; the term partnership has been used quite generously to describe a wide range of arrangements—from on paper agreements, for example, to full blown organic collaboratives. For this reason, standards were created to help tighten the definition of a PDS (NAPDS, 2008; NCATE, 2001); however, despite these attempts, a common definition and identifying PDSs is still lacking (Fields, 2009; Nolan, et al., 2011).
Trying to understand novice supervision in a PDS context that was not truly a PDS context would jeopardize the validity of the research. This PDS is unique in that it has won three national awards to date for its exemplary work as a collaborative. As an exemplar, it offers a learning rich environment and a model for enacting the principles outlined in PDS work and for examining the boundary-spanning roles of partnership work. It presents a context that exists as a robust PDS—a context ripe for researching concepts in mature PDSs.

Participants

Participants are the key individuals who act as the backbone of the study. The information they provide is the data—so who they are, how they are selected, and the relationships that they have with the researcher are all important features of the research and the research process. In this section, I describe these features as well as how the researcher was perceived throughout the research process and any ethical concerns that arose.

Participant Selection

Participant selection in qualitative research is dependent upon the methodology. In case study research, the cases are typically selected for either their ordinariness or their extraordinariness (Creswell, 1998; Stake, 2003). This study is a case of novice supervision in a professional development school, so the probable participants were the novice hybrid educator engaging in supervision and the recipients of those supervisory practices, which included her interns, mentors, and other members of the PDS community. The novice hybrid was selected because she was extraordinary; she was unique to a majority of the hybrid population—she was a first year supervisor—and she offered information about the experience of being a novice supervisor. In many other ways, though, she was ordinary compared to the other novice hybrids.
that have been in the context and to the image of supervisors in teacher education contexts; she was a veteran teacher nearing the end of her teaching career. The image of supervisors in teacher education is that they are typically retired teachers or principals who observe and evaluate teacher candidates (Greenberg, et al., 2011), so in this sense, the case selected was ordinary with regard to the image of supervision in teacher education. Her participation was essential, for without her, the study was not possible. Therefore, the methods of her selection were critical and dependent upon the tradition of inquiry, which was case study, in qualitative research. Both criterion and purposeful sampling were used.

Criterion sampling involves selecting individuals because they have a common experience (Creswell, 1998). The main participant was selected using this approach because she shared a common experience with the rest of the hybrid population under examination—she was a classroom teacher who was in her first year of being reassigned to the role of supervisor in a PDS context. The other participants—her interns and mentors—were also selected using this approach. They all shared the common experience of being supervised by her as a novice school-based hybrid educator. Of the 60 total interns, the selection for this study was limited to eight because she was assigned eight interns, who were located in two different buildings. The same rationale was applied to the mentor selection, as it included only those mentors whose interns were supervised by her as a novice hybrid educator. Therefore, of the 63 mentors, eight of them were probable participants. This meant that there were a total of sixteen probable participants for understanding this case. The purpose was to understand novice supervision in a PDS context; therefore, sources for that information were those who were directly affected by the novice hybrid and shared that as a common experience. To review, the probable participants included: one novice hybrid educators, eight interns, and eight mentors. Table 3-2 represents the probable and actual participants in this study.
Table 3-2: Probable and Actual Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probable # of Interns</th>
<th># Interviewed</th>
<th>Probable # of Mentors</th>
<th># Interviewed</th>
<th>Probable Total</th>
<th>Total Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maxwell (2005) also suggests the use of purposeful sampling, the intentional selection of individuals who provide information that cannot be retrieved from any other individual. The selection of this hybrid as a participant was both intentional and purposeful. It was intentional because of the limited possibility of participants, and it was purposeful because she was a key participant who possessed a story to be told—she was a novice hybrid in an exemplary PDS context who could offer insight into novice supervisory practices in that context. The opportunity to study the novice hybrid experience is transient, happening only every couple of years. The rationale for her selection was simple; she was a veteran teacher who became a novice supervisor for that particular year, and according to the literature, she seemed typical and ordinary to the typical image of a supervisor in teacher education. These reasons offer a rationale for selecting her as the primary participant in this case.

The narrowing of probable participants to 16—eight interns and eight mentors—was both purposeful and intentional as described above and portrayed in Table 3-2. Moreover, the selection of this site was also intentional. As an exemplar, this context offered an image of the possible. Understanding the novice supervisor experience should be conducted in as ideal of a context as possible. This award-winning PDS provided such an environment for study. Ultimately, the selection of these individuals as participants in this context was based on their extraordinary status as either a novice supervisor or being supervised by a novice supervisor, determined by the criteria of their common experience, and chosen by their access to information, which no one else
could provide. The strategies used in the participant selection were congruent with case study methodology, which was the foundational paradigm of this study.

**Participant Description**

The primary participant in this study was a new PDA who was a school-based hybrid educator, meaning she was a classroom teacher who was reassigned to be a supervisor. Helen, as I call her, has been an elementary teacher for almost thirty years, and she is passionate about children’s literature. Helen has furthered her professional learning by achieving a master’s equivalency and taking some coursework on mentoring. She also has had some experience as a teacher educator by being a mentor teacher, but she has never been a PDA or in the role of supervisor previously.

Mentors and PDAs have both common and distinct characteristics. Both are types of teacher educators; however, mentors work with only one intern on a daily basis while a PDA is responsible for multiple interns – typically anywhere from two to twelve depending on the PDA’s status as full or part time – on a weekly basis. Mentors are confined by the institutional constraints of schools, limiting their freedom over their schedules. PDAs are the opposite; they completely determine their schedules each week, but when school-based hybrid educators return to their classroom teaching responsibilities, this loss of freedom contributes to their struggles during re-entry (Burns, 2010). Ultimately, PDAs also bring with them varying experiences as classroom teachers and as teacher educators.

As a long-standing member of the district and the PDS community, Helen held relationships with other teachers in the district. When she became a supervisor, she worked with some of these teachers because these teachers were mentor teachers of her interns. She also held relationships with experienced supervisors in the PDS community.
Relationships

Qualitative research advocates for a relationship beyond neutrality between the researcher and the participants (Glesne, 2006). In fact, the researcher often acts as a participant-observer (Borko, Whitcomb, & Byrnes, 2008; Creswell, 1998; Glesne, 2006). Experiencing the culture from this first hand perspective is an appropriate and acceptable aspect of qualitative research in general (Glesne, 2006). Achievement of this close status is dependent upon the relationships. Relationships are critical in qualitative research because of the intimate role of the researcher to the context, participants, and research. Through relationships, and specifically rapport in those relationships (Glesne, 2006), the researcher gains access to the critical information needed to understand that which is under investigation (Maxwell, 2005). Relationships do not automatically occur; instead, they must be built. Relationships require trust, intimacy, and reciprocity (Maxwell, 2005), which act as the key characteristics in the relationship building process. The absence of any one of those characteristics could jeopardize the entire relationship and compromise the research. Having an awareness of the current state of the relationship between the researcher and the participant(s) is critical because the success of the research is dependent upon the success of those relationships. Therefore, the relationships that I established with the participants impacted my access to information and consequently impacted the research.

It is important to disclose that I was a member of this community while conducting the research; I was a more experienced hybrid educator who also supervised. As one of these PDAs, I established relationships with the other PDAs of past and present. For the past three years, I worked with Helen in many situations and PDS gatherings. During the year that this study was conducted, we saw each other at least once a week at our weekly PDA meetings and oftentimes throughout the week in the school buildings. I was paired with the primary participant in a school, which meant that I worked directly with her in her building and with her interns. Since I was a member of the PDS community for a few years, I also knew some of the mentor teachers who
were working with her because I worked with them when I collaboratively designed and implemented with their principal a professional development experience over a three-year period. In addition to being in the field with Helen, I also co-taught one of the methods courses with her and another university-based hybrid. Working in the field and co-teaching together required immense amounts of communication through face-to-face interactions, email messages, and telephone calls, so I had many opportunities to establish trust and rapport in building our relationship. These varying types and levels of interaction impacted the relationships I had with her mentors and her.

Since PDAs were university faculty, reassigned teachers, or doctoral students, they brought with them variation in roles and responsibilities, backgrounds, and knowledge and expertise about supervision. Some were classroom teachers; others are university faculty. Some possessed more practical knowledge; others possessed more theoretical knowledge. Some took coursework in supervision; others did not. Some had been members of the community for many years; others were just beginning their assimilation. These characteristics influenced their identities, which influenced the relationships.

Being a reassigned teacher, a faculty member, or a doctoral student situated the person differently and impacted the relationships. I was a graduate student hybrid while Helen was a reassigned classroom teacher hybrid. Therefore, it is important to understand how these identities could have potentially impacted the research relationships. Faculty members, for example, were situated with more status in the university community than graduate students. Even if attempts were made to equalize the working relationship to be more of a colleagueship, the inherent nature of the two roles is hierarchical—one was teacher and the other student—implying that one, the faculty member, had more knowledge and power, creating an unequal relationship of superiority and inferiority. Tension could also have existed between graduate student PDAs and school-based hybrids. Since the role of graduate student was inherently inferior to that of faculty member, it
was possible that school-based hybrids also viewed graduate students as inferior. However, the opposite may also have been true as well. Graduate student PDAs were less removed from the classroom than their faculty counter parts, which may have gained them favoritism with school-based hybrids who were either still working in classrooms as mentors or who were immediately removed from the classroom as reassigned teachers. Seeing this connection could have strengthened the relationship before one was even created. Relationships between fellow graduate student PDAs could have resembled more of a colleagueship. Feeling some sense of camaraderie and empathetic understanding of a similar experience as students made this relationship the most equal of all three types.

Another characteristic that could have influenced the relationships was the status of newcomer or old-timer in the community (Lave & Wenger, 1998). If an individual spent more time in the community, she may have had more clout among other old-timers than newcomers. This status could have impacted the relationships among and between PDAs. The possibility existed that structures present in the PDS flattened the hierarchical relationships that were naturally present among these varying characteristics based on the identities of the PDAs. Therefore, as a graduate student PDA and member of the community for four years, my relationships with faculty PDAs were different from my relationships with school-based hybrids, which were different from my relationships with graduate student PDAs.

Relationships require trust, intimacy, and reciprocity (Maxwell, 2005). Throughout this research, I worked diligently to establish these characteristics in forming and strengthening my relationships with all participants throughout this yearlong study. When we had conversations together, we often held them at a location that was either neutral or an environment that was more comfortable to them. I wanted the participants to feel that they could speak freely with me. In fact, in January Helen asked me who would be listening to the audiotapes of our interviews. Since she had spoken so candidly with me, she was worried about others hearing what she said in the
interviews (Field Notes, 01.26.11). I also was aware of nonverbal cues from my participants. During the research, I could identify moments when Helen and the other participants were holding something back, so I would frame a question differently in order to understand and dig deeper, if possible, into their thinking and feelings. I was very aware of our relationships and how that relationship was impacting the responses. Ultimately, I built trusting relationships with my participants and reflected on those relationships continuously throughout the research process.

Relationships are at the core of qualitative research. Their creation and preservation with participants and participants living in the culture is critical for understanding the nature of the multiple realities in that context. Recognizing this criticality requires the researcher to cultivate relationships and reflect on them throughout the entire research process, thereby contributing to the standards of quality and rigorous research.

Perceptions of the Researcher

Perceptions are inextricably linked to the relationships between the researcher and the participants; therefore, the researcher must constantly monitor her behavior in order to develop the rapport necessary in fostering positive research relationships (Glesne, 2006). Positive perceptions strengthen relationships while negative ones weaken them. How the participants perceive the researcher’s role, responsibility, motive, and manner has implications for the relationship and the research. Therefore, the researcher must have an understanding and awareness of the participants’ perceptions.

In supervision, there is a constant tension between acting as a supervisor and acting as an evaluator. Although the two are not the same, most people combine these roles (Nolan & Hoover, 2005). It is this combination that impacts the power dynamic and the relationship. The same notions could be applied to researcher and participant. If the researcher is perceived as an evaluator, someone passing judgment on a participant’s actions, then the participant is likely to
respond or act in atypical manners. Atypicality is not the intention, for it jeopardizes the research by providing false information as data. Consequently, the researcher must have an awareness of the perceptions surrounding her and consciously make an effort to validate appropriately matched perceptions and invalidate the others.

Since I have worked in this PDS context and built relationships over the past three years, I was seen as a colleague with the current PDAs. My status as colleague supported the relationships that I formed with Helen, but I was also aware of other perceptions. The participants knew that I was studying their supervisory practices as novice supervisors. This position as researcher-as-colleague had the potential to create distance between us and result in them concealing information. However, I found that the relationships I formed with the participants were strong, and they enjoyed the time that we spent together. Before the beginning of the next year, Helen remarked that even though she was no longer my research subject, she wanted to continue to meet weekly. Moreover, it was because of this relationship that I could probe further when I noticed nonverbal cues that indicated the potential of her concealing information. It was during those times that I either altered my questioning to gain deeper meaning through alternative questioning or I “checked-in” with them asking about their feelings and their body language. The intimacy of these research relationships with Helen, her interns, and mentors helped me to know and feel the credibility in the data.

However, this relationship of researcher-as-colleague was also problematic. While it allowed me to have intimate access and very honest and forthright conversations, disseminating any findings that might cause the participant discomfort was troublesome. Caring about Helen as a person meant that I needed to reflect on the process to ensure that I was honoring both. There also were larger implications for this research. Since it was conducted in a closely connected community, damaging relationships had implications at both the individual level and at the systemic level. In fact, one of the mentors, who ultimately agreed to participate in the study,
shared that when she was initially contacted, she was reluctant due to past experiences with doctoral research studies. However, after having a conversation with me and discussing her fears, she ultimately agreed to participate. Negative experiences have opportunities to damage the fragile relationships between schools and universities that might inhibit future research opportunities. Therefore, I had to be aware of these relationships, reflect on them and the research, and ultimately have conversations with individuals to ensure that I was honoring the research, the relationships, and the individuals.

Also, I was aware of my status as researcher-as-evaluator; I did not want this position to interfere with our relationship and the data. My role as a researcher was not to judge but rather to describe what was happening and how it happened. Even though examining our practice was a norm in this context, my status as fellow PDA assisted in this process. Since inquiry was a cultural norm in this PDS community, research was not a foreign entity. I was keenly aware of and constantly monitoring the perceptions of my role as researcher because establishing and maintaining these relationships was critical.

Supervision is highly personal. It requires intimate relationships between the supervisor and the supervisee. As the researcher, I was privileged to this relationship between Helen and her interns and mentors. Therefore, forming relationships with the interns and mentors was essential. While these relationships were not as close as my relationship was with Helen, they were still relationships that were negotiated.

With regard to the interns, I was one of their course instructors. Some of the interns knew me more closely because of working as another PDA in their building whereas others’ interactions with me were strictly in a seminar experience with ten other instructors. However, as one of their course instructors, they saw me as a teacher – a person of power and influence over their grades. However, because I was not directly involved with their grading, this relationship seemed to not interfere with our research relationships. In fact, it facilitated the conversation
because not only did we know each other in some manner, but we also experienced inquiry as a cultural norm of this context together. Therefore, this research seemed ordinary and a regular part of the routine of PDS work.

With regard to the mentors, their perceptions of me varied. In some of the buildings, I was currently another PDA, so they interacted with me on occasion at mentor meetings. I also worked closely with one of the building’s principals and her staff to support their professional development experiences, so these mentors worked more closely with me. In one building, I had never supervised, but it was possible that the mentors and I interacted at biannual mentor retreats and other PDS gatherings. Another contribution to their perceptions was whether or not they had participated in previous dissertation research. For example, one participant was quite hesitant to participate because of negative prior experiences; however after talking with me about the study and expressing her concerns, she agreed. Even though our relationship was not always positive or strong, I believe that she agreed to participate because of our conversation, which she gave because I was a member of the community for the past four years. Ultimately, my status as a member of the community contributed to their perceptions of me as researcher.

**Ethical Concerns**

Since qualitative research is intimately connected with people and places, the researcher must be aware of ethics in order to conduct quality qualitative research. As previously mentioned, trust, intimacy, and reciprocity are the key characteristics in creating the rapport necessary to foster relationships with participants (Maxwell, 2005), but rapport is not friendship. Befriending someone involves a more intense liking of that person than simply having rapport with her (Glesne, 2006). Therefore, when forming relationships, the creation of rapport through trust, intimacy, reciprocity, and a liking to some extent is valued over the intense liking of the other, thus, creating the necessary research relationships to conduct quality qualitative research.
Relationships are the intimate connections between the researcher and the participant, and through such contact, the participant can disclose personal information, especially when the researcher is considered a true member of the culture. Disseminating information disclosed in what the participant considered a private conversation has implications—implications for the research, the participant, and the researcher. A dilemma then exists. The researcher must weigh the cause and effects associated with making public the disclosed information. She must consider the contribution to the field, the relationships between the participant and the other members of the community, and the relationship with the researcher and her status in the community. Glesne (2006) recommends discussing and continuously negotiating the ethical issues with the research participants in order to preserve not only the relationships, but also the integrity of the research as well. These ethical dilemmas are inherently present in qualitative research.

Being a member of the community in which the research was conducted presented an ethical concern. Balancing the task of building a relationship while simultaneously monitoring its potential movement towards a friendship was challenging. It required a constant awareness of the relationships and occasional conversations with the participants to negotiate our relationships. By member checking, I invited Helen to communicate with me as I communicated with her. Such a response acts as a preservation mechanism for the relationship while simultaneously remaining true to the research. Yin (2003) states that the participants should have the opportunity to review some or all of the written report.

When the participants review the information, it is possible that they will not agree with what is written, which then positions the researcher in a dilemma depending upon the nature of the disagreement. Yin (2003) comments on this dilemma by saying,

The informants and participants may still disagree with an investigator’s conclusions and interpretations, but these reviewers should not disagree over the actual facts of the case. If such disagreement emerges during the review process, an investigator knows that the case study report is not finished and that such disagreements must be settled through a search for further evidence. Often, the opportunity to review the draft also produces
further evidence, as the informants and participants may remember new materials that they had forgotten during the initial data collection period. (p. 159)

After I member-checked with Helen regarding only her perceptions of her supervision, Helen identified some passages that made her feel uncomfortable and we discussed those sections together. Since the section I shared with her was regarding her perceptions, I felt it was very appropriate to listen to her concerns, probe deeper to understand her perceptions, and then decide to what extent information should be changed based on the data she provided and the data from the member-check. Following this conversation, I wrote an analytic memo based on the field notes I took during our session to capture and process this experience, and I ultimately made some adjustments to her section because I found that I wanted to ensure that I had captured her perceptions accurately.

Methods

The methods must align with the research question (Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Shavelson & Towne, 2002). In order to produce an in-depth analysis of the cases, the study must use data from multiple sources; no one method defines case study research (Creswell, 1998). Yin (1994) states that methods for case study research should include direct observation and systematic interviews. Consequently, data for this study was gathered through interviews, field notes, and documents.

Interviews

Qualitative interviews have an open structure that permit the researcher to follow the thought of the interviewee while staying inside the frame of the study. These interviews do not have set questions, but they are more intentional than conversational. Weiss (1994) commented,
The style of the qualitative interview may appear conversational, but what happens in the interview is very different from what happens in an ordinary conversation. In an ordinary conversation each participant voices observations, thoughts, feelings. Either participant can set a new topic, either can ask questions. In the qualitative interview the respondent provides information while the interviewer, as a representative of the study, is responsible for directing the respondent to the topics that matter to the study. (p. 8)

Such formatting maintains the integrity of the research because it permits the interviewee to talk freely and in-depth about the topic and provide concrete examples (Weiss, 1994) to illustrate her point.

Interviewing requires two vested participants who both have a responsibility—one provides direction and the other provides the content (Weiss, 1994). If either fails, the research is compromised. The researcher must also recognize that her influence, which Weiss (1994) called reflexivity, on the interviewee’s responses is inevitable. Having an awareness of the researcher’s influence is critical in conducting rigorous research, for ignorance of reflexivity could result in the manipulation of data no matter how inadvertent. On the other hand, standards for quality research do exist. The use of concrete examples and enough detail to visualize the incident, known as visualizability, are indicative of quality data (Weiss, 1994). When needed, I probed my participants further to provide concrete examples to illustrate their points.

Interviews were the primary data source. I interviewed Helen and the mentors and interns that were assigned to her. Helen was interviewed approximately weekly while the others were interviewed once at the end of the year. Weekly interviews offered insight on observations I made in the field as well as provided information regarding her reflections as she supervised throughout her first year. These conversations accentuated critical moments throughout Helen’s year as a novice supervisor. They also allowed me to probe deeper into her thinking and offered insight into her actions. Weekly interviews were a manageable amount for us, and scheduling time together weekly allowed for some routine reflection time together. Routine can provide some stability and comfort, which strengthened the relationship and the integrity of the research. Being
cognizant of Helen’s time while simultaneously gathering enough timely data required balance, and weekly contact in this manner provided that balance. On occasion due to various time constraints, we met every other week, but primarily the interviews were conducted weekly.

In addition to the weekly reflective interviews, I also interviewed Helen at the end of the year about her beliefs regarding supervision. This conference served as a foundation for understanding her beliefs about supervision. During this conference, Helen verbalized her perceptions of her beliefs, which is known as her espoused platform (Nolan & Hoover, 2005). In addition to the beliefs that are publicly articulated, individuals also hold tacit beliefs that are transparent to others through the individual’s actions, but are often hidden from the individual herself. These are known as platforms-in-action (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007) or what I called beliefs-in-action in the conceptual framework as shown in Figure 1-3 in Chapter 1. Engaging in participant observation and interviewing Helen’s interns and mentors also enabled the analysis of any discrepancies between the Helen’s espoused platforms and her beliefs-in-action. Discrepancies are often critical incidences and powerful learning experiences (Mezirow, 2000), so understanding these embedded incidences from multiple perspectives was imperative to understanding novice supervision in a PDS context.

Field Notes and Analytic Memos

Interview data is perceptive in nature; meaning, the information gathered is filtered through the perspective of the informer. In order to complement this perception data, I wrote field notes. As a participant observer, I needed a mechanism to record my observations; field notes were that mechanism. They were like a camera in that they were a way of capturing and preserving in a still moment the intimate experiences of others (Emerson, 1995). In order to preserve authenticity, field notes were recorded during and immediately after the experiences. This immediacy preserved the freshness and, consequently, the accuracy of each experience. In
addition, I also wrote analytic memos, which are a means of capturing the researcher’s thoughts during the experience (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995; Saldaña, 2009). These memos served as a space for processing the experiences as they were unfolding and critically reflecting on my role and position as researcher. Memos permitted initial patterns and insights in the data to be identified.

Documents

Documents included the observation sheets and reflection responses Helen gave to her interns. When supervisors observe, sometimes they record their observations in written form. Other times they relied on other data tools, such as video, or their memories. These document items were artifacts and a potential data source for understanding their supervisor practices. These kinds of documents provided insight into the ways in which the supervisors’ provided feedback, and in some ways, conceived of their roles as supervisors.

In order to request this data, I needed the interns’ permission. Most interns did not keep organized files with this information readily available, so I had to track down this information. Only some of the interns were able to provide me with these documents and most of these documents were incomplete, meaning they only had some of the observations or some of their reflection journals. Since this data was inconsistent across participants, it was not used as a primary data source. Instead, I used what information was given to me to verify specific incidences that particular interns referenced if I had those documents.

Methods Matrix

A methods matrix is a visual representation of the research questions and the data sources in an effort to critically examine the research questions and the data sources. Table 3-3 shows this methods matrix. In it, I aligned the research questions on the left with the various data sources on
the right. An “X” indicates that the particular artifact served as a data source for that question.

“PO” stands for participant observation. Docs means documents. As specific kinds of documents, “O” indicates observation sheets and “R” means reflection journals. “S” is an abbreviation for novice hybrids as supervisors.

Table 3-3: The Methods Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>PO</th>
<th>Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does a novice hybrid educator supervise in a PDS context?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are her beliefs about supervision?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does she perceive her supervision?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do others perceive her supervision and its impact on themselves?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What experiences in the PDS impact her learning as a novice supervisor?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: S = Novice supervisors, O = Observations, I = Interns, R = Reflections, M = Mentors

Each question has a minimum of one “x” and is informed by multiple data sources. In the case of two of the questions, the data source came solely from Helen because the questions were about her perceptions of her beliefs and practices as a supervisor. However, the following question regarding how others perceive her practices was designed to offer insight into her beliefs-in-action. For that reason, there are no “x”s marked under the novice hybrid column and there are “x”s marked in the remaining columns.
Data Analysis

In order to analyze the data, all thirty-seven interviews were transcribed and then coded. When coding qualitative data, coding often occurs in more than one round (Saldaña, 2009), and I used descriptive open coding as a first round. Drawing from Saldaña’s (2009) work, descriptive codes are words that represent the specific segment of data; they are not confined by any particular predetermined term, but rather the specific code emerges from the essence of the data. Those initial codes were then organized into categories. These categories became the structural codes for the second round of coding. Structural coding involves coding a specific segment of data as it relates to a predetermined topic or a topic that emerges from open coding (Saldaña, 2009).

Coding is recursive in nature. While I began by using open coding, once the initial structural codes were identified, I used that information to make adjustments to the conceptual framework. At the same time, the topics and categories in the conceptual framework as it evolved, which was informed by the literature, became additional structural codes. Saldaña (2009) also states that there is no one right or correct way to code, but rather coding is a mechanism for capturing the essence of the data or datum; therefore, the researcher should have the freedom, knowledge, and ability to use a variety of coding techniques to capture such essence. Coding, categorizing, and re-coding occurred for each of the interview data sets—Helen as novice supervisor, her mentors, and her interns.

After the rounds of coding and categorizing, the categories were grouped together to identify patterns and themes within each of the main structural codes, which included knowledge, beliefs, practices, and impact. Then, within each of these structural codes, the individually coded data was grouped and organized into patterns. Saldaña (2009) refers to this as “themeing the
Themes for knowledge, beliefs, practices, and impact were identified for each data set of supervisors’ perceptions, mentors’ perceptions, and interns’ perceptions.

In order to compare the themes, I created a table, which was essentially a thematic comparison across the various perceptions within the case; it is a comparison of the individual themes for each of the perspectives presented. For instance, I analyzed and compared the themes for the Helen’s perceptions of her own knowledge, the mentors’ perceptions of her knowledge, and the interns’ perceptions of her knowledge. This pattern was repeated for beliefs, practices, and impact, which resulted in some larger themes that ultimately created an image of novice supervision and a conceptual framework for understanding supervision in a PDS context.

Writing the Report

In describing the methodology for this case, I referenced two well-known scholars in case study research—Robert Stake and Robert Yin. However, these scholars approach case study differently, and these differences have implications for this particular study. Baxter & Jack (2008) compared the way in which these two scholars approach case study research. They found that both Stake and Yin have similar philosophical underpinnings—they both approach case study from a constructivist paradigm; meaning, they both believe that truth is relative based upon an individual’s perspective. Where Stake and Yin differ is regarding their approaches to case study methodology.

Stake (1995; 2003) approaches case study with an emphasis on understanding the particularity of the case under examination. He argues that the nature of case study research does not lend itself toward universal generalizability because the nature of generalization and the nature of particularity are in direct conflict. Generalizing a case would lose the focus and emphasis on the particularity and the complexity, which, he argues, is the beauty and essence of
the case. He states, “The search for particularity competes with the search for generalizability” (2003, p. 140). According to Stake, generalizability is the responsibility of the reader who, from reading the case as a narrative story, was able to generalize to his or her own life. He says, “People find in case reports certain insights into the human condition, even while being well aware of the atypicality of the case. They may be too quick to accept the insight. The case researcher needs to provide grounds for validating both the observation and generalization” (p. 147).

Yin (1994; 2003) argues that cases are generalizable, but they are generalizable to theory. He states, “The short answer is that case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes” (p. 10). In order to do so, cases must be exemplary, which means that they must be rigorous, but rigor has plagued case study research. Yin argues that case studies can be rigorous if they follow systematic design and analysis. While Stake also advocates for rigor, they differ in how they approach rigor. Stake advocates for rigor through detailed description and a written report through storytelling, whereas Yin advocates for rigor through systematic analysis and a written report in a narrative that is more analytic than storytelling. Both kinds of the case reports need to be compelling, but the style in which the cases are written is the defining factor of difference.

While I admire Stake’s storytelling approach to case study research, I feel that Yin’s approach aligns better with the presentation of this study. According to Yin’s (2003) descriptions, this study is an explanatory case study because it sought to understand how a novice hybrid educator supervises in a PDS context. Explanatory case studies have the greatest diversity in style when writing the report, and Yin (2003) outlines six different styles for the written report. They include linear-analytic, comparative, chronological, theory building, “suspense”, and unsequenced. In the written report, explanatory case studies can use all of these structures except the unsequenced structure. Yin (2003) also advocates that the researcher must know the audience
of the written report, and for a dissertation, the linear-analytic structure is appropriate. I used a combination of the linear-analytic structure, by sequencing this report in the traditional five chapter dissertation style, and the comparative structure in chapter four, by comparing the different perspectives on the novice hybrid’s supervision. Yin claims that the comparative structure should be used when, “The same case can be described repeatedly, from different points of view or with different descriptive models...” (p.153). In this case of novice supervision, there are three different perspectives on the novice hybrid educator’s supervision; those perspectives include Helen’s as the novice supervisor, her mentors’, and her interns’. The nature of the multiple realities presented in this case suggest that a comparative structure is also an appropriately matched style for this case study.

**Chapter Summary**

Case study research requires an in-depth examination of the particular case. This study is a case of novice supervision in a PDS context. In order to delve deep, the study used three different methods for gathering data: qualitative interviews, field notes from participant observation, and document analysis. Since case study research is not tied to one particular data collection method, the use of these three to provide an in-depth analysis of the case was appropriate. Moreover, the methods aligned with the research questions. This study examined novice supervision in a professional development school context by looking closely at the supervisory practices of a school-based hybrid educator. The framing of this question is indicative not only of qualitative research but more specifically of case study research. Since the methods are in alignment with case study research and the question is phrased to indicate case study research, the methods selected—chosen based on the question and the methodology—are appropriate to understand this phenomenon.
CHAPTER 4
THE CASE OF HELEN: A TRIFOCAL PERSPECTIVE

The purpose of this study was to understand novice supervision in a PDS context. While some may equate supervision as the practice of observing and evaluating another’s practice or overseeing the performance of another, I argue that supervision in a PDS context is much broader than these narrow conceptions. Supervision is complex leadership aimed at simultaneously renewing schools and universities as educational institutions. In order to understand novice supervision in this context, I closely examined one hybrid educator, whom I have given the pseudonym Helen. In order to understand her supervision, I gathered multiple data sources and primarily relied on interviews from three sources—Helen, her mentors, and her interns. By gathering data from these three perspectives and interpreting their realities through my lens as researcher, I hoped to gain a more comprehensive portrait of novice supervision in this context. Examining Helen’s perceptions, her mentors’ perceptions, and her interns’ perceptions of her supervision enabled me to understand Helen’s supervision as her identity or way of being.

The Anatomy of Identity

While previous studies have recognized that novice hybrids struggle with identity formation (Burns, 2010; Dinkleman, Margolis, & Sikkenga, 2006), what is unknown is what this identity of supervision looks like as a novice. Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) images of supervision are orientations of supervisors in school settings. At present, few images of supervision exist in PDS settings. Only Gimbert & Nolan’s (2003) self study offered an image of supervision in a PDS context. The lack of images in the PDS context, especially the images of
novice supervision, called for a conceptual framework for considering supervision. Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) images were an additional beginning model for understanding supervision in this context. Even though Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) images are archetypes, they do depict supervision as a construct. Drawing upon the conceptual framework in Chapter 1, I deconstructed Helen’s supervision into four sections: (1) knowledge, (2) beliefs, (3) practices, and (4) impact in order to ultimately reconstruct the multiple realities to create an image of supervision in a PDS context. Creating a portrait of her supervision required capturing the multiple realities that experienced her supervision—her perceptions, her mentors’ perceptions, and her interns’ perceptions of her supervision. Understanding supervision is complex; therefore, I used the conceptual framework in Chapter 1 as a guide for deconstructing her supervision. This framework included examining her knowledge, beliefs, practices, and impact as representative of the supervisors’ personal characteristics, their performance of supervision, and the results of their supervision. Using this framework allowed me to examine the multiple perceptions of Helen’s supervision including the knowledge she brought to her work, her beliefs as she espoused them and as others’ perceived them, her self-described and others’ described practices of her supervision, and its impact on her and themselves.

This chapter is divided into three sections, which depict the three lenses used to examine Helen’s supervision in a PDS context: (1) her perspective, (2) her mentors’ perspectives, and (3) her interns’ perspectives. Interns and mentors were the individuals who directly worked with Helen and experienced her supervision, so including their perspectives of Helen’s supervision offered a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of it. Each of these three sections begins with background on the particular individual or group of individuals whose perspective is being told and uses this identity framework to deconstruct and describe Helen’s supervision. All of the perspectives are filtered through my lens as the researcher. This chapter examines Helen’s supervision as a novice supervisor through a tri-focal perspective.
Focal Lens 1: Helen’s Perceptions

In order to understand Helen’s perceptions of her own supervision, I interviewed Helen weekly for an entire academic year. By engaging in this kind of interview process, I hoped to “live” her first year as a supervisor along with her, but through her eyes. Weekly interviews allowed the most significant aspects of her experience, as she perceived them, to be highlighted. This process yielded a total of twenty-two interviews. Each was transcribed, coded, and analyzed using the processes described in Chapter 3. Helen’s perceptions include her background information and her perceptions of her knowledge, beliefs, and practices as a novice supervisor.

Helen’s Background

Helen is a second grade teacher. After teaching for 28 years, she decided to become a hybrid educator. In addition to being a veteran teacher, Helen is also a seasoned mentor. She had been a mentor in the PDS context for three years, and she also mentored numerous teacher candidates from other preparation programs before becoming a Professional Development Associate (PDA), which is a specific kind of hybrid educator who engages in supervision. She has a Master’s equivalency and has taken some coursework in supervision. However, those courses were about mentoring in particular. After being a hybrid educator, Helen can see herself returning to this kind of role in teacher education once she retires. Helen has a passion for children’s literature and maintains her own private library of children’s picture books.

As a professional, Helen has a thirst for learning. She continues to seek opportunities to further her professional growth. In addition to her pursuit of formal education, Helen also desired an experience that would rejuvenate her career and further her professional learning. Thus, she chose to become a PDA. These decisions show that Helen is self-motivated in supporting her own professional learning. Expert teachers have a desire for the continual pursuit of knowledge (Bray,
Kramer, & LePage, 2000), and Helen appears to be in this phase of her teaching career. She also would be considered a career professional according to The Holmes Group (1986) because she has extensive experience, outstanding performance, further study in a particular area, and the ability to support other adults’ learning.

During her first year as a novice supervisor, Helen was assigned eight interns who were placed in two elementary buildings, which means that she worked with a total of eight mentors. As part of her hybrid experience, Helen co-taught a Classroom Learning Environments course during the fall semester. She worked collaboratively with two other PDAs—a university faculty member and a graduate student who were experienced PDAs—to plan and implement lessons for the course.

Of Her Own Knowledge

As a novice supervisor, Helen brought to her work three kinds of knowledge—knowledge about practice, knowledge about teacher education, and knowledge about supervision. As a second grade teacher and a reassigned teacher, Helen brought extensive knowledge of the school district’s curriculum and, in particular the primary curriculum, and she used that knowledge to supervise her interns. In addition to curriculum, Helen also possessed the wisdom of an experienced practitioner. She believed she held a deep understanding of what it means to teach and what it means to be a teacher. With regard to teacher education, Helen was previously a mentor, so she did bring with her some knowledge of mentoring and working with teacher candidates. But Helen also recognized that being a teacher educator required additional knowledge, some of which she had and some of which she wished she had. Furthermore, Helen recognized that supervising required additional knowledge than that which she had as a mentor teacher educator, but she knew that she was the most inexperienced with this knowledge base.
Helen greatly desired to expand this kind of knowledge. In this section, I describe in more detail the three kinds of knowledge Helen possessed as a novice supervisor in a PDS context.

**Practitioner knowledge.** Helen possessed extensive knowledge about the school district’s curriculum and particularly the second grade curriculum. For example, Helen demonstrated this knowledge base by commenting about the content of one of her intern’s lessons. She said,

> It was supposed to be inquiry based science. How do we help animals in the wetlands? It was one of the initial lessons where these animals write letters to the kids about the problem in their home and, and they’re seeking help. (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 43-45)

During this lesson, Helen held prior knowledge about the content of the lesson and the scope and sequence of the lesson because she had taught this curricular unit herself. Helen drew upon her curricular knowledge when she supervised.

Helen also was passionate about children’s literature. As a teacher, she often drew upon children’s literature to teach a variety of concepts. This passion and experience contributed to her practitioner knowledge base because she drew upon this knowledge to understand her interns’ teaching, and she also acted as a resource for them in this regard. For example, Helen commented about one of her intern’s lessons and referenced her knowledge about the author and book. She said, “All of [the author’s] stories have so many dimensions, so I was excited that this was the book (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 51-53).” Helen felt this knowledge was an asset that she brought to her knowledge as a novice supervisor.

In addition to curricular and content knowledge, Helen held pedagogical knowledge because she was an experienced practitioner. She believed that she had a solid understanding of best practice and in particular best practice for teachers in the primary grades. When she visited other primary classrooms, she sometimes encountered practices that were contrary to what she felt she knew to be quality teaching at this grade level. She said, “There are just so many things
that go against the grain of what I know about primary teaching” (Weekly Interview 11.18.10, Lines 48-50). Helen believed that the knowledge about effective pedagogy that she accrued over her twenty-eight years of experience as extensive and adequate to support her interns who were working at this age group. She articulated this perspective by saying,

   Just having been in the trenches, done the work of a classroom teacher for so many years…knowing what is necessary to be a teacher. I mean I know all the little pieces. And so if I’m supervising novice teachers that are learning all those pieces I have an understanding about that. (Weekly Interview 01.26.11, Lines 252-257)

From Helen’s perspective, she believed that supervisors should have experience as a practitioner in order to supervise effectively. For her, having practitioner knowledge was the most comfortable.

   In summary, Helen felt that supervisors should have practitioner knowledge, which included knowledge about pedagogy and knowledge about content. Shulman (1986) called this kind of knowledge pedagogical content knowledge. Meaning that in order to teach, teachers must have the knowledge of what to teach (the content knowledge) and how to teach (the pedagogical knowledge). For Helen, pedagogical content knowledge concerned curriculum, and specifically the primary curriculum, and pedagogy. In order to supervise effectively, she believed a supervisor should bring extensive pedagogical content knowledge and this knowledge should come from the experience of actually being a teacher and a practitioner for an extensive length of time.

   **Knowledge about teacher education.** Helen also possessed knowledge about teacher education. Even though Helen felt less comfortable with this knowledge base and believed that her knowledge here was limited, she recognized that supervisors in PDS should possess this kind of knowledge. For Helen, this kind of knowledge included knowledge of teacher education curricula, knowledge about adults as learners, and knowledge about certain skills required of teacher educators. Knowledge of teacher education is not separate from knowledge about practice, but rather it is inclusive; it includes practitioner knowledge as a part of the required
knowledge for teacher educators. Loughran (2006) argued that teacher education has a specific knowledge base and skill set; he called this a pedagogy of teacher education.

Helen exhibited some of the knowledge of a pedagogy of teacher education and she recognized some areas of knowledge that she needed with regard to this knowledge base. Helen held and recognized that knowledge of teacher education to include the curriculum of teacher education, adults as learners, and some skills of teacher education. Ultimately, Shulman’s (1986) notions of pedagogical content knowledge are also applicable to knowledge for teacher educators in developing and enacting a pedagogy of teacher education. Meaning, teacher educators need to have content knowledge of the teacher education curriculum that they are teaching and the pedagogical knowledge of how to teach teachers. Helen possessed pedagogical content knowledge of teacher education.

**Teacher education curriculum.** As a supervisor in a PDS context, Helen was required to perform the task of teaching. In order to teach, Helen needed to have knowledge about the teacher education curriculum. Some of this knowledge she knew from being a mentor, but much of the content she had to learn during her first year of being a teacher educator as supervisor. Helen articulated an example of this learning as she was deciding on which committee to join for planning the field-based seminar experience for the interns in the program. She said,

> I thought okay do I put myself in a strand where I’m, it’s totally a challenge and I can just learn so much from it like inquiry? Or should I put myself in a strand like teaching and learning where I come in and I think oh I might have something to offer. So I kind of put that out there and, and I was encouraged to go where I thought my strengths were. So I signed up for two: teaching and learning and diversity or multiculturalism. (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 284-289)

In this example, Helen articulated that she already held some knowledge that was in the curriculum—she felt her strengths were in teaching and learning and multiculturalism, so she joined those seminar planning teams. Helen also conveyed the fact that she did not know some
aspects of the teacher education curriculum—like inquiry—and that she would have to learn those aspects.

Once Helen learned some of the content, she was able to support her interns in the classroom by recommending literature as a resource to support practice. Helen shared,

[One of my interns] was reflecting about her back-to-school night and said she thought that it was a disaster. The kids were running all over the place. And she said, ‘And I think the kids were to blame.’ It was really strong. So I gave her the book Yardsticks and I said, ‘You know just reading this may give you an overview of what to expect from a six-year-old in September.’ I said, ‘Just read five, six, and seven because you have kids that are less mature.’ (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 344-352)

In this example, the resource was a reading from a fall course she co-taught with university-based hybrid educators. Since she now had more of an understanding of the teacher education curriculum, she was able to support her interns in the field by connecting them to resources.

Another part of teaching teacher candidates is reading and responding to lesson plans. Helen felt most comfortable with this part of the knowledge of the teacher education curriculum because she felt it was rooted in practice. As a practitioner, she felt most knowledgeable and confident in this regard. She commented,

Reading the lesson plans has been very interesting and engaging for me because it’s my world. I’m feeling better about that and more comfortable with that process than when I was doing methods because, I’ve talked a lot about how that was really very challenging for me because it was such a different world. But this is my world and I’ve had some really, really powerful, important conversations with interns about their plans that have, I think, left them with just important things to think about. (Weekly Interview 01.12.11, Lines 23-29)

Helen recognized that teacher educators need knowledge about lesson planning, and Helen possessed this knowledge because she was an experienced practitioner.

Participating in the supervisory task of teaching teachers means that Helen was required to assess and evaluate their work. In a more formal sense, Helen needed to read, respond, and evaluate the interns’ assignments for their coursework. This area was sometimes a struggle for Helen because reading and assessing adult work was a new domain for her. Helen was a
reassigned teacher, so until she assumed this role, she worked extensively with children. She felt comfortable reading, responding, and evaluating their work because she had extensive practice in this area; with regard to teacher candidates, Helen’s experience was limited. She lamented on this struggle by saying, “So I have these assignments starting on Monday. So that kind of thing causes a lot of angst. That stuff shouldn’t have to be so hard” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 482-484). She also said, “Now I would know [the work] wasn’t good because I am looking at the rubric, but I wouldn’t necessarily know how to best help her figure out how to make it better” (Weekly Interview 04.28.11, Lines 64-65). Helen’s struggle here is indicative of another kind of knowledge needed in teacher education—understanding the learners, and in teacher education the direct learner is an adult, which is different from the direct learners of teachers who are children.

**Adults as learners.** As a teacher, Helen felt she possessed knowledge about children and their growth and development, but working with and understanding adult development was foreign to her. Helen shared, “I thought that [interns] would come into this year...some of the things that they don’t know have surprised me” (Weekly Interview 11.30.10, Lines 316-317). Despite these feelings, Helen recognized that this knowledge was critical and important for her work as a supervisor. She continued to think about working with adult learners and how she could better understand them and improve their learning experiences. She said,

> Again, because this part of the work is new to me, assessing adult work and even just assigning it, that’s really making me think about how we can help them see these assignments as more than just getting points and there’s a lot more to it. (Weekly Interview 09.16.11, Lines 272-276)

From her experiences as a novice supervisor, Helen began to acquire this knowledge over time. She remarked,

> I was just so not used to facilitating adult learners. I felt so out of my element. I just didn’t understand how to engage in that process. It was such an unknown to me. Now it’s so much more comfortable to me because I’ve done it. (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 339-342)
As a teacher educator as supervisor, Helen recognized that understanding adults as learners was critical knowledge that she needed tremendously in the beginning, and that she began to acquire over time.

**Skills.** Supervisors bring to their work a set of skills. They need knowledge about these skills and how to perform these skills in order to enact them. Figure 4-1 shows skills Helen used as a novice supervisor and the flow chart for action. First, I explain this figure theoretically, breaking down each of the skills and the potential paths that a supervisor chooses to engage. Then I connected these skills to Helen’s knowledge about these skills, essentially breaking down Helen’s pedagogical knowledge as it relates to being a teacher educator.

Helen realized that she needed knowledge about how to perform skills in her new role, but she was not always sure what that knowledge was per se. However, Helen actually held some tacit knowledge about exercising these skills. As a teacher educator as supervisor, Helen engaged in technical helping. Meaning, she focused her attention on helping and supporting her interns’ growth and development as practitioners. To engage in this kind of task, Helen needed to know how to perform it. For Helen, these skills included what I am calling seeing, marking, ignoring, intervening, pointing, unpacking, and processing for action, and the knowledge regarding how to perform these skills was more tacit for Helen; she did not recognize that she had the knowledge to perform these skills nor did she realize that she was performing these skills. With regard to the Figure 4-1, Helen did engage in these skills, completing various courses on the flow chart for action.
"Seeing" is the ability to identify critical moments in teaching as it is happening. The teacher educator as supervisor is watching another’s practice, has an awareness of the pulse of the situation, and is able to identify key instances that impact or influence the situation. Once supervisors “see” or identify critical moments in practice, they have three choices. They can ignore the critical moment; they can intervene in the critical moment; or they can mark the critical moment.

Helen “saw” some key moments in a mentor teacher’s practices and marveled at them. She remarked, “And I was just amazed by her skill! Because she completely saved, mentally saved the moment, but it became something really great” (Weekly Interview 09.16.11, Lines 87-89). In this situation, Helen was commenting on a specific critical moment that shifted the momentum and focus of the lesson. Critical moments are usually based upon teacher decisions and actions or the absence of actions that caused a shift in the situation. For the mentor teacher, the result was positive, but that result is not always the case. In another situation, Helen “saw” some critical moments in one of her interns that were not as positive. Helen said, “And I see a lot
of places where she’s going to need a lot of support with classroom management” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 226-229). Here she recognized that her intern needed some support with regard to classroom management because she saw, or had identified, critical moments in her intern’s practice that did not have positive results for students. Seeing allows expertise to become visible for the novice.

Another example of the ability to see occurred while observing another one of her interns who was struggling with a lesson. She said,

One of the things I wrote was, ‘Did you notice that most of the children didn’t have an idea before you called them back on the rug?’ Now I could tell the intern was not comfortable with that herself because she turned to her mentor and said, ‘A lot of them haven’t written anything yet.’ And the mentor said, ‘That’s okay. It can be morning work.’ It was like they looked at the clock and thought, ‘We have this many minutes and we have to finish this activity,’ so I think the intern had an intuition about it. (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 172-178)

Here Helen identified a critical moment—the moment when her intern discussed her worry with her mentor teacher. This moment involved the intern realizing that a decision was pending and asking her mentor for guidance; the intern knew the children had not finished and were not ready to move on and yet the intern felt the pressure of time and her mentor’s wishes requiring her to move on.

These examples illustrated the skill of seeing. They showed Helen’s ability to examine practice as it was occurring and mark those moments to discuss with the teacher or teacher candidate, which was more common in Helen’s supervisory practices. In order to “see,” Helen needed the knowledge of how to see—how to examine practice and identify critical moments in that practice. For Helen, this knowledge was tacit and invisible to her as a novice supervisor.

Referring back to Figure 4-1, seeing does not require discussion—the seer identifies critical moments and then consciously decides the next course of action. Those actions could include ignoring, intervening, and marking either mentally or physically the critical moments. No matter what the response, the skill of “seeing” and the knowledge of how to see are essential for
teacher educator as supervisors. Helen possessed this ability and this knowledge. The depth of her understanding of this skill is unknown mostly because the instances she identified were relatively similar, and she did not consciously recognize that she was using this skill or that she had the knowledge to use this skill. This area remains open for further exploration in future studies.

*Path One: Ignoring.* One option after seeing is ignoring. If supervisors choose to ignore, then action stops and the critical moment is known only to the supervisor. The seer identifies the moment and then chooses not to act upon that moment by intervening or commenting on it to the teacher. The seer chooses to ignore for a variety of reasons, and ignoring is not necessarily a sign of incompetence or neglect; in fact, it could be a sign of metacognition. For instance, a supervisor might see a moment in an intern’s practice that seems questionable. While this practice is not hurting children, it might be something that the supervisor might do differently if she were the teacher in the classroom. Therefore, the supervisor might choose to ignore that moment because marking it or intervening at that moment might damage a fragile relationship she has with that intern; or she might choose to ignore it because marking it following that sequence through processing for action would not be developmentally appropriate for the intern at that moment. Whatever the reason, conscious ignoring demonstrates the ability to see and purposely select inaction; it demonstrates powerful metacognition present in supervisor thinking, skill, and decision-making.

Helen described one situation where she identified several critical moments in a lesson with which her intern was struggling. She said,

> [My intern] had everything planned so well, and it just broke my heart. By a third of the way into the lesson, she was shouting. Her voice was so loud just to be heard above the kids. And she would do the attention getting and for a split second there might be a pause, but she never waited to see if it was really taking effect. And she just kept plunging through because in her mind she was thinking, ‘I have this lesson and I have to get through. I have 45 minutes. I have to. I have to.’ And I was so despondent…just before we began the mentor said, ‘I’m going to follow her lead. That’s my plan. I’m just going to follow her lead.’ So there were a few moments when the mentor went over to a few kids that were particularly crazy, but for the most part she did not intervene at all.
She didn’t stop anything. It was a speeding train and it went plowing off the mountain. (Weekly Interview 11.18.10, Lines 124-136)

In this instance both the mentor and Helen chose not to act. It is possible that only Helen saw these moments because the mentor gave no indication verbally or through her actions that she was able to “see” the same moments that Helen saw. Helen believed that the mentor also saw those same critical moments and engaged in ignoring, but it was possible that the mentor was not ignoring because she simply did not “see” these same moments. Ignoring results is the extinction of the critical moment; the critical moment, as she identified it, remains known to the supervisor and usually remains temporarily as the moment was not critical enough to mark for later courses of action.

Path Two: Intervening. Another option after seeing is intervening. Intervening would involve the seer recognizing the moment and stepping in to support the teacher as she is instructing, to support children in their learning experience, or in the case of seeing other supervisors’ work, to support the supervisor as she is enacting the function of supervision. If supervisors choose to intervene, then they have two additional choices. First, they can choose not to discuss their rationale for intervening or process it with anyone else in which case, again, the rationale for the intervention remains with the supervisor. This decision would be considered ignoring—the supervisor chose to intervene but chose not to discuss her rationale for intervening with anyone. The second choice is to discuss the intervention by breaking down or “unpacking” her decision-making for the novice. One method of unpacking is thinking aloud as the process is unfolding, or another method would be to reflect on the intervention afterwards.

Helen saw a critical moment in one of her interns’ lessons with regard to its impact on student behavior. She said, “And then I left that group to go with a group of really disruptive kids who I could tell just needed someone to sit with them” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 248-250). Helen made the decision to intervene to support both the teacher candidate as she was
instructing and the student as he was learning. After intervening, the supervisor can choose to ignore, meaning she does not process the critical moment with the novice or she can choose to break down the expertise—known as unpacking—for the novice. In the above situation, Helen chose to ignore; she did not process that situation and her decisions and expertise with her intern. Sometimes Helen ignored, which was usually because she felt there was no time to process the critical moment, and sometimes she unpacked it.

*Path Three: Marking.* A final option after seeing is marking. Marking involves the actual recording, either mentally or physically, of the moment. Helen usually marked moments in order to point and to process them with her interns as novices. In order for Helen to articulate specific instances, she had to mark them. All of the examples where Helen articulates that she identifies critical moments are illustrations of Helen’s knowledge of how to mark them.

Once a critical incident is marked, the supervisor can choose to ignore, meaning she either chooses not to or does not have the opportunity to discuss the critical moment with the novice, or she can point. Supervisors then have two choices: (1) they can ignore it by choosing not to discuss it, in which case the critical moment again remains known only to the supervisor, or (2) supervisors can point to the critical moment making visible the expertise in the moment.

Pointing involves the ability to see moments in other practices, in particular expert practices, and then articulate those critical moments to a novice; pointing usually occurs in the moment. Helen’s mentors and interns identified this skill often in Helen’s practices, which I describe later in this chapter. However, in order to point, Helen needed the knowledge of how to engage in this task. She needed the knowledge to see and then the knowledge of how to articulate those critical moments to novices.

Once a supervisor points, she has two choices again. She can (1) ignore it, meaning that she identifies the moment but does not process it with the novice. She might say something like, “Do you see this (blank)?” or, “Did you notice (blank)?” or (2) the supervisor can process the
critical moment by unpacking it by breaking down the expertise for the novice. Unpacking is the action of breaking down the critical moment so that meaning can be learned from the experience. In this decision, she might say, “Did you notice (blank)? And she adds the rationale, “The teacher is doing (blank) because...” Unpacking can be supervisor-centered or it can be supervisor-facilitated. With regard to being supervisor-centered, the supervisor is the actor describing the instance and extrapolating meaning from it, or the supervisor can be the facilitator by capturing the critical moment through data and supporting the novice in drawing conclusions about the critical moment.

When Helen would point to her specific decisions or practices for her interns, she would then unpack the critical moment by breaking it down and telling the intern about the intricate details. Sometimes Helen recognized the need to unpack, but because of time constraints and scheduling, she was unable to do so. She lamented,

I really didn’t get a chance to debrief any of these with the interns. Which, that’s my wondering. How does that work? You do this intensive, in-house co-teaching thing where in the moment you’re doing all this and maybe you even haven’t prepared them for what you’re going to do because you don’t even know what it’s going to look like or feel like yourself until you’re there. Then they have to go do something else and so do you. I’m really uncomfortable with that because I feel like I really want to explain to her. (09.23.11, Lines 211-222)

This example showed how Helen recognized the need and had the desire to unpack her own expertise as she was co-teaching with her interns, but she was unable to do so. This practice of unpacking is also described in further detail later in this chapter, but for the purposes of this section, Helen needed to have knowledge about how to break down these practices; Helen needed to know how to unpack expertise for novices.

Once a supervisor has seen, marked, pointed, and unpacked the critical moment, she again has two choices: she can (1) ignore the next step in which case the critical moment is told to the novice and no further action occurs; she simply made visible the expertise and dissected it, or (2) she can process it for action with the novice. Processing-for-action is the final step. Meaning
that, together the supervisor and novice understand the critical moment and decide what the next steps are for the novice—what will the novice do with this newly acquired knowledge?

Processing-for-action includes reflecting on the critical moment with the intent of some kind of action or potential action. The supervisor can reflect alone or she can co-reflect, where the supervisor and the novice process the critical moment together and derive some action or potential action.

Helen offered two different situations where she processed-for-action by herself. She described,

She’s a very bright young lady but she’s still a novice teacher. I mean she needs to have a series of experiences with using skills that will let her move forward and let her see, ‘Okay, I really am making headway.’ (Weekly Reflection 11.18.10, Lines 319-321)

In this situation, Helen described her reflection on the situation and the potential course of action she could have taken with the novice. Other times, Helen reflected and could not identify a course of action. She said, “Well, how do we help? That would be the question...I’ve really been thinking about how to manage this with her” (Weekly Reflection 04.01.11, Lines 46-78). Either way, processing-for-action involves reflection with either a resulting action or the intent to have a resulting action. Processing-for-action implies movement or the potential for movement; it involves reflection with the intent to change practice in a new or the next situation.

In order to engage in this skill, Helen needed to know how—she needed knowledge of this skill as a part of her pedagogical knowledge of teacher education. The instances Helen described involved her engaging in the processing-for-action alone and with the action being hers as a supervisor. These examples make it unclear to determine the extent of Helen’s knowledge regarding this skill or even if this knowledge was more than just tacit knowledge. Regardless of the extent of the knowledge, the point is that Helen possessed some form of this knowledge in order to perform this skill.
Although these skills—seeing, ignoring, intervening, marking, pointing, unpacking, and processing-for-action are described as necessary skills in possessing and enacting a pedagogy of teacher education, it is possible that these skills could be applied more universally. Meaning, it is possible that these are pedagogical skills that masters use to support novice learning while the novice is learning through apprenticeship to a community of practice. For example, in preparing fitness trainers, a master might support a novice by enacting these skills—seeing moments in either the novice’s practice that he chooses to ignore, intervene, or mark, etc. or by seeing moments in other master trainer’s practices and ignoring, intervening, or marking, etc. those moments for the novice to learn. This example alludes to the idea that these skills might be pedagogical skills that can potentially be universally applied to supporting novice learning in a variety of contexts, and that could also include supporting novice supervisor learning.

**Knowledge about supervision.** In addition to knowledge about practice and knowledge about teacher education, Helen also knew that she needed knowledge about supervision. This knowledge base was the most limited for Helen, which is not unexpected since she was a novice supervisor and had no formal education or preparation with supervision; her experiences with supervision were limited to mentoring as a form of teacher educator as supervisor and being the teacher of a principal as supervisor. She commented,

> A classroom teacher comes into this role and the expectation is we’re supposed to know how to do this. I’ve never had any coursework on supervision. I mean, I’m just an experienced teacher with maybe some good people skills and someone who has a good work ethic. I mean I have good things I bring to it, but I don’t know. (Weekly Interview 01.26.11, Lines 234-238)

Even though she had this background, Helen realized that the knowledge she needed to be a supervisor was slightly different than the knowledge required of her as a mentor teacher. She said,

> [Knowledge about practice] allows me to understand you know the components of what teachers need to learn. But as a classroom teacher, I was also a mentor, which is a form of
supervision certainly, but it is very different I’m finding than being a PDA as a supervisor. (Weekly Interview 01.27.11, Lines 19-22)

She added, “But I just don’t think it’s given me everything that I feel I need as a supervisor” (Weekly Interview 01.27.11, Line 43). Helen’s feelings of not having knowledge about supervision were troublesome to her.

However, Helen did possess some knowledge about supervision; it was limited and unknown to her, but she still possessed knowledge about supervision that she brought to her role. She believed that supervision entailed working with interns and that other tasks in which she had to partake were outside of this domain and, therefore, outside of supervision. She said, “So that’s part of the number of hours that are part of this job that don’t have anything to do with interns” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 493-494). Tasks that did not directly involve interns were not considered supervision. Helen said, “Plus I think a lot of my time is...some of the work of the PDA doesn’t have anything to do with supervision” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 453-455). Helen possessed some knowledge about supervision, but that knowledge was limited to the knowledge she brought with her as a practitioner, which is only one part of the larger base of knowledge supervisors need. Although Helen’s knowledge of supervision was limited to that which she knew about practice and some amount of what she knew about mentoring, Helen recognized that supervisors need this knowledge and additional knowledge; she just was unaware of the breadth and depth of that knowledge.

Of Her Own Beliefs

Supervisors bring to their practice a set of beliefs. These beliefs become apparent through the supervisor’s actions and by expressing those beliefs to others. Regarding teachers, Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) state, “…their platform is seen in action, in their patterns and habitual ways of interacting with students” (p. 83). This platform is also relevant to understanding
supervisor’s platforms as they become apparent in the supervisor’s daily practices. In Chapter 1, I presented a conceptual framework for understanding supervision in PDS contexts. I called these beliefs that become apparent through supervisor’s actions “the beliefs in action.” The beliefs that are spoken are known as the espoused platform (Nolan & Hoover, 2005). In addition to beliefs, the espoused platform also contains opinions, values, and attitudes (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Understanding the espoused platform requires a discussion or activity that requires the supervisor to express her beliefs, as she perceives them.

In order to understand Helen’s perceptions of her own beliefs, I conducted an espoused platform conference (Appendix A). Espoused platform questionnaires exist for understanding supervisors’ belief systems of supervisors who supervise in school contexts (Badiali, 2006; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001; Nolan & Hoover, 2005; Sullivan & Glanz, 2009), but no current conference existed for understanding supervisors’ belief systems who supervised in a partnership context, such as a PDS setting. Therefore, by adapting these instruments, I created an espoused platform conference protocol (EPC) for understanding supervisors’ beliefs in a PDS context. This conference was used to understand Helen’s espoused beliefs as a novice supervisor.

According to Helen, she believed that, as a supervisor, the intern was her domain. Meaning, Helen believed that the intern was her primary responsibility. She saw her role as working with teacher candidates to support them in their professional growth as the next generation of teachers. Helen also believed that she possessed an understanding of the characteristics of quality teachers, and she used those characteristics as criteria for supervising her interns. Moreover, Helen believed that as a supervisor, she was the expert. She believed that, as an expert, it was her responsibility to share her knowledge and expertise as a veteran teacher with her interns. Finally, Helen believed that supervision was a complex endeavor. Engaging in supervision was much more complex than she had realized.
Intern as domain. Helen believed that her responsibility as a supervisor was to support the learning of interns as they entered the profession. Helen believed that her interns needed her support more than her mentors. She stated,

I think because the mentor is, at least for me because I’m the classroom PDA, it’s like, it’s very collegial. I feel like we’re on equal footing in a way. I don’t see the mentor, at least in my experience, the mentor has never been as needy as the intern. (EPC, Lines 481-485)

The intern, as her domain, situated herself as superior and her interns as subordinates. She also placed greater priority on meeting the interns’ needs with more immediacy than the mentors’ needs. She commented,

If the mentor said, ‘I’d like to meet with you,’ I’d be happy . . . we could have set up the meeting in three days, but if the intern said, ‘I want to meet with you,’ it was within 24 hours. So it’s just a different level of responsibility. (EPC, Lines 491-495)

Helen believed that the intern was primarily her responsibility. As a supervisor, her domain of supervision existed primarily with the intern.

Helen brought certain dispositions to her work as a supervisor. She cared deeply about this responsibility of working with future teachers, and she embraced it with tenacity. She said, “I take my job very seriously knowing that I’m helping these young novice teachers enter the profession, and I would not say any of this if I didn’t wholeheartedly mean it” (EPC, Lines 75-78). Part of this responsibility included helping interns develop their own professional identity. She stated, “I also think a goal is to help them figure out who they are as a teacher” (EPC, Lines 250-251). In order to support her interns on this journey, Helen held certain beliefs about the kind of supervision she would provide them.

Helen believed that a supervisor, who was shepherding young professionals, she should offer a certain kind of support—an ethic of care—in their supervision; a supervisor should be helpful, supportive, and caring. She said, “I just want them to say that she was really helpful, that she supported me, I learned a lot from her, she made me feel really comfortable about everything
and that she cared about my success” (EPC, Lines 965-969). This kind of care and attention meant that she was available to her interns whenever they needed her. She stated,

I’m going to be available to you, I’m going to be a listener; I’m going to be available and work alongside you in whatever way you need. I’ll model for you; I’ll co-teach with you; I’ll talk about things with you – all the things. (EPC, Lines 581-586)

Helen believed that her interns would experience supervision that was caring and supportive; they would engage with someone who brought knowledge and expertise about teaching to the role. Helen believed that, as a supervisor, she was a nurturing and strong role model for her interns. She believed that a supervisor whose domain was future teachers should exude these characteristics. She added, “You would feel like somebody, there’s somebody who really cares about me, there’s somebody I can feel comfortable asking any question, going to if I have an issue” (EPC, Lines 552-554). As someone who saw her domain as the intern, Helen believed that supervisors should bring this kind of ethic of care to their supervision of aspiring professionals.

By focusing the scope of her supervision on interns, Helen believed that her role and responsibility as a supervisor was to prepare the next generation of teachers. She said, “…my goals are to have them become as prepared as possible to enter the profession” (EPC, Lines 237-238), yet she realized that this goal was an impossibility. She added, “There’s no way that you prepare them for the first year of teaching really” (EPC, Lines 243-244). Despite the fact that she felt this goal was unachievable, she still worked hard in pursuit of it.

**Characteristics of quality teachers.** In order to support interns on this quest, Helen believed that, as a supervisor, she had to have a good sense of quality teaching and the characteristics necessary to become a teacher. Helen believed that teachers should have a strong work ethic and be passionate, collaborative, and lifelong learners.

Helen believed that teaching was not easy; it was difficult and it required certain personal characteristics. Helen believed that teachers needed to work hard, and she valued that kind of work ethic in her interns. She said,
The fact that she toughed it out and did so well in a situation that I think another intern would have crumbled or certainly complained, or I can just picture having gone through this year and seeing how other interns managed things through my colleagues and just my own; (this intern) was special. And I just think she has all the makings of being an outstanding teacher. (EPC, Lines 86-95)

According to Helen, her interns must have a solid work ethic. She said, “…what I would expect from an intern is really, really solid work ethic” (EPC, Lines 586-587). Helen believed that as a successful teacher, she brought this work ethic to her work as a supervisor and her interns should do the same. She added, “…if I’m going to work as hard as I know I’m going to work, then I want the same reciprocal kind of approach to the process” (EPC, Lines 593-595). Helen believed that successful teachers should have a strong work ethic. As a successful teacher herself, Helen brought that same dedication, diligence, and tenacity to her work as a supervisor, and she expected the same from her interns.

Helen also believed that teachers should be passionate about their work. When asked about her desires for interns, she said, “…stay passionate and to continue to really love what they do even when it gets really hard” (EPC, Lines 262-263). She believed that interns, as aspiring teachers, need to find joy and delight in teaching. She added, “It really has to be fun. There has to be joy in this work or it’s just not worth doing” (EPC, Lines 610-611). Helen believed that being passionate and having fun were commitments beyond simply loving children; teachers must have a disposition beyond a general fondness for kids. She commented about an experience with her own daughter by saying,

[My daughter said], ‘I think I might want to be a teacher. I love children. I love children. I think I might want to be a teacher.’ And as I talk to her I’m feeling like classroom teaching is probably not the way she should go because of the things she’s saying to me (EPC, Lines 288-292).

She added, “Because I don’t think she understands or would have the temperament or would want to manage what I know a classroom teacher has to deal with” (EPC, Lines 296-299). Helen believed that she possessed a strong understanding of the dispositions of effective teachers, and as
a supervisor of interns, she understood the qualities and characteristics of those individuals who would be successful as teachers. Helen believed that teachers needed to have a passion for the work beyond a love of children.

In addition to work ethic and passion, Helen also believed that successful teachers needed to collaborate, and they also must find or create collaborative opportunities if they found themselves in contexts devoid of this characteristic. She suggested to interns,

Do your darndest to figure out how to make it collaborative even if it’s with one other person. Even if it’s with a person in a different school, just never allow yourself to feel isolated in the work because to me that is . . . that’s taking the first step to leaving the profession because it’s too hard to do when you’re isolated. You’ve got to feel connected to other people that are going to keep you energized and so that you can share what you know. (EPC, Lines 519-528)

Helen believed that teaching was difficult and in order to be successful and have longevity in the profession, teachers needed to collaborate. If collaboration was not present, then their responsibility as professionals was to find and create those opportunities.

Finally Helen believed that effective teachers also needed to be lifelong learners. Engaging in continuous learning meant that teachers should constantly question their own practice and reflect on it. Without critical reflection, teachers could enter the danger zone of stagnation. She suggested to her interns, “Continue to question your practice. Don’t ever think, ‘I’ve been teaching X number of years, I know what I’m doing.’ Just don’t ever even go close to that place. Just always, always, always question” (EPC, Lines 513-516). Helen believed that success was sustained through critical reflection and analysis, and effective teachers engaged in these practices.

As a supervisor of interns, Helen believed that she would instill these characteristics of effective teachers in her teacher candidates. If those characteristics had sustained her, then they would do the same for her interns. She said,

If any one of those things was missing for me, and there were moments when they were, that was when I started to question, ‘I don’t know if I want to do this anymore,’ or I
started to feel lazy or I started to feel overwhelmed. So I think that just is the key to longevity in the career and being happy about being a teacher. (EPC, Lines 534-540)

Helen believed that because she possessed these characteristics of a strong work ethic, passion, collaboration, and lifelong learning, her interns should have those characteristics themselves in order to “make it” in the teaching profession. Helen brought these beliefs about the characteristics of effective teachers to her work as a supervisor of interns.

Helen believed that the domain of her supervision was her intern. She felt that it was her responsibility to educate the next generation of teachers. In order to engage in this process, Helen held certain beliefs about teaching. She felt that she possessed a strong understanding of quality teaching and the characteristics necessary for interns could become successful teachers. She drew upon these beliefs as she worked with the interns, which she believed to be the main focus of her work as a supervisor.

**Supervisor as expert.** Helen believed that she was a strong teacher and, therefore, could act as a strong role model for future teachers. She felt that these characteristics were essential to being a supervisor. She said, “Hopefully you would feel that there is a really strong model, someone that I aspire to have skills like this person has” (EPC, Lines 554-556).” Being a strong role model indicated that Helen believed she held expertise about teaching. As the expert, it was her responsibility to share that expertise with her interns. Helen said, “I am somebody who is going to express teaching and her experience with teaching in a really authentic but optimistic way” (EPC, Lines 559-561). She then added,

The most effective way I helped my interns this year was by sharing what my teaching life has been like and what my experience has been, kind of just letting them into my world and letting them really understand how it has worked for me. Clearly it has been a great experience for me for 28 years. So what made that happen? What are the things I have done that have worked for me? Now, that may not be exactly their path, but at least I sort of model what has worked for an effective teacher for this long (EPC, Lines 613-622).”
Helen believed that she was an effective teacher. As a supervisor, she saw herself as an expert in teaching and understanding teaching. This vision meant that she felt her responsibility was to share that expertise with her interns.

Helen also believed that she needed to share her expertise in a manner that did not pass judgment on others. Helen remarked,

I just had to be really, really aware and I was always very, very careful about being judgment free. At the same time coming to terms with there are ways I can express what I think, what worked for me you know all of those ways that we do it so that we’re not judging but we’re still saying what we think need to you know be said. (EPC, Lines 367-373)

Helen desired to share her expertise in a manner that was without judgment. She believed that it was her responsibility to share her opinions without others believing that she was critiquing their practices even if those opinions may have disagreed with another’s practice. Helen also said,

I found tools and ways I think I brought the mentor along just a tiny little bit. I’m not going to pretend it was much more than that. But I think I found a way to talk with her collegially and I think she respected my opinion. (Lines 319-323)

Helen believed that she possessed the ability to share her expertise with others while simultaneously being judgment-free.

As an expert, she felt sharing would assist her in changing others’ practices – both mentors and interns. She believed that her role as supervisor was to change or impact practice.

The above example showed how Helen believed she had impacted one mentor’s practice. She also commented on another situation where she believed that she was not as effective in changing a mentor’s practice, but she was able to gain respect. She said, “I don’t think I moved this mentor along as much but I think she respected me” (EPC, Lines 388-389). Helen felt most effective when she supported an intern whose mentor used practices with which Helen disagreed. Helen commented,

Because I really felt that she was one of my interns that I really, really helped. Because she was working with a mentor that was not demonstrating best practices and really was not the best model for her in many ways, I engaged in a lot of discussion, a lot of role
playing, a lot of possibilities of alternative things to think about or ways to handle situations. I think of all of my interns I worked the hardest with her, partially because I knew she needed it because I knew that where she was every day was not the best model, and also because she was so willing and open and happy about engaging in that. She was always, always open to it. She was really quite amazing because she was so respectful and professional. (EPC, Lines 97-110)

Helen felt effective in this situation because she was able to share her expertise and support her intern in an environment that she felt was less than ideal. She said,

But more importantly I felt like I was able to support the intern in that environment... So to me that was positive because I got through it and maintained in a difficult situation and I felt like positive things resulted. (EPC, Lines 324-335)

Helen believed she was successful as a supervisor because she was able to impact practice in a manner that she felt was positive. She believed it was her responsibility to change others’ practice through sharing her own expertise.

As an expert, Helen believed that she understood how to support interns and how they should be mentored. Helen believed that interns’ experiences in the classroom should be scaffolded. Interns should be mentored slowly into the process of teaching rather than having them assume too much responsibility too quickly. Helen reflected on one situation where her expectations for her intern were different from the mentor’s expectations. She said,

And I said I felt she was given a lot of responsibility very early on when perhaps in my point of view it was too soon to be asking her to do as much as her mentor was expecting her to do. But she rose to the occasion. She managed it. She always asked for assistance if she needed it. (EPC, Lines 64-70)

She elaborated on this situation by saying,

I think she left [the intern] to jump into the deep end before she really had enough experience, confidence, and skills. It was like throw her in the deep end without the floaties on her arms and see what happens. And she did okay. But there were lots of times where she didn’t do okay. And it made her question herself in ways that I didn’t think were necessary. I think if she would have had more support and more appropriate modeling and more co-teaching, where it truly was co-teaching, it just would have been more advantageous for her growth, but clearly she was okay. (EPC, Lines 123-134)

Helen held beliefs and expectations about appropriate mentoring practices, and she disagreed with how this mentor was mentoring the intern and teaching in the classroom. Despite the
disagreement, Helen was able to recognize the mentor’s ability to have confidence in the intern’s ability. She said,

    And I think her mentor was correct. I mean there were lots of things she recognized about (the intern). She saw that she could do it. She recognized that in her. Now you know my point of view is she still should have given her more time and she should engage in the process with her. (EPC, Lines 116-121)

Helen stood firm in her beliefs about appropriate mentoring and scaffolding practices for supporting interns even when she recognized that a particular strategy was effective despite the fact that it was different from her own beliefs.

These examples illustrated that Helen believed that as a supervisor she was an expert. Being a practitioner for many years indicated that she held expertise about practice that situated her as an expert, and Helen believed that supervisors were and should be experts, especially experts about practice.

**Supervision as complex.** Helen’s beliefs about supervision changed throughout her first year. Even though Helen had worked with teacher candidates previously as a cooperating teacher in other teacher preparation programs, she did not realize how difficult and complex supervision was. Helen reflected,

    I mean it wasn’t always fun. I mean that’s the thing about this job. Not that I thought it was going to be a party, but I did actually think it was going to be more fun than it turned out to be. (EPC, Lines 338-342)

Through her experiences, Helen realized the importance of relationships in supervision and the difficulty and skill required in building and sustaining relationships. These new perceptions were different from her original beliefs. She said,

    I mean it’s kind of silly to think this but I just thought everybody would always get along and everything. I just didn’t stop to really think, ‘Oh, this could be a mismatch of personalities,’ and I also, to be honest with you, I was surprised that there were things going on in classrooms that were not good, as much as I saw. (EPC, Lines 348-354)

Helen also held perceptions and beliefs about the quality of teaching happening in her colleagues’ classrooms, and although some rooms impressed her, others did not. This dissatisfaction with her
peers’ practices created struggles for her as a supervisor as she tried to establish relationships with mentors and interns in those classrooms, which showed her that supervision was quite a complex process.

Helen believed that she would easily build relationships with her interns. However, that was not always the case. Helen described the relationship between a supervisor and an intern as being a dance. She said, “The dance is just that, the relationship piece. It is like you engage in one way and your intern responds to that. Your intern engages in one way, you respond to that” (EPC, Lines 885-888). Interns responded differently to her supervision. Helen reflected on the inauthentic nature of some of those relationships. She stated, “I just felt like we never got to an authentic place. It was always very nice. She always said the things that were . . . the things nice interns say. I just felt like she never got real” (EPC, Lines 390-394). She also added,

I tried to challenge her thinking, because I did that all through the year. I really tried to do that. And she would receive it nicely before but towards the end she pushed. It was clear. She would say things like, ‘Well I don’t know. I think it looks fine to me.’ (EPC, Lines 422-426)

Her struggle with this relationship and others similar to it contributed to her beliefs that supervision was more complex than it seemed.

In addition to the struggles with relationships, Helen realized how demanding the PDA role was. In order to meet her interns’ needs, she would work late hours. She said, “There were times when I was late for other things because my intern needed to talk or I stayed up way later than I wanted to because I had to work through a difficult issue” (EPC, Lines 472-475). She also realized how multifaceted the role was. As a supervisor, she described the tasks in which she engaged, “Observation, discussion, writing back and forth, video reflection, different tools like systematic observation tools, co-teaching where the mentor or the intern and PDA co-teaches, there would be modeling, there would be sharing of resources” (EPC, Lines 572-576). Having to
engage in these multiple tasks contributed to her belief of the complex nature of supervision. To illustrate, she recounted one of her typical days as a supervisor. She described, 

I went home and I remember just pouring myself into a chair and thinking, 'Oh, my God. Think about what you did today.' I wore so many different hats. I had to interact in all different levels. I had a couple of mentor issues, so I had to deal with two completely different kinds of mentor personalities. I had to deal with a principal. I worked with kids in a classroom and that day I had to discipline them because these kids were out of control. Then I was a PDA working as a supervisor in this classroom, but then I was also a PDA as a methods instructor. I mean I had so many different interactions. I went from some really positive, great things to being pulled into a closet to talk about a problem. And it happened like rapid fire throughout the day. Now teaching can be a lot like that, too, as a classroom teacher. But I just remember thinking, 'You did really well today.' It was a hard, hard, hard day and I was exhausted. But I felt really good and I felt really good about the fact that I was able to do all that. (EPC, Lines 757-776) 

This description illustrated the multifaceted nature of the PDA role. Helen described the difficulty as, “…being able to balance the role of being in the classroom, doing the paperwork, and managing all the relationships” (EPC, Lines 1033-1035). To handle this complexity, Helen believed that the most important skills for a supervisor to possess were people skills. She said, “The number one set of skills without a doubt are people skills” (EPC, Lines 740-741). Helen then added, “You have to be resilient and you have to have ‘mad’ people skills because you never know when you are going to be called on” (EPC, Lines 784-787). Managing the demands of the multiple roles of a PDA contributed to her belief of the complexity of supervision.

As a supervisor, Helen visited many classrooms. Sometimes her beliefs about teaching coincided with the mentor teacher’s practices and sometimes they did not. When a misalignment occurred between the mentor’s practices and Helen’s beliefs, Helen felt internal tension. She said, 

…as a PDA, I was entering a classroom environment that was very discomfoting to me. It was not a place that I felt reflected what I know to be best practices for primary students. There was a lot of dissonance there for me in terms of what I know as a classroom teacher. And that was hard. I had an intern in that environment, and I had to figure out how to support her and the mentor in a way that was judgment free, that allowed me to maintain good relationships. (EPC, Lines 308-317)
Helen struggled to determine how best to support her intern in this kind of environment while simultaneously maintaining relationships with both the intern and the mentor. These kinds of experiences contributed to Helen’s belief that supervision was complex.

**Summary.** Helen held certain beliefs as a novice supervisor. She believed that the intern was her domain, and it was her responsibility to educate the next generation of teachers. Supporting the intern’s learning was the focus of her supervision. In order to support teacher candidates, Helen believed that she understood characteristics of quality teaching. Those characteristics included a solid work ethic, passion, collaboration, and lifelong learning. Helen also believed that, as a supervisor, she was the expert. As the source of knowledge, Helen believed that it was her responsibility to share with her interns her wisdom as a successful veteran teacher. Finally, Helen believed that supervision was complex, and it was much more complex than she realized. Supervision as a PDA was multifaceted and demanded an enormous amount of time and energy. This section explored Helen’s perceptions of beliefs as a novice supervisor. The next section is dedicated to understanding Helen’s perceptions of her practices as a novice supervisor.

**Of Her Own Practices**

Through her weekly reflections, Helen described many critical moments that happened to her throughout her first year of supervision. In these moments, she described her practices—how she approached and responded to different situations. Helen’s descriptions of her practices were categorized into tasks and characteristics.

**Tasks.** Using the framework in Chapter 1, Helen’s practices were categorized into tasks, and Helen engaged in all of the tasks in that framework. As a novice supervisor, she performed the tasks of direct assistance, community development, learning structures, curriculum development, action research, and teaching.
Direct assistance. This task focuses on the technical-helping aspects of supervision.

Helen worked directly and primarily with developing her interns’ skills as practitioners. For example, she helped her interns develop their classroom management skills. She commented,

The children do not respect her. They like her; I can tell they really like her but they don’t respect her as a teacher. She is so overwhelmed with the process of managing this behavior because she hasn’t seen a consistent way of setting expectations and following through on them. (11.18.10, Lines 114-117)

Helen worked with this particular intern on her teacher presence and management of student behavior. Another example of direct assistance was supporting interns with their affect. She reflected on another one of her interns’ performances,

We talked about her affect and the way she needs to...she’ll say things like this, ‘I’m a really fun person. I really am. I’m a really fun person,’ but it’s all very across the board. She used the same tone of voice to introduce her lesson to kind of hook them as she did to say, ‘I’m hearing too much talking. I need everyone’s bottoms on their seats.’ She said it in the exact same way as she said, ‘So today we are going to take a virtual fieldtrip.’ (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 857-862)

These two examples are only some of the foci of her direct assistance, but they demonstrate that she performed this task.

To help develop her interns’ skills as practitioners, Helen would capture their teaching. Sometimes that capturing included using video as a data collection tool. Helen noted, “I videotaped two social studies lessons in two different classrooms. And it was really fun to do that” (Weekly Interview 01.12.11, Lines 30-32). After the lessons, Helen wanted her interns to reflect on their performance. When time permitted, she would sit with them and ask them some reflective questions. She explained, “I’m going to go through those basic questions, how do you think it went? Did anything surprise you? What did you want the children to learn? Do you think you achieved your objective?” (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 89-91). Helen either discussed these questions with her interns or she placed them at the bottom of her written observations for them to consider. The goal of these behaviors was to support interns’ development of their practice.
When engaging in technical helping, the process can be more supervisor-centered or more teacher-centered, or in this case teacher-candidate centered. As a novice supervisor, Helen used more supervisor-centered practices, often determining the foci for her visits and the nature of support. Helen had specific goals for her interns, and these goals stemmed from her observation of their practices. For example, she said, “I just want her to recognize you don’t always have to be heavy handed” (Weekly Interview 12.07.10, Lines 152-153). Sometimes achieving her goals for them took time. She reflected, “She’s still not where I’d like her to go but she has a ways to go” (Weekly Interview 12.07.10, Lines 130-131). Helen held strong beliefs about best practice and set goals for her interns to achieve these goals. All of these examples illustrate Helen’s performance of direct assistance, which is a supervisory task.

**Community development.** Community development involves the convening of various members of the community or communities to problem solve. Helen performed this task with interns, mentors, supervisors, and the larger, national PDS community.

With regard to interns and mentors, Helen routinely met with each group separately. Helen, along with other supervisors, brought all interns in a particular building together weekly to build community by celebrating their successes, answering questions, and discussing their issues and concerns together. They also brought all mentors in a particular building together monthly with the same purposes as the weekly intern meetings.

With regard to supervisors, Helen met with them weekly as a participant and sometimes as a facilitator. All supervisors convened weekly to engage in the same processes for community development, and Helen felt that part of her responsibility, as a reassigned teacher, was to be an advocate for mentors’ voices in the community. She commented, “This was before school even started about, she’s so disappointed that mentors have lost their influence, their voice and she took it a bit to an extreme” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 615-616). In order to develop the PDS community, Helen felt that voices of the various stakeholders should be present at these
meetings, and for her, that meant being an advocate for mentors. Sometimes Helen was also responsible for facilitating those weekly supervisor meetings. She said, “Now I’m facilitator this week and I’m so stressed about it” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 195-196). These kinds of feelings showed that she had limited if any experience of engaging in this task with adults. While she may have performed community development with her students when she was a teacher, she felt nervous about performing this task with adults now that she was a supervisor.

In addition to these routine gatherings, Helen, along with other supervisors, also brought members of the PDS community together. Each year, the following year’s mentors and interns gather to meet one another and determine the matching process between the mentor and intern. While Helen had participated in this gathering as a mentor, the facilitation of this kind of experience was new to her. She reflected,

I did have my first experience with having the social where the match is made between interns and mentors. And I was a little nervous about it just because it’s just something you want everyone to leave feeling like everything went successfully. (Weekly Interview 04.14.11, Lines 1-4)

Facilitating community development was a new skill for Helen as a novice supervisor. While she performed this task, she definitely felt apprehensive about the experiences, at least in the beginning.

Helen also had the opportunity to engage in community development with members of the larger PDS community—visiting university faculty and school district personnel from institutions across the country. When these visitors arrived, Helen acted as an ambassador. She, along with other supervisors, hosted their visit, taking them to schools and answering their questions during tenure of their visit. She commented on this experience, “I’ve had the experience of being an ambassador before but having the kind of intensive conversations and the questioning, that part maybe took it up a notch” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 413-416). While Helen had engaged in ambassadorship previously, she felt this experience was different.
She recognized that conversing with a national audience for the betterment of developing the national PDS community was different from her work as a teacher.

In summary, Helen engaged in community development by bringing together groups of interns, mentors, supervisors, and members of the larger PDS community. Working with groups of individuals in order to develop community is part of the responsibility of supervisor, and Helen, as a novice supervisor, had experiences with this task.

**Learning structures.** At the end of her first year of supervision, Helen shifted the focus of her practice. During the academic year, Helen mostly focused her supervision of her interns on direct assistance. After her interns graduated, Helen also incorporated another task of supervision – learning structures. Helen arranged for her interns to observe other teachers in the district. She took them to these classrooms and then reflected on these experiences with them afterwards. She commented, “I’m thinking I’m going to arrange something the following week at [another teacher’s] classroom” (Weekly Interview 05.20.11, Lines 67-68). By arranging these kinds of experiences, Helen was creating structures to support her interns’ professional learning.

**Curriculum development.** As a supervisor, Helen was responsible for working with other supervisors to refine the teacher education curriculum for the courses she taught throughout the year. She shared, “Basically all the different strands were put up on the white board. We had the document in front of us on computers” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 212-213). In this situation, which was a common experience for her, Helen described how the supervisors and she examined the scope and sequence of the particular course they were planning. This quotation showed how Helen performed the task of curriculum development collaboratively with the support of other experienced supervisors.

**Action research.** As a supervisor, Helen was responsible for supporting her interns’ as they engaged in inquiry. When Helen was a mentor teacher herself, she had supported her interns in inquiry and she had engaged in inquiry herself; therefore, as a supervisor, she did bring those
experiences to her work. However, she still felt unsure about engaging in this task as a supervisor. She said,

We had good conversations and I feel much more connected to where they are in the inquiry process... although I’ve done an inquiry myself and presented it at the conference and certainly have had interns in the past in my classroom as a mentor who participated in inquiry. I’ve never supervised someone through inquiry and I have to say I was really not feeling completely comfortable about it. And I’m still not completely comfortable but I’m definitely feeling better (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 2-8)

Even though Helen was uncomfortable about supporting others with inquiry, she herself exhibited some of the characteristics of having an orientation or stance towards inquiry. Helen often wondered about her own practice as a supervisor asking such questions as, “Do they all need it? Like these are the questions I wonder about” (Weekly Interview 03.24.11, Lines 107-108). In this situation, Helen was reflecting on the amount of support and face time that she was giving a struggling intern, and she wondered about the impact of this practice on this intern and on her other interns. She wondered if she should be providing that same kind of support to all of them and in what ways it might be beneficial to the rest of her interns. These examples showed how Helen engaged in the task of action research; she exhibited an inquiry stance herself and she supported her interns as they conducted inquiry by reading and responding to their inquiry work and having conversations with them even though she felt unsure of herself with regard to this task.

Teaching. Helen recognized that she spent a large amount of her time engaging in this task. As a supervisor, Helen was responsible for teaching on a multitude of levels. She taught coursework, responded to assignments, and co-taught with her interns while in the field.

First, she formally co-taught one of the methods courses for her interns and she also co-taught their field-based seminar experience. Even though Helen was a classroom teacher before taking this role, she was still unsure about engaging in this kind of task as a supervisor. As a teacher, her students were children and she felt comfortable with the knowledge base she had
about them as learners. Adults, who became her new learning population, presented more of a challenge because she was unfamiliar with them and their needs as learners. She said,

I’ve had anxiety with methods. It’s the first time I’ve been instructing adult learners, although I felt really pretty comfortable with the material. I just, every single time I would finish a methods class, I would just breathe a huge sigh of relief because it was not a comfortable time for me. (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 319-322)

Helen co-taught this particular course with university-based supervisors for half of the academic year. As her quotation indicates, over time and more experience, her feelings of discomfort eased. The initial few weeks of teaching were worrisome because of her perceived lack of knowledge and experience with this population. Helen also realized that she was not alone in this endeavor; she always had the support of other experienced supervisors to co-plan and co-teach with her. She expressed, “But there was always a feeling of looking to your right, looking to your left, that comfort of somebody adding to what you said or correcting something that maybe was misspoken. I mean that felt really good” (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 308-310). When teaching as a novice supervisor, Helen was supported in the PDS setting. She had the opportunity to collaborate with others during this process.

Second, Helen also was responsible for responding to her interns’ coursework. During the spring semester, Helen needed to read and respond to her interns’ lesson plans. Having eight interns created an enormous amount of paperwork, which caused her to reconsider how she viewed her role and responsibilities as a supervisor. She shared, “Since we started, the second semester is adding the dimension of reviewing lesson plans. And so I’m trying now to find a balance between how many plans do I look at closely, give feedback, and process before the lesson” (Weekly Interview 01.12.11, Lines 5-7). Helen was trying to find her own balance between the amount of lesson plans and her desire to give feedback given the fixed amount of time she had each week.
Another assignment was a weekly journal that her interns submitted to her. In order to support their professional learning, Helen would respond to their work. For example, she shared a time where an intern was not fulfilling her responsibilities for the assignment. She shared how she gave that intern feedback about this concern. Helen said, “And so I had to be very specific about that one page minimum. I gave her guided questions to respond to, and so this last journal submission they were definitely long enough” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 44-46).

Another example of how she had to respond to student work was regarding an assignment, where again, an intern was struggling. She shared,

Well I read her paper last night and . . . it’s almost a stream of consciousness in some ways. She writes in this very flowery way using big flowery adjectives to describe her students. But there’s nothing, there’s nothing solid. There was not a single appendix with a single artifact with any solid evidence. (Weekly Interview 04.28.11, Lines 26-30)

Responding to student work is a part of teaching, and it showed one way in which Helen participated in this task as a supervisor.

Third, Helen also co-taught with her interns while working with them in their field placements. She said, “I sat next to them their table. And I co-taught with them” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Line 25). Co-teaching with interns could impact interns differently. Helen was aware of other kinds of perceptions and she shared some concerns she had,

I was really a little nervous because I never wanted her to feel like I was taking over. So I was very careful about the way I did it and I would always engage her with whatever I was doing with the kids. (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 70-73)

Helen was afraid that her interns would perceive her desire to co-teach with them in a negative light or as a sign of their incompetence. Therefore, Helen tried to compensate for her perception of their perceptions by trying to make them more comfortable with the experience.

Helen co-taught with her interns for a variety of reasons. One of those reasons included when an intern was nervous and just wanted some support. Helen described a time when this kind of situation occurred, “And [my intern] said, ‘I really feel like I’m not even sure how to do it.’ So
I sat with her, and again tried to do some co-teaching with her (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 156-158). Helen used co-teaching as a means of supporting interns in their practice, and she also used co-teaching when she noticed an area of growth for a particular intern. She shared, “[My intern] hadn’t set the stage for what I look at as we’re here now to work together, so what needs to happen now? So I was trying to model some of that” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 165-167). Here Helen described her desire to co-teach for modeling. She felt that interns could learn from her as they observed her working with children. For instance, she described,

> We had fun. And by the third small group the same lesson, we did three times with small groups, by the third one I was barely saying anything. And [my intern] had taken the lead and I saw her body language and the way she would lean. And I of course overdid my affect. I went a little bit, I mean I wasn’t phony but I definitely emphasized the kind of things that I was hoping she would notice. Like just getting really excited with every answer the kids gave and doing a lot of leaning in and body language kinds of things to express to the students excitement and joy with their ideas. (Weekly Interview 11.18.10, Lines 6-12)

She shared another time where she was co-teaching and had to intervene with a particular student, who challenged both her authority and her intern’s authority as teachers,

> There was one little boy who is in there, and I said to him, ‘I’m going to take your pencil. And I’m going to hold it until you show me you’re ready.’ I mean I got into my very authoritative, firm… and he kind of looked at me like, ‘Oh. You really mean business.’ I had to be really pretty aggressive because he was basically taunting me like, ‘I’m going to make my 9 like this.’ And he was just toying with me to see what I was going to do. (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 200-209)

By watching her teach, encounter struggles, and resolve them successfully, Helen believed that her interns would learn. Therefore, she often co-taught in order to model what she perceived to be effective practice.

In summary, Helen engaged in the supervisory task of teaching. She co-planned and co-taught courses with university faculty and she also read and responded to her interns’ coursework. Finally, Helen taught in the field by co-teaching alongside of her interns while they worked with children.
Summary. Helen engaged in all of the tasks as a novice supervisor. Those tasks included direct assistance, community development, learning structures, curriculum development, action research, and teaching. While engaging in these tasks, her supervision took on several characteristics, and I describe these in the next section of understanding Helen’s perceptions of her practices.

Characteristics. Analyzing Helen’s weekly reflections of her practices revealed some characteristics of her supervision. Her supervision could be characterized as connected, Helen spent a great deal of time with her interns and felt connected to them—as caring, Helen cared deeply about her work as a supervisor—as supportive, Helen supported her interns, her mentors, and their students—as evaluative, Helen evaluated or passed judgment on others’ practices—but as novice, Helen recognized that she was new to this role.

Connected. Helen spent a great deal of time with her interns in their classrooms. She said, “I see my interns each two hours a week in the classroom” (Weekly Interview 03.24.11, Line 89). Sometimes, if an intern was struggling, she spent even more time with her, “It would be, it’s classroom time, no meeting time, just classroom time two hours. Then if we add meeting time it’s probably four hours this week” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 773-774). Helen described different ways in which she spent time with her interns. That time included observing them or working with them in their classrooms, meeting time with them about their teaching or their assignments, and then assessing their work. By spending this kind of time with her interns, Helen was building a physical presence in the schools and classrooms in which she supervised in hopes that her mentors and interns would feel that she was there to support them; they were connected to a pillar of support when and if they needed it. Helen also felt that spending a great deal of time allowed her to know her interns and their teaching better. She said, “I think by being in the classrooms often, I’m able to see those kinds of subtle changes in response to a conversation we’ve had or a journal conversation even” (Weekly Interview 12.07.10, Lines 156-
Being present allowed her to be more closely connected to her interns, and sometimes she realized this connection after it was gone. Helen reflected on one of her interns who was dismissed from the program,

Lately I’ve just been thinking about her and wondering what she’s doing and if she’s okay and it made me realize that that connection we have with these interns is, goes so much deeper than just our role as supervisor. I wasn’t particularly close to her in the sense of an interpersonal way because you know it was always challenging supervising her from the very beginning. So that was sort of a roadblock to getting what I would call in a close relationship. But I care . . . I was so consumed with her and cared so much about helping her find success and all of that, that in a way I was probably closer to her than, than others because of the amount of time I invested. (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 9-17)

Helen spent a great deal of time with her interns; therefore, she felt connected to them even if their relationship was not the strongest.

**Caring.** Helen cared deeply about her role as a supervisor. She expressed, “I hoped to make them see that I’m really putting in a lot of time and energy. I care so much about my role” (Weekly Interview 01.27.11, Lines 130-131). Helen conveyed these feelings of care by spending time with her interns and giving them and their work effort. Helen also sometimes embraced a more parental role as supervisor. She described some of her actions of care and concern as being motherly, “…things that a mother or a caring adult in her life would ask. So those kinds of things it’s usually around times when [the interns] demonstrate extreme stress. I think my role changes to more of a parental caregiver” (Weekly Interview 01.27.11, Lines 103-105). She hoped that these actions would demonstrate to her interns that she cared for them and that her supervision was caring in nature.

**Supportive.** According to her descriptions of her practices, when Helen supervised she supported children, interns, and mentors. Sometimes when Helen went into classrooms, she worked directly with children. She commented, “I would sit with the group of kids” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Line 12), and “I just basically started to just interact with the kids and with
Helen also supported interns with their learning. She was there to support them with any needs that they had. For example, she shared a time where one of her interns was struggling with lesson planning, so she offered her some support,

I said you know what? Next week if you’d like, we’ll schedule time and I’ll sit down with you and we’ll write your first couple plans. Well we’ll probably start with one. We’ll write it together. And I can be your sounding board right there. (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 485-487)

Helen felt that she would differentiate her supervision in order to meet her interns’ needs, which meant that sometimes some interns received more time than others. She said, “So there was always a sense of well, [I’ll] give you what you need” (Weekly Interview 11.30.10, Lines 340-341). Other ways in which she supported them was by being a confidential, trusting person with whom they could confide. She expressed, “So they can expect commitment, confidentiality, and a sense of trust that I’ll work hard to do my role to support them” (Weekly Interview 11.30.10, Lines 350-352). Helen felt that her supervision was supportive of her interns as aspiring professionals.

Helen also recognized that she supported mentors, especially when an intern was struggling. She stated, “I see it as supporting both the mentor in her supervising of [the struggling intern]” (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Line 161). Helen’s feelings here were affirmed when this mentor expressed her gratitude about Helen’s support during the situation. Helen said, “I’m just feeling more effective because her mentor and I are so on the same wavelength. And her mentor is so appreciative of this support. She said that so many times” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 99-101). Sometimes supporting mentors meant resolving conflict between mentor and intern pairs and diffusing heightened emotions. Helen commented about a time where she had to
calm a mentor down because their intern’s behavior had frustrated and angered the mentor tremendously. Helen shared,

I talked to [the mentor] about it and kind of talked her down, let her know she had every right to feel what she was feeling. She basically said, ‘If she is not going to be respectful and do at least the bare minimum of expectations, I don’t really want her in my classroom.’ She said that. She was upset. (Weekly Interview 01.26.11, Lines 58-61)

Resolving conflict was one way that Helen supported mentors. Another way in which Helen resolved conflict was by delivering difficult news to the intern. For example, one of her mentors and she were concerned with their intern’s behavior. Helen determined that she should be the one to express these concerns to the intern; Helen would jeopardize her relationship with the intern in order to preserve the intern’s relationship with the mentor. Even though she assumed this responsibility, it caused her great concern. She said,

But my worry is [this intern] is so immature . . . it’s so difficult for her to hear any kind of criticism. She takes it so personally and then she shuts down. And I can be more heavy handed I think because she only sees me a couple of times a week. But [her mentor] and she have to basically live together for the next five months. (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Lines 105-109)

By assuming this burden, Helen felt that the intern and mentor’s relationship would be salvaged; she was willing to make sacrifices for what she perceived to be a benefit to her mentors and interns. Although Helen believed that the intern was her domain, she knew that she sometimes supported mentors when she supervised. All of these examples showed how Helen’s supervision was supportive of children, interns, and mentor teachers.

**Evaluative.** As a supervisor, Helen believed that her role included examining others’ practice. She articulated, “Being a PDA is one of the first times I think I’ve had to look that closely at another person’s practice” (Weekly Interview 11.18.10, Lines 358-359). She recognized that examining others required her to place judgment on others’ practices, and sometimes those practices and the nature of her role as supervisor created tension, but the tension
was more covert in nature especially with her mentors. Helen felt the conflict in this aspect of her role. She expressed,

I’ve done a lot to help [my interns] to recognize that I don’t want them to see me as the person who decides their future kind of thing, with having that burden of, ‘Well, I’ve got to make sure Helen likes this because she’s the one that [gives me a grade]…Because it’s the truth. So we’re not going to pretend that I’m not, right? Because it would be silly to do so. But at the same time I want them to see me multi-dimensionally. And I don’t even want that [perspective] to be the biggest percentage. I really want it to be pretty fairly distributed in the ways that they see me. (Weekly Interview 01.27.11, Lines 77-85)

This kind of dual requirement of supervision as supportive and supervision as evaluative, because Helen was a supervisor-as-teacher and her interns were interns-as-students, caused Helen to struggle with what she perceived to be the requirements of her role as supervisor simply because she knew that being evaluative had the potential to create conflict with her interns.

There were different kinds of conflict that Helen experienced. One kind of conflict included interns’ responses to Helen’s constructive criticism. Helen shared,

I was critiquing some of the choices she’d made in terms of managing behavior at her station and she completely fell apart. She started to cry. And so of course we stopped talking about the observation and I said, ‘Oh, what’s going on?’ She said, ‘I’m overwhelmed. It’s just too much.’ (Weekly Interview 01.27.11, Lines 96-99)

Although Helen was able to resolve this situation relatively amicably, a residue of tension remained. Other times when Helen critiqued an intern’s practice, the mentor got involved, which created an us-them mentality—the mentor and intern against Helen. Helen shared,

I think it’s because I questioned something she was doing. And she just said, ‘It’s so hard.’ And then later in the day I got an email from her mentor who now wants to speak with me. So that’s like another little wavy, blury thing off to the side. (Weekly Interview 01.26.11, Lines 245-248)

Sometimes when Helen questioned an intern’s practice, Helen felt some tension with the mentor. She felt that the mentor became nervous and believed that Helen was watching and evaluating her practice. Helen very deliberately and intentionally tried to dispel these feelings that she felt were caused by the nature of her role as supervisor; she even would compliment the mentor’s practices and try to find personal connections in order to ease mentors’ fears (Member Check, 03.14.12).
Another kind of conflict that Helen experienced when she practiced her supervision as evaluative was when her beliefs about pedagogy collided with a mentor’s beliefs and practices. Helen believed so strongly that the intern was her domain and her responsibility that she felt compelled to support interns especially in situations where she felt they were not receiving the best role models for teaching. One way in which Helen responded to this dissonance was to talk with the intern privately and try to share some strategies that worked for Helen as a practitioner, hoping that the intern would be able to implement them. She shared,

I decided to have it just be [the intern] and I [in the conversation]. First of all her mentor was well into report card zone. She needed that day to just focus on getting progress reports done. And I thought I had done enough touching base with her that I could have [my intern] to myself and say some things to her that I maybe wouldn’t have said in front of the mentor. This intern is very mature and she’s very intelligent, and she’s one of three of mine that I think is really passionate about the work. She’s the whole package. She just needs experience. She’s got so much going on already. So I was able to say to her very judiciously, but I basically did express that she will likely have some struggles around the fact that her mentor’s management style is so completely different than what I’m suggesting might be helpful. And I let her know this is not a magic wand. But this is just something I’ve learned over 27 years of teaching with primary kids. That it is a really good beginning base. (Weekly Interview 11.30.10, Lines 54-65)

In this situation, Helen believed she was supporting her intern. When the supervisor and the mentor disagree, the intern feels caught in the middle, so when Helen’s practices placed the intern in this kind of dilemma, tension resulted.

Having an aside with an intern was not the only way in which Helen responded to situations where she disagreed with a mentor’s practice. She also offered to co-teach with her intern in the classroom, hoping to model best practice for the intern and demonstrate that alternative methods can be successful. She explained,

And so I proposed the co-teaching. I said we could just because I talked about the different ways to access kids’ understandings before you start teaching. She said, ‘I know but I’ve never really done anything like that.’ I said, ‘We can do it together. We could have a little white board and a little Venn diagram picture and we could take turns you know questioning your students. We could do it in small groups or in stations.’ I put out all these different possibilities. And then she said, ‘Just wondering when we’ll have the time.’ And I said, ‘Well, what about during stations? All of your kids cycle through,’ and she didn’t say this but I felt like I could read her mind. It was like, ‘Well (my mentor)
gives me things that I need to do.’ I guess [her mentor] gives her handwriting or spelling or things to do during that time. But I’m feeling like I maybe could talk to [her mentor] and talk to her about what I’ve offered to [the intern] and if she could see a fit. If [the intern] comes back and says, ‘I would like to do this,’ then I’d go to [the mentor] and say, ‘How do you see it fitting in? And is it possible one day a week during stations?’ Or, and I would just frame it as this is part of [the intern’s] wondering about some of these things and I’d be happy to model some things with her. (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 870-886)

When Helen used co-teaching as a strategy to resolve conflict, she involved the mentor more collaboratively by consulting with her regarding the potential experience.

Ultimately tension resulted when Helen practiced supervision as being evaluative, which has been documented previously (Blumberg, 1980) and is a constant dilemma in the practice, implementation, process, and understanding of supervision. Helen believed that it was the nature of her role as supervisor that was the dominant factor in perpetuating tension between the supervisor and the teacher, which in this case is the teacher candidate. Since she believed that her role as supervisor was to support the interns’ learning, she held conversations with her interns, she critiqued their practices and their mentors’ practices to support in the technical-helping aspects of their teaching, and she offered to co-teach with her interns to support their learning. Helen believed that her practices were helping her interns to learn; she felt these practices were collaborative and collegial in nature, but she did recognize that critique was evaluative in nature (Member Check, 03.14.12).

**Novice.** Helen considered her own supervision to be novice. She realized that her knowledge about and experiences with supervision were limited, and she greatly desired more education. Sometimes she encountered situations where she did not know how to respond, and she attributed that to her lack of experience. She said, “I’ve been not sure what to do” (Weekly Interview 05.20.11, Lines 4). While all supervisors may not always feel they know how to respond to all situations, more experienced supervisors would have more experiential and educative background to draw upon; Helen recognized her lack of experience in this role.
Novices also tend to have less tolerance for ambiguity and desire context-free rules to guide their actions (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986). Helen acknowledged that she preferred concreteness and rules to offer her guidance. She commented,

“I’m very concrete. I’m a rule follower. So someone tells me this is the rule, this is how you do this, I’ll do it to the letter of the law . . . I figure things out if it’s not working. I tweak it, but to me it feels very loosey-goosey I have to say. (Weekly Interview 03.24.11, Lines 123-127)

Therefore, when she practiced supervision, she abided by any rules that were given to her and she expected her interns to do the same. For example, she was very strict about deadlines for their assignments (Member Check 03.14.12).

In addition to her own rules, Helen felt that interns should abide by the district’s and their mentor’s rules. Helen commented on a situation where one of her intern’s performances seemed to deviate from the district’s curricular rules. She said,

“Well I feel like I’m going to go back and look at the unit too because it could be that it’s a very scripted type of activity and she might have been doing exactly what it said. I would like to think not because it’s one of our newer units. And I would hope that the way it was . . . it definitely came from the wetlands unit, this lesson. But I haven’t taught it, so I don’t know how it’s framed. So I want to go back and see how the lesson was written. And if she was really doing what it said to do then that makes sense to me because she’s still following rules now. (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 80-86)

In this case, Helen approved of her intern’s practices if the intern was in fact following the district’s curriculum—essentially the curricular “rules” that the district gave to teachers and the interns as novice teachers in their context.

Helen felt that rules were more of a guiding structure that both her interns and she should follow. She believed that interns should follow their mentors’ wishes because they were guests in those classrooms (Member Check 03.14.12). Helen also recognized that power was present in these relationships and that the intern, as subordinate to the mentor or to Helen, should follow the rules. Rule following is important to Helen and she believed that her interns should also follow those rules or guiding structures; these rules trumped any personal disagreement that her interns
or she might have with the curriculum. Helen’s background as a teacher and her status as a novice supervisor contributed to her feelings; Helen believed that she needed to follow the rules that were given to her and that her interns as novice teachers should also follow any rules given to them.

Helen placed great value on rules and she used them to guide her work as a novice supervisor; rules as a form of structure gave her a sense of comfort and guidance. She said, “When you are a supervisor and you have a struggling intern, here’s a protocol. Instead of having to kind of figure it out (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 104-105).” Helen preferred to have rules to tell her how to perform her role as a supervisor. Therefore, she wanted structure for her interns, especially those who were struggling. She mentioned, “I’m feeling like we should put some kind of structure in place before the next semester begins” (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Lines 77-78). Helen’s comfort with and desire for rules influenced her supervision causing her to create structure and boundaries for her interns. Understanding the rules and boundaries were helpful and comforting to her as a novice supervisor and, she believed, was helpful and comforting to her interns as novices.

**Summary.** Helen’s descriptions of her own practices showed that she participated in all supervisory tasks. She engaged in technical helping with her interns. She also facilitated the development of the various communities within the structure of partnerships by bringing together groups of interns, mentors, supervisors, and even members from the larger PDS community. Helen also created professional learning structures for her interns in order to deepen their pedagogical understanding, and she supported their teacher inquiries as well as conducting some herself and exhibiting a stance towards inquiry. Finally, Helen engaged in the task of teaching; she taught her interns coursework throughout the academic year.

Helen’s supervision also exhibited the following characteristics. It was connected—she maintained a physical presence in order to become part of the school and classroom communities.
It was caring—Helen also cared deeply about her work as a supervisor; she gave great time and effort in hopes that her interns would know that she cared about them and their progress. It was supportive—she supported children’s learning, interns’ learning, and mentors’ learning. It was also evaluative—she critiqued others’ practice. However, she felt it was the nature of her role as supervisor that created some covert tension in her relationships rather than her practice of critique. Finally, her supervision was novice—Helen practiced supervision in the way that she wanted to learn it, with a concrete structure and rules. The next section examines Helen’s perceptions of the impact on her as a supervisor.

**Impact on Her as Novice Supervisor**

Helen believed that she learned a tremendous amount from her first year. This next section explores Helen’s perceptions of the impact of her supervision on herself as a supervisor. It explores how she learned and what she learned.

**Learning processes.** By examining Helen’s weekly reflections, I was able to determine that Helen learned through conversations and interactions with other individuals. She was apprenticed into her role by working with and having access to a variety of individuals. Most of these interactions were in more of an informal setting, but more formal collaborative structures present in the PDS context also created learning opportunities for her. Finally, Helen also learned from her experiences and reflecting on her encounters. Helen learned out of necessity; she learned because she encountered experiences that required her to act, and she learned because she reflected on those actions and the outcomes of those actions. In addition to reflection, Helen’s learning was social in nature. She learned from others by observing them and conversing with them.

*Multiple apprenticeships.* Lave & Wenger (1998) argue that apprenticeship should be to a community of practice as compared to one particular individual. The learner is responsible to
the community and the community is responsible for the learner, so that the learner is trying to understand the collective knowledge of the community as compared to an individual. In this case, Helen was placed in a context that was itself a community of practice and contained within it multiple communities of practice. Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings (2008) offered characteristics of apprenticeship to a community of practice and the individuals who compose it to include intentionality, shared responsibility, trust, and engagement with multiple persons in that community of practice. Helen held multiple apprenticeships within her apprenticeship to the community. By conversing with, observing, and consulting these conceptual and procedural mentors, she learned about herself as a supervisor.

With Conceptual Mentors. Helen had two kinds of mentors—those who supported her conceptual learning and those who supported her procedural learning. These kinds of mentors were not necessarily distinguishable by role. Meaning, university-based hybrids acted as both kinds of mentors and even the same university-based hybrid was both a conceptual mentor and a procedural mentor, depending upon the situation. However, with regard to conceptual mentors, all of those who engaged in supporting this aspect of Helen’s learning were university-based and primarily tenured-faculty. Conceptual mentors were those encounters that caused cognitive dissonance for Helen and challenged her thinking about a situation; they could have been both literal and figurative.

Literal conceptual mentors are individuals who assume this particular role. They are physical people who engage in intellectual sparring and intellectual posing. Through their actions, they can eventually maintain a cognitive presence in an individual’s mind so that when the individual encounters a new or foreign situation, these conceptual mentors act as guides in supporting the individual’s decision-making. Figurative conceptual mentors are ideas, shared norms, or values that assume this particular role. Through their essence of being, these conceptual mentors also spar, pose, and guide, but instead of being a physical face or physical presence, they
are more abstract and intangible. Ultimately, they can maintain a cognitive presence so that when the individual encounters a new situation, these kinds of conceptual mentors also act as a guide to support the individual’s decision-making. Conceptual mentors, both literal and figurative, are the theoretical conscience to whom an individual consults personally, intimately, and intellectually as she learns.

Sometimes Helen even labeled specific individuals as literal conceptual mentors. These individuals maintained a presence in her thinking about supervision. For example, Helen shared, “I think about what would [this conceptual mentor] do? I always think about that. What would he say? How would he have framed it?” (Weekly Interview 01.26.11, Lines 238-239). Sometimes she even attributed this conceptual mentor to a particular institution, “I don’t mean this to sound too rigid, okay? Because I think that’s what the university voice would say, ‘Then you’re not considering individual differences’” (Weekly Interview 03.24.11, Lines 182-184). Sometimes, when encountering a particular situation, Helen would express that she heard the voice of a conceptual mentor, especially when she encountered a disorienting dilemma that challenged her beliefs. She shared,

…there’s a part of me, and I hear [a particular university-based hybrid]’s voice too, ‘Isn’t that exactly the kind of novice teacher that we should have in our PDS who needs the year, who needs the support, who needs repetitions and needs guidance?’ And that’s true. Intellectually I believe that. (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 735-738)

These conceptual mentors maintained a presence in her thinking and provided guidance or guiding questions to help shape her thinking and her practice as she supervised.

Conceptual mentors also challenged her thinking. These individuals engaged her in conversation that disrupted harmony in her thinking. Helen shared,

…it was really an intriguing comment. It was something like, ‘We don’t really know what we have here until you visit and see it through your eyes.’ Or something like that. I thought that’s good. That was a good observation on his part because I think you can get too immersed in your own little world and not really see it for what it is. (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 662-666)
Sometimes Helen perceived this intellectual sparring in a collegial manner, and sometimes Helen interpreted those conversations as being more punitive. She expressed,

‘But you’re not considering where she’s coming from,’ [he said to her]. And I countered that. We had a spirited back and forth. Inside I was feeling really pretty awful because he didn’t affirm anything that happened in the meeting. He didn’t affirm any of it. (01.05.11, Lines 209-212)

In this case, she felt that the delivery was very punitive and disrespectful, and that the individual who expressed it to her was not critiquing her practice; to her, he was criticizing her character.

She also felt that the manner in which he positioned himself—in a position of power—also contributed to the situation and the manner in which she received his comments. While it is possible that the individual was trying to intellectually spar with Helen, she felt that his delivery, and his position of power, made the comments feel like a personal attack (Member Check 03.14.12). It is also possible that when Helen was in situations where she felt insecure and uncertain about a situation, mostly about her practice as a supervisor, and these feelings were coupled with a conceptual mentor whose viewpoints she often did not share, she did not perceive these kinds of comments as intellectual sparing. However, when the situation challenged her thinking as a practitioner and was delivered by someone she respected, she felt more comfortable engaging in this intellectual debate. She shared,

I, as a classroom teacher, [thought] the idea that teaching and learning should not be part of seminar was, it just blew my mind. I couldn’t wrap my head around it. And so there was a lot of talk around that. And [the conceptual mentor] was doing a little devil’s advocate but, it was definitely coming from a very strong belief system of his and I said I’m sorry, I’ve been in the trenches for 26 years. And if I know that these novice teachers will leave with things that can assist them and help a student learn or get past some stuck place or even if it works with one student, I say, ‘Yes! We should give it to them.’ Well the good news is teaching and learning has remained. (11.11.10, Lines 258-267)

This situation illuminated the idea that the conceptual mentor posed a particular orientation that countered a belief of hers. Even though the conceptual mentor did not change the outcome of the decision, the most important part of a conceptual mentor, in a more figurative nature, is that conceptual mentors focus on promoting (re)thinking through dialogue; the outcome is of
secondary importance. The idea of conceptual mentoring is for the individual to come to their own conclusion by challenging and then having the individual reconsider or critically reflect upon her own deeply held knowledge, beliefs, and practices.

Conceptual mentors can also challenge thinking by posing intriguing ideas rather than being directly confrontational. For example, Helen said,

He said, ‘This doesn’t happen often, but,’ he said, ‘Occasionally we do have interns or student teachers in the more traditional model who are better at classroom management than their mentors or their cooperating teachers.’ Now that’s kind of an astounding thing for me to wrap my mind around. (Weekly Interview 11.18.10, Lines 282-285)

This idea caused Helen to pause and consider an alternative perspective or explanation for a situation she encountered. These situations caused her to critically reflect on her deeply held assumptions as a teacher and supervisor. She also shared,

Oh, my gosh yes! Which is exactly what our esteemed colleague’s point was. And there’s a part of me, ‘Okay I embrace that,’ but then I say, ‘But is it fair to the intern? They’re supposed to be learning how to be the best teacher they could be. And the thing is not every intern in a situation that is less than ideal recognizes that it’s less than ideal.’ (Weekly Interview 05.26.11, Lines 175-178)

Sometimes ideas were posed, not directly to her, but as concepts to be considered. Helen described one of these moments,

I think I learned a lot today as a classroom teacher. Like the way [a particular university-based hybrid] unpacked lesson planning as inquiry, the way he took [a chart] and rearranged it, that was like, ‘A-ha!’ Like the angels were singing! I loved the way he did that! I just never thought about it that way. (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 362-366)

These examples illustrate the idea of intellectual posing. Conceptual mentors pose intriguing ideas that cause an individual to pause and reconsider her perspective. Ultimately, Helen had many forms of conceptual mentoring that impacted her as a supervisor and her identity as a supervisor; she was apprenticed to these multiple conceptual mentors, both figuratively and, more often, literally that shaped, influenced, and ultimately impacted her identity as a supervisor.

*With Procedural Mentors.* Procedural mentors can also be literal or figurative. They are those individuals (literal procedural mentors) or ideas (figurative procedural mentors) that inform
an individual’s actions by offering solutions. Their solutions are the practical applications of theoretical ideas, and these procedural mentors share those successful strategies because they have seen positive results from using them.

For Helen, procedural mentors were more literal than figurative mentors because they were individuals to whom she turned for practical guidance regarding how to solve a particular dilemma. She shared, “I have to talk to some other [supervisors] and just see how maybe they do it” (Weekly Interview 01.12.11, Line 22). She also shared, “And I really got some good counsel yesterday from [a school-based hybrid] and [a university-based hybrid]. It confirmed all the questioning areas that I had” (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Lines 11-13). Sometimes procedural mentoring was simply an experienced supervisor making her tacit knowledge transparent or visible to Helen as a novice by thinking aloud. Helen reflected on a time where she experienced this act and how powerful it was to her. She said,

I had the opportunity to like discuss it with [an experienced supervisor] and [she] would share what [she] thought and I expressed my ideas and we had a conversation about it. And sometimes [she] would stop and say, ‘So the reason I’m making this comment is...’ [She] would just do that without me even asking [her] about it because I think [she] was sensing that that was something really helpful for me to know. (Weekly Interview 04.28.11, Lines 67-72)

For Helen, thinking aloud was a powerful procedural mentoring mechanism for supporting her learning. Literal procedural mentors for Helen were both university-based and school-based supervisors. They helped to inform Helen as she encountered specific situations and offered her practical applications for supporting her work as a supervisor.

As a novice supervisor, Helen was apprenticed with many individuals, community norms, and shared ideas in the PDS context. She experienced two kinds of mentoring as apprenticeship—conceptual and procedural mentoring. Both kinds impacted her learning and shaped her identity as a supervisor.
Collaborative structures. Collaborative structures are frameworks for offering conceptual and procedural mentoring, and they can be formal or informal in nature. Helen had both kinds of collaborative structures. She experienced informal structures by intersecting with other supervisors and teacher-colleagues with whom she could converse. Helen shared, “My colleagues, from conversations, you know, like putting questions out there and talking things through... I think that’s where I’ve learned the most just from talking with other [supervisors]” (Weekly Interview 03.24.11, Lines 280-283). She also shared,

She just, each week whatever was kind of the focal point of that week, she just talked to me about the kinds of things she had that she knew from her experience and the kinds of things she was helping interns with and so I would just listen and apply it. (Weekly 04.01.11, Lines 28-31)

These conversations helped to shape her identity as a supervisor.

Helen also experienced more formalized collaborative structures. First, she was strategically placed in buildings with more experienced supervisors who could mentor her both conceptually and procedurally. Second, she also attended a weekly meeting of all supervisors across the context. One of those meetings was formally dedicated to supporting supervisor learning. Helen found these sessions to be valuable. She compared this formal learning space to her experience as a teacher when her principal used faculty meetings as learning and sharing spaces, which were opportunities that she highly valued. She explained,

And then we would engage in professional development for that 45 minutes [at our faculty meeting]. And there was always some kind of product, you know charts or something that was documentation of the work we’d done. And so I think about the PDA meetings and the learning and sharing piece . . . or the PDA learning piece is really the . . . that’s the analogous learning and sharing. (Weekly Interviews 04.01.11, Lines 130-135)

In addition to the formal learning meeting, all supervisors then participated in a meeting to problem solve about logistical issues surrounding the community and personal issues and concerns regarding working with interns and mentors. During these meetings, all supervisors could present to the group an issue or concern that they had so that the group could assist in
collaborative problem-solving. Both of these formal collaborative learning structures fostered conceptual and procedural mentoring.

In order to have mentoring, the environment needed to be trusting, and trust is a critical element for fostering an environment for supervision (Cogan, 1973). Helen did not always see the weekly meeting as a trusting space. She shared, “And I didn’t always feel comfortable monopolizing PDA meetings with this issue. I was always really uncomfortable with taking too much time at a meeting to talk about it but really feeling like I needed to talk about it” (Weekly Interview 04.01.11, Lines 109-112). She also shared, But then also to be quite honest with you, sometimes at those PDA meetings during issues and concerns, I have really mixed feelings about what I hear and see because it’s a huge risk to take to put out a struggle when it’s directly involving the potential success or failure of one of our students. (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 168-171)

Helen noted how much risk she felt in sharing an issue or concern at this weekly meeting, especially when she was a novice. However, after she built up the courage to share, she felt better. She commented, “And I’m glad I did. I feel really good about the fact I did because then I just . . . I felt like I had some sense of, ‘Oh, I have people behind me’” (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 191-193). These weekly meeting spaces did create opportunities for Helen to share and receive conceptual and procedural mentoring, and they helped to shape her identity as a novice supervisor.

**Disorienting dilemmas.** Helen also learned through experience. Research suggests that people learn out of need when they encounter a situation that requires them to acquire new understanding (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986; Marsick & Watkins, 1990). Marsick & Watkins (1990) state, “As a result, both informal and incidental learning often take place under non-routine conditions, that is, when the procedures and responses that people normally use fail” (p. 6). Mezirow & Associates (2000) referred to these moments as critical incidences or disorienting dilemmas, which result in transformational learning; the individual is transformed because she
experiences a situation that causes her cognitive dissonance and requires her to critically reflect on her assumptions and practices. The individual’s perspective is then altered and a transformation has occurred.

Helen experienced many disorienting dilemmas that impacted her learning and ultimately her identity as a supervisor. These disorienting dilemmas were of a variety in nature. Most were regarding interactions with mentors, interns, or other supervisors and sometimes these experiences were from watching others; however, the important part was that Helen critically reflected on the incident. For example, Helen watched one of her mentors successfully offer choice in her primary classroom and her success made Helen question her assumptions about students’ abilities at this age. Helen shared, “So I kind of just loved seeing it in action and it made me really think how I decide what kind of paper [my students] should use” (Weekly Interview 09.16.11, Lines 145-147). By watching this mentor and challenging her assumptions about her own beliefs and practice, Helen reflected on the situation and believed that she would change that practice when she returned to the classroom.

Sometimes these dilemmas were from conflict. Helen reflected on a conference she held with a struggling intern and she shared, “I was really doing just a lot of soul searching about that whole issue. Did I over talk?” (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 216-217). She added, “It’s still sort of haunting me a little bit. And you know making me question how it went and what I might have done differently” (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 266-267). These reflective thoughts occurred often for Helen. These illustrations showed how Helen encountered a variety of disorienting dilemmas, and those instances coupled with her ability to critically reflect on the situation demonstrated that Helen learned and that this role-taking experience had powerful, transformative qualities.

**Learned content.** In addition to understanding how Helen learned, it was also important to explore what she learned. Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall (1983) claimed that powerful adult
learning happens when adults are placed into meaningful, role-taking experiences. These experiences cause the individual to grow with regard to their cognitive functioning, so ultimately they perform at a higher cognitive functioning level than where they previously functioned. Helen felt that she learned an extensive amount in just the first year of her new role. She felt that she learned about herself as a supervisor and what she understood about supervision. This role also broadened her perspective in that it made her more empathetic to other stakeholders’ perspectives.

**Supervisor identity.** First Helen learned about herself as a supervisor. She found that after her first year she understood more about herself and the dispositions she needed to bring to her work as a supervisor. She said,

> I’ll tell you what – you have to have fortitude. You need to be confident in your own self because so many things you’ll be questioning, so many things around you. And you have to be open-minded. Really that’s where this maybe has been really good for me actually... Because it’s made me, really now I’m still coming to the same conclusions but I have really had conversations with myself about, well just because you think you know what to do, do you? (Weekly Interview 05.26.11, Lines 163-170)

Helen realized that her learning in this role was not going to be told to her, but rather she learned through experience, inquiry, reflection, and conversation. This kind of learning strengthened her character and made her realize that she needed to have more comfort with discomfort.

Helen also had a realization about her role and her identity as supervisor. When she was a classroom teacher, Helen’s identity was as a teacher. Helen held legitimate power, which means children responded to her because she held that title (Levin & Nolan, 2010). As a supervisor, initially her identity was still as teacher, and when she went into classrooms, she expected students to respond to her the same way they did when she was the teacher—but they didn’t. She realized that her identity was different, and she struggled with this new aspect of her identity and how she would use it to make a positive impact on others. She shared,

> But this is really interesting for me because I’m used to kids listening to me for 26 years because I’ve been a teacher. They don’t listen to me because they look at me…
really weren’t responding to those cues that I’m so used to giving pretty smoothly and easily and kids respond. And it wasn’t happening. So that was humbling for me, and it’s making me wonder how I am going to model classroom management strategies if the kids aren’t going to listen to me? So I have to do some thinking about that. It really bothered me that they weren’t. (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 169-187)

Helen also realized that as a teacher, she was a well-established member of her own classroom community and the school community, but becoming a supervisor made her more itinerant. She shared, “You know this week I have recognized that I really don’t have a home” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 366-367). Not having a sense of belonging to one particular community was troublesome for her. Over time, she broadened her communities from one classroom and one school to multiple classrooms and multiple schools, but the initial struggle of place as part of her identity troubled her. Experiences like these ones were disorienting. They caused Helen to reflect on her new identity created from her new role-taking experience. She started to question what it meant to supervise and what it meant to be a supervisor. These questions are about her identity and its evolution. The struggle with identity formation when becoming a teacher educator has been documented (Morris, et al, 2000), and Helen’s learning and struggle about her new identity act as another piece of evidence to support such findings.

**Empathy.** Becoming a supervisor broadened Helen’s perspective. She was now able to better understand the various perspectives of other stakeholders; she expanded her empathy regarding the intern experience, the administrative experience, and the institutional experience.

Even though Helen was a mentor and felt she understood her interns’ perspective, becoming a supervisor really enlightened her to their experience. She said, “…to be honest with you all those years I was a mentor, I had no idea what their workload really was until this year (Weekly Interview 11.11.10, Lines 711-713).” She also added,

I never realized the extent to which they, the conflict and the dissonance they have to deal with about their peers leaving – partying first and then leaving – and the sense of now here we are... I guess I as a mentor I never really thought about how hard this transition time is for them. (05.20.11, Lines 40-50)
Helen developed a greater sense and awareness for the interns’ perspective and their experience during the PDS internship.

This role as a supervisor also caused Helen to reconsider her perspective on administrators. Since she interacted with different principals and assumed some similar responsibilities, she developed a greater sense of empathy for them and their position. She shared, “It makes me think a lot about principals, too, and their role (Weekly Interview 05.26.11, Line 184).” Now she was able to consider their perspective more than she previously had as a teacher.

Finally, Helen also broadened her understanding at an institutional level. She held a greater sense of empathy for the university than she previously had. She expressed, “I just realized what a big task it is to create something with an existing structure in place. Some of that I honestly didn’t understand because I’m not a university person” (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 434-436). Helen’s knowledge about the university culture was limited. By being a supervisor, she was exposed to some of the dimensions of this work. Regarding visitors from another institution, Helen said,

The questions they had for us were in-depth questions. They were clearly here not just to have a little mini vacation. They came to learn, and I thought they were well prepared. I felt they knew a lot about us before they came from the kind of questions they were asking. (Weekly Interview 09.23.11, Lines 420-426)

By interacting with other university faculty, Helen’s understanding, of the university as an institution and the characteristics of university faculty, was broadened from her previous understanding.

Knowledge base. When Helen described her knowledge as a supervisor, she felt she was lacking with regard to adults as learners. As a teacher, she felt confident in her understanding about children, their needs, their learning, and their work, but the adult as learner was more of a foreign entity. Helen realized that she lacked this knowledge base due to inexperience. Her first year of supervision increased this knowledge base. She expressed, “I’m learning a lot about adult
learners” (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Line 341). Over time, Helen realized that she had a better sense of interns’ developmental needs and what to expect from them. For example, she shared, “She really wasn’t struggling that much in my experience. She was my most struggling intern. And she was really fine now that I really have one that’s struggling” (Weekly Interview 01.05.11, Lines 454-456). Helen also made connections between her knowledge of children and her expanding knowledge about adults. She said,

   Well just that there’s such a range. I do think that analogy of it’s not that much unlike your second grade class or your fourth grade class because, again, in that group of students that I have every year there are you know there are students who are self-motivated, who take initiative, and who care about the quality of their work. And then there are kids who couldn’t care less. (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Lines 343-347)

This ability to compare deepened her understanding of adult learners because she made comparisons between her prior knowledge and this new learning. From these experiences, Helen concluded that she needed to change her practice. She said, “What I’m learning I guess too is that I know I’m just going to need to do a lot more modeling or encourage mentor modeling” (Weekly Interview 12.14.10, Lines 350-352). Helen showed how her knowledge about adults as learners expanded from her engaging in a powerful role-taking experience.

**Summary.** According to Helen’s descriptions of her experiences and the learning that occurred, Helen was in an environment conducive to supporting novice supervisor learning. The support structures in place to support her learning were not always evident to her, but she did have more organic and embedded support to address her readiness as a novice. She had conceptual and procedural mentors to whom she could turn, she also had collaborative structures in place to provide supportive opportunities for learning, and she also learned through critical reflection on her experiences.

Moreover, Helen learned about herself as a supervisor, empathy towards others by broadening her understanding of multiple perspectives, and adults as learners. This learning shows that Helen was in an environment that supported the development of content knowledge
for supervisors. The impact of Helen’s supervision on herself and the structures that supported that impact showed that Helen was learning from a powerful role-taking experience; she was engaged in authentic professional learning for supervisors.

**Focal Lens 2: Mentors’ Perceptions**

Understanding Helen’s supervision required more than understanding her perception; there is no one reality. Instead, multiple realities exist, so in order to understand supervision in the PDS context, it was essential to examine the other multiple realities of her supervision. One of those perspectives included the mentors with whom she interacted. This section is dedicated to understanding Helen’s supervision as her mentors perceived it. I dissect Helen’s supervision again by breaking down her supervision into her mentors’ perceptions of her knowledge, beliefs, practices, and impact on them as mentors all interpreted through my researcher lens.

**Mentor Backgrounds**

Helen worked with a total of eight mentors—one for each of her interns. Six out of these eight mentors agreed to participate in this study. Her mentors ranged from five years to twenty-three years of teaching experience. When grouped, three mentors had less than ten years, one had between ten and twenty years, and two had over twenty years of experience. These demographics indicate that Helen’s mentors were in various stages of career development with them most likely falling into the categories of professional or expert phases in the cycle. According to Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch, & Enz (2000), professional teachers are tenured teachers who have a commitment to collaboration and see the value in reflection. Students view them positively. In addition to these qualities, expert teachers not only value reflection but they find the time to engage in this worthwhile activity despite obstacles. Expert teachers reach all students of varying abilities and
they create an environment of mutual respect. For some teachers, this stage in the career cycle can last for an entire teaching career.

With regard to mentoring experience, Helen’s mentors ranged from two years to fourteen years of mentoring experience. When organized into groups, two mentors had less than five years, two mentors had between five and ten years, and two had more than ten years of mentoring experience. This even distribution of demographics indicates that Helen worked with a range of mentors—from novices to veterans—but none were in their first year; all of her mentors had some experience with mentoring. Most of Helen’s mentors had no experience or limited experience working with student teachers from non-PDS teacher preparation programs. Only two mentors had also had a student teacher in a non-PDS program.

There are three types of Professional Development Associates (PDAs) in the PDS context. PDAs can be university faculty, doctoral students, or reassigned classroom teachers. Helen’s mentors had previously worked with a number of different PDAs. Some worked with as few as two and some worked with as many as ten. This information means that all of Helen’s mentors had experience with other supervisory styles. This information also means that her mentors did not typically have a long duration of time with any one particular PDA. Therefore, these mentors for the most part were used to building and forming relationships with PDAs often. It also means that these mentors did not have any kind of sustained relationship with a PDA. All but one of Helen’s mentors had more than one kind of PDA, and two mentors had only reassigned teachers as PDAs. One mentor possessed extensive experience working with novice supervisors. A majority of the PDAs with whom she worked were in their first year of supervision, meaning that this mentor in particular was a veteran with regard to working with novice supervisors. All of these demographics indicate that Helen’s mentors bring an understanding of supervision from working with a variety of PDAs, and not necessarily just a school-based hybrid perspective.
Mentors in the PDS are all volunteers. That mindset means that they are part of this program because they choose to be. Helen’s mentors participated in the PDS experience for a variety of reasons. Mentors wanted stability in their professional and personal lives before they were ready to make the immense commitment to the program and the idea of working alongside a teacher candidate for an entire year. Once ready, mentors participated because of the positive reputation of the program, benefits to them and to their own students, rejuvenation for their careers, and their own sense of stewardship for the school or for the profession.

Mentors were committed to the ideas that this PDS program possessed. The idea of collaborating with individuals for an entire year, having voice in the teacher education program, and having a sense of commitment from the community were motivating factors for them. Mentors knew that they would be working in a collaborative environment and an environment that their colleagues valued. The positive reputation of the program was also a motivating factor. One mentor said, “…I’ve worked with [many teachers] that have said so many good things about it” (Mentor Interview, 06.06.11, Line 8). Mentors heard about the program by talking to other teachers and listening to others speak positively about the PDS program. They also watched their colleagues work with interns and noticed the positive impact it was having on the students by having more teachers in the classroom. Another mentor commented, “I was really thrilled with how it would impact the students” (Mentor Interview, 06.02.11, Lines 34-35).

In addition to benefits to students, mentors also were motivated by the benefits to themselves. They saw mentoring in this program as rejuvenating their professional careers. They recognized and valued the energy and influx of new ideas that working with teacher candidates would bring to their knowledge and practices. One mentor stated, “It’s just delightful to, to have (the teacher candidates) enriching our lives every day” (Mentor Interview, 05.18.11, Lines 56-57). Mentors also felt a sense of stewardship. Stewards are individuals who see their role as preserving the past while simultaneously fostering renewal, and stewards have an interest in
educating the next generation of their profession (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). One mentor commented, “I just wanted to… I wanted to be able to do the same thing for someone else like [my mentor] did for me with, with teaching” (Mentor Interview, 05.19.11, Lines 34-36).

Overall, Helen worked with mentors who had varying experiences in teaching and mentoring. Some of her teachers were veteran teachers with regard to teaching and mentoring while others were in the earlier stages of their professional careers and even novices with regard to mentoring. Helen’s mentors also had worked with many hybrids and many kinds of hybrids; therefore, they had experience with a variety of supervisory styles. Her mentors were committed to the program because of its ideas, its positive reputation, its positive impact on them and children, and its possibility in fostering stewardship. Therefore, Helen learned to supervise in an environment that was collaborative and with mentors who were all volunteers and supportive of the program.

**Of Her Knowledge**

According to her mentors, Helen possessed three kinds of knowledge in her supervisory role. Helen had contextually-specific knowledge. As a district employee and reassigned classroom teacher, Helen brought to the role knowledge about the curriculum, schools, students, parents, and politics; she held cultural knowledge specific to this context. Helen also had practitioner knowledge, which was highly valued among her mentors. Having practitioner knowledge meant that Helen not only had the status of a practitioner, but she also had an understanding of the complexities of teaching and of classroom life. Finally, Helen had knowledge about teacher education. She had an understanding of teaching about teaching and she became her mentors’ connection to the university. This next section explores each of these three kinds of knowledge in more depth.
Contextually-specific knowledge. According to her mentors, Helen had contextually-specific knowledge. This knowledge is an understanding of the curriculum, district, schools, politics, and idiosyncrasies of the context. Mentors valued this knowledge and saw it as an asset of having a reassigned teacher as a hybrid educator. One mentor commented,

I felt like they’ve had maybe a better understanding of our curriculum and how things just operate just in general here in this school district…But I think the biggest thing probably has…is, is just being familiar with the, the (school district) and the curriculum. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 63-79)

Helen, as a classroom teacher and member of the district, was an insider to the community, and, therefore, she brought this knowledge to her role as supervisor.

According to Lave & Wenger (1998), a community of practice is composed of old-timers and new comers. Insiders are old-timers whereas outsiders are new comers in the community. Old-timers are the gatekeepers of the community knowledge, and new comers learn this knowledge through their apprenticeship with old-timers. Although she was a novice supervisor, Helen was an old-timer to the district community. That meant that she possessed critical knowledge about the district community. As a teacher, she knew and had taught the curriculum, and she understood the inner workings of the school district. Helen understood and possessed cultural knowledge specific to this context.

As an old-timer, Helen was able to use that knowledge in her role to support mentors, interns, and children in her role as a school-based hybrid educator. In one situation, one of Helen’s interns was struggling while teaching a small group of students, so Helen decided to support the intern and the children by “stepping in” or intervening and teaching the lesson with the intern. The mentor commented,

I think it was almost a stroke of luck that Helen was also a second grade teacher. So I would say it’s atypical just in the sense that she could jump in and she knew the curriculum. It’s like she knew that lesson because she’s taught it so many times before. And I wouldn’t expect anybody off the street to just be able to come in and jump into a lesson like that. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 426-434)
Helen’s contextually-specific knowledge enabled her to participate seamlessly in this manner. In addition to teaching and working with children, this knowledge enabled Helen to unpack mentor expertise for her interns. Helen would point to specific practices and decisions her mentors were making for her interns in order to deepen the intern’s reflective practices. Helen’s mentors believed that her contextually-specific knowledge aided her in this process. One mentor stated, “[Helen] has done reading stations and so I think it was very easy for her to comment on what I was doing and understand what I was doing” (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 286-288).

Although other hybrids may possess this knowledge, Helen’s mentors believed that her status as a reassigned teacher—as an old timer—enabled her to supervise more easily.

**Practitioner knowledge.** According to her mentors, Helen had practitioner knowledge, and this knowledge was highly valued among mentors. Having practitioner knowledge meant that Helen was a practitioner, and her mentors felt that she was one of them. As one of them, she had experience and could understand classroom spaces.

Helen was an old-timer, so mentors, as old-timers themselves, viewed her as one of them. As a reassigned classroom teacher, she had recent experience in the classroom. Mentors saw this experience as an advantage. One mentor said, “I think [reassigned teachers] are very closely connected to what it’s like being in the classroom. And they’ve had that experience more recently sometimes than others that haven’t—and that’s an advantage” (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 35-39). Since Helen had years of experience as a classroom teacher and a mentor teacher, her mentors saw her as having experience as a practitioner. Mentors valued her extensive experience.

Another mentor commented,

I guess for me personally knowing that there was another person that had a lot of experience with interns herself, and even though she was in a bit of a different role this year, she could relate to how to keep that… how to make a good connection with your intern and keep it positive and supportive for each other. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Line 154-160)
As a novice supervisor, Helen was recently removed from the classroom; therefore, according to her mentors, she brought with her valued experience as a practitioner that they respected.

Having practitioner knowledge also meant having an understanding of the complexities of classroom life. Helen’s mentors felt that she could understand the functioning of their classrooms and the “chaos” of normal life in those spaces. One mentor stated,

I think that [reassigned teachers] can relate 100% to a classroom. Like I think they come in with understanding how busy a classroom is and not judgmental when you know things aren’t as organized or structured or some kids are having off days. I think they are more understanding of all those different things that go on in a classroom. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 131-137)

Another mentor added, “[Helen] understands what it’s like to be in a classroom. She understands you know just the chaos. It’s, it’s really you know a three ring circus in here and, she gets that” (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Line 134-137). This mentor also said,

But just her awareness of what teachers are doing and just how much there is to do and then understanding that when you put another person who doesn’t know what’s going on, how much more it takes. And she was really there to support and help in any way that she could. She understood that there’s so much going on and then when you add this other person and it just adds another layer. Not that the people from [the university] aren’t helpful. But I feel that unless they’ve been in a classroom, you don’t always really realize what all is, is going on and what the expectations are in an elementary classroom. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Line 142-154)

Helen, as a school-based hybrid educator, possessed this knowledge of understanding the complexities of classroom life.

Since Helen understood the complexities of classrooms, her mentors believed that she had more realistic expectations of classrooms and for teacher candidates. They believed that she had a strong sense of whether a teacher candidate could be a successful teacher because Helen herself was a practitioner. One mentor said, “And she has a really good grasp of can this person make it really and truly in education? Because she knows firsthand what it’s like to be a teacher” (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 167-170). Her mentors believed that Helen’s practitioner
knowledge enabled her to have a more realistic sense of classrooms. She also had an understanding of what it takes to be a teacher because she, herself, was a practitioner.

According to her mentors, Helen had valued practitioner knowledge. Her mentors viewed her as a practitioner with experiential knowledge, which meant that she understood teaching and classrooms. As a practitioner, Helen was an old-timer in the community, and her mentors viewed her as one of them.

**Knowledge teacher education pedagogy.** As a former mentor, Helen brought to the role some knowledge about teacher education and how to engage in teaching about teaching. Loughran (2006) argues that teacher education has a specific knowledge base and a skill set, known as a pedagogy of teacher education. Her experience as a mentor meant that Helen brought with her some understanding of breaking down pedagogy in order to teach others about teaching.

One of Helen’s practices was unpacking mentor expertise for her interns. Helen would identify those practices and critical teacher decision-making points. When Helen pointed, she was also enacting her pedagogy of teacher education. In that, not only did she have to recognize those points, but she also had to communicate that knowledge to interns. In order to point, Helen must have had an understanding of pedagogy in order to teach others about teaching.

In addition to unpacking mentor expertise, Helen also had to have the necessary knowledge to identify practices and critical moments in her observations of her interns’ teaching. As a supervisor, part of her role was to observe her interns. Observation fits into the supervisory task of direct assistance (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001). In order to observe, Helen had at least some knowledge about the skills of observation, which included how to observe and how to record those observations. This understanding of the process of recording information about another’s practice and how to use that information to support the professional learning of teachers and teacher candidates is part of the knowledge of a pedagogy of teacher education and it is also knowledge of being a supervisor. In this sense, these two paths intersect. The knowledge
base of supervision includes having an understanding of a pedagogy of teacher education, and Helen, as a former mentor, brought at least some of that knowledge to her role as a school-based hybrid educator and novice supervisor.

**Summary.** According to her mentors, Helen brought certain knowledge to her role as a novice supervisor. As an old-timer to the community, Helen possessed highly valued contextually-specific knowledge, so she understood the intricacies of the school district context. Helen also had highly valued practitioner knowledge. As a reassigned teacher, she had recent classroom experience as a teacher and a mentor, so she brought that knowledge base of experience and understanding classroom life to her role as a supervisor. Helen also had some knowledge about teacher education. As a former mentor, she possessed some critical knowledge about teaching about teaching. Helen’s mentors recognized this knowledge base that Helen used in her role as a school-based hybrid educator.

**Of Her Beliefs**

According to her mentors, Helen held some beliefs about supervision. While her mentors did not ask Helen about her beliefs, they described her practices as examples of her beliefs-in-action. Their experiences with Helen led them to their perceptions of her beliefs. Their descriptions of her practices did not mean that Helen actually held these beliefs, but rather her actions were indicative of this belief system. Understanding Helen’s beliefs-in-action through her mentors’ perceptions afforded the opportunity to compare Helen’s perceptions of her own beliefs and her actions as a novice supervisor. By examining these two perceptions of beliefs, it is possible to examine the alignment or misalignment between an espoused belief system and a belief system-in-action.

According to her mentors, Helen believed that the intern was her domain. Meaning, Helen believed that her primary responsibility was to the intern; therefore her actions—essentially
the focus of her supervision—was on the intern. Helen also believed in differentiating her supervision. She believed that her role was to support her interns in any way possible and that meant differentiating her supervision among her interns. Finally, Helen believed that as a supervisor, she was the expert or the source of knowledge. This belief meant that her role and responsibility was to answer questions for her mentors and interns. Seeing the supervisor as the source of knowledge also meant to Helen that her role was to talk and her mentors’ and interns’ role was to listen.

**Intern as domain.** According to her mentors, Helen saw her role as focusing on and having a responsibility to the intern. Seeing the intern as her domain meant that Helen believed her primary responsibility as a supervisor was to help the intern become a teacher. One mentor commented,

> At the beginning of the year when my intern was doing more observing of me, [Helen] would come in and they would sit together and be watching me…But then, then it, it kind of changed and at the end [Helen] was, would come into the room and be doing observations just on the intern…But [Helen] was, was I think mostly focusing on the intern. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 355-366)

This mentor described a common practice of Helen’s—pointing. Helen would unpack her mentors’ expertise for her interns by identifying practices and critical moments in the mentor’s teaching and then talking with the intern about these instances. Helen pointed in order to support the intern’s learning as an aspiring teacher. When pointing, Helen’s focus was on supporting the intern’s learning and not the mentor’s. If her responsibility was to help the intern become a teacher, then engaging in pointing was a strategy for teaching about teaching.

This quotation also illustrated another one of Helen’s common practices—observation. Helen’s mentors recalled that, especially after January in the school year, Helen observed her interns more formally than in the beginning of the school year. In the beginning of the year when Helen visited, she would often check-in with her mentors and interns and work on developing her relationships with the mentor, the intern, and the children. After January, when the interns’ role
shifted more from an observer to a lead teacher in the classroom, Helen shifted her practices from pointing to observing in a more formal manner. Formal observation entailed coming into the particular classroom, watching the intern teaching, documenting what she saw, and then conversing with the intern about those observations. Helen’s mentors stated that most times Helen talked with their interns while they were teaching, so the mentors were not able to participate in the conversation. During these conversations, Helen talked about what she thought went well, what did not go as well, and what she thought could be changed. In addition to her thoughts, Helen also asked the intern for her perspective using those categories to guide the conversation. One mentor said,

[Helen] would write up an observation and e-mail it. She would talk to [my intern] and have some suggestions, you know I mean, [my intern] and I met constantly. So I was able to do that just as you would do if you were working with another teacher you’d sort of bat things back and forth to see how you could improve things. But that was about us and our classroom and the children. And Helen was specifically about [my intern] and you know helping (her) come up with some different ways to do things. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 178-187)

Helen’s exclusion of mentors in these kinds of conversations about the intern’s practice illustrates her belief that the intern’s learning was her domain.

Mentors echoed this belief. One mentor said, “I think that [Helen] is there to oversee what the intern is doing and the progress she’s making in the classroom” (05.19.11, Line 197). While her mentors believed that they had a role in their interns’ progress, they saw Helen’s role as focusing on the intern, and the interns’ progress was ultimately her responsibility. Helen’s mentors were comfortable with her practices when they aligned with their belief system, so as long as Helen’s focus was on the intern, then there was no dissonance between them. Since Helen’s and her mentor’s beliefs were in alignment about the domain of supervision, then they were comfortable with her practices and their relationship with her.

**Differentiation.** According to her mentors, Helen believed that each intern’s growth and development was unique. This belief meant that Helen had to treat each situation uniquely and
she had to differentiate her supervision. When Helen differentiated, she did not necessarily change her supervisory practices among her interns; instead, she simply changed the amount of time that she spent with each intern. Sometimes this differentiation meant that some interns saw Helen more often than others.

Since Helen believed that each intern grew at her own pace, she did not have a set structure or plan with prescribed developmental benchmarks for her interns—at least initially. This practice was troublesome for some mentors who wanted and craved that kind of framework; as mentors, they wanted something prescribed to tell them what was acceptable and appropriate. One mentor said,

…the biggest challenge for me was, I feel that with the internship program it’s a full year, and they say everybody learns at their own pace and we have all different learning styles. But in the regular student teaching program, it’s very structured. By this week, they need to be doing this, by this week they need to be doing this, and that doesn’t exist in the internship program. And so I kept saying to Helen, we need a calendar of events. She needs to be here by this point and here by this point. And Helen kept saying, ‘We can’t do that. That’s not how this program works.’ (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 208-220)

Helen expressed her beliefs system even though it was in direct conflict with the mentor’s beliefs.

Helen’s belief about differentiating her supervision in order to meet her needs meant that some interns saw Helen in their classrooms more than others. This unequal distribution of face time created some tension between Helen and her interns. One mentor commented, “But you could just tell that there was a moment where [my intern] was feeling like she wanted her to be around more for certain things and was frustrated that she wasn’t. But I think she’s now realizing why that was” (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 645-649). According to this mentor, one of Helen’s interns was unable to understand Helen’s differentiated practices and that bothered her. This intern felt that she needed Helen just as much as the other interns even if she was not struggling as much as someone else. This mentor noted,

I mean, I’d have to really think through but it seems that very typically when [my intern] got frustrated with something it was because [Helen] wasn’t able to be there to see a certain lesson, or, or had to change their schedule for some reason…if [my intern was]
always used to having [Helen] come in on a Tuesday afternoon and for some reason that stopped, that’s when I would hear my intern say, ‘Well, you know, I need her just as much, too.’ (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Line 794)

This example illustrated how Helen believed that she needed to differentiate her supervision to meet interns’ needs. However, Helen made a point to attend specific lessons or activities if she was asked. This mentor also stated,

> When [my intern] had a lesson or something that she really was hoping to have either the extra help for or something you know specific that she wanted Helen to observe and help her with, Helen would be there. Nine times out of ten, Helen was very good at, at coming in to do that when it worked, it made sense. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Line 822)

Her actions indicated that struggling interns needed more attention and support than those who were not as successful, but Helen made concerted effort to be present for all interns when they had a special or extenuating circumstance. For the interns that were struggling, they did not have choice in having Helen’s presence; she visited them more often, but those interns who were successful had the opportunity to request more time with Helen if they desired because they saw her less. Helen distributed her time to focus more on the needs of struggling interns than on those who were successful. Consequently, some interns received more contact time with Helen than others.

**Supervisor as expert.** According to Helen’s mentors’ descriptions of her practices, Helen believed that her role as supervisor meant that she was the source of knowledge—she held the expertise. As expert, Helen’s role was to talk and answer questions that her mentors and interns had. As expert, Helen was the provider of knowledge. Helen’s expertise was sought especially with regard to intern development and appropriate expectations for interns. One mentor stated,

> Well being my second year I still feel like iffy on if I’m doing things right. So, I’m constantly asking [Helen] questions. And, I’ve, I think just with like with knowing what [my intern] should be doing next. It’s just hard for me to see the whole year from the beginning of the year and say, okay about this time, she should be doing this or she can be doing this or she shouldn’t be doing that yet. So [Helen] was really good at kind of helping me lay out the, the steps. You know and I know it’s different for every intern, but
with [my intern] making her like a, a plan for the year and say, ‘Okay, [my intern] can move on to this now if you’re okay with that,’ but it’s just to have some guidance in telling [my intern] what she could do. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 89-103)

Helen believed that interns’ progress was unique to the intern, and she would relay that belief to her mentors. This belief made her hesitant to provide a structure that would impede on that flexibility and freedom of individual development, yet mentors desired such structures to support them as teacher educators. One mentor said,

But eventually we did sit down and instead of doing that, we just, we sat with [my intern] and we planned out this week your responsibility is going to be taking attendance. And it was just the simplest of tasks that we could say, you know, most interns are doing all of these things at this point in the year. This week let’s focus on doing the attendance. And so Helen did, she tried to compromise with me on that and help me set the calendar of events. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 220-226)

Despite the fact that Helen did not believe in a prescriptive structure, she was willing to compromise her belief and yield to the mentor’s needs. Helen, as the source of knowledge, supported the mentors and provided them with some more guidance in this area.

This situation where Helen’s and her mentors’ beliefs about expectations differed was resolved more amicably because Helen gave the support structure that her mentors wanted. However, Helen did not always compromise, and it is possible that this compromise occurred because her beliefs about structure were not as strong as other beliefs she held. When disagreements in expectations were present and Helen did not comply with the mentors’ wishes, dissonance occurred. One mentor commented,

Like we had some miscommunication about how many lesson plans and then here my intern went into overdrive one weekend and I really didn’t know that because [Helen] and I miscommunicated over the expectations for her of how many lesson plans she had to write. That was another thing. So sometimes we kind of miscommunicated about lesson plans and things [my intern] was doing. So I got more to where I’d write it down and just try to be more clear so that my intern wasn’t going crazy with the number of lesson plans she had to write. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 386-397)

Helen held strong beliefs about her interns and her expectations for developmentally appropriate practices for them. In this situation, the mentor and she disagreed about the expectations for
writing lesson plans, and their relationship was strained because Helen maintained her
expectations and did not yield to the mentor.

Another example of a difference in expectations was with regard to the intern’s
responsibilities as she progressed throughout the spring semester. One mentor said,

And, you know, [my intern] would never have a full day of teaching. It would be more of
a shared thing where I would do half the teaching and then she would. And I’m not a very
outspoken person obviously so I just like sat there. But I thought to myself like I just
remember how much I benefited from teaching a full day and having weeks of teaching
full days under my belt and going into my first year and being like I’ve done this… And
so we just do things differently… It was the only time that I ever disagreed with what she
was saying or, you know, didn’t see eye to eye with her. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11,
Lines 384-421)

Helen believed that she had an understanding of the intern’s role and the expectations for her as
she progressed throughout the spring because Helen, as the supervisor, was the expert. She had
been a mentor for many years and was now in the role of supervisor. For her, that meant that she
was the source of knowledge for these kinds of situations.

In both situations, Helen’s expectations for her interns collided with her mentors’ beliefs.
Helen approached these situations by telling and establishing herself as the expert. Mentors
responded by yielding publicly—not saying anything to Helen when she was present or just
writing down their understanding of the conversation to recall for the next time—but they did not
yield privately. Instead, mentors held their ground and their covert behaviors acted against
Helen’s wishes. These situations paralleled teachers’ responses to this kind of hierarchical
supervision in the past. Teachers enacted warning systems to let others know when the supervisor
was coming so that they publicly obeyed and then, when the supervisor left, they returned to their
previous behaviors. Blumberg (1980) labeled these behaviors as the private cold war between
teachers and their supervisors. These situations with Helen show that these kinds of behavior
continue even when the supervisors are teacher educator supervisors. If mentors do not agree with
the supervisor and the supervisor imposes her beliefs on them, then they outwardly comply but
inwardly and privately rebel; the private cold war continues. These mentors complied publicly, but then they closed their doors and did what they wanted to do when Helen left. Since these mentors were not invited into the problem-solving process collaboratively, they rebelled.

As an expert, Helen situated herself as the knowledge provider. She often made suggestions to mentors about their teacher education practices and to interns about their teaching practices. One mentor stated,

Like the beginning of the year, I remember as [my intern] was starting to take more over and we… I think it was in one of the conferences Helen had suggested… had made suggestions you know based on how her and her intern had done things in the, in the past. And it wasn’t quite how I had done things in the past or how I was as an intern. So I left there kind of unsure of if I was doing things right or if I should veer you know towards what her suggestion was. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 331-342)

As expert, Helen often talked more than she listened. Another mentor commented,

I guess one thing that I could say is that a lot of times Helen would do more of the talking instead of listening to [my intern] talk. But [my intern] was very, very introverted. Like she would not talk. So you know, she would be perfectly happy just sitting here looking at us, and Helen said, ‘What are you thinking right now? What’s going on through your mind?’ She would say, ‘I don’t know.’ And then there would be that silence. And Helen would then fill it instead of just waiting to see if [my intern] would say anything else. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Line 467)

Helen was uncomfortable with silence, so instead of waiting, she would fill the silence with her voice. This mentor reflected on this situation and said,

I guess [Helen] really just didn’t give [my intern] a chance to speak, but those opportunities were given. I can’t really say that it was so negative, it was… because [my intern] did have her turn to speak, but she just wouldn’t. I guess for curiosity on, on my part, I wonder if we just sat there looking at each other she would have spoken. My guess is still no. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Line 529)

This practice of telling situated Helen as expert and her mentors and interns as novices—Helen as superior and her mentors and interns as subordinates—and that contributed to some of the relationships she held with them. For instance, one mentor noticed,

But overall, I feel like the three of us seemed to have worked very well together. And I think [my intern] ended up feeling a little more comfortable to come to me to share things that were going on. But that’s I’m sure because I see her every day. But I know she went to Helen, too, and asked for advice and I think really appreciated what Helen could, could
share with her. So definitely, definitely overall I thought a great year. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Line 782-790)

In this situation, the intern was reluctant to share her feelings with Helen. She was, however, willing to seek her advice, and that action improved their relationship. As expert and source of knowledge, Helen’s role was one of provider and teller rather than listener. When Helen was positioned as expert and the intern or mentor was cast in a subordinate role, the relationship between intern and supervisor improved. Another mentor stated,

And I, I truly kind of feel that [Helen] had a little trouble letting go of her own classroom and practices as she went into other people’s classrooms. I think that… and to be honest with you, I feel like it really didn’t change for me until I consulted her for help with one of my students when I was at wits end with him. I felt like when I did that, I felt a change in (her). The cause? I sought her for advice and she loved sharing it. So that, that seemed to be the changing point. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 289-299)

Helen’s position as expert made her feel helpful to her mentors and interns. She was able to provide for them and meet their needs. Nolan, et al. (2007) referred to this style of leadership as a transitional leader—someone who leads by solving others’ problems and meeting their needs; she is the problem-solver.

Despite the fact that Helen positioned herself and her supervision in this hierarchical manner, her mentors felt that she always gave suggestions and feedback in a positive manner. One mentor said,

But with Helen, you know, positives first and then she asked me what I was thinking. And I said, ‘Well, here are some things that I think, you know, could go better’… [Helen]’s so positive and, and also but realistic and you know just . . . and came up with ideas, you know, ways for us to, to help each other. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 380-388)

As expert, Helen was the first to speak and offer her opinion before she invited mentor contributions, but she did so using positive language. Mentors appreciated her ability to give constructive criticism positively, especially when the receiver of advice was the intern and not the mentor. They appreciated her ability to offer advice and suggestions in what they perceived to be a positive manner. Another mentor commented,
So I just feel like she was making [my intern] feel good about the things she was doing and while she was giving [her] ideas, it was never in a negative way and never putting anybody or anything down. Every idea she had was very positive. And I just think that it kept [my intern] going and feeling good. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 179-185)

Even though Helen situated herself as expert and told her interns her judgments, her delivery was very positive.

According to her mentors, Helen believed that, as supervisor, she was the expert. As the source of knowledge, it was her responsibility to provide answers and suggestions to her mentors and interns. Her mentors perceived that she delivered her advice in a positive manner, and they were receptive to that advice as long as it was directed towards the intern and not towards them. When the mentors’ beliefs collided with Helen’s, they were not receptive to her suggestions and her position as expert. The result was a perpetuation of the private cold war between teachers and supervisors – teachers yielding publicly to the supervisor’s wishes but rebelling privately and continuing their practices. In those situations, teachers saw themselves as expert and were unwilling to yield to the suggestions of the supervisor.

**Summary.** According to her mentors, Helen held beliefs about her role and responsibility as a supervisor. Helen believed that the intern was her domain in that she was responsible for monitoring their progress and supporting them when needed. Helen also believed in differentiating her supervision, which meant that struggling interns received more contact time and attention than other interns. Finally, Helen believed that as a supervisor, she was the expert. As the source of knowledge, it was her responsibility to provide answers and suggestions to interns and mentors.

**Of Her Practices**

After analyzing Helen’s mentors’ perceptions of her practices, Helen’s supervision was categorized into tasks and characteristics using the conceptual framework described in Chapter 1.
Helen engaged in the tasks of direct assistance, community development, action research, and teaching. Helen’s supervision was also described as connected, supportive, evaluative, and novice. This section further describes each of these tasks and characteristics in more detail.

**Tasks.** Helen’s mentors held perceptions of her role. They perceived her role as supervisor to be enormous and encompassing many supervisory tasks. One mentor said,

> It just seems, I mean, [Professional Development Associates as supervisors] just have such a big responsibility in that there is just so much that they need to do. I mean they need to be coming into the classrooms and watching [interns] in the classrooms. [Helen] was also very willing to help out in any way that she could as far as when we were doing reading stations. If my intern wanted to come watch me, then she was willing to take on doing a station. But also being a support to myself and my intern. So when we were not teaching, she was always there. Intern meetings, mentor meetings, all the papers that they need to look at and grade. It just seems like there is a lot that a [supervisor] has to do. And, and going from different schools, different classrooms, it just seems like a big job. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 157-172)

In addition to being enormous, they also saw her responsibility as having to be versatile. Helen was required to perform multiple tasks and engage in multiple roles. Another mentor commented about Helen’s role as supervisor as being, “To support, to inform, to teach, to mediate. There are so many hats that she wears. Really,” (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 370-371). These comments about the role of supervision showed that mentors perceived it to be a huge responsibility and task.

With regard to the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 1, Helen engaged in four tasks of supervision. They included direct assistance, community development, action research, and teaching. In the task of direct assistance, she supported interns with the development of their technical skills as aspiring teachers. With regard to community development, Helen facilitated the relationships primarily between the mentors and their interns as members of the PDS community. With regard to action research, Helen supported her interns’ inquiry activities and she conducted inquiry herself. Finally, Helen taught; she taught interns, mentors, and children.
**Direct Assistance.** Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) described the task of direct assistance as engaging in practices that are aimed at directly impacting a teacher’s practices. The manner in which this task was performed ranged from more supervisor-centered to more teacher-centered. Helen, as supervisor in a PDS context, not only had the opportunity to engage in direct assistance with teachers, but also had the opportunity to perform this task with teacher candidates. However, because her mentors perceived her domain of supervision as being the intern and not themselves, Helen solely focused her supervision on developing the interns’ practices and not necessarily the mentors. Therefore, Helen engaged in direct assistance primarily with teacher candidates.

Helen visited her mentors’ and interns’ classroom on a weekly basis and sometimes even more often on a biweekly basis. Helen engaged in more formal models of direct assistance in the spring when her interns were the lead planners and teachers in the classroom. More formal models include her visiting classrooms, recording her observations, and sharing those observations with her interns. She rarely held any pre-observation conferences to co-plan the observation and she rarely included her mentors in the post-observation conference.

Helen practiced more supervisor-centered forms of direct assistance. She determined the focus of her observation and chose the mechanism for recording her observations. Following the observation, Helen conferenced most times with the intern and rarely with both the intern and mentor regarding her observations, but she shared the observations with the mentor and allowed the intern to offer some ideas about ways that the intern could improve. One mentor said,

I remember [my intern] was learning to use more expression when she was reading. So she would just chat with her about that and ask her how she felt about it. And then ask her what she thought she could do differently. And so she just gave her the opportunity to come up with ideas rather than feeding her ideas. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 401-408)
In this case Helen did not record information about the intern’s practice, but rather she relied more on her memory and the intern’s memory as the artifact. However, in other observations, Helen recorded data in a more systematic way. Another mentor stated,

She did a lot of observing this year. She did a great job of... she did more systematic observation and documentation than other (supervisors) I’ve had in the past, which was really nice. But, and then she would of course share that with [my intern] and I. So she spent a lot of time giving really great feedback that way more so than others I’ve had. They all have but [Helen] seemed to really be good at keeping up with that. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 212-220)

Helen used both systematic observation and memory reliance to support her interns’ development of their teaching skills. While Helen shared her observations with her mentors, she often did so through e-mail. Her face-to-face conversations were primarily held with the intern. Helen used these kinds of tools to perform direct assistance to her interns.

**Community Development.** Engaging in the task of community development entails bringing together groups of individuals—including teachers, teacher candidates, administrators, faculty, children, or a combination of any of these groups—to problem solve. Helen routinely brought together groups of interns and groups of mentors. She co-facilitated with other supervisors weekly intern meetings. In these gatherings, interns from an entire building came together to collaborate, share, and problem solve relevant issues that were concerning them at that moment. Helen also co-facilitated with other supervisors monthly mentor meetings. These meetings were an opportunity for all mentors in the building to come together to engage in similar tasks as the interns—collaboration, sharing, and problem solving—regarding issues that were relevant to them as mentors. Helen also co-planned and co-implemented with other supervisors bi-annual mentor retreat gatherings where mentors across the district came together to collaborate, share, and problem solve issues relevant to the PDS community.

In order to engage in the tasks of community development, Helen had to coordinate and facilitate the bringing together of various groups of individuals. Bringing together groups
required the fostering of relationships with these individuals and among these individuals. In
order to build relationships, Helen spent a great deal of time in all of her classrooms and the
schools getting to know the children, the intern, the mentor, and the school staff and
administration. One mentor said,

Well, I think her role is to keep the triad going and think about the relationship between
the mentor and the intern and how she can complement that or add to it or make us aware
of things that might be happening that I might not be catching or that [my intern] might
not be catching And I think just making herself a part of the classroom in a way that she
can still do what she needs to be doing with all of her other interns and mentors. But
getting to know [my intern] as her student and how [my intern’s] adjusting to the class, to
the kids, and to myself and we’re kind of working together on that I guess. (Mentor
Interview 06.06.11, Lines 296-308)

In addition to developing relationships with other community members, this mentor also
commented on another practice of Helen’s—her ability to foster relationships among individuals,
especially between her interns and mentors. Mentors saw Helen’s role as supporting them
especially if there was a conflict between them and their interns. They preferred to have Helen
deliver this kind of information to the intern in order to preserve the relationship between the
intern and the mentor. Mentors believed that since they “lived” with the interns on a daily basis, if
they were the ones to deliver such news or information, then the interns would respond poorly
and the relationship would be damaged. They appreciated and valued Helen’s practice of taking
on this responsibility even if it were at the expense of her relationship with the intern as long as
their relationships with their interns were preserved.

By maintaining a physical presence, Helen was able to build relationships with other
community members and eventually establish herself as a member in the school and classroom
communities. In addition to fostering these kinds of relationships, Helen also worked on
facilitating the relationships among others and particularly the relationship between interns and
relationships. She became the liaison of communication between them in order to preserve this
relationship. The above examples illustrated how Helen built these relationships so that she could
bring together various groups of individuals to collaborate, share, and problem solve. In these ways, Helen was engaging in the task of community development; she was building relationships between and among community members in order to facilitate various groups to support the classroom, school, and PDS communities.

**Action Research.** According to the framework outlined in Chapter 1, the task of action research entails the supervisor engaging in inquiry and/or supporting the inquiries of others in the community. Teacher inquiry is the systematic study of one’s practice (Dana & Yendol-Silva, 2009). When Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001), and many others, described action research as a task of supervision, they viewed the school as the center of inquiry. They also believed that this task was the unifying force of all tasks of supervision. Their view of action research included supervisors engaging in inquiry, supporting others’ inquiries, or co-inquiring with teachers. In the PDS context, an additional layer of teacher candidate inquiry is added to the possibilities of participating in action research. Supervisors in this context support teacher candidates’ and teachers’ inquiries and they conduct their own inquiries either solely or more often collaboratively with other supervisors, administrators, teachers, or teacher candidates.

According to her mentors, Helen supported her interns’ inquiries. All of her mentors chose to participate in inquiry by supporting their intern’s inquiry rather than conducting their own inquiry or co-inquiring with their interns. Since none of her mentors were co-inquiring with their interns, Helen’s focus of support rested primarily with her interns. Helen would read and respond to her interns’ weekly descriptions of their progress on their inquiries. She also would meet with them individually to discuss their progress and their inquiries. One mentor said, “[My intern] is just a wonderful teacher. Her inquiry project needed some restructuring, so [Helen] really helped her with. . . I mean really made her feel so much better after they worked together” (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 98-102). In addition to offering moral support, Helen also answered her interns’ questions. Another mentor recalled,
I just know that they would… it was kind of one of those things where I remember my intern needing to have some questions answered and so the two of them would kind of go off and, and so, specifically I’m not really sure. But I know that there were some questions that [my intern] had, so she worked with [Helen] on that. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 209-215)

Helen’s participation in this task of supervision focused primarily on the intern and supporting the intern with her teacher inquiry.

In addition to supporting her interns’ inquiry, Helen also conducted inquiries herself with other supervisors. She worked collaboratively to explore questions, gather data, and disseminate the group’s findings at state and national conferences. Conducting inquiry and examining their own practices supports the professional learning of supervisors (Kilbourn, Keating, Murray, & Ross, 2005). Other than their knowledge of Helen attending conferences, Helen’s mentors did not comment about her conducting inquiry. Instead, this practice may have been more obscure since the mentors were focused on Helen’s work with their interns. By engaging in this task of action research, Helen was supporting the professional learning of others and developing her own professional learning as a supervisor, some of which mentors noticed and some of which was unnoticed in her supervisory practices. Perhaps mentors did not view supervisor self-learning as part of supervision or Helen’s role and responsibility as supervisor. It is possible that their view of supervision was more other-centered than self-centered. Meaning, they viewed Helen’s supervision in this task as supporting others’ professional learning and they did not consider her supporting her own learning as a component of her supervision.

**Teaching.** In the original Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) model, teaching was not included as a task. However, Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) advocate for supervisors engaging in teaching of children and of teachers. In a PDS context, supervisors teach. They teach teacher candidates in their university coursework. As they supervise, they teach in field-based settings through authentic, problem-based learning. They teach children for mentors or for interns
in some situations. However, supervisors in this setting also co-teach with interns and with mentors. They also indirectly teach mentors through their work with their interns.

When working with interns, Helen co-taught her interns’ courses during the field experience with other supervisors. As part of her teaching responsibility, she read and responded to that university coursework. One mentor commented,

I know that [my intern] writes in her journal every single week a reflection journal on a topic and Helen looks at those. I’ve never read [my intern’s] journals, but I know that Helen has commented on them at our meetings that we’ve had with how good they are. So I know that she takes time to read every single thing that [my intern] gives her. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 202-209)

In addition to responding to these assignments, Helen also taught her interns about professional responsibilities and supported them in transitioning from student to professional. Another mentor noted,

And helping [my intern] be aware of her, of her responsibilities too sometimes outside of the room because I don’t always know of course what kind of assignments and things she needs to be keeping up with. And I know that that was something that Helen helped her do. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 310-315)

As a supervisor, Helen taught through her supervision of her interns’ coursework. She was responsible for reading and giving them feedback in these areas. Mentors felt that this aspect of teaching was Helen’s responsibility. As the connection to the university, teaching the interns in this manner was Helen’s domain. Another mentor said,

I feel like they’re the ones who are not only in the classroom but they’re also their connection to the university. And that’s the part that I certainly try as, as much as I can to support them in their class work, in their (university) work, but I think it’s really the (supervisors) that really help with that. If (the interns) have an assignment to do and it involves the students doing a lesson or whatever, I’m more than willing to make sure that happens in the classroom and will help with that. But all the reflective journals and all the other things that they do, I really kind of depend on the (supervisor) to help with that side of it. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 458-472)

In their opinion, Helen was the connection to the university; therefore, any course work was her responsibility as supervisor.
In addition to teaching through university course work, Helen also taught her interns in the practicum experience. Helen would unpack her mentors’ expertise through pointing. Helen identified these practices and strategies her mentors were using while they taught children for her interns and then described the mentors’ actions and decisions to the interns. Pointing supported her interns’ learning because she worked to develop their understanding of pedagogy through meaningful observation of expert practice. To illustrate, one mentor commented on Helen’s teaching of the interns by saying, “And so she was helping [my intern] as I was teaching. They were sitting over to the side and [Helen] was you know telling her how do you . . . you know helping her understand what, what she was seeing and things that I was doing” (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 220-224). Helen was teaching through pointing.

Helen also taught her interns through her ability to teach children. She often co-taught with her interns so that she could model effective strategies and support the children’s learning. One mentor said, “[Helen] jumped into the lesson and she helped with the blocks” (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Line 399). Another mentor commented, “So [Helen] was there to support [my intern] in case she got stuck or needed help with her first time” (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Line 260). Helen taught through teaching; meaning, Helen taught her interns about teaching by modeling teaching strategies while the intern watched and by co-teaching with the intern. Helen was enacting her pedagogy of teacher education in that she was teaching novices about teaching.

In addition to teaching about teaching, Helen also taught mentors about mentoring. Teaching mentors usually occurred more indirectly, so it was possible that Helen did not notice this impact on her mentors’ practices. Helen’s mentors would observe her work with children and with their interns. Their observation of her enacting her pedagogy (and her pedagogy of teacher education) caused them to re-consider their practices as mentors. One mentor commented,

To, to encourage a good supervisory practices in teachers. I don’t know…I’m usually so caught up in what I am doing, teaching kindergarteners that I don’t always remember that I am also a teacher of the student teacher or of an intern. And so what’s my role? You
know, what do I need to be doing? And you know, just helping us learn how to be teachers of interns, too. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 350-357)

Helen supported mentors’ learning by teaching about mentoring. In this way, Helen was teaching about pedagogies of teacher education and she was developing her mentors’ understanding of teaching about teaching.

As a supervisor, Helen engaged in the task of teaching. She taught interns in their university courses and evaluated this coursework. She also taught interns in their field-based practicum experiences by pointing to expert practices and unpacking this expertise for the intern. In addition to teaching interns, Helen also taught children and through this modeling, she was also teaching interns about teaching. Helen co-taught with her interns so that they could observe her modeling effective pedagogy. Finally, Helen also taught her mentors about pedagogies of teacher education. By working with her interns, Helen modeled practices for teaching about teaching. Therefore, when engaging in the task of teaching, Helen enacted in multiple pedagogies. She taught children and practiced effective pedagogy. While engaging in practice, she was simultaneously teaching interns about pedagogy. While teaching interns about pedagogy, Helen was simultaneously enacting her pedagogy of teacher education and developing her mentors’ pedagogies of teacher education. This understanding of the existence of multiple pedagogies demonstrates the complexity of supervision in a PDS context.

Summary. As a supervisor, Helen performed several tasks. She engaged in direct assistance to support the technical development of interns’ teaching practices. She also engaged in community development. Helen brought together groups of interns and groups of mentors to collaborate, share, and problem-solve relevant community issues. In order to participate in this development, Helen forged relationships with various community members and she fostered relationships among these members as well. Most often she focused her attention on supporting the relationship between the intern and mentor by being a liaison of communication. Another task
in which Helen engaged as a supervisor was action research. She supported her interns’ inquiries and she inquired into her own practices as well. Finally, Helen also engaged in the task of teaching. She enacted multiple pedagogies in order to teach her interns about teaching and in order to teach her mentors about teaching about teaching. This section described the tasks in which Helen engaged as a supervisor. The next section is dedicated to understanding the characteristics of her supervision as she engaged in these tasks.

**Characteristics.** According to her mentors’ descriptions of her practices, Helen’s supervision could be characterized as being connected, supportive, evaluative, but novice. To elaborate, Helen’s supervision was connected. She established a presence in the classrooms and schools in which she supervised. This connection meant that Helen’s mentors were never alone; they were always connected to a supervisor for support. They saw Helen as resource that they could seek for advice and knowledge. Helen’s supervision was also supportive. She supported interns’ learning as aspiring teachers, she supported mentors in their mentoring practices, and she supported children in their learning. Even though Helen’s supervision was supportive, it was also evaluative. Helen placed judgment on her interns’ and mentors’ teaching practices. This practice situated her mentors and interns in subordinate roles. Helen’s supervision was also novice. As a novice supervisor, Helen focused primarily on the intern, which is only one aspect of the overall domain of supervision in the PDS context. Her mentors wanted more voice and participation in working with their interns.

**Connected.** Helen established a presence in the schools and the classrooms in which she supervised. She worked diligently to develop relationships by spending a great deal of time in these spaces. One mentor commented,

…the thing that stands out I guess is just being in the building. Just being here, you know, we’re in the middle of doing play practice and she’s there. So just really just being in the building, being, sitting at lunch, interacting. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 248-252)
Helen would go out of her way to be present and supportive of her interns, mentors, and the community. In addition to attending special functions, Helen would often eat lunch with her mentors and interns, and she would often just check-in with them to see how things were going and if they needed anything. One mentor said, “[Helen] was really good at checking in and just being there as, as a support system for [my intern] it seems” (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 84-86). Another mentor stated,

    Tomorrow is our kindergarten play. And I know that she’s trying really hard to be there just to see it. She doesn’t need to be, but it’s just she has worked in all the classrooms this year and so she’s supporting the community that way quite a bit. You know always making little snacks and leaving them, kind of support. But just being a presence in the building I think supports everyone. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 324-331)

This presence let her mentors know that she was there for them; mentors were not alone and they always had a resource available to them. This mentor also said,

    …well it, I mean we had a lot of time, the three of us together, in the classroom which was great…This is the first time that I had an intern who needed (support with developing teacher persona), so we spent a lot of time working on that together, Helen, myself, and, and her. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 195-205)

Helen’s presence was comforting to mentors and they valued this practice of hers. One mentor said, “So just that she got to know us on a personal level and made her role as a supervisor I think more personal and comfortable and we just appreciated that” (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 216-219).

    Helen’s supervision was characterized as connected because she ensured that she was connected to her classrooms, interns, and mentors by building relationships with them and the children in those classrooms. This connection conveyed to mentors that they were supported and had a resource available to them when they needed it. Helen built this presence and these relationships by simply spending time in the school and in the classroom, attending special functions related to the classrooms, and engaging in normal, ordinary tasks of the mentors such as eating lunch with them. Through these actions Helen developed relationships with mentors,
interns, and children because she knew them on a personal level. This invested time created the necessary connections and relationships to engage in supervisory tasks.

**Supportive.** According to her mentors, Helen provided an immense amount of support to the students, the interns, and themselves. With interns she was willing to work collaboratively with them to refine their skills with lesson planning, observing, and teaching. With mentors, she supported them in fostering the relationship between their interns and them. Helen also provided resources and gave advice when they needed it. With children, Helen worked with them to support their learning. Sometimes she was teaching students solely, but more often she was co-teaching with her interns to support students’ learning.

**Supporting Interns as Aspiring Teachers.** Helen’s mentors felt that she provided their interns with an immense amount of support. In fact, they felt that she could not have been any more supportive, especially of struggling interns. Helen was willing to dedicate extra time to support her interns, and she gave even more time and energy to those who struggled. One mentor stated,

> So, then she again offered, you know, what can I do to help? You know, I will meet you after school, before school, during school. At one point [Helen & the intern] were working during classroom hours just because it was . . . it just made the most sense for them to focus on that. She offered to co-teach lesson with her. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 185-191)

This mentor noted one of Helen’s common practices—her co-teaching with her interns. Helen was willing to teach with her interns in order to support them as novice teachers. She especially co-taught when an intern was struggling or if the intern was teaching a particular concept or subject for the first time. Helen offered these services; sometimes the interns accepted and sometimes Helen just jumped into the lessons to co-teach with them. Another mentor said,

> . . .[my intern] was learning how to do guided reading. Helen offered to come in and either run (my intern’s) center while she could watch me or to sit with [my intern] at my center and kind of explain like the things I was doing. It ended up being that she came in and ran her center. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 75-80)
Another mentor found her intern responded differently to Helen’s request to co-teach. She said,

She offered to co-teach lessons with her. There were some interesting reading lessons and Helen had pulled out some books that she thought would be of interest to both the students and to [my intern] and had said, ‘Let’s plan together to teach this lesson.’ And [my intern] really had no interest in doing so with Helen. And she told her that. So it was, it was a tough relationship. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, after Lines 191-198)

It is possible that Helen’s practice of offering this kind of support especially to struggling interns situated this intern differently than her peers; therefore, this positioning impacted her relationship with Helen.

In addition to co-teaching, Helen also supported her interns with lesson planning, and she used the same strategy of collaborative support; she was willing to co-plan with them. Helen routinely offered to complete the lesson plans with the interns, especially those interns who were struggling. One mentor commented,

She’s, oh gosh, she was so supportive. Just willing to come in, and we met with [my intern]. [Helen] would ask questions such as, when we’re working on objectives in a lesson plan, that was the struggle for all of the interns, and she was just very willing. . . several times she asked her can I sit down with you? And can we do this together? (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 175-181)

Helen was always willing to collaborate with her interns to support them with planning and teaching.

In addition to working with interns on lesson planning and teaching, Helen also supported her interns with their inquiries and in unpacking their mentors’ expertise. She co-observed her mentors with her interns so that she could engage in pointing—a strategy for identifying specific moments in an expert teacher’s practice and commenting on that practice so that the rationale for the decision to use that practice became clearer to the novice.

Helen was willing to do whatever it took to support her interns and help them be successful as novice teachers. She offered extensive support to work collaboratively with her interns to plan and teach in the classroom.
Supporting Mentors as Teacher Educators. In addition to supporting interns, Helen’s mentors felt that she provided them with a great deal of support. One of the ways in which they felt Helen supported them was by supporting their interns. Mentors felt that their teaching responsibilities sometimes imposed on their ability to observe and give feedback to their interns, so they believed that anytime Helen could engage in these tasks, she was supporting them. One mentor said,

So it’s really been very difficult for me to stop and, and observe. You know, I can observe while I’m teaching, but it’s just not the same as Helen coming in and being very, you know, having some specific goals for [my intern] that perhaps [my intern] chose and then observing th[eir]m. It’s just . . . I, I feel like I would have to have two brains to do that. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 169-175)

Another mentor commented, “Well, a great deal because she’s supporting my intern in doing things that I can’t be doing at that very moment. So it’s helpful to me and it’s helpful to my intern” (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 348-351). Mentors appreciate Helen’s abilities to observe and provide feedback to their interns. They greatly value this support.

Mentors recognized that Helen was very dedicated to her role as a supervisor. Helen would go above and beyond to provide support for her mentors. Sometimes she spent her time in the evenings discussing situations with mentors in order to support them. One mentor said,

She, Helen and I, had numerous phone conversations in the evenings just you know if I had questions about what I was doing and what I should be asking [my intern] to do… I remember one evening we were on the phone till 10:15 at night. There’s no way. I mean she was sacrificing so much of her personal time and I can’t honestly say that she could have been more supportive. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 207-265)

By spending this kind and amount of time with her mentors, Helen built strong relationships with her mentors because her actions showed that she cared and that she was willing to support them. This example demonstrated the strength of the relationship between her mentors and her and it also showed that Helen acted as a resource. Mentors were not alone and they could call her if they needed support. Another mentor said, “I think just someone like Helen is there for you whenever you need her” (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Line 188). Helen offered her mentors an immense
amount of support, and her mentors felt that they had a resource and support system; they did not have to face any situation alone.

Mentors also greatly valued Helen’s ability to support the relationship between their interns and them. Helen was willing to act as a liaison of communication between her mentors and interns. She was willing to mediate conflict and be the person to express mentors’ concerns in such a way that it preserved mentors’ and interns’ relationships. Mentors felt that if they told their interns that kind of information, it would damage their relationships. One mentor said,

But I do know that there has been times where it’s more like I would say to the PDA okay you know you, can you talk about this because I don’t want our relationship to be affected… so it’s better when it comes from the PDA versus comes from me because we’re... I also see the [supervisor] as the person that can if something is shaky or needs big improvement, they are the ones that can bring that up rather than it coming from me. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 271-284)

Since mentors and interns worked together on a daily basis and Helen was more intermittent, they felt that having her intervene was more appropriate for their relationships. Mentors were also uncomfortable with conflict. Another mentor remarked,

My only reason is that I’m not controversial and outspoken and I have a hard time with conflict. And if a mentor and intern were having a conflict and I had to mediate or be in the middle, it would be really hard for me to lead that. Or if an intern was struggling, it would be really hard for me to approach that. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Line 452)

Another mentor agreed and said,

And, you know, Helen was able to then kind of come in between so that you know calm me down a little bit. I feel that’s more on me obviously than it was on Helen. Helen was very blunt, very straightforward at times with [my intern]. She would say things that maybe I wouldn’t necessarily say. But I felt that a lot of times she was saying things that needed to be said. And I just have a hard time with that. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 502-510)

Mentors wanted to talk about issues with their interns but they were too worried about their relationships. They saw Helen’s ability to handle conflict as an asset, and they greatly appreciated this kind of support. Another mentor said, “But I was so grateful that we were addressing something that you know was definitely an area that, that [my intern] could you know grow in”
Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 420-423). Helen supported mentors by being a liaison of communication; she addressed the tough issues with the interns in order to support mentors and preserve the relationships they had with their interns and mentors greatly valued this practice.

Mentors, especially more novice mentors, greatly valued Helen’s experience as a teacher and as a mentor. They turned to her for advice, and she acted as a resource for them in developing their mentoring skills. One mentor stated,

There were a few situations throughout the year where I wasn’t sure how to handle a situation that came up with my intern. And [Helen] had just been out of the classroom and had been teaching much longer than I had. So I felt like she had a lot to offer me as to how could I handle this. So she supported me very much so in how to kind of take on some of the conversations that I needed to have with my intern first. Or together—we would do it together. And so I feel like that went very well and we had a great year together I think because of some of the advice that she gave me for that. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 100-112)

In this way, Helen supported mentors’ development of their pedagogies of teacher education. She supported their learning as teacher educators.

**Supporting Children as Learners.** Helen’s mentors valued her ability to work with children, and they greatly appreciated her willingness to support children’s learning. One mentor stated, “That’s something that I really like is that (Helen is) very hands-on, you know, (she’s) been willing to help with reading groups and everything else that’s going on in the classroom” (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 85-88). Helen co-taught with her interns or even sometimes taught small groups so that her intern could observe her mentor.

Helen was willing to alter her plans for an observation to work with children if the situation warranted. She knew that children were the priority and was willing to put their needs first over the interns’ and hers if necessary.

[Helen] has felt very comfortable stepping in. I remember one time something was going on in the room and we weren’t planning on having her do a station and it was a really… it was some math game and there were a lot of materials and with kindergarten it was a brand new game. And it was not very easy situation to kind of sit in and she, of course, was more than happy to no do the observation that she was going to do and do that instead, which was great. And she was always like that. Other [supervisors in PDS] have
been as well, but Helen seemed very comfortable with that. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 884-896)

Since Helen was a reassigned teacher, her contextually-specific knowledge afforded her these opportunities because she knew the curriculum and she felt comfortable to “jump in” whenever necessary. Another mentor remarked,

When she just came in to the classroom if she wasn’t observing she would jump in with reading groups or if kids were working on something writing she would jump in and help with the writing, which was nice because she is a classroom teacher and actually [Helen] was a second grade teacher in the past. So she really knew the curriculum and she knew how to help and she was helpful. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 98-106)

Helen’s willingness to teach showed her desire to support students’ learning, especially when the intern was struggling. Helen felt a responsibility to the children to ensure that their learning was not impacted poorly by a struggling intern. The mentor greatly appreciated this practice and said,

As far as her being a supervisor coming in and, you know, sitting with [my intern] during math stations and [my intern] was struggling to recall the names of some of the blocks that the kids were working with. And [my intern] or Helen, was able to sit there and help her through that lesson. And it not only helped [my intern] but it helped my students, which they come first. And I think that Helen saw that…she was initially there watching just to supervise the lesson. But instead was able to jump in because she knew the curriculum and was able to help get through that lesson so that, my students benefitted, which they come first, again… it made it positive because the kids learned. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 377-395)

Helen recognized a problematic situation and she co-taught with this intern so that the students were not the victims of incompetence. This mentor added,

I was with my own reading group but I was happy that she was here, thankful that she was here. I knew that if she hadn’t been in the classroom at that time, but students really would have gained very little from that lesson…But having Helen in that place, she was able to not only teach [my intern] because [my intern] was then learning and you know she was being shown what this lesson should look like. But then of course then the students benefitted as well. (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Lines 403-413)

Helen placed a great emphasis in supporting students’ learning. Her knowledge of the curriculum supported her in this endeavor in that she was able to co-teach with her interns and teach in small group settings to ensure that the students’ benefitted. Her supervision shows that she was able to support student learning.
Summary. Helen offered a tremendous amount of support to interns, mentors, and children. She co-taught with her interns or offered to co-teach with them and she also observed and gave them feedback as mechanisms for supporting their learning as aspiring teachers. Helen also supported her mentors as teacher educators. She spent extra time to ensure that they were supported in times of need and she gave advice in order to develop their mentoring skills. Helen also supported children. She would teach small groups or “jump in” for her interns so that the students benefitted from having another experienced teacher in situations where the intern was struggling.

Evaluative. Helen’s mentors saw her role and responsibilities as giving feedback to their interns. She often gave this kind of feedback to her interns by giving them suggestions, essentially practicing supervision as telling. In addition, her mentors commented that her feedback was typically in the form of constructive criticism, and they supported this kind of critique as long as the intern was the recipient of the critique. It was when Helen commented about or placed judgment on their practices that they did not appreciate the constructive criticism. These actions indicated that Helen’s supervision was evaluative in nature, and mentors sensed it. One mentor said,

> When she would come in to observe, you know, that Murphy’s Law of whatever is going to go wrong would and did. With our boys, they were just all so out of sorts. So those things would stick out. And I’m there every day and see all the wonderful things and then [Helen] comes in this spot moment and it’s like ahh. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 423-432)

This quotation demonstrated how Helen’s mentors felt about experiencing her supervision. They recognized that Helen’s role was to observe, pass judgment, and evaluate, and so they felt saddened or frustrated when their interns’ lessons were not perfect. To them, Helen’s supervision was evaluative.

Supervisor as Telling. According to her mentors, Helen would sometimes ask her interns for their perceptions of the lesson. One mentor commented, “And then she’s able to pull her
afterwards and talk about you know here’s what went well. And what do you think you struggled with? And what would you do differently next time?” (Mentor Interview 05.17.11, Line 448-452). Often after asking the intern for her thoughts, Helen would reply with her own thoughts and opinions about the observation. Another mentor stated,

…and she said things this is what you did really well, this is how we could tell that you weren’t really quite sure what you would say, and this is how you could change that for the next time during a real interview as she would need to do. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 386)

This series of questions and comments were a very typical framework that Helen used to guide her conversations with her interns.

Mentors were divided as to the benefits of this practice. Some mentors recognized that giving feedback in the form of constructive criticism was a necessary supervisory task even if interns’ feelings were hurt or the interns’ relationship with the supervisor suffered. One mentor explained,

And [my intern] was upset with [Helen] that she would give her that kind of feedback in front of everybody. And I had said, ‘Well, you know, if you think about it, she’s doing her job. Like she’s the person that’s going to tell you that because it’s her responsibility to get that through to you,’ and I think [my intern] just was feeling so insecure at the time anyway and it just happened to be that Helen is the one…that needed to say some things that needed to be said and were said very well but at the time were hard for [my intern] to hear because it was just making her feel even more inadequate even though she’s not. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Line 392-406)

This mentor recognized that giving constructive criticism through telling was part of Helen’s job. However, another mentor felt that telling was not the best practice. She remarked, “I think it’s important to not, to not tell them how to do it…So if I go to [Helen] for advice then to help me but just to give (the mentors and the interns) the space to make their own plans” (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Line 431-445). Helen’s mentors held mixed opinions about Helen’s practice of telling, but nonetheless, it was a practice that she used.

Giving Feedback. Helen’s mentors believed that giving feedback was also part of her responsibility as a supervisor. Helen gave ample feedback to her interns, and her mentors
perceived this trait as an asset. One mentor said, “So she spent a lot of time giving really great feedback that way more so than others I’ve had. They all have but she seemed to really be good at keeping up with that” (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 217-220). Her mentors appreciated this kind of support for their interns.

When Helen would visit the classroom, especially during the second half of the internship, she would record her observations and then e-mail them to the mentor and the intern. Usually Helen tried to script what was happening in the room while simultaneously including suggestions for the intern or questions for her to consider. One mentor commented, “She would write up an observation and e-mail it. She would talk to [my intern] and have some suggestions” (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 178-179).

Following the lesson, Helen would talk with the intern, if time permitted. During these conversations, Helen would ask the intern questions like what went well, what did not go well, and what would she change, and then Helen would offer her thoughts about the experience. These conversations were usually between Helen and her interns; mentors were not typically part of these conversations, unless the intern was struggling. Helen’s mentors did not often participate because Helen held them usually when the mentor was teaching.

When giving feedback to their interns, Helen’s mentors perceived her tone to be caring, supportive, and calm. They felt Helen’s feedback was very positive. One mentor said,

It was typical in that she’s very calm, very supportive, very thorough. She presented the idea and gave [my intern] a chance to come up with some solutions and then she gave some issues. And that was typical. I mean that happened all year long. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Lines 431-436)

Despite the fact that Helen’s delivery was positive, her feedback was more judgmental and evaluative in nature. This constructive criticism affected her interns. One mentor explained,

I think something that I really admired about Helen this year is that, and again my intern is lovely and wonderful, but there were a few times where I was a little disappointed in how [my intern] perceived things. And some of that feedback that I’m talking about, some of that constructive criticism, wasn’t necessarily perceived the way that it needed to
be. It’s just a maturity thing. It wasn’t something personal. But I remember a few times feeling a little disappointed in how [my intern] was assuming that meant Helen felt one way or the other about her. And I was very impressed with how Helen I think knew that… [my intern] really benefitted from that. And I think [my intern] will realize that years down the road. I don’t know that [my intern] really gets it yet, but I think she will. (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 339-365)

Despite the fact that the relationship between Helen and the interns were affected, Helen’s mentors still supported Helen and her ability to give feedback as constructive criticism. They saw it as a necessary and essential part of her role as supervisor.

*Intern as Domain of Evaluation.* While Helen’s mentors supported her practices of telling and feedback as constructive criticism, they were not as supportive when they became the recipient of these practices rather than their interns. This quotation was previously referenced above, but it is applicable here as well in that it shows how mentors appreciate Helen’s advice and feedback only when they request it. Mentors must initiate this process—not Helen. This mentor said, “I think it’s important to not tell (mentors and interns) how to do it” (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 439-440). Not only did mentors not want to be told, they also did not want to have Helen critique their practice.

One of Helen’s mentors felt like her practices were being critiqued or judged, and she felt that was outside of Helen’s domain. It was acceptable to have Helen evaluate her intern’s performance in the classroom but not hers because she was the mentor; that was overstepping Helen’s boundaries and role as a supervisor.

I have never felt that a (supervisor in PDS) came into my room in a judgmental way. I always felt it was always collaborative. And things we learned and shared was a two-way street. This year was a little different for me because I felt that the one observation that was written up had a comment in there about me and something going on in my teaching because my intern wasn’t even teaching and I took that a little offensively. I was a little bit like, ‘Whoa, wait a minute here. I’m not being evaluated. That shouldn’t even be brought up into this evaluation because it was a visit.’ So I was a little put out by that. And that was the only time in all of my years which as I’ve mentioned, and I’ve been involved a lot of years, that has every happened…I kind of was more skeptical and watched for it. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 148-165)
This mentor went on to add,

Well, I was upset. I was a little upset that she kind of imposed upon my…she was critical of my practices. And it’s not that I’m not a person open to suggestions and things like that because I feel like I learn so much from the PDS input and so on. But I was taken aback by that because I felt it was critical of me, and it shouldn’t have been…well because I thought she’s not here to evaluate me. She is focusing on my intern. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 189-196)

This example illustrated the double standard that mentors possess regarding evaluative practices of supervision in teacher education. Mentors accepted evaluative practices of their interns, but they did not accept them when they were the objects of the critique. What was acceptable for interns was not acceptable for them. This mentor was not the only one who felt judged by Helen’s supervisory practices. Others concurred with this mentor when she reached out to her colleagues about this experience. She said,

And I did finally bring it up at a meeting of my colleagues to see if it was different this year and a big sigh of relief went up there that here we were all feeling the same way. And that made me feel comfort that I wasn’t the only one feeling like that. It’s hard to pinpoint exactly what it was. Well, besides the other person did say that they felt they were critical of them as well. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 346-353)

Some of Helen’s mentors felt that Helen was judging their teaching and them. They recognized that Helen’s supervision was evaluative in nature. They accepted those practices when their interns were the recipients of the constructive criticism, but they felt betrayed when they were done to them.

Summary. Helen’s supervision could be characterized as evaluative. Her mentors noted that she excelled at giving feedback, and she often delivered her feedback by telling her interns her opinions of their performance. Mentors perceived this feedback to be constructive criticism and recognized it as an essential part of Helen’s role as a supervisor. However, Helen’s mentors believed that this practice should be reserved solely for their interns. Supervision practiced in this manner was not acceptable when mentors were the recipients of evaluative practices.
**Novice.** Helen’s mentors recognized that Helen believed her domain was the intern, which meant that Helen’s practice of conferencing with just the intern was in line with their perceptions of her beliefs. However, they wished to be part of those conversations. One mentor described Helen’s practices as, “She came in weekly but we didn’t always have time to meet as a threesome. But she definitely always met with my intern after a lesson. But we didn’t always have time for the three of us to meet” (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 478-482). Mentors recognized that being part of the conversation meant finding time, and they wanted more of Helen’s time. Another mentor said,

> More time. Having just more time. Time for the three of us to meet. When my intern would teach a lesson, we would try to make it work so that [my intern] could meet with [Helen] as much as she could after the lesson to get feedback, which worked out well. But it would be nice if the three of us could sit down and do that. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11, Lines 257-263)

Some of her mentors had previous experiences with supervisors who were more experienced than Helen, and those supervisors included them in the conversations. Helen, being in her first year, focused primarily on the intern and excluded the mentors from those interactions. Her mentors wished to have more of her time, to create time for these opportunities, and to be included in supervisory conferences with their interns and Helen.

**Summary.** Helen’s mentors commented on her practices as a supervisor. Their perceptions of her practices demonstrated that Helen performed the tasks of direct assistance; using technical-helping models of supervision, she supported her interns’ learning. Helen also performed the task of teaching; she co-taught her interns’ methods course work and seminars in their field experience. She also co-taught children in small group settings with some of her interns. Helen performed the task of community development; she brought together groups of interns weekly and groups of mentors monthly to problem solve relevant issues to their practices and to the PDS community. Finally, Helen engaged in the task of action research; she supported her interns’ inquiries into their teaching and conducted her own inquiries with other supervisors.
In addition to the tasks, Helen’s mentors’ descriptions of her practices showed that Helen’s supervision was connected. Mentors felt that she was always there to support them whenever they had an issue; they felt connected to her and knew that they were not alone. Helen’s supervision was supportive. Her mentors recognized that she supported children’s learning, their interns learning as aspiring teachers, and their learning as teacher educators. Although supportive, Helen’s supervision was also characterized as evaluative. When Helen gave her interns feedback, she often did so through telling—sharing her opinions and judgments of their performance. Her mentors supported this practice of evaluating their interns, but they did not support her evaluating their practices. Finally, Helen’s supervision was novice. When Helen conducted supervisory conferences, she included the interns but not the mentors. Her mentors desired more of her time and the ability to be included in those conversations.

Of Her Impact on Them as Mentors

Helen’s mentors believed that Helen’s supervision impacted them, but the extent and kind of the impact was quite diverse. While many felt that they learned something from Helen, one mentor felt that the relationship Helen and she had impacted her ability to learn from her. She said, “I didn’t feel I had the same relationship with this PDA that I had in past years, like learning and things” (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 336-338). This mentor believed that she had learned more from previous supervisors because of her relationship with them. However, other mentors were able to describe how Helen’s supervision impacted them.

Her impact was quite diverse ranging from impacting mentors’ pedagogy to mentors’ pedagogy of teacher education. For example, one mentor shared how she watched Helen work with her students and the manner in which she talked to them. She said,

Helen has like the calmest voice ever and she came in and read a story to my kids at the beginning of the year. I feel like every year I learn more behavior management things, just learn from other teachers. And just listening to the way she talks to the kids and
listening to the way she was like dealing with the behavior problems on the rug. She never raised her voice. It was just calm and soothing and I felt like listening to her as she was reading. You know what I mean? So it makes me want to have that more, like not monotone, not . . . just a calming voice when I talk. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 124-132)

Watching Helen be successful with her students demonstrated a successful pedagogical strategy for the mentor and caused the mentor to reflect on her own practice; essentially by working with her children, Helen created a disorienting dilemma for the mentor. Helen’s impact on this mentor was indirect; the mentor learned by observing Helen’s modeling.

One way in which Helen impacted her mentors’ learning was with regard to their roles and skills as mentors as they develop their pedagogies of teacher education. Through experiences with Helen, mentors learned that data and documentation were important; that decisions and evaluations require data and evidence to support them rather than relying on memory or effort. One mentor commented,

That effort doesn’t do it; you have to have evidence. That was something [Helen] brought up at the evaluation conference when I was talking about all (of the intern’s) growth. But [Helen] needed evidence so that it isn’t like oh they’re working so hard; they’re doing a good job. Okay well where’s the data? Where’s the facts? So she kind of pointed me in that direction…Well it was like yeah you need that in life. You know you need the evidence. Just can’t say oh they’re a good kid but you know they mean well. But where’s the evidence? The evidence supports it then it can stand alone. So it was kind of it was like whoa okay. And then it made me think about why I saw my interns’ inquiry so heavily data driven. This is the first year I felt like oh my gosh the inquiry project was huge in data than in past years. (Mentor Interview 06.02.11, Lines 328-358)

Helen caused this mentor to reflect on her assessment practices by talking with her and engaging the mentor in evaluation conferences as a collaborative partner.

Another way in which Helen had an impact on mentors’ pedagogies of teacher education was by modeling. Her mentors learned from her by watching her work successfully with their interns. One mentor learned about attitudes towards working with teacher candidates. She expressed,
Well there’s another person [Helen] that’s very calm and careful with people’s feelings and that supervision can be very supportive. It doesn’t have to be destructive. It can be very caring…Helen embodied that for me just to be very supportive and positive and yet if there’s a problem to deal with it as carefully as possible. (Mentor Interview 05.18.11, Line 321-324)

Another mentor shared,

Some of the ways that she worded things were maybe a little bit different and made me think, ‘Oh, yeah. That’s a good way of saying…I mean to give her some things to think about that she needs to work on but in a way that is more supportive than being critical. (Mentor Interview 06.03.11)

In addition to verbal feedback, another mentor commented that she learned how to give better feedback to her interns from reading Helen’s feedback to their intern and observing Helen work with their intern. She said, “I learned how to give great constructive criticism. I really feel like that’s what I gained the most from her… And how to give great feedback on a lesson. She does a very nice job of observations” (Mentor Interview 06.06.11, Lines 268-270). Sometimes Helen was given credit for this learning and other times she was not. Meaning, Helen’s impact was more indirect; her mentors claimed that they learned from Helen from either watching her work with children or with their intern. In this way, Helen impacted mentors’ pedagogy and pedagogy of teacher education.

In addition, they also gave examples of learning from their interns, but they did not realize or recognize that Helen had influenced the interns’ learning in ways that contributed to their learning. For example, Helen worked directly with her interns on conducting their formal inquiry. One mentor said,

Yeah, [my intern’s] whole inquiry project was giving kids checklists to do either like with their morning work or their writing. And I saw how well it worked like especially during writing with paragraph writing. We’ll give them a checklist of everything that their paragraph has to include. So that way we’re not constantly saying, ‘Does your paragraph have this?’ We can look at their sheet and see if it’s checked off or not, which means that we’re going to assume that it’s done. So I just I thought it was a really good tool that I think that I could carry on into other subject areas—not just writing or morning work. (Mentor Interview 05.19.11, Lines 57-64)
Mentors commented that they learned from their intern conducting inquiry, but they did not recognize Helen’s contribution or influence into this process. In this way, mentors learned from Helen’s supervision, but their learning was impacted indirectly through Helen’s work with others.

Helen’s supervision impacted mentors. By working successfully with children and with interns, Helen modeled pedagogy both as an educator and as a teacher educator that caused mentors to critically reflect on their own practices as teachers and as teacher educators. Mentors’ perceptions of her supervision indicate that supervision has the potential to impact multiple pedagogies.

**Focal Lens 3: Interns’ Perceptions**

A third reality in understanding Helen’s supervision was her interns’ perspectives. Just as Helen’s supervision was analyzed above according to her perspective and her mentors’ perspectives, this section dissects Helen’s supervision according to her interns as interpreted through my lens as a researcher. This section examines the interns’ perceptions of Helen’s supervision by understanding their perspective of her knowledge, beliefs, practices, and impact on them as interns.

**Interns’ Backgrounds**

Interns are undergraduate seniors who agree to abandon the university calendar and adopt the school district calendar to show their commitment to becoming a professional. This commitment is tremendous in that interns begin two weeks before their collegiate peers and, after graduation, they return to their internship experience to work in schools until the last day of the school year. In order to be accepted into the education major, these teacher candidates must have and maintain a 3.0 grade point average.
Like their mentors, interns are also volunteers. They choose to apply for this program and then they undergo an intensive screening and interviewing process. Members of the PDS community read and rate their applications and then interview all candidates. Once candidates are interviewed, the community—through the use of representatives—decides who will be accepted into the program. Those who are not selected can complete their degrees in other university programs.

While some racial, ethnic, and economic diversity is present, most interns are white and come from middle to upper middle class families. In order to participate in the program, they must be able to afford their own transportation to the schools and they must have alternative housing due to the time demands of the internship beginning before and ending after the university semesters.

Helen worked with a total of eight interns who were located in two buildings. Seven of her eight interns agreed to participate in this study. All of her interns were female and all of them taught at the primary level—three of the seven were in first grade, two were in first/second multiage classrooms, and the remaining two were in kindergarten. The purpose of this section is to understand Helen’s supervision through the lens of her interns. This part describes Helen’s interns’ perceptions of her knowledge, her beliefs, and her practices as a novice supervisor in a PDS context.

**Of Her Knowledge**

Helen’s interns recognized that Helen brought a specific knowledge base to her practices as a supervisor. They felt that Helen had contextually-specific knowledge as an experienced practitioner in this specific context; she understood the curriculum and culture of the schools in which she supervised and the district. Helen also had practitioner knowledge, which they valued greatly. They saw her experience in the classroom as a forte. Finally, they recognized that Helen
brought knowledge about supervision to her role. Their understanding of her knowledge about supervision was equated to knowledge about being a teacher educator and working specifically with them as interns.

**Contextually-specific knowledge.** Helen’s interns recognized that Helen held specific and valued knowledge as a member of the school district community. As a reassigned classroom teacher, she was an old-timer in that she possessed an understanding of inner workings and intricacies of the school district. Being a former second grade teacher, she also understood the primary curriculum because she taught it for many years.

Helen’s interns recognized this knowledge as an asset and they appreciated it. They felt that this knowledge facilitated Helen’s abilities as a supervisor in that she was able to co-teach with them or teach a small group of students for them since she knew the primary curriculum. As an old-timer, Helen also knew of district resources that she shared with her interns. For example, Helen wanted to expose her interns to other teaching strategies, so she identified fellow teachers whose practices she admired and set up observations of these teachers for her interns. One intern said, “And I also wouldn’t have known where to go to see the daily five and café. And she set it all up for us” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 276-278). Helen’s interns recognized that she held this valuable knowledge, and without it, they would not have had this kind of an opportunity to observe other teachers in the district. This intern also said,

> I think it’s been nice how she really wanted us to go see other classrooms and she picked us up and drove us over there…so we all drove over together and then we got to see her old school. And then she found some things in the book closet that she gave us. So it was a good day. But it’s just nice that she wanted to spend that time with us and take us to see other places and other classrooms. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 259-270)

According to her interns, Helen used her contextually-specific knowledge to support their learning. This knowledge afforded her the opportunity to connect her interns with other teachers and examples of exemplary teaching practices in the district. Her interns appreciated this knowledge and her ability to use that knowledge to support them.
Practitioner knowledge. Since Helen was a reassigned teacher, she was not far removed from the classroom. Meaning, the year before she became a supervisor, she was a classroom teacher. Helen’s interns recognized that she was a practitioner and held this kind of knowledge. One intern said,

I think it’s helpful that [Helen] is a classroom teacher. And [she’s] already had that experience so [she’s] been through it. And I think that that is very important role to like...another type of mentor, just differently. (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 44-46)

Since Helen was a practitioner, she could understand the complexities of teaching and of classroom spaces. Another intern stated, “I feel like having her like right from the classroom was really beneficial. I think she brought her strategies and her point of view right away into my classroom. So yeah I think that was good” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 448-449). Interns greatly valued her practitioner knowledge and believed that it benefitted them. This intern added,

So she brings things from what she’s taught her way and then I can kind of learn from her as well as learning from [my mentor] at the same time and kind of have different viewpoints on the same thing. She taught second grade so she really connects well with us. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 47-50)

Helen’s knowledge as a practitioner afforded her the status of “another mentor” or essentially another practicing teacher in the classroom. Interns appreciated this quality of Helen. Another intern attributed this knowledge as contributing to her learning experience and the supervision she received when she said,

I learned a lot about guided reading because of having her, she had already had the second grade screen so it was like I could even compare what she does to what [my mentor] does and it was like more than just someone supervising me that’s never even been in second grade. So she actually knew like this is what you can do as well and this is going to work because she’s been doing it for 27 years and that works. I couldn’t imagine if someone was trying to tell me do this, do that, if they hadn’t maybe had the experience, I would have felt like, ‘Are you positive this will work?’ because from (Helen’s) experiences she could actually relate that back to me. And I knew that what she was telling me was true because she had done it. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 69-77)

Helen’s interns recognized that Helen possessed practitioner knowledge. Even though she was a supervisor, she was recently a classroom teacher and even more specifically a teacher in a similar
if not the same grade level as her interns. Helen’s interns respected this knowledge, which gave her some credibility among her interns. This knowledge made Helen seem relevant and current with regard to practical knowledge about teaching. In her interns’ perspectives, having practitioner knowledge was something to be admired and desired. As aspiring teachers, Helen’s interns wanted this kind of knowledge and recognized it as an asset of Helen’s qualities as a novice supervisor.

Knowledge about supervision. Helen’s interns recognized that she held knowledge about teacher education; they recognized that she possessed some knowledge about working with and supporting the learning of adults as teachers and as teacher candidates. First, they recognized that being a supervisor meant that she had to have knowledge about teaching adults. One intern said, “Teaching second graders to teaching college students is different cause you’re not really teaching us” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Line 582). Helen’s interns believed that supervisor knowledge needed to include an understanding of teaching adults, but they did not see her role as being a teacher. They felt supervision and teaching were different, but they did recognize that teaching children and teaching adults was different.

Supervisors are teacher educators. As individuals who work with teachers, teacher candidates, and other school and university personnel, these individuals must have knowledge about teacher education and knowledge about supervision in order to supervise. Helen’s interns recognized that Helen held knowledge about supervision. Their understanding of supervision meant that Helen held knowledge about how to observe and conference about practice. One intern said, “Either she was in to observe my teaching whether it was a written observation or a video recording and when she was just coming in more informally she would sit and work at a station with me” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Line 162). Observing entailed recording or capturing the teaching experience. Helen’s interns recognized that in order to observe, Helen needed to also have an understanding of some basic skills regarding observation.
In addition to observing, Helen also gave her interns ample feedback. Her interns recognized that in order to give them feedback, she needed to have some understanding of how to give feedback. One intern commented,

She’s always in and helping me, and every time I needed the help, she gave me feedback and would work on it with me or like point out things. So she made an effort to come in as often as she could and really just sit with me. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 23-25)

According to her intern’s descriptions of her practices, Helen’s knowledge of giving feedback included two practices—pointing and telling. Helen would point to specific practices by identifying critical incidences during the mentor’s teaching in an effort to raise intern’s abilities to observe and to reflect. Helen would also tell her interns her opinions about the practices she observed.

Interns also recognized that in addition to giving feedback, Helen also had to have knowledge about conferencing. Helen talked mostly with interns about their teaching, but during the bi-semester evaluation conferences, Helen was required to conference with both interns and mentors. Another intern stated,

But during like the formal evaluation time, my PDA and my mentor, we all sit down together and look over the performance framework form…And we just go through each step and I lead the conversation and give my ideas of why I feel I fit in whatever part of the component it is and then [Helen] leads what her and my mentor had discussed and they both give their ideas on it. (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 190-194)

Helen’s interns recognized that in order to conduct conferences, she needed to have knowledge about conferencing and the skills necessary to facilitate an effective conference.

Summary. According to her interns, Helen possessed certain knowledge as a novice supervisor and reassigned teacher; Helen had contextually-specific knowledge, practitioner knowledge, and knowledge about supervision. This knowledge meant that Helen was an old-timer and held specific knowledge about the school and district cultures. In her intern’s eyes, Helen also held the status of practitioner. She was recently removed from the classroom and therefore has relevant and current knowledge about being an effective practitioner. Finally, Helen held
certain knowledge about supervision. According to her interns, Helen’s understanding included how to observe, give feedback, and to conference effectively.

Of Her Beliefs

By examining Helen’s interns’ descriptions of her practices and their experiences of her practices, her interns’ outlined several of her beliefs that she brought to her supervision. They perceived Helen’s beliefs to include them as her primary focus; as a supervisor, she was primarily responsible for them as aspiring educators. They also believed that Helen considered herself to be an expert and that the role of supervisor was equated with expert; Helen as supervisor held superior knowledge and skills to them as novices, and she brought valued expertise and experience to her role as supervisor. They also perceived that Helen believed that a supervisor was also supposed to monitor their behavior; she was responsible for “keeping them in line.” Finally, they thought that Helen also believed that as a supervisor, it was her responsibility to evaluate or judge their practice often, and that she was the primary determiner of their grade.

Intern as domain. Helen’s interns believed that her role and responsibility was to support them and their learning. One intern said, “She’s always looking to help us grow…And she was always trying to look for other ways to help us grow” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Line 339). Helen, as their supervisor, was responsible for helping them grow as aspiring teachers. Another intern commented that Helen’s responsibility was to, “…professionally grow into a teacher in a year, to make us professional and help us improve in our teaching and make sure that we’re understanding what we’re doing and why we’re doing it” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Line 272). They were the primary focus of her supervision, and it was her responsibility to support their professional learning above all else and other stakeholders in the PDS. In this way, Helen’s interns saw themselves as the domain of her supervision.
Helen’s interns believed that they were the focus of her supervision and, because of that, Helen acted in ways that showed she cared about them as learners and as individuals. Her interns believed that she truly cared about them. One intern remarked,

She really shows you she cares. It’s not like I care about you but don’t show it. Like it’s honest and you can see it; you can feel it. So it’s just like her nature and everything about her. She’s just happy and sincere about it. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 426-428)

Helen’s interns felt that she was sincere in her care for them. Another intern stated, “She was a very caring person too. That was definitely helpful. Sometimes she was hard on us but she always meant the best for us, definitely” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Line 69). Even though Helen’s supervision was sometimes “hard,” her interns knew that her intentions were genuine and caring. They knew that she was committed to them and cared about them because she saw them as the focus of her supervision.

Another example of her care for her interns was the compassion that she showed them. The PDS internship experience was a demanding teacher preparation program, and interns often felt stressed. They wanted a supervisor who was compassionate and understanding. One intern said, “So just kind of work through it with us because it’s very stressful and there’s a lot we’re doing in the classroom, too. So just be understanding when we’re stressed out” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 25-26). Another intern gave an example of how Helen showed her compassion and dedication to them; she would spend extra time reviewing and giving feedback on assignments. She said,

When we had a lot of work, she would sit down with us and take her own time, and go through every part with us, and proofread it ahead of time before we would submit things to make sure that we had it right. And she would sometimes send us, even after we submitted I remember with (one assignment), I didn’t realize I had to write a last paragraph. So she let me send it after without taking off points, which was really nice. (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 221-227)
Helen’s interns believed that she cared about them as individuals and that she showed her care through being compassionate and understanding towards them as aspiring young professionals and as the subjects of her supervision.

**Supervisor as expert.** Helen’s interns believed that she thought her role as supervisor was to be an expert, and knowing this belief, her interns sought her for advice. When one of her interns and mentors were struggling with student behavior in the classroom, they sought Helen’s advice since she was the expert. One intern shared,

> We talked to Helen about it and got her advice. So it was really nice to see (my mentor and Helen) connect that way, and talk about it together because it made Helen feel really good that she was being asked advice. It kind of helped them to better their relationship more because they don’t really have like a close relationship. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 285-288)

In this situation, Helen’s belief that she was expert solidified the relationship between her and her intern and mentor, but when Helen imposed her belief on others without being consulted for advice, the relationship was compromised. Another intern shared this story,

> We had a lot of kids that were just not following directions and [my mentor] wanted me to do certain things. But then Helen didn’t always agree with those things. But it was hard cause she wasn’t in my classroom all the time and those were the things [my mentor] was telling me to do. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 78-81)

In this situation both the mentor and Helen believed that they were experts. The mentor felt she was the expert in pedagogy in understanding and working with her children, and Helen believed she was also an expert in understanding how to manage children’s behavior because she was a practitioner for almost thirty years. In this situation, the mentor and intern did not seek Helen’s advice, but instead, Helen imposed her knowledge and beliefs about children on her intern because Helen believed that as a supervisor, she was an expert, which positioned the intern in a difficult position—she was torn between the advice of her mentor and the advice of her supervisor both of whom believed they were the experts. These situations are examples that illustrate how Helen’s interns believed that Helen, as supervisor, saw herself as an expert.
**Supervisor as monitor.** According to Helen’s interns, they believed that she thought her role as supervisor was to monitor or oversee them. Essentially she was responsible for making sure that they were being responsible and fulfilling their duties. One intern commented about Helen and her role as supervisor by saying, “To supervise us and make sure that we are fulfilling our responsibilities (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Line 44).” Another intern stated, “to make sure that I’m fulfilling my responsibilities in the classroom as well as my coursework” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Line 183). As a supervisor, Helen was charged with monitoring their performance. Another intern said, “to make sure that we’re showing progress” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Line 272). Monitoring was linked to performance; therefore, if Helen believed that she was a monitor, then she was responsible for overseeing their actions to ensure that they were making progress. Another intern said,

…observe us, to watch what we’re doing and see if we’re like meeting the requirements of the program because she’s the one giving us a grade… I think of her as like the person who is coming making sure I’m like on track and doing what’s expected and being there to answer questions if I have them. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 115-118)

As a supervisor, Helen monitored and evaluated their progress. She ensured that they fulfilled their requirements. The responsibility rested on Helen’s shoulders as supervisors to ensure that her interns were performing at expected levels. As monitor, she was the superior and her interns were subordinates. Another intern commented, “I have all of these things due and I kind of answer to her kind of thing. But we communicate back and forth because she lets me know what I need to do” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 265-266). As monitor, the onus of performance was not on the intern as actor but rather on the supervisor who held the power and control of ensuring that the product—the intern’s performance—was acceptable and met certain requirements and standards.

Being a monitor connoted notions of power and authority. Sometimes they enjoyed this position when it made them feel special. One intern remarked,
It was just the way she was introducing us to everyone and the way that she carried us around the school like we were these wonderful people, like we were worthy of being introduced to everyone and we were so special to her. We were like her little like prizes. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 325-327)

Her interns recognized this power difference. Most times, this differential was not as advantageous to them. One intern said,

There’s a difference between like my mentor and [Helen]. There’s like this higher authority figure that I have to always meet her expectations. And not that I don’t do that with my mentor but she’s just this higher up. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 33-35)

To her interns, Helen was an authority figure, and someone to whom they reported. This supervisor who oversaw and evaluated their performance held the authority to give them a grade and, therefore, held power and control over them. This intern added, “She’s giving me a grade and she’s my advisor and she’s writing me a letter of recommendation. And I feel like there’s a lot riding on our interactions and relationship” (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 370-371). Interns felt that their relationship with Helen as supervisor contributed to how she viewed and evaluated their performance. Since she was a monitor and held power and authority over them, it was imperative that their relationships with her were strong. Interns felt this pressure to perform. One intern said, “Normally we saw her in the supervisor light where she would come in and observe. But now it’s more like she’s taking us to other schools and it’s just more relaxed and not all the pressure is on you” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 462-463). After graduation when all of the grades were submitted, Helen’s interns saw a change in her supervision. It felt more fun and relaxed without the pressure of meeting her expectations. She was no longer overseeing and monitoring them, but rather she engaged in other practices like taking them to visit other schools to see other teachers’ practices. This change conveyed the message to them that Helen believed her role was to oversee them.

**Supervisor as evaluator.** Helen’s interns also perceived that Helen believed that her role as supervisor was to evaluate. Several of the quotations above mentioned that Helen was
responsible for giving them a grade, thereby indicating that Helen was responsible for evaluating their performance. As an evaluator, Helen would observe and document her interns’ performances and then sometimes converse with them about it. Being an evaluator meant placing judgment on others’ performance, which had different effects on interns. One intern said,

I feel like when she comes in a lot of the time it’s me working on management with my kids who don’t listen. And I try. I never give up or I don’t get frustrated. But I always feel frustrated after. And that was one big reason why I was really stressed about having her come in throughout the whole year because all of (feedback on) my lessons all stem back to the classroom management with the kids because they just are so challenging… So that was a really big aspect of why it stressed me for her to come in. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 232-237)

While this intern felt stress and pressure, other interns did not feel that way. One intern stated,

She was always there just to support me and help me through and I was never anxious whenever she came in. She was just there to help me and that was very clear… the first two or three times I was a little nervous but then whenever I realized she was just there to help, it wasn’t a big deal. It didn’t take very long for me to get comfortable. (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 162-165)

Another intern said,

I was never afraid when she was observing me that she would like . . . I don’t know, really tear it apart or anything or that she didn’t like what I was doing. So, yeah, I wasn’t afraid. I just felt comfortable. When she was in the classroom, even the kids just see her as another teacher in our room. And nothing really changes when she’s here. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 299-302)

Regardless of their feelings, Helen’s practices still indicated to her interns that she believed that as supervisor she was there to evaluate their performance.

Of Her Practices

Using the conceptual framework described in Chapter 1, Helen’s interns’ descriptions of her practices indicted that Helen engaged in the tasks of direct assistance and teaching. She engaged in direct assistance mostly with her interns to support their growth and development as aspiring teachers. She also taught the interns coursework and she co-taught in small group settings with her interns. In addition to the tasks, Helen’s supervisory practices had several
characteristics. Her interns felt her supervision was connected, caring, supportive, and yet evaluative. Helen’s supervision was connected; her interns knew that Helen was there for them whenever they needed her. Helen’s supervision was caring; she got to know her interns as people and her interns felt cared for because of her small acts of kindness. Helen’s supervision was supportive; she supported additional members of the PDS community besides interns. Helen’s supervision was also evaluative; she engaged in the practices of telling and sharing which situated her interns in a subordinate position. This next section describes these tasks and characteristics in more detail.

**Tasks.** According to her interns’ descriptions, Helen engaged in two tasks of supervision—direct assistance and teaching.

**Direct Assistance.** Using the conceptual framework and the descriptions provided in Chapter 1, direct assistance involves the technical-helping aspects of supervision. It entails working with teachers, and in this case, teacher candidates, to develop their skills as educators. Her interns recognized that this aspect was part of Helen’s role as a supervisor. One intern said, “She’s supposed to watch us teach and help us realize the things that are going on while we’re teaching” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Line 219). Another intern commented about her role as being, “…helping us grow and learn from our own teaching” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Line 44). “Watching us teach” meant observation; her interns knew that her responsibility as supervisor was to observe them and support their growth and learning through observation and technical-helping.

Technical-helping can range from being more supervisor-centered where the supervisor determines the focus and tools for observation to being more teacher or teacher-candidate centered where the teacher determines the focus for observation. Helen’s supervision tended to be more supervisor-directed in that she determined the focus of observation. One intern said, “That was the focus for a while that I need to set expectations” (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Line 478).
This quotation showed how the focus of setting expectations was not the intern’s decision, but rather Helen’s decision. In addition to determining the foci, Helen also was more supervisor-directed in her conversations with interns about their practice. Another intern said, “She did most of the talking. I would chime in, but she really led the conversations, (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Line 222). Supervisor-directed forms of supervision have a place especially if the teacher or the teacher candidate is struggling, but Helen appeared to use more supervisor-directed supervision as a common practice.

There are also forms of supervision that are more collaborative in nature where the focus is jointly discussed and determined. Either way, technical-helping is concerned with the observation cycle of supervision. Meaning, a focus is determined for the observation, an observation is conducted, a conversation occurs following, another focus is determined for the next observation if possible, and then cycle continues. One intern described her experiences with Helen regarding technical-helping. She said,

I would usually be teaching. She’d come in for like a lesson that I was teaching and then she would either be recording notes on her computer and not exactly like watching what’s going on in the room, but just more like concentrating on getting all the words down or it would be like a flip cam videotaping sort of deal. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 77-80)

When used with teachers, the primary participants are the teacher and the supervisor, and supervisor could be an administrator, a coach, or a peer playing that role. Usually, though, there are those two participants. In this situation, Helen as supervisor and the intern as teacher were the two primary participants, which was common in Helen’s interns’ descriptions of her supervision as technical-helping. However, in teacher education, the dual nature of participation can remain the same by including the university supervisor and the teacher candidate. But a third, more robust model of including more participants is possible. In addition to the supervisor and the teacher candidate, the teacher candidate’s mentor teacher or mentor teachers if the intern is shared could also be involved. Including these multiple participants affords opportunity for enriching the
conversation about practice because the participants involved bring diverse perspectives on
theory and practice. Since Helen often conversed with her interns while the mentors were
teaching, the opportunity to include the mentors as participants in her supervisory practices was
not present. However, Helen did include mentors as participants at least twice during each
semester when the intern was being evaluated. Helen consulted with the mentor teachers and
involved the mentor, intern, and herself as supervisor in those conferences.

Another component to the technical-helping model is the inclusion of a conversation after
the observation. One intern commented on Helen’s practice and said, “She’d always sit down
with me and we’d talk about what went well, what didn’t go well and how I could improve”
(Intern Interview 05.24.11, Line 292). These three reflective questions were very common in
Helen’s supervision. Sometimes Helen would engage in conversation with her intern if time
permitted, and if not, she would send the observation feedback to both the intern and the mentor.
However, she always asked her interns to either discuss these questions with her or at least think
about them if they were not able to talk about the observation.

Technical-helping was an effective task for Helen and her interns. Interns commented on
its effectiveness in supporting their growth and learning. One intern said,

I think I learned about being aware of my own teaching because she made me aware of it
by like about giving me examples of how I sound, like voice and stuff. And she helped
me with that so I think that’s something that I learned from her, especially with read-
alouds and not knowing how I sounded. She gave me feedback and pointers on that.
(Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 34-38)

Helen used direct assistance to support interns’ growth and development with regard to their
technical skills, but she also impacted more than just those aspects. By engaging in the
conferences with her interns and asking them to reflect on their practice, Helen was supporting
interns’ growth and development of their dispositions towards teaching. One intern said about
Helen’s role,
To help us reflect and to further question things because like I said in my journal, she always would respond back with either a question or ‘let’s talk about this specific thing further,’ so that we could kind of engage in a conversation more and more and just continuously reflect on everything. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 219-222)

By engaging in conversations and questioning both face-to-face and through feedback on their journals, Helen was helping interns realize that reflection was a critical disposition and practice for a teacher.

Interns recognized that direct assistance was only one facet to Helen’s role as supervisor. One intern said,

And I feel like there’s so much to her role. She even said the one time, ‘You know observing you guys is only one factor of my role,’ but sometimes I wish I had been a bigger part, you know? (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 212-214)

Helen’s interns wanted more of Helen’s time. Although they recognized that she gave them ample feedback, they wanted more. They wanted to be the sole responsibility of Helen’s role as supervisor because they valued these technical-helping aspects of her role. These illustrations demonstrate how Helen engaged in the task of direct assistance as a novice supervisor.

_**Teaching.**_ Helen also engaged in the task of teaching. Using the conceptual framework and descriptions in Chapter 1, Helen utilized several kinds of teaching. She co-taught her interns’ formal coursework and field-based seminar experiences with other university-based and school-based supervisors. Teaching also involved planning and preparation for those courses, and her interns recognized this requirement as part of her role. One intern said, “She has to do a lot of planning and stuff for courses—lots of planning actually. She’s always planning for classes for next year or upcoming classes” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Line 212). As a teacher, Helen was responsible not only for planning and preparation, but she was also responsible for reading, giving feedback, and evaluating all coursework related to those experiences. Another interns said, “She has to read our reflection journals. She’s got to grade all of that stuff” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Line 193).
In addition to the traditional notions of teaching coursework, Helen also engaged in teaching-in-the-field. This kind of teaching involved co-observation and co-teaching. Helen would co-observe the mentor teachers with her interns in an informal manner. They would watch the mentor teachers’ practices, and Helen would point to specific practices and critical moments to help illuminate the complexity of teaching and teacher decision-making for her interns. Interns found this practice extremely helpful. One intern commented,

She really helped me learn about how to teach reading and all those important strategies to go through that I think I saw by watching [my mentor]. But (my mentor and I) didn’t really ever talk through it like Helen talked through it with me. So I think that was most beneficial or what I learned the most from her. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 176-178)

Master teachers sometimes do not realize or have the time to unpack their decisions and practices. Helen made this transparency possible through co-observing her mentors with her interns and pointing to their specific practices.

In addition to co-observing, Helen also engaged in co-teaching with her interns. She would often co-teach alongside her teacher candidates in small group settings where she was directly working with students. On occasion, Helen would sometimes lead a small group setting herself so that her intern could observe her mentor teach in that setting.

Helen engaged in the task of teaching in formal and informal spaces. She formally co-taught her interns coursework and she informally taught them through the practices of co-observation, co-teaching, and pointing. As a novice supervisor, Helen used the tasks of teaching and direct assistance to support her interns’ growth and development as aspiring teachers.

**Characteristics.** As Helen engaged in the tasks of supervision, her supervision took on several characteristics. According to her interns’ descriptions of her practices, Helen’s supervision was characterized as connected, caring, supportive, but also evaluative.

**Connected.** Helen’s supervision was connected because she was a constant physical presence and support structure for her interns. They knew that she was reliable and would be
someone they could depend on and turn to if they needed support; interns knew that they were not alone. One intern said, “I know that [Helen] was always there if I had a question or to get feedback on this. So she was just there in that way that I could get any kind of support that I needed” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Line 54). Another intern said,

> Whenever I had any sort of question I could even text message her and she would respond right away with something. So I felt like that was just continuous support… I mean I think she was always there whenever I needed her. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 29-32)

Her interns knew that Helen was available and accessible to them. She was a connection of support for them so that they were not alone when they needed assistance. Helen’s interns felt connected to her because she made an effort to learn about them as people. This intern added,

> I felt like Helen worked really hard to really get to know me as a person and my interests and everything. And that helped me feel like that I was just kind of more connected to her I guess. And then I wasn’t really ever you know afraid to go ask her something. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 3-6)

As a supervisor, Helen made an effort to be a connection for her interns so that they had a resource or an ally if they needed assistance. Her supervision ensured that her interns were never isolated, but rather they had a lifeline present whenever they needed it.

**Caring.** In addition to feeling connected, Helen’s supervision was also characterized as being caring. In the quotation above, Helen made an effort to learn about her interns as people and as individuals. Another intern commented,

> Helen did a survey for us at the beginning of the year and we just didn’t even realize what it was for and then we got birthday gifts . . . I was like how did she know those were like my favorite foods? And [Helen] was like, ‘It was from the survey I did for you.’ (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 23-26)

This effort also demonstrated that she cared about them. Helen paid attention to the small things – the little gifts that showed Helen paid attention, knew about her interns as individuals and cared for them as people. This intern added, “When she would drop little gifts, you wouldn’t even be
expecting it! Just like cute little things that you know you’re not expecting, you don’t expect them
(as supervisors). But it shows you that she really cares” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Line 399).

In addition to getting to know them as people, Helen wanted her interns to realize that as a supervisor, she was a person, too. She invited her interns to her house to have dinner and to get to know each other. Interns really appreciated this gesture. One intern said,

I thought it was really nice when she invited us to her house…it wasn’t anything education related, but it was just like the fact that she took the time to make dinner and invited us over because we were all new to PDS. We were nervous and that just stuck with me. Like that’s like a happy thought I think of when I’m stressed out. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 399-403)

Interns as college students are usually far away from home in this context. Helen welcomed them into her home to show that she cared about them as people. In some ways, these actions positioned her in more of a maternal role as supervisor. One intern said, “I just felt like she was kind of like a mom almost because I felt really comfortable with her” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Line 3). Another intern said, “She was like a motherly figure. So I think of her in that way because I knew that if I ever had a problem I could go to her” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Line 242). Helen was accessible to her interns and she created trusting relationships with them. These gestures helped to build relationships with her interns as students.

**Supportive.** According to her interns’ descriptions, Helen’s supervision was also characterized as being supportive; Helen was very supportive of her interns. Being connected and caring are characteristics that lay the foundation for support. When interns felt connected to their supervisor and cared for, they also felt supported. Not only did Helen support her interns, but she also supported children and the school community.

**Of Her Interns.** Helen’s interns commented on how demanding and rigorous the PDS preparation experience was for them. They often felt stressed and wanted a supervisor who was going to support them through this difficult time. They felt that Helen fulfilled that role. One intern said,
I think it means just having someone there for you because the whole experience is kind of overwhelming the whole year… like a cushion. If I was going to fall, she wouldn’t let me completely bomb anything. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 198-200)

When interns did struggle, Helen was there to support them and encourage them. Another intern said,

I just had a huge meltdown . . . I started bawling and just bawling. And then that night I called her and I was like, ‘I just don’t know what I’m supposed to be doing,’… She really helped me that time and made me feel a lot better. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 261-263)

Knowing that Helen was there to support them unconditionally was comforting to her interns, and it was one reason why her supervision was characterized as supportive.

Another way in which Helen supported her interns was through encouragement. Interns wanted encouragement. They wanted to know that if they made a mistake, there was someone there to support them and lift them up emotionally. One intern said,

That whole mom part of her comes out like a little bit, like that part that you want when you’re feeling down and you need someone to do that for you… And that’s why we get along so well because I can talk to her about stuff. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 433-435)

Helen was very supportive and encouraging of her interns, especially when they were not feeling as confident. Another intern said, “Helen did a good job of doing that just making us feel good about looking towards the future” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Line 9). Interns also wanted to know that Helen believed in them. Another intern commented, “She thought I could do anything and she’d be there to help me… It was nice to have her there. It’s always nice to have her there” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 272-273). As a supervisor, Helen supported her interns through encouragement, and her interns desired and appreciated this aspect of her supervision.

In addition to encouragement, some of Helen’s interns greatly valued the feedback that she gave them, and they wanted more of it. One intern said, “I got observed so much. . . and regular student teachers don’t get observed nearly as much. So that was really nice” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 113-114). Interns appreciated this time and attention that they received.
from Helen; they enjoyed having her in the classroom. Another intern said, “It was my first lesson I had to do up there so I said, ‘Can you please come up and just be there?’ And she would come up and help me out and then give me feedback” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 37-39). As a supervisor, Helen provided her interns with ample feedback to support their learning.

Overall, Helen’s supervision was supportive for her interns. She was physically present for them when they were struggling. She acted as a support system to encourage her interns and give them unconditional support. She also provided them with feedback. Her interns greatly appreciated this support in her supervisory practices.

*Of the Children.* Interns were not the only recipients of Helen’s supportive supervision. Her interns recognized that Helen also supported the students in their classrooms. When Helen visited her interns’ classrooms, sometimes she formally recorded her observations, sometimes she worked with children, and other times she did a combination of both. One intern reported,

> Whenever she was in here, she was always working with students…she would be sitting at a table checking in with students seeing what their strategy was to solve the story problem or whatever that was on the board. And she would ask them questions about it and probe them to talk out their thinking with her. So I felt like she really supported all the kids in this room really well whenever she was in here. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 62-66)

Another intern said, “And she’d help with the kids…It was just fun to have her there as an extra set of hands, too, just working with the kids” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Line 162). Helen’s interns felt that her supervision not only supported them but it also benefitted students. Interns, like teachers, developed a fondness for their students, and they appreciated when their supervisor made an effort to work with and get to know their children. Another intern stated, “She’s come in and done read-alouds with my kids. So she’s supported my kids and really tried to make an effort for them to get to know her” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 305-306). Helen’s supervision was supportive of children and children’s learning in the classroom. Her interns really valued this aspect of her supervision.
Of the Community. In addition to supporting interns and children, Helen’s supervision extended to the school community; she became a member of the school community. One intern noted, “I think she became really a member of our school” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 74), and she did so by maintaining a presence. Another intern stated,

I know like that she had a lot of interns and I saw her often in the building. So I think that that showed support, that she was here very often and it was nice to have her in the building and working in our classroom. (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 144-146)

Not only was Helen in the building, but she also made an effort to attend special events. Another intern recalled, “She supported the school because she would come to things like our fishy play and I know she’s going to be at the kindergarten play tomorrow. So she does make an effort to be part of the school community” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 253-254). Helen supported the school community by being physically present and making an effort to attend special functions. By being present and maintaining a presence, interns, children, teachers, and other members of the school community knew who she was. She demonstrated that she was willing to support the community.

Summary. Helen’s supervision was characterized as supportive because she engaged in tasks that conveyed that notion of support to her interns. Her interns recognized that she not only supported them, but she also supported children’s learning and the school community. By supporting these other stakeholders, Helen’s supervision extended beyond the bounds of just working with interns; Helen was showing glimpses of broadening her notions of supervision to extend beyond simply working with interns.

Evaluative. Even though Helen’s supervision was characterized as connected, caring, and supportive, it was also evaluative. Being evaluative meant placing judgment. One of her interns said,

I felt like when she would come in she just start I don’t know judging me and judging the class and not always like . . . cause she’s only in like at such a short period of time that
Judgment is a natural part of observation; it is not judgment-free. However, how her interns perceived that judgment had an impact on their relationships with her. Judgment is also part of evaluation, and part of Helen’s responsibilities was to evaluate her interns and assign them grades. According to her interns, being evaluative also meant observing, giving feedback, and discussing the observation and feedback. When Helen engaged in these acts, her delivery and actions indicated to her interns that she was evaluating or placing judgment on her practices. This evaluative stance impacted interns differently.

*Giving Feedback.* Helen’s interns recognized that as supervisor Helen needed to give them feedback. Her interns appreciated the feedback when it was positive. One intern remarked,

> She had such nice things to say about me and I wasn’t surprised... she’s never really said that I really need to work on something. I never had a view that she was thinking of me badly. But it made me feel really good to think that it stuck out that much that she would say she trusted me with her own kids... I think that’s as much as you could really say. That’s really nice and that made me feel more confident in my teaching. If she trusted me then other parents would too. (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 299-303)

Another intern also had a positive response to Helen’s positive feedback. She said,

> It made me feel good because it was my idea to go off and make a movie with the kids about one of the books they read. So it was nice that she said that because it was all me and not something like out of a unit or whatever. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 304-306)

When Helen’s feedback was positive, her interns responded favorably and felt closer to Helen.

When her feedback was more constructive in nature, some interns felt some anger and animosity. One intern said,

> Like it bothers me when teachers do things that aren’t reflective of what you would be preaching for your students. So I feel that she wasn’t giving what you’re supposed to – like start with a positive and then kind of give feedback... I felt like that’s a thing a teacher does. I don’t feel like she was doing that. She kind of... I just felt like negative. It was a lot of negative stuff. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 160-164)
Helen’s delivery of her feedback caused her students to react negatively. Sometimes the feedback was not simply what Helen said but rather what she did. One intern recalled a time in particular where she felt taken aback by Helen’s response to her teaching. She recalled,

“I remember one lesson in particular where I was like, ‘Okay, pencils down,’ and some of the kids weren’t putting their pencils down. So I kept saying, ‘All right. We need to make sure all of our pencils are down.’ And she just thought it was something I should have like brushed over and not really like addressed a second time. So she pulled me out of class and was like, ‘We need to talk right now.’ And so I was caught very off guard because she’d never done anything like that. And, yeah, she took me in the hallway and talked to me and told me I was like caring a little too much about things like that. And then [my mentor] was a little upset because she had been telling me to do things like that. So that was kind of a tough time where I just wasn’t really expecting it and the way that she addressed it wasn’t so . . . it just kind of shocked me because it was right after lesson. ‘We need to go outside and talk. Do you have time right now?’ And she had never done that before. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 78-89)

Sometimes the constructive criticism was not in what Helen said or how she delivered it, but it was in her nonverbal language. One intern noticed, “It was her face expression when she said it, and you could tell in her face . . . it was that bad. And it just felt like I was that bad” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Line 60). While Helen may have not intended to convey this kind of message to her interns, some of her feedback and the manner in which it was delivered hurt and upset her interns. Other interns were not as negatively impacted and interpreted Helen’s feedback differently. One intern said,

Whenever I was starting to get nervous and feel like, ‘Oh, why is she here to see this mess?’ She knew that I was feeling that way and she jumped in and helped and made me feel more at ease. And then, whenever we actually got to reflect and talk about it, it was very helpful and wasn’t critical or anything like that and very constructive. (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 242-245)

This intern interpreted Helen’s presence and evaluative nature as a mechanism for helping and supporting rather than judging and degrading. She added, “She wasn’t judging me all the time. She was really just there to help” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Line 272).

Helen’s interns had conflicting reports about their perceptions of Helen’s evaluative practices. Helen’s delivery, comments, and nonverbal cues made some of them upset and
nervous, while others embraced this feedback as a mechanism for supporting them. Either way, what was undisputed about Helen’s supervision was that it was evaluative in nature. The extent to which it was evaluative or the impact that it had on interns varies, but her supervisory practices of giving feedback could be characterized as evaluative.

**Supervision as Conversing.** In addition to giving feedback, Helen also held many conversations with her interns. Most of her conversations were focused more on “checking in” with her interns to make sure that they did not have any questions, were handling all of their responsibilities, and ensuring that they were not feeling too stressed. One intern explained,

> We would have a lot of conversations if we were feeling stressed about coursework or anything like that, we could always schedule a time to just talk about stuff… So this semester she was especially really good about making time to make sure we weren’t feeling stress or that we really understood everything we needed to be doing. (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 158-161)

Helen cared deeply about her interns, so she made great efforts to meet with them and talk about “life in the PDS.” Interns valued these conversations. One intern stated, “And that was nice just to catch up quick and it didn’t have to be like a formal observation but just to touch base with anything like assignments or inquiry or anything like that” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 12-13). Helen made time to have these kinds of conversations because she valued this time with her interns and her interns valued this time with her.

Helen also held some conversations with her interns about their practice. One way in which they conversed about practice was when Helen responded to their journals. Her interns wrote her weekly reflection journals on a topic of their choice and Helen would respond in written form with some comments and questions. She would then follow up on occasion with her interns to continue the conversation that started in the journals. One intern said,

> She was really good with feedback on all of my journals every week and it would spark conversation. She was open to like starting a new conversation elsewhere. So if something came out of my journal, she would contact me and we would talk about it like in the faculty room one day later just to further talk about things. So that was really good
to have this ongoing conversation all year about things that were going on. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 3-7)

Interns valued these kinds of conversations with Helen, and they appreciated that she took the time to follow-up with them.

Another way in which Helen conversed with her interns was regarding her observations of them. Interns found these conversations helpful and wished that they could talk with Helen more often after observations. Time, however, seemed to be the culprit inhibiting their conversations. One intern explained,

Sometimes we would try to find time to but then other times it was hard cause I would have to go and then teach again. So it was like when do you find the time? So that’s when she would send me like her own personal notes at the bottom of what she recorded cause it was hard to find the time. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 209-212)

When Helen did have time to hold these kinds of conversations with her interns, they were usually held in the back of the classroom while the mentor teacher was teaching. One intern described this process by saying,

We would go back into the corner of the room at one of the tables and sometimes the kids would be going out for recess, but sometimes the kids would still be there working and [my mentor] would be teaching and we would just be sitting there talking. She’d pull up what she had written down or maybe she videotaped me and we’d watch it together. And she’d talk about it and that would be usually what it looked like. (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 126-130)

Her interns gave conflicting reports regarding the consistency to which she held these conferences. Most of her interns said these kinds of conversations happened occasionally and they wished it happened more often. One intern stated,

It was helpful because it’s helpful when you do it immediately after because then you kind of forget half the things that happen in your lesson anyway. So that was really nice when we actually had time to do that. So we could sit and kind of talk it through together. (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 100-102)

Interns valued these conversations and they wanted them to happen immediately so that the experience was fresh in their minds. Another intern said,
She would leave. And then she would send it to me and let me look at it and sometimes she would follow-up. It just depended on time…But sometimes I did feel like she had so much to do that sometimes… sometimes it felt like certain things we might have not got to discuss and I just wanted to discuss it. But there’s just not the time to discuss it, but I know I have the time. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 351-355)

This intern exposed a common dilemma of Helen’s; Helen had to decide how to hold conferences with her interns given the time constraints of the schooling schedule and the interns’ teaching demands. Interns valued these conversations and wished that time could be found to discuss their relevant issues in the observation feedback, yet Helen seemed to place more emphasis on the informal conferences about their assignments, coursework, and feelings by finding time to have those kinds of conversations and struggling more with finding time to have conversations about their observations.

While the intern above felt that conversations about practice were infrequent, another intern offered a different perspective. She commented that having conversations with Helen after an observation was a common and frequent practice. She said,

I’ve gotten a few written reflections, and well, actually, I’ve gotten a lot more because she would have a written reflection but then we would usually have time afterwards just to sit and talk about what she wrote down. And so actually the majority of my observations I got a chance to talk with her afterwards. (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 115-118)

This particular intern also reported having a strong relationship with Helen and was not troubled as much by Helen’s supervision as being evaluative. Whereas another intern reported, “We never really would sit down and talk about it” (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Line 470). This intern claimed to not have a strong relationship with Helen and described it mostly as being fake and inauthentic. It was difficult to determine whether Helen was inconsistent with her conversations, giving more to those interns with whom she had stronger relationships, or whether her interns were inconsistent in their perceptions. Meaning, those whose relationships with Helen were not as strong felt that they received less conversations than those who had a stronger relationship with her even if the actual amount of conversations was the same.
When engaging in these conversations, Helen used two kinds of practices in her supervision—telling and sharing. Helen would tell her interns her thoughts and opinions, and she would also share advice and resources with them. Both of these practices stem from the belief that the supervisor is the expert. Experts hold knowledge and therefore they share that knowledge by telling others their knowledge, thoughts, and opinions, and by sharing their knowledge and advice with others. This next section describes these two practices that Helen used in her conversations with interns.

*Supervision as telling.* When Helen engaged in conversations, she would typically have the interns respond to three reflective questions: what went well, what did not go as well, and what surprised you? Helen would ask the interns for their input and then she would tell them her thoughts and opinions about it. One intern described this process by saying, “She would ask the questions. I would answer them, and then she’d respond on how she was thinking about it, like what did she think went well because maybe it was different than what I thought went well” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 390-391). Especially when time was limited, Helen would tell her interns her thoughts about the observations. Another intern said, “When there was time permitting, we were able to just quick chat about it and she’d just give me some of the main ideas or pointers” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 162-163). Interns were not opposed to Helen’s practice of telling. In fact, they desired it, especially when the feedback Helen told them was positive. Another intern stated, “So really positive because she always made sure to tell me that I did well but then things that I definitely needed to work on” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Line 242). Helen’s interns were receptive to telling as long as the information she delivered was positive. If Helen’s delivery of the feedback through telling was not as positive, her interns were not receptive to this practice.
Interns perceived Helen’s telling to be negative and derogatory when she gave them constructive criticism. One intern described an experience of receiving Helen’s feedback. She said,

Then I remember her stepping in and kind of saying what she already knew about my inquiry and telling me all these things I needed to do differently. And then other people started saying all of these things I needed to do differently, and it was really overwhelming. And that’s kind of why I got upset. And I know she didn’t mean to. But I felt kind of like I was being talked down on. (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 332-336)

They recognized that Helen’s intentions were well meaning, but her delivery resulted in negative and hurtful feelings. Another intern described Helen’s practice of telling by saying, “It’s just the way she could have worded it would have been better I guess because I appreciate the feedback, but she was not always the nicest (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 415-416).” This practice of telling her thoughts and opinions about the interns’ performance in these conferences demonstrated that Helen was placing judgment on their practice. By placing judgment, Helen was evaluating their practices.

**Supervision as sharing.** Another form of telling was sharing. Helen engaged in this practice of sharing when she offered her advice and expertise to her interns. Sharing entailed offering resources. One intern explained, “She’s shown me different ways of organizing my ideas and how to access different things if I need help with something. She’s shown me different web sites and tools that I could use to go and get that help” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Lines 24-25).

In addition to offering resources, Helen also shared “tips and tricks” for handling a variety of situations. One intern said, “She gave me some ideas for while I was at stations” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Line 54). Another intern said, “She just seemed happy to help me and to offer me suggestions” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Line 285). Sharing also entailed Helen describing ways in which she would have resolved a situation when she was teaching; in essence Helen was sharing her experiences with her interns. One intern said, “She would give us ideas for classroom management…She was able to give me tips on what she had done” (Intern Interview 06.02.11,
Some interns valued this kind of sharing. One intern stated, “So just hearing like her point of view and her experiences really helped” (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Line 285). However, another intern offered a different perspective on this kind of sharing. She said, “I felt like most of the time she was just telling what she would do in that situation” (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 85-87). To her, this practice of sharing her experiences was not as helpful. In the conversations, Helen used this practice of sharing her advice and experiences with her interns as a strategy for supporting their learning. While some interns found it beneficial, other interns were indifferent to this practice.

**Summary.** According to her interns, Helen engaged in two supervisory tasks—direct assistance and teaching. With regard to direct assistance, Helen observed and conferenced with her interns to support their learning. With regard to teaching, Helen co-taught her interns’ formal coursework with other supervisors and she also co-taught children with her interns. When examining her interns’ descriptions of Helen’s practices, Helen’s supervision was characterized as being connected, caring, supportive, and yet evaluative. Her supervision was connected because interns never felt alone; they knew they had a resource whenever they had questions, troubles, or worries. Helen’s supervision was caring because her interns knew that she deeply cared for them as individuals. She made attempts to get to know her interns and she offered them gestures of kindness and care like inviting them to her house for dinner and leaving little trinkets to celebrate their birthdays. Helen’s supervision was also supportive. In addition to supporting interns’ learning, Helen also supported children and their learning. She routinely worked with students in her interns’ classrooms. Helen also supported the school community by maintaining a presence and attending special functions. Finally, Helen’s supervision was evaluative. She gave her interns ample feedback by recording her observations and holding conversations with her interns. She delivered this feedback by telling her interns her opinions about their performance.
and by sharing her resources and experiences with them. This next section discusses the impact that Helen’s supervision had on them as interns.

**Of Her Impact on Them as Interns**

Helen’s interns described many ways in which Helen’s supervision impacted them. First, they reported that Helen, through her conversations with them and routine reflective questions, taught them how to reflect on their practice. Second, they also described actions, behaviors, and attitudes that suggested that Helen’s supervision created tension between Helen as the supervisor and them as teachers, thus perpetuating the historical tensions between these two groups of educators. This tension included feelings of distress, disempowerment, disconnection, and dependency. However, the notion of reflection seems to be contradictory to the results of perpetuating tension. This section discusses these conflicting reports and the nature of this conflict.

**Developing reflective practitioners.** Some of Helen’s interns stated that Helen taught them about reflection. One intern expressed, “She definitely helped me to reflect on everything I’ve been teaching . . . every time that we would sit and she was there, we would reflect on what I was learning” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 69-70). This intern noted the power of conversation in understanding practice. Another intern commented, “She’s taught me obviously how to reflect and the importance of that” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Line 24). These comments showed how Helen’s supervision impacted some of her interns’ reflective abilities. It is uncertain the extent to which her supervision impacted their stance towards reflection, but the interns associated the reflective questions Helen always gave them—what went well? What surprised you? What would you change?—as their understanding of reflection and the process of reflection.

**Perpetuating historical tensions.** Blumberg (1980) noted the tension that existed between supervisors and teachers when supervision was practiced in a very hierarchical and
evaluative manner. Teachers altered their behavior temporarily to conform to the supervisors’ wishes. These inauthentic representations of their practice did not result in lasting behavior modification because teachers would simply close their doors and revert to their previous behavior in the supervisor’s absence. Teachers felt disempowered and disconnected from their own learning; the responsibility of their learning rested in the hands of the supervisor; teachers did not have ownership over their own learning. Helen’s interns’ descriptions of the impact of her supervision suggested that Helen’s beliefs and practices of supervision as being expert, evaluative, and monitoring continued to perpetuate hierarchical forms of supervision and historical tensions as her interns felt distress, disempowerment, a lack of ownership, and dependency upon her supervision.

**Distress.** Sometimes Helen’s supervision conflicted with mentors’ beliefs and practices. When this occurred, interns became distressed and felt caught between the two individuals whom they perceived to be experts and experienced professionals who controlled their future in terms of evaluation. One intern remarked,

I just wish there had been more communication from the start with the two of them. They could have gotten along better so that wouldn’t have made it more challenging because I feel like we’re all on different pages, but I’m in the middle. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 317-319)

Another intern shared,

I was really upset. I was caught off guard. I think I started crying because it just shocked me and it was something I was torn with because it was something [my mentor] wanted me to do and something Helen didn’t want me to do. So it was like I was being pulled both ways. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 109-111)

When this kind of situation occurred, interns felt trapped and unsure of how to respond; it forced them to take sides—to choose between their mentor and their supervisor. In this kind of scenario, the mentor trumped Helen as supervisor, and interns abided by their mentors’ wishes. One intern confessed,
I did what [my mentor] had told me because she was in the classroom more at the time. So she knew what . . . I mean Helen definitely knew what my class was like, but I mean I’m with [my mentor] every day and that’s something that she wanted to be done, so I did what [my mentor] said. (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 125-128)

Another intern described her decision-making process when in this predicament,

I like to take suggestions from both, but in some cases, I don’t feel as though Helen knows exactly how our class is just because she’s not here every day. So I feel like sometimes when she gives suggestions it’s not really relevant or applicable just because she only sees that one segment a week sort of deal; she doesn’t really know. [My mentor] is here every day so we’re kind of more on the same page...I just feel like [Helen] just doesn’t always know because she doesn’t know the class as well as [my mentor and I] do. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 279-285)

Helen’s practices of supervision also sometimes conflicted with the interns’ perceptions of themselves. When this tension occurred, a similar result was produced. Helen’s interns may have tried her suggestion, but they ultimately reverted to their previous behavior, which they deemed to be more effective than Helen’s suggestions. One intern described her rebellion of Helen’s supervision,

[Helen] gave me an enthusiasm scale, which made me feel like I was boring. And I don’t think I’m boring; that’s my personal opinion. I always felt like I was trying to overcompensate when she would come in and . . . I just felt like she wanted me to be kind of like a clown. And that’s not who I am. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 317-320)

The interns’ descriptions of their decision-making showed that Helen’s supervision was very hierarchical; she was the expert and they were the novices. When her beliefs about practice conflicted with the interns’ and/or mentors’ beliefs, the interns rebelled and either reverted to their previous behavior or they conformed to their mentors’ desires. These kinds of results mirror Blumberg’s findings of teachers putting on a show for their supervisors and then closing their doors and rebelling in terms of their practices. Helen’s supervision produced similar results, but the population was teacher candidates as compared to teachers.

Disempowerment. Sometimes the manner in which she talked with them or gave them feedback made them feel unintelligent. One intern shared,
I don’t think people sometimes realize that their feedback can be really be negative. And I know you know if it went bad, you have to tell the person, but I think it’s good to start with the positive. But I definitely had less since before and it was like I knew she was telling me like the truth and... I was so frustrated by that point I just like started crying. I know she was just being honest with me, but it was just the way it came out... but when you’re at the beginning where you don’t, you know that it’s bad but you don’t know how bad. And then when she told me... I felt devastated. (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Lines 42-48)

Whether it was intended or not, Helen’s interns perceived her supervision to be evaluative and her delivery to be negative and punitive, placing the power as Helen’s and the intern’s as none. Another commented, “The way sometimes she responded to different things. It’s not like she outright said anything that was negative but sometimes you don’t have to say anything for it to be heard” (Intern Interview 06.02.11, Line 478). The result was feelings of incompetence. One intern expressed, “I just felt really dumb a lot. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Line 152).” Interns did not have consensus on this feeling, as one intern expressed, “She never made me feel stupid” (Intern Interview 05.24.11, Line 254). This particular intern was what Helen considered to be a strong intern, so the reason for this disparity is uncertain; however, more than one intern claimed feelings of stupidity and only one expressed the opposite.

Helen’s supervision limited her interns’ voice. One intern shared, “I don’t know just to have a voice. And I think we do. It’s just certain times it could have been better maybe” (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Lines 109-110). Another intern said, “I felt like it was just like my way is wrong and her way was better… She didn’t like flat out say it though. It was just kind of the impression that I received (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 228-30). Helen’s beliefs of supervision and her practices as telling disempowered her interns; it casted her as supervisor in a supervisor role and her interns in a subordinate position; they felt powerless.

**Lack of Ownership.** Helen’s practice of supervisor-centered supervision placed the ownership on her, and the interns felt disconnected from their learning, “I would be like, ‘Well that’s what I think’ and that was just kind of making me feel like I had to do what she wanted...
instead of what I really felt as a teacher” (Intern Interview 05.19.11, Lines 463-465). This feeling of disconnection resulted in indifference about their learning,

She would observe but I wouldn’t get direct feedback. It wouldn’t be immediate. It would kind of be like the next week if we had a chance to talk, she would tell me, like this is what you should do. And I would take suggestions and put them into like place and stuff like that. So therefore I was learning…but I don’t know. (Intern Interview 05.25.11, Lines 68-71)

Indifference was not the only response. Sometimes interns actually felt that her practices were helpful even if they had not had ownership over their learning. If they found Helen’s suggestions to be helpful, then they had stronger feelings about their learning. For instance, one intern shared,

I definitely think the biggest thing that sticks out in my mind is my read-aloud style at the beginning of the year and she had observed me and like written up an observation and told me where things needed to improve. Like I wasn’t as enthusiastic or changing voices for the characters in the book, which is something that I thought I was doing. But then to have an adult hear it and observe it and see it differently, that I think was very helpful because then I became aware of it and worked on improving that. (Intern Interview 05.31.11, Line 76)

Even though interns felt disconnected from their learning, they sometimes found Helen’s supervision helpful.

**Dependency.** Another result of Helen’s supervision was dependency. Since Helen used the practice of telling, she as supervisor was responsible for doing the work of observation and analysis; Helen was the actor and her interns were the listeners primarily. These practices resulted in her interns desiring to be told—to be given feedback—rather than developing the skills to have them construct meaning about their own practice. Interns found these practices to be very helpful because that was the role of supervisor and learner to which they became accustomed. An intern shared, “I was like tell me, tell me. I want to learn. I want to learn. So I was very open to all of that” (Intern Interview 06.06.11, Lines 168-169). Helen’s interns became dependent upon her opinion of their performance. Since it was their responsibility to please their supervisor because Helen situated herself as the authority figure, interns wanted to know her thoughts and opinions,
When she came in here to observe me, she did written observations most of the time. She filmed sometimes but it was mostly written and that really helped me to see like what she was thinking at the moment as things were going on. She would write her comments like right in that document along with what was going on with my lesson. So I liked that a lot. (Intern Interview 05.18.11, Lines 3-6)

Interns became dependent upon her feedback as the accurate assessment of their practice; Helen as supervisor was required to do the thinking and the interns’ responsibility became the mindless recipients charged with implementing her suggestions.

**Summary.** Helen’s interns believed that she was a knowledgeable supervisor who brought to her role a wealth of knowledge and experience as a veteran practitioner. Her interns also felt supported and connected to her. They knew that they could call on her whenever they needed. At the same time, there was a definite difference between Helen and her interns in terms of role and power; Helen was their supervisor and they were her subordinates. They felt that Helen believed she was the expert and that her responsibility was to oversee them, which caused them to have less ownership over their own learning. Sometimes her interns felt that they could not disagree with her – she was supervisor, so their responsibility was to conform to her wishes.

**Chapter Summary**

The purpose of this chapter was to present the story of Helen’s supervision as a novice supervisor. In order to understand her supervision, I decomposed Helen’s identity as a supervisor into her knowledge, beliefs, and practices and understood it from three perspectives—Helen’s perspective as a supervisor, her interns’ perspectives, and her mentor’s perspectives. These realities of supervision offered a more comprehensive understanding of Helen’s supervision, as it was not understood from only one reality but rather from the multiple realities that experienced it and interacted with it. In the next chapter, I reconstruct these multiple realities to create an image
of novice supervision, discuss the results of this case, offer implications of this research, and suggest future studies to continue this exploration.
CHAPTER 5
CREATING AN IMAGE OF NOVICE SUPERVISION:
THE RE-CONSTRUCTION OF MULTIPLE REALITIES

“Were we to agree completely on what we see, we would presume that we are seeing correctly – and often we are not.”
(Stake, 2006, p. 87)

The purpose of this case was to understand Helen’s supervision as a novice supervisor in a PDS context from multiple perspectives—her reality, her mentors’ reality, and her interns’ reality; I sought to understand how a novice school-based educator supervised in a PDS context. In order to understand her supervision, her identity as a supervisor was deconstructed into four parts based on the initial conceptual model in Chapter 1—her knowledge, her beliefs, her practices, and her impact, and then understood through a trifocal lens—her perspective, her mentors’ perspective, and her interns’ perspective. This deconstruction was aimed at answering the ancillary questions regarding her perceptions and others’ perceptions of her supervision. This deconstruction afforded an opportunity to examine the individual parts that comprised her supervision as a construct, which was the main purpose of this study. The intent of this section is to create an image of novice supervision by reconstructing the multiple realities of her supervision and applying it to the conceptual framework in Chapter 1.

Using a Modified Johari Window

In order to make sense of the multiple realities of Helen’s supervision, I used an adaptation of the Johari Window. The Johari Window was created by Joseph Luft and Harry Ingram in 1955 as a framework for understanding multiple perspectives and dynamics in a group
(Luft, 1984). Figure 5-1 is an illustration of the Johari Window. In this framework, there are four quadrants—the open area, the blind area, the hidden area, and the unknown area. The information in the open area is known to everyone in the group or community—the individual and the other members of the group. In the blind area, only the group members know the information; the other information is unknown to the individual and only learned by obtaining feedback. The hidden area includes information that only the individual knows and keeps secret from the group members. That information is only learned through disclosure.
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Figure 5-1: Joseph Luft and Harry Ingram’s Johari Window of Understanding Group Dynamics

The fourth quadrant includes information that is unknown to everyone. These four quadrants help to consider the multiple perspectives or realities that inform group dynamics or, in this case, an understanding of novice supervision in the PDS context.

The intention of the Johari Window was to offer a model for understanding interpersonal relationships and self-awareness. It explains the awareness an individual has about herself, how others might see her, and how information is shared and disclosed. Since the intention of this case was to understand novice supervision through multiple realities, it seemed to be an appropriate
model. Helen’s supervision was not isolated; she performed it with and in the presence of others. In order to understand her supervision, it was essential to understand the multiple realities of her supervision as displayed by her behavior. However, this figure alone is inadequate for understanding the multiple realities at play in this case. There is another perspective at work that requires a slight adjustment to this framework, and that perspective is mine as the researcher. By talking with the various participants and experiencing Helen’s supervision as a participant observer, I add an additional perspective because their multiple realities are interpreted through my lens—a fourth reality. In order to incorporate this fourth perspective, I adapted the Johari Window. Figure 5-2 depicts the addition of this reality and the lens through which Helen’s story is told.
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Figure 5-2: Adapting the Johari Window to Include the Researcher’s Lens

In this adapted framework, the open area is dissected into two. The white triangle includes the information that Helen, her mentors, and her interns know, but is unknown to me as
the researcher. This could include information that they shared with each other, but that they did not reveal to me through our conversations or experiences. The gray triangle in the open area reveals the information that all of us know because it has been revealed to all of us. In the Johari Window, all boxes are not necessarily equal in size and are in constant motion, shifting to accommodate for information that continues to be shared, learned, and concealed as the dynamics of the group, or community in this case, shift. I believe that in this open area, the gray triangle would be much larger than the white because of the intimate stories and details that participants shared with me. However, to not include the white triangle would be naïve and inaccurate to believe that I, as researcher, was privy to all information.

In the blind area, the gray triangle is indicative of what others know and I know because they disclosed it to me but that is unknown to Helen because they revealed that information to me only and not to her. The white triangle includes the information that the participants have still kept secret, revealing neither to Helen nor to me as the researcher. Again, to not be aware that the participants would have concealed information from me as the researcher would be naïve. However, from the intimate stories that most individuals provided, I feel that the gray triangle here is relatively large as well.

In the hidden quadrant, the gray triangle reveals what Helen knows and I know, because she revealed this information to me as the researcher, but is hidden from the other group members because she did not disclose this information to them. The white triangle indicates the information that only Helen knows and that she had not disclosed to the other participants or me as the researcher. By spending a year with Helen and interviewing her weekly, I feel that I know her and her supervision well; I was able to read her body language in interviews and recognize when to probe further. Even though in many instances I probed deeper, there could still have been information that she chose to keep to herself; however, from the information I
gathered, I feel that information as represented by the white triangle is smaller than that which she revealed to me in the gray triangle.

In the unknown quadrant, the gray triangle represents the information that only I know and Helen and the others do not know, and it would include information that I know in understanding her supervision from both interpreting her supervision through all of my experiences with her and others and from my experiences and knowledge about supervision that everyone else does not know. Finally, the white triangle would include information that none of us know and have yet to be learned.

The Johari Window provides a structure for understanding the different perspectives of her supervision. In this next section, I use these quadrants to describe what was known to all of us (the open area), what was unknown to Helen (the blind area), what was unknown to her mentors and interns (the hidden area), and what was known only to me (the unknown area). This section includes only information in the gray triangles of each quadrant in the Johari Window because the gray represents my researcher’s lens and the fourth perspective or the reality of interpretation used to understand Helen’s supervision.

**The Open Area**

Helen seemed to be a relatively open person, sharing much of her knowledge, feelings, and beliefs with her mentors, her interns, and me. Many of the themes overlapped from all perspectives, which indicated that Helen’s espoused platforms were mostly aligned with her practices; she was not hiding much information from anyone.

Everyone knew that Helen was an experienced practitioner from the school district in which she was supervising. They recognized that she brought an extensive amount of knowledge as a practitioner and about the school district. This meant that Helen could support her interns’ and mentors’ pedagogies because she knew the curriculum, the learners, and the pedagogy to
teach these learners; Helen held valuable and extensive pedagogical content knowledge. Helen also had previously been a mentor, so everyone knew that she held some knowledge about mentoring—or essentially knowledge about teacher education. At the same time, everyone also knew that Helen was a novice, which meant that she had some but limited knowledge about supervision and being a supervisor. Since she had few formal courses in supervision, her knowledge was limited to her experiences.

Having this extensive practitioner and contextually-specific knowledge contributed to Helen’s beliefs about being a supervisor. Her extensive knowledge contributed to her view of herself and others’ view of hers as an expert teacher, and everyone recognized that Helen liked to share that knowledge of her experiences as an expert teacher with others. As an expert, Helen should have held expert power. According to Nolan & Levin (2010), individuals have expert power when others respond to them because they see that person as an expert. Since everyone recognized that Helen was an expert teacher, it would seem reasonable to expect that she held expert power, but that was not always the case. In many situations, Helen did hold expert power with her interns; they would listen to her ideas and strategies because she was a veteran teacher. They assumed that if it worked for her in all of her years of experience, then it should work for them. However, Helen did not hold this power if her suggestions conflicted with the intern’s mentors’ beliefs and practices. Interns also saw their mentors as expert teachers, and because the interns had the luxury of seeing strategies employed in classrooms with children, they were more likely to believe those strategies of their mentors than Helen despite the fact that she was giving suggestions from her experience. Helen’s experience was removed from their realities of the interns’ specific classrooms. When Helen’s strategies as an expert practitioner were not aligning with their mentor’s strategies, the mentor as expert negated Helen’s expert power. While this positioning of the mentor was never overtly articulated to the other participants, it was articulated to me as the researcher. This understanding sits in the open area because it is a practice that
everyone understands but does not reveal to each other; it is a subversive tension that exists in the open because it is known to all but it is rarely discussed.

Another belief that everyone knew and understood was the notion that a supervisor in this context was responsible for and gave priority to the intern because the intern was the domain of supervision. Everyone saw Helen’s role and responsibility as being to the intern. They expected her to be responsible for the intern first and Helen reciprocated this belief by prioritizing her support for and guidance of the intern.

This belief of the intern as domain contributed to a vision of Helen’s roles and responsibilities as a supervisor. This meant that when Helen performed tasks, only those tasks that were directly related to the intern were seen as supervision. They all agreed that the tasks that she performed primarily with interns, which fell into the categories of direct assistance and teaching, were what made her a supervisor; the other tasks were just responsibilities, but they were not supervision.

Finally, everyone could agree on a few characteristics of Helen’s supervision; they all recognized that Helen was caring, connected, supportive, but yet evaluative. Everyone knew that Helen cared deeply about her work as a supervisor and that she was passionate about teaching and about developing teacher candidates. They also knew that Helen was a pillar of support; her mentors and interns had someone to whom they could turn whenever they needed her. Even though Helen was incredibly supportive, giving extensive time and effort to her mentors and interns, she was generally evaluative in her supervisory approach. Since the intern was the domain of her supervision, she was charged with helping them become the best teachers they could be. This meant that she practiced her supervision from an evaluative lens, placing judgment on her interns’ practices and trying to support their growth and development by sharing her experiences. She saw and practiced supervision as teaching-through-telling rather than supervision-as-inquiry. As a novice, her means of enacting her pedagogy of supervision consisted
of a more didactic approach rather than facilitating or problematizing through an inquiry approach.

The Blind Area

The blind area is the information that Helen’s mentors, interns, and I know but that she does not know. Even though Helen was open with the rest of us, her mentors and interns were not as open with her, keeping some information from her. Further complicating this blind area, her mentors and interns concealed information from each other. Since these two groups of individuals concealed information from each other but shared it with me, there is an additional layer of complexity to this quadrant. There is information that her mentors and I know; there is information that her interns and I know; there is information that her mentors and interns know that I do not know because they shared it with each other and not with me; and there is information that all of us know. However, I am only able to comment on that information that has been revealed to me, which includes the information that her mentors, interns, and I know and the information that each group knows separately because they have shared it with me but not with each other.

Information concealed from Helen primarily consists of the impact her supervision has had on them. With regard to her mentors, they rarely if ever revealed to Helen the impact that she was having on them as mentors. Her mentors disclosed to me that Helen impacted their pedagogy and their pedagogy of teacher education by watching Helen work successfully with their interns and their students. Not only did Helen not know that she had this impact on them, but she also did not know how this impact was achieved; she did not know that the intern was the vehicle through which changes in pedagogy and teacher education pedagogy were happening. The implications for this concealment meant that Helen would continue to see her role as working only with the interns, and she could withdraw from her mentors by disconnecting herself and her supervision
from them. If the domain of supervision resides only with the intern, then a great disconnect can occur between the mentor and the supervisor, which ultimately perpetuates the status quo. It would suggest that supervision has a limiting impact if it is only aimed at impacting the teacher candidate. However, by cultivating relationships with her mentors, Helen was having an unrecognized impact on her mentors. Knowledge of this dimension of her supervision would make it possible to work more purposefully in cultivating more robust relationships with her mentors by including them in more experiences. Expansion of her domain of supervision to include mentors would work towards the more complex goals of supervision in a PDS context. However, mentors do not volunteer to have a PDA supervise them. Rather, they may ask for a PDA to support them in many ways in their classroom, but PDAs work with mentors indirectly when they work with the interns. PDAs can choose the extent to which they involve mentors in the process of supervision when working with their intern. For example, when Helen was performing the task of direct assistance, she primarily recorded her feedback and observations and then discussed these observations with the intern only; the mentor was usually teaching and not a participant in the conversation. A way for expanding the domain of her supervision to include mentors would be for Helen to invite them more as partners in the process. For instance, she could have scheduled discussion times when the mentor was also available so that everyone could be a participant in the conversations. This example would constitute an example of expanding the scope of supervision to include mentors more purposefully.

Her interns also concealed the impact of her supervision. They did not reveal to her the negative impact that she was having on them. Helen believed in her heart that her strategies, or essentially her pedagogies of supervision, were having a positive impact on her interns. She had no idea that how she situated herself as superior and how she employed supervision-as-telling and supervision-as-evaluating would cause her interns to be distressed, disempowered, and disconnected from their own supervision. The implications for practicing supervision in this
condescending manner begin the disempowerment of teachers at the teacher candidate level; they begin their teaching careers becoming accustomed to having others examine their practice and tell them how to improve rather than constructing their own knowledge and understanding of pedagogy. This perpetuates the traditional indoctrination of bureaucracy of schooling by beginning it at the teacher preparation level. Teacher candidates become accustomed to being told what to do; they learn to follow rules and listen to others’ perceptions and evaluations of their teaching rather than having them be reflective and construct their own meaning and understanding of their teaching and its impact on students.

Without Helen’s consent to participate in this study, the impact on interns may have gone unrecognized, and the consequence of not knowing about these effects is even greater. By being courageous and making her supervision public, we are privy to a better understanding of this kind of supervision and its impact on teacher candidates, and we can use this information to support novice supervisor learning. Teachers are encouraged to make their practices public; the same should be true for supervisors. Making practice public encourages reflection and dialogue about practice, and it is a mechanism of supporting professional learning and improvement.

The Hidden Area

Helen revealed a great deal to her mentors, her interns, and me. In fact, in January, Helen wondered who would be listening to the audiotapes because she had been so candid with me. After describing the procedures of the study again, she agreed to continue, but it was after that point that I was able to notice some additional nonverbal communication that would indicate when she was keeping certain information concealed from me. However, using probing techniques and contextual cues, I was able to get a sense of her experiences and understandings during those particular interviews. For these reasons, I feel that having the white triangle in each
of the quadrants is important; these spaces acknowledge that as the researcher I know much information, but I do not know all of the information.

Helen kept some information from her mentors that she shared with her interns, and she kept some information from her interns that she shared with her mentors. For example, when Helen did not agree with a mentor’s practice, she did not disclose that opinion to the mentor. Instead, she talked with the intern—sometimes more candidly than others depending on her relationship with her intern—about the mentor’s strategies and techniques. This decision resulted in the intern feeling caught in the middle between the individual with whom she worked every day (her mentor) and the individual who, in the intern’s eyes, ultimately gave her the grade (her supervisor—Helen). The implications for a supervisor sharing her assessment of a mentor’s practices with the intern, especially when the practices are viewed unfavorably, create tension and unravel relationships rather than build them. It creates an us-them or an adversarial mentality, causing the intern to take sides choosing between the two individuals who hold power over them. However, Helen did not feel that these practices created this kind of feeling in her interns; instead, she believed that the tension that she sometimes felt from her interns or her mentors was from the nature of her role as supervisor. However, the nature of the role of supervisor is determined by others’ perceptions of a supervisor and the actions and behaviors of the supervisor that can either confirm those perceptions or dispel them.

Information that Helen shared with her mentors but not with her interns was usually regarding the intern’s performance especially when the intern was struggling. For example, Helen spent many conversations after school and in the evening with a mentor whose intern was eventually removed from the program, and from Helen’s perspective, the intern had no knowledge that the mentor and she were discussing her performance. Helen had concealed information about the intern’s performance from the intern. While Helen and her mentor eventually talked with the intern several times about her performance in informal and formal
settings, it is possible that not all of the information about the intern’s performance was shared. Sometimes when an intern is struggling, telling the intern all of the areas of concern can be overwhelming and the intern can crumble; instead, supervisors must select the areas of concern that are of utmost importance so that the intern can focus and not become overwhelmed.

Helen’s mentors and her interns only had some sense of her roles and responsibilities. Helen kept much of that information hidden from them. When they were asked about Helen’s role as a supervisor, most felt unsure that they could completely describe it. Both interns and mentors were able to describe tasks that related directly to them; however, mentors described tasks that Helen performed with their interns as well whereas Helen’s interns did not describe tasks that were related to their mentors. The uncertainty of the role of supervisor in this context indicated that supervision is highly invisible. Interns’ and mentors’ perspective tended to be “from the ground” whereas once Helen became a supervisor, she had a broader perspective of the role and responsibilities of someone outside of the classroom. For example, she noted that she had a better sense of her principal’s role now that she was a PDA. This example indicated a shift in perspective; Helen changed from being on the ground to having a “bird’s eye view.” However, what was unknown to Helen was that there was a perspective that was at a different elevation than hers because supervision that she was experiencing was also highly invisible. This invisibility makes learning about supervision difficult, and it means that novice supervisors need to learn through their experiences while simultaneously being mentored by conceptual and procedural mentors. Supporting novice supervisor learning requires collaborative structures created through the tasks of supervision—direct assistance, community development, learning structures, curriculum development, action research, and teaching—being while the novice supervisor experiences supervision being done to them. Essentially, supporting novice supervision should include situating the novice supervisor in a community practice where they experience more complex forms of supervision.
The Unknown Area

This quadrant includes the information that I know as the researcher but Helen, her mentors, and her interns do not know. Helen, her mentors, and her interns have a narrow scope of supervision. Their knowledge about supervision is limited, which is to be expected because Helen is a novice supervisor and Helen’s mentors and interns have not participated in the role of supervisor. Their only exposure to supervision is through their experiences as recipients of the supervision that has been done to them.

Supervision, like teaching, has some elusiveness. For instance, to the outside observer and the novice, masterful teaching looks easy, thereby masking the complexity of the nature of teaching. Novice teachers struggle with understanding teaching and its complexity until they are given the opportunities to teach; it is this experience with teaching that makes the complexity transparent. Supervision is equally complex, but to the novice or the outsider, this quality is masked and it only becomes apparent when novice supervisors are afforded opportunities to experience and practice supervision. This means that in order to support the professional learning of supervisors, we must place them in powerful, role-taking positions that allow them to experience supervision while simultaneously being mentored in a community of practice where a novice supervisor can be apprenticed to many individuals as she learns to become a supervisor and develop and refine her supervision. If novices are left to practice supervision in isolation, then we are destined to perpetuate the status quo.

Another notion that was unknown to everyone was that of comfort and discomfort and their roles in learning. Meaning, Helen was uncomfortable with discomfort; in this way, she exhibited many of the characteristics of the archetype of Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) that I named Ms. Congeniality—she wanted everyone to be happy, and she hoped that her interns would respond to her because they liked her as a person. Levin & Nolan (2010) refer to this power base as referent power. To Helen, happiness occurred through making herself and others
comfortable. When discomfort was present, she worked to create harmony again. Displaying these behaviors is not necessarily negative; in fact, relationships are the heart of partnership work. However, the culture of schools lends itself towards congeniality and deliberate avoidance of conflict. The culture of the university is quite the opposite where the goal is to disrupt harmony and to challenge the status quo. In the culture of schools, dissenting dialogue could be seen as a personal attack, so conflict and discomfort are often avoided because there is a lack of understanding of the purpose and intent of discomfort. Some of the most powerful learning experiences occur when discomfort is present. In fact, the literature around transformational learning theory suggests that transformation cannot occur without cognitive dissonance or essentially intellectual discomfort (Mezirow & Associates, 2000). This would indicate that the idea, purpose, and role of discomfort needs to be discussed, which could actually be uncomfortable given the different orientations in the cultures of schools and universities, yet it needs to be addressed. Otherwise, we continue to perpetuate the status quo.

In addition to Ms. Congeniality, Helen also exhibited characteristics of Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) archetype that I named The Monitor. This archetype has a definite division between the supervisor and the supervised, and the roles are very hierarchical—the supervisor is superior and the other is subordinate. Helen positioned herself in this position of authority and her interns were the subordinates. They recognized and felt the difference in power between them. Helen also saw her role as overseeing the interns’ responsibilities; she ensured that they were being professionally responsible and monitored their behaviors ensuring that they met deadlines punctually. Helen was very serious and committed to her role as supervisor, and she behaved in ways that she believed a supervisor should behave.

Her alignment with The Monitor is again not unexpected to some degree. Helen’s knowledge was limited with regard to supervision, so she supervised in ways that she had experienced supervision as a teacher and in ways that she believed the idea of a “supervisor”
should behave. The “Helen of today” is not the same Helen that was; she is already different and she is changing some of her knowledge, beliefs, and practices. These changes indicate that her participation in a community of practice provided by the complex, collaborative structures of the PDS community are impacting deeply seeded beliefs of a veteran teacher. It is important to understand these structures and their impact because in order to support novice supervisor learning, we cannot place individuals in role-taking experiences without multiple apprenticeships in a community of practice; the presence of this community cannot be understated.

**Summary**

In order to understand novice supervision, I deconstructed supervision into three multiple realities that I described in great detail in Chapter 4. The purpose of Chapter 5 was to reconstruct these realities in order to make sense of the novice supervision, and to do so requires an understanding of the lens through which this research was conducted, analyzed, and presented. I just used the Johari Window as a beginning model for understanding the role of perspective of individuals in a group setting, and I modified it to demonstrate how my role as the researcher created a fourth lens or reality of this research. Understanding this modified Johari Window framework is important because it demonstrates the reality of interpretation used for understanding Helen’s supervision. In order to create an image of Helen’s supervision as a novice supervisor, I compared Helen’s perspective, her mentors’ perspectives, and her interns’ perspectives, interpreted these multiple realities through my reality as the researcher as indicated in gray in Figure 5-2, and then applied that information to the conceptual framework in Chapter 1, which is the purpose of this next section.
When this study was conducted, no conceptual framework existed for studying supervision in a PDS context, nor were there models for examining supervision in teacher education. Therefore, I drew upon current models used to understand supervision in school contexts to create a beginning model for describing supervision in a PDS context. Leadership that exists in the space between schools and universities not only includes school leadership, but it embraces a vision that is much broader and encompassing than the original conception of supervision. In this section, I describe the evolution of a conceptual framework for understanding supervision in PDS contexts as complex leadership. As I explain the framework, I draw upon the information learned from this case study to construct this model. While this framework was created for understanding supervision in PDS contexts, it is possible that it could as be applicable for other contexts of supervision—in schools, in teacher education, and in the space-in-between, known as partnership work.

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) created a framework for understanding supervision in school settings. Figure 5-3 shows their initial framework that I first described in chapter one.
In Chapter 1, I also argued that this framework needed some modification in order to more accurately describe the supervision that occurred in PDS contexts. Figure 5-4 (next page) shows my modifications to the Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) framework.
Based upon my definitions for supervision and learning communities along with some initial theorizing, I made changes to the Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) framework to include the bolded and capitalized areas seen in Figure 5-4, and I described each of these changes more thoroughly in Chapter 1.

In addition to Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001), I also used the work of Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) to create the initial model seen in Figure 5-4. Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) created four images of supervision in school contexts. Their intent was show four extreme orientations that supervisors display towards their work. I ultimately named those archetypes The Monitor, Ms. Congeniality, The Critical Friend, and The Organic Member, which is a term first used by Garman (1982) to describe a collegial frame of mind that supervisors bring to their work, because I felt these names reflected the imagery that Sergiovanni & Starratt were trying to convey with their Supervisor A, B, C, and D. Using a combination of Sergiovanni &
Starratt’s (2007) sources of authority and Levin & Nolan’s (2010) power bases, I also described the nature of power and authority that exists in each of these images. Originally, I felt that this work was missing from the Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) framework, so I added a beliefs category to the framework and incorporated Sergiovanni & Starratt’s images there believing that this category, “beliefs,” encompassed the intentions of Sergiovanni & Starratt. However, after examining the data in this study and rethinking their work, I realized that my initial conceptual framework was an insufficient model. Therefore, I needed to create a model that better reflected and conceptualized supervision in this context.

Figure 5-5 offers a more robust and comprehensive conceptual framework for understanding supervision in a PDS context that more appropriately represents the complex and visionary leadership occurring in this space. It shows that leadership in PDS contexts extends beyond the pervasive stereotypes of supervision-as-leadership being only in schools and supervision-as-technical-helping being primarily in teacher education.
In this next section, I dissect this framework, which was created based upon the data that I found through exploring novice supervision in this context and some additional theorizing to explain not only what was happening but what could happen as leadership in this context.

The Model: A Methodological Finding or a Tool for Analysis?

An interesting question was posed to me: was the conceptual model of supervision in a PDS context a finding of my research or a tool for analysis? My response is that it is both. When I began this research, no models for understanding supervision in a PDS context were present, so I
used models for understanding supervision in schools as a beginning conceptual framework. Initially, even these models (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007) seemed inadequate for understanding supervision in the PDS context, so I made some initial adjustments.

When coding the data, I used a combination of descriptive open coding and structural coding based on the initial frameworks. Some of the descriptive open codes fit into some of the initial structural codes and others offered insight that the initial conceptual frameworks were not an exact fit for what was occurring in the PDS context. As I analyzed the data, I used multiple rounds of coding, and that was in direct response to the evolution of the framework. As codes informed the model, I made adjustments to the model; then the model would inform the codes that I used in the next round. In this way, the model was a tool for analysis. I used the model as a guide for creating structural codes for analyzing the data and then I would use the data to make adjustments to the model. This cycle of coding, adjusting, and recoding demonstrate that the final model created is a finding that was derived from understanding the depth and detail of this single case. Yin (2003) argues that individual cases can be generalized theoretically, and this case and the model that it yielded is an example of this kind of theoretical generalization. The data from the case was used to generate theory about supervision in this context since no previous model existed for understanding supervision in the PDS context. Ultimately, the final model was used to conceptualize supervision in the PDS context. It exists now as a tool for understanding different kinds of supervisors and different kinds of supervision in this context. For these reasons, the model was both a tool for analysis and a finding; it became a theoretical model for understanding supervision in the PDS context.
Understanding the Conceptual Framework

Understanding this conceptual framework requires attention to each individual component and an explanation of how the case of Helen, as an example, is situated on this framework. However, it is possible that this framework could be used to position other orientations than that which Helen portrays.

Personal Characteristics

Supervisors bring to their work knowledge, skills, and personal theories. While previously conceived as prerequisites for supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001), I felt that supervisors brought additional characteristics to their supervision than just knowledge and skills. The literature has documented that supervisors bring beliefs to their work as evidenced by the examples of espoused platform conferences that existed for understanding supervisors’ beliefs in schools settings (Badiali, 2006; Nolan & Hoover, 2005; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001). Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007), though, claimed that supervisors brought to their supervision more than beliefs; they felt that supervisors brought personal theories, which included values, attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs. Rather than use prerequisites, I felt that the addition of personal theories to this category showed that the knowledge, skills, and personal theories were all personal characteristics that supervisors held that ultimately impacted the manner in which they practiced supervision.

Knowledge. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) claimed that supervisors need to have knowledge about schools, school systems, teachers, teacher development, students and student development. They also need to have knowledge about how to perform the function of supervision, but these authors did not articulate how these knowledge bases were used or the depth of the knowledge. The case of Helen depicts in greater detail an example of the knowledge
base of novice supervisors and the complexity of knowledge required to enact supervision at deeper and more complex levels. However, additional examples of what constitutes pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge of each knowledge base still needs to be explored as does understanding tacit knowledge with regard to each of these knowledge bases.

**The knowledge base of novice supervisors.** Helen brought extensive practitioner knowledge, some knowledge about teacher education, and very limited knowledge about supervision to her role as a supervisor. Figure 5-6 shows the dimensions of her knowledge.
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Figure 5-6: The Dimensions of Helen’s Knowledge as a Novice Supervisor

Examination of Helen’s supervision revealed that as a former teacher and a reassigned teacher she held extensive practitioner knowledge. Everyone—Helen, her mentors, and her interns—valued and appreciated this knowledge. Supervisors should have practitioner knowledge,
and Helen, being an effective and respected veteran teacher, brought that knowledge to her supervision.

Since Helen was a novice supervisor, the possibility existed that other depictions of knowledge were possible. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) did not use the terms practitioner knowledge, knowledge of teacher education, or knowledge of supervision, but they alluded to them. Therefore, in order to understand supervision in this context, the knowledge base of supervisors needed to be conceptualized. Figure 5-7 depicts these dimensions of the knowledge bases of supervisors in a PDS context.
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Figure 5-7: Conceptualizing Knowledge Bases of Supervisors in a PDS Context

Practitioner knowledge, knowledge about teacher education, and knowledge about supervision are not separate but rather inclusive of the other kinds as they expand outward. Practitioner knowledge involves knowledge about curriculum, content, pedagogy, and children as learners. Essentially, teachers must have what Shulman (1986) called pedagogical content knowledge; they must know what to teach (content knowledge), how to teach (pedagogical knowledge), and how to teach what to teach (pedagogical content knowledge).
Knowledge about teacher education includes practitioner knowledge but it expands upon it to include knowledge about curriculum, content, and pedagogy as it relates to teacher education. It also involves knowledge about adults as learners. Loughran (2006) argued that teacher education has a specific knowledge base and skill set; he termed these ideas a pedagogy of teacher education. Really, Loughran was alluding to the idea of pedagogical content knowledge existing for teacher educators. Essentially teacher educators, especially supervisors as teacher educators and teacher educators as supervisors, must know what to teach (the content knowledge of teacher education), how to teach teachers and teacher candidates (the pedagogical knowledge of teacher education), and how to teach what to teach to teachers (the pedagogical content knowledge of teacher education).

A third layer is knowledge about supervision. Knowledge about supervision encompasses teacher educator knowledge and practitioner knowledge, but it also includes content and pedagogy as it relates to supervision—essentially the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the function of supervision as inquiry. Knowledge about supervision also involves knowledge about learning communities, and their participants as learners. Essentially, supervisors must know what to teach (the content of supervision), how to teach supervisors and facilitate learning of individuals and groups in communities of practice (the pedagogical knowledge of supervision), and how to teach what to teach to other supervisors, other individuals, and groups (the pedagogical content knowledge of supervision).

Table 5-1 compares these knowledge bases. It shows the content, pedagogy, and learners within each of the knowledge bases. Ultimately, this table shows how each knowledge base includes the former and expands to encompass a more content, more pedagogy, and more learners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practitioner Knowledge</th>
<th>Knowledge about: Teacher Education</th>
<th>Knowledge about: Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Subject Matter Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Subject Matter Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Subject Matter Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Content Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Knowledge: How to teach</td>
<td>Pedagogical Knowledge: How to teach</td>
<td>Pedagogical Knowledge: How to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Knowledge: How to teach teachers</td>
<td>Pedagogical Knowledge: How to teach teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Constituents: Children as Learners</td>
<td>Indirect Constituents: Children as Learners</td>
<td>Indirect Constituents: Children as Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Constituents: Adults: Teachers &amp; Teacher Candidates as Learners</td>
<td>Indirect Constituents: Adults: Teachers &amp; Teacher Candidates as Learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpersonal Skills.** Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) stated that supervisors must have knowledge about how to foster relationships with, between, and among teachers. They felt that skills should be with both individuals and groups of individuals. However, if supervision in a PDS context is aimed at impacting individuals, groups of individuals, and learning communities, then an additional layer of skills exists beyond individuals and groups. Supervisors...
must also know how to become members of various communities of practice and build relationships between and among other communities. This skill set is more complex and requires a greater understanding of these processes.

Helen also brought interpersonal skills from being a teacher and a mentor teacher of interns. As a teacher, she built relationships with other teachers, primarily in her division and school, but not exclusively in these contexts. As a mentor teacher she built relationships with interns, other mentor teachers, and some university faculty supervisors. As a supervisor, those individual relationships expanded to include more relationships across buildings and institutions.

Helen built relationships by getting to know her interns personally and professionally. She invited them to dinner and gave them small gifts on special occasions to let them know that she cared about them. Helen’s relationships with her interns and mentors were not uniform. Some of her relationships were very strong and others were tarnished. Helen saw her supervision as giving feedback through critique and others felt that these practices were much more evaluative and judgmental than she perceived. As a novice supervisor, Helen was developing her skills to handle the multiple layers, kinds, and complexities of building relationships in a partnership context, and she learned those skills through being a member of a community of practice in the PDS culture. Helen had procedural mentors who supported her understanding and learning of how to foster relationships in this context.

**Technical Skills.** Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) identified technical skills as those skills needed to observe, plan, assess, and evaluate instructional performance of teachers. Helen’s technical skills consisted initially of those she learned primarily through the experience of being supervised and being a mentor teacher. As a veteran teacher, she had been observed, evaluated, and critiqued for almost thirty years. Therefore, as a novice supervisor, her observations included the written accounts of what happened in the classroom as it related to a teacher candidate’s performance, questions that she wanted the intern to consider usually
regarding a practice that was questionable, and her commentary—positive remarks on aspects she thought went well in the lesson. Her technical skills were focused on individuals and those individuals were mainly interns. As a novice supervisor, Helen was developing her technical skills to better support individuals and this learning was done through the collaborative structures in the PDS culture. Helen had procedural mentors who helped to support her learning of technical skills. However, if supervision is complex leadership aimed at impacting more than individuals, then supervisors must also have technical skills to observe, plan, evaluate, and assess at more systemic levels. For that reason, the conceptual framework depicts depth in technical skills.

**Personal theories.** This category was not originally included in the Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) framework. However, Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) claimed that supervisors bring personal theories to their work, and these personal theories include values, attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions. When I began examining novice supervision in a PDS context, I focused on beliefs; it was not until later that I determined there was more than beliefs happening that required the change from beliefs as a personal characteristic to labeling them personal theories. For this reason, I focus Helen’s supervision primarily on her beliefs, but I recognize that she also brought values, attitudes, and assumptions to her work.

Helen beliefs were espoused and others were more tacit only becoming apparent through her practices. Helen’s personal theories have hues of the beliefs systems implied in two of Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) images of supervision—what I have named The Monitor and Ms. Congeniality. In Helen’s case, a supervisor was someone of authority who was charged with evaluating and overseeing the performance and behaviors of her subordinates. At the same time, Helen was concerned with maintaining peace in her relationships with others and the relationships between others. Although she desired to be collaborative in her supervision, her beliefs implied that she was hierarchical in her understanding and execution of supervision. However, the data showed that her personal theories were shifting due mainly to the conceptual
mentors with whom she interacted in the PDS context. Helen held initial personal theories, some of which remained at the initial phase, some that transitioned, and some that were truly transformed. For that reason, the personal theories category includes three levels to reflect the depth of change that could occur in this context.

**Function: Supervision as Inquiry**

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) argued that the function of supervision was developmental. Meaning, supervisors perform supervision by understanding and addressing the readiness of teachers. In my initial model, I felt that, because readiness was a component of understanding professional development (Thompson, 1997), the function of supervision should be as professional development; professional development would include addressing developmental needs. However, after conducting the study, I realized that the function of supervision was as inquiry. Meaning, supervisors perform or should perform supervision through an inquiry stance—by asking questions and systematically studying their own practice and the practice of others collaboratively.

Although the Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) model uses a triangle to show the function of supervision as developmental, it is possible that the shape is more prismatic in shape. A prism would indicate that the supervisor’s personal characteristics are the light that enters the prism and then gets refracted into the personal-theories-in-action as the supervisor performs the various tasks of supervision. In a prism, the different wavelengths of light are invisible until they enter the prism and then are refracted into the colors of the spectrum. A parallel can be drawn to the supervision model. A supervisor’s personal characteristics are like white light—the colors are masked until they enter the prism of supervision and become refracted into personal-theories-in-action that influence the manner in which the function of supervision and the tasks get performed. Moreover, in a prism, the angle of incidence determines the nature of
the refraction of the light, and depending on that angle some or all of the light can be refracted. If a parallel is drawn to this model, the angle of incidence could be the varying degrees or depth of the supervisor’s personal characteristics. Meaning, a supervisor who displays more surface level understanding of knowledge, skills, and personal theories would have a different “angle of incidence” than a supervisor with more complex personal characteristics. This angle would determine the extent to which the supervisor performs the function of supervision. For example, when mapped on the conceptual framework, Helen held extensive knowledge about pedagogy, some knowledge about teacher education pedagogy, and limited knowledge about supervision. Her skills were strong with working with individuals and she had some skills working with groups. Her personal theories were also primarily in the initial level, with some at transitional, and a few at transformational. This positioning would indicate that she would have a different angle of incidence towards her supervision than another individual who held more knowledge about supervision and teacher education pedagogy, who had greater skills working with individuals, groups, and communities, and who had personal theories that were primarily transformational. Therefore, the function of supervision was closer to supervision-as-telling and supervision-as-evaluative than it was to the ideal of supervision-as-inquiry.

Helen had some tendencies towards inquiry, but they were very informal and she was unaware of her approach. She would reflect onto her own supervision by asking how she was doing and examining various situations as they occurred, but she rarely systematically studied her own practices and she often rationalized her decisions rather than critically examining them or offering alternative explanations. The model is three-dimensional because I think there is a meta-cognitive aspect that demonstrates greater depth. Supervisors may perform supervision as inquiry and be unaware of and unintentional in their actions, whereas supervisors may also have a greater awareness of approaching their supervision from an inquiry stance and helping to foster this disposition in others.
Personal Theories-in-Action

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) used arrows to indicate how supervisors were performing their supervision, but they did not explain their use of arrows. Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) claimed that individual’s personal theories are espoused and they are felt by others as they experience their personal theories. Sergiovanni & Starratt called these platforms-in-action. In my initial model, I labeled the arrows as beliefs-in-action to represent the intentions of both Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon and Sergiovanni & Starratt. After I realized that personal theories were a more appropriate label, it seemed equally appropriate to rename this category personal theories-in-action so show that supervisors enact their supervision through their espoused and unconscious personal theories. For example, Helen’s personal theories-in-action were mostly aligned with her espoused platform, but on occasion they differed. These misalignments created tension and resulted in disorienting dilemmas for Helen as she encountered experiences that challenged her assumptions about practice, teacher education, and supervision.

Tasks

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) claimed that supervisors engage in five tasks with teachers as they perform supervision. Those tasks included direct assistance, group development, professional development, curriculum development, and action research all of which were aimed at student learning. In my initial model, I changed some of the names to more accurately reflect the function of supervision as professional development and I added the task of teaching; I outlined the rationale for these changes in Chapter 1. The current model operates under the assumption that supervision is performed through an inquiry stance and that the tasks of supervision are performed with individuals, groups of individuals, and communities. This addition of layers more clearly shows the depth and complexity of supervision in this context as being performed with more than just teachers as individuals. It is also possible that more complex
forms of supervision include performing these tasks with different kinds of individuals, collaboratively with groups of individuals, and with communities.

With regard to tasks, Helen engaged in all tasks of supervision, but she did not engage in all of them uniformly, nor did she and others have an awareness of all of these tasks in which she was engaging. The scope of her supervision focused on individuals and primarily on one group of individuals—interns. The individual layer of the conceptual model can be broken down further into three layers—interns, mentors, and supervisors. Helen’s beliefs about supervision and her practices narrowed the scope of her supervision to include interns and two main tasks aimed at supporting their growth and development of skills—direct assistance and teaching. Figure 5-8 shows the scope of Helen’s supervision as compared to a broader understanding of the goals and purposes of supervision in a PDS context. The shaded triangle shows that the scope of her supervision was narrow and limited to interns; therefore, the focus of her supervision was on supporting and working with interns as the next generation of teachers.
While she did partake in the other tasks, those tasks were not as visible or as much of a focus as direct assistance and teaching were. Helen believed that supervision equated to these two tasks; she did not know that supervision could be conceived of more broadly. The recipients of Helen’s supervision, which were interns and mentors, saw only those aspects that directly related to them, and Helen only saw supervision as she was engaged in it; she did not see the supervision that was occurring to support herself as a supervisor and the multiple learning communities that were engaged in a PDS context. Her perspective was limited, but hints of it broadening occurred when she described her own learning. This result indicated that supervision, especially the supervision that was being done to her, was highly invisible, which made learning about supervision more difficult. Recognizing that Helen was experiencing supervision herself

Figure 5-8: Helen’s Scope of Supervision
indicated that there were multiple levels of complexity of supervision in this context, and for that reason, the additional layers were added to the model.

**Unification**

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) believed that supervisors should perform the tasks in such a way that their supervision should unite the goals of the school as an organization and the needs of the teachers. Their model showed that supervision was broader than just working with teachers, but rather supervision was aimed at improving instruction for the betterment of children’s learning. The current model is inclusive but shows that the unification is more complex than just organizational needs and teachers. For goals, this model shows that there are the goals of individual institutions—schools and universities, goals of the community—the PDS community, and the larger political goals needed for an agenda of educational reform. For needs, this model shows that individual needs—i.e. students, teachers, administrators, university faculty—community needs, and educational reform needs need to be met. For example, Helen’s primary focus on interns in her supervision meant that her supervision resulted in meeting individual needs, in particular individual institutional goals and primarily the goals of the school as an institution, and, to some degree, community needs—the needs of the PDS community. Helen’s supervision and her learning indicated that more complex forms of supervision were happening to her, so for that reason, the model depicts additional layers beyond organizational goals and teacher needs.

**Impact**

Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001) claimed that the product of the function of supervision as developmental was student learning. I changed the language from product to impact because the word product connoted that of a factory assembly line and therefore left hues
of the hierarchical and oppressive supervision rooted in the industrial era. While I recognize that this image was not the intention of Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon, I felt that changing the word to impact would prevent any preconceived notions of supervision as a process-product, efficiency system. Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon felt that if supervision was aimed at improving teachers’ instruction, then the result would be improved student learning. However, if supervision is aimed not only at individuals but also more systemic change, which is the mission of the PDS movement, then the impact needs to extend beyond individuals to include an impact on all individuals—i.e. students, teachers, others supervisors, school administration, university faculty. It also would include an impact on the community and various communities within the different institutions. This impact will range, but an example might include a shift in shared valued, norms, or principles. Finally, the most complex form of impact would be on simultaneous renewal and simultaneous renewal is the pinnacle of the PDS mission. The mechanism for achieving simultaneous renewal has not clearly been articulated, but I argue that supervision in the PDS context has the potential to be that vehicle of educational renewal.

With regard to Helen’s supervision, her supervision resulted in learning, but the learning primarily resided in individual members—herself, her interns, and her mentors; however, the impact of the supervision that was being done to her offers insight into the complexity of supervision and the multiple pedagogies that can be impacted in this context. Figure 5-9 depicts the multiple pedagogies in a PDS context.
With regard to the multiple pedagogies, Helen had some impact on interns’ pedagogies. By giving them feedback as constructive criticism through telling and sharing her experiences as a veteran teacher with them, her interns changed their practices to some extent. However, these practices resulted in Helen’s interns relying on her feedback to make assessments of their practice. In addition to this feedback, Helen’s interns learned by watching Helen model practices successfully with their students. This result showed that as a supervisor, Helen was impacting pedagogy. Helen’s impact was more indirect with her mentors’ learning; they learned by watching Helen work successfully with their interns and their students and, therefore, made changes to their own practices with children and with their interns. This change showed that Helen was impacting her mentors’ pedagogy and their pedagogies of teacher education. On a broader level, Helen’s understanding and practices of being a teacher educator and a supervisor also were changing and being impacted by a more complex level of supervision that was occurring to her. Even though she was unaware of this pedagogy and what was occurring to her,
Helen’s pedagogy of supervision was changing. This shows the depth of the impact that supervision as complex leadership has multiple pedagogies present.

Helen learned by having many support structures in the PDS community. She had conceptual and procedural mentoring as well as collaborative structures that allowed her to ask questions, reflect on her actions and assumptions, and seek some solutions. Helen learned through her experiences and critically reflecting on those experiences, which showed that the role of the reassigned teacher in a robust, mature PDS context had transformational qualities.

Helen’s mentors and interns learned mostly indirectly. Sometimes, individuals did not realize that changes in their thinking and practice were occurring through an indirect source. Meaning, mentors, for example, did not always attribute their learning to Helen, but rather they commented on ways in which they learned from their intern. Helen’s supervision and impact on the intern were invisible to the mentor, but her supervision of the intern was causing an indirect impact on the mentors’ pedagogies. This example also illustrates another characteristic. In addition to indirectness, there were also levels of awareness. Individuals who were experiencing change sometimes had an awareness that it was occurring and sometimes they did not. This limited awareness also shows the invisibility of supervision as complex leadership, making it difficult to identify and understand.

Using the Conceptual Framework to Construct an Image of Novice Supervision

Supervision in professional development schools is complex and it needed a conceptual model to explain the complexity that was occurring in this context. When Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) created images of supervision, they were attempting to conceptualize different theoretical approaches to supervision. Their images were archetypes and they recognized that supervisors in reality would most likely not exhibit one particular orientation. In reality, Sergiovanni & Starratt
were conceptualizing supervision as an orientation and not simply as a belief system, which I had originally considered, but their constructs were designed for supervision in schools. Supervision in schools and supervision in teacher education have typically been viewed as separate and distinct entities, with supervision-as-technical-helping in teacher education possessing a more lowly status than supervision-as-leadership in schools because supervision in teacher education, anecdotally, was perceived as being very evaluative and disconnected. Supervisors in teacher education visited sporadically and their visits were aimed at evaluation, observation, and technical-helping—essentially the task of direct assistance—and no tasks beyond that. That scope of supervision is limiting. The case of Helen presents for us an image of supervision that, although novice, is broader than either of the previous conceptions of supervision in schools and supervision in teacher education and shows promise for displaying visionary leadership that goes beyond that which is occurring separately in schools and universities.

At present, few images of supervision in a partnership context exist. By reconstructing the multiple realities of Helen’s supervision, I have created an image of her novice supervision in a PDS context. This image is not an archetype but rather a portrait of supervision, and it is a first step in understanding novice supervision in this context. In order to construct an image of Helen’s supervision as a novice, I used the multiple perspectives of her supervision and applied that information to the conceptual framework in Chapter 1. Table 5-2 shows the thematic comparison for this case used to create the image of Helen’s supervision.
Table 5-2: A Thematic Comparison of the Multiple Realities of Helen’s Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Helen</th>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>Interns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Knowledge about Teacher Education</td>
<td>2. Practitioner Knowledge</td>
<td>2. Practitioner Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>1. Intern as Domain</td>
<td>1. Intern as Domain</td>
<td>1. Intern as Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Supervisor as Expert</td>
<td>2. Supervisor as Expert</td>
<td>2. Supervisor as Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Supervision as Complex</td>
<td>3. Differentiation</td>
<td>3. Supervisor as Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td>Tasks:</td>
<td>Tasks:</td>
<td>Tasks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Assistance, Community Development,</td>
<td>Direct Assistance, Community Development,</td>
<td>Direct Assistance, Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Structures, Action Research,</td>
<td>Action Research, Teaching</td>
<td>Characteristics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caring, Connected,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive, Evaluative, Novice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring, Connected, Supportive, Evaluative,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Apprenticeships, Collaborative</td>
<td>2. Impact on Pedagogy of Teacher Education</td>
<td>2. Perpetuating Historical Tensions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures, Disorienting Dilemmas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distress, Disempowerment, Lack of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership, Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Identity, Supervior Knowledge,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Table 5-2 is examined vertically, it shows the themes for each of the perspectives on Helen’s supervision; Chapter 4 described each of these themes in greater detail. In order to construct an image of her supervision, I examined this table horizontally to examine the multiple realities of her supervision. Constructing the image required applying that information to the conceptual framework for understanding supervision in a PDS context. Figure 5-10 shows a conceptual framework of Helen’s image of supervision. The areas that are bolded show the
dimensions of her supervision. These bolded areas were described above as examples to explain the conceptual framework created as a result of this study.

Ultimately, Helen’s supervision was novice, which was not unexpected. However, what was unexpected was what this supervision looked like in this context and that her supervision had hints of being more than superficial. The case of Helen permitted an examination of supervision to show that supervision in a PDS context has the potential to be robust leadership whose agenda

Figure 5-10: An Image of Novice Supervision Constructed Through the Conceptual Framework
is much broader than training teachers or fixing schools; it is leadership aimed at renewing education and doing so through the simultaneous renewal of schools and universities.

When Sergiovanni & Starratt (2007) created their images of supervision, they were short, descriptive images rather than longer, more elaborate explanations. The case of Helen in its entirety is aimed at giving an image of novice supervision, but the attention to thick description needed in understanding a case does not lend itself to creating a short, descriptive image to compare or add to Sergiovanni & Starratt’s images. To conclude, I distill the case of Helen to its essence, trying to create a compact description of an image of novice supervision in a PDS context. It is told in the third person and was created through the entire process of understanding and conceptualizing the multiple realities of Helen’s supervision.

**An Image of Novice Supervision: The Case of Helen**

Helen is an experienced practitioner who cares deeply about teaching, and she cares deeply about students and the teacher candidates in her charge. She is a committed, dedicated veteran educator who constantly questions her own practices as a teacher and as a supervisor. Helen brings with her tremendous knowledge about practice; she greatly values this expertise in herself and in others, and she approaches her supervision through this lens. As a supervisor, she is charged with inducting the next generation of educators into the profession by imparting on them her expertise and helping them to have enough tools and tricks of the trade to be successful as a teacher. As a supervisor, Helen’s role primarily is engaging in technical-helping with her interns; she is supervisor and the intern is sponge, ready to soak up all of the information Helen can give to her. Helen’s expertise as a practitioner allows her to identify best practice, so she works hard in hopes of changing others’ practices so that they can become exceptional teachers like herself.

As a teacher of teacher candidates, Helen must know about adults as learners, but this requirement makes her feel uncomfortable; as a practitioner, she is used to working with children
not adults. However, being a skilled practitioner allows her to draw parallels between working with children and working with teacher candidates; interns as learners need guidance, rules, and structure. Since Helen can best determine their needs, she gives tremendous time and effort to meeting those needs and helping them become successful practitioners.

Building relationships with others is an essential component of Helen’s role. When working with interns, she is incredibly supportive and caring. She sets high expectations and expects her interns to give as much effort as she does. After all, she highly values education and cares deeply about the teaching profession; therefore, interns as aspiring professionals should do the same. That means that if interns are not fulfilling their professional responsibilities, it is Helen’s responsibility to keep them in line, ensuring that they are staying on top of their coursework, coming to school on time, and behaving professionally.

Helen’s supervision is caring and supportive, but working with mentors is of second importance. Helen spends a great deal of time in classrooms; she dedicates a minimum of two hours of visitation time to each intern on a weekly basis. This time allows her to become a member of the classroom communities and the school communities in which she supervises; students, teachers, and school staff know her face and her name. Interns and mentors feel connected to Helen, and they have a support system present to help them whenever they need it.

When Helen visits classrooms, her primary focus is on supporting the intern’s growth and development. That may mean that Helen sometimes works with children to model best practice for her intern or even the intern’s mentor teacher, or sometimes that may mean Helen pointing to expertise and unpacking it for her intern. If time permits, Helen will spend time talking to her intern about what she observed in the classroom by sometimes asking the intern for her perceptions, but mostly Helen converses by sharing her own thoughts and feelings about the experience. She follows a set of guiding questions to help her and her intern reflect. The questions include what went well, what did not go well, and what should be changed. If Helen cannot
conference with her intern, she includes these questions on the written document of her observations for her intern to ponder independently.

When Helen encounters a mentor teacher’s practice that is inadequate or unsatisfactory, she holds private conversations with interns to offer them a counter narrative. It is Helen’s hope that she will show her interns alternative and more successful strategies for working with children because she is such an experienced practitioner herself. However, this strategy places her interns in the middle between their mentors and her, as supervisor, and creates an us-them or an adversarial mentality. Despite Helen’s efforts, interns resort to appeasing their mentor teacher over her. Yet at the same time, Helen wants everyone to be happy. She is concerned about others’ feelings and wants to ensure that there is harmony in her relationships with others and the relationships between others; Helen is uncomfortable with discomfort. When an intern and mentor are struggling with their relationship, Helen will sacrifice herself and her relationship with the intern or mentor in order to preserve their relationship; she volunteers to deliver constructive criticism to the intern rather than having the mentor give it and she also quietly addresses interns’ concerns with their mentors. Helen acts as a liaison of communication between her mentors and interns, and mentors appreciate Helen’s willingness to deliver the “bad” news tremendously.

Helen’s interns are the focus of her supervision. She invites them to her house for dinner and gives them small gifts throughout the year to show that she cares about them. Her interns want to be told about how well they are doing and where they can improve, so she gives them that advice and constructive criticism. Her interns become dependent upon her opinion, and they desire to have her input as a barometer for indicating their efficacy. When Helen offers constructive criticism and is not flattering of their performance, her interns experience devastation and their relationship with Helen suffers. They behave because they care about Helen as a person and because she is their supervisor; she is the person of authority and someone who brings valued expertise about practice.
Ultimately, Helen is a dedicated, caring, and supportive educator who brings a tremendous amount of expertise about practice to her role as supervisor. However, her knowledge about teacher education and supervision are limited making her scope of supervision narrow; her role as supervisor is limited to stewardship of the next generation of teachers. She is focused on nurturing teacher candidates by sharing her practitioner knowledge with them so that they will have a beginning tool set of strategies. There is a definite delineation between who is supervisor and who is learner; she is “the sage on the stage” and her interns are the passive recipients of her expertise.

Revisiting Ethical Dilemmas

When this study was conceptualized, it was impossible to realize the quandary that I would experience as a researcher and as a member of the community in which the research was conducted. Initially, I recognized that there would be ethical dilemmas present, but I did not understand the depth of the emotion involved in ethical dilemmas until I experienced it.

I know Helen as a supervisor, as a colleague, and as a person because I have spent a year “living” her first year alongside of her. Glesne (2006) states that the researcher as participant observer is constantly negotiating her role of researcher and community member; that dilemma was ever present. I had to be aware of my role and when I was wearing my researcher hat and when I was wearing my community member hat, and that balance was difficult. Spending so much time with someone it seems natural to form a bond because this person has given you access to the most intimate aspects of her professional life at one of the most vulnerable times—her first year when she was experiencing a new role. Living the rawness of this experience with her ultimately resulted in me caring about her as a person.
When I finished the study and realized some of the perceptions and results of her supervision, I knew that she would be devastated to learn about these findings. I equate it to gossip in a way. These individuals did not tell Helen how they felt or the impact her supervision had on her, yet they told me. Now, I was privy to information that was unknown to her and yet I could not tell her; I had promised confidentiality to the other participants in the study. At the same time, as a supervisor, it is very difficult to get authentic feedback from your mentors and interns because the nature of the role of supervisor and the behaviors a supervisor exhibits to either dispel or confirm these notions of power inherent in the role of supervisor determine the nature, kind, and extent of feedback a supervisor receives. However, I had raw, authentic, and intimate feedback that could ultimately help to support Helen’s learning as a novice supervisor, yet I could not tell her because of my obligation to the other participants.

Moreover, complicating this research was the PDS context. The research here had implications beyond just this study. Helen revealed to me when I presented the conceptual framework at a conference that she realized what I had done; the reality of interviewing her mentors and interns and knowing intimate information that I could not share with her was unnerving, and she confided in me that if given the chance, she would probably not participate in research again. That news was devastating to me as a researcher and scholar. Helen’s participation in this study was instrumental; it required courage and bravery for the sake of knowledge. The idea that she would not participate again meant that our future understanding of supervision could be limited. Moreover, if she shared these feelings with other individuals in the community, it would be equally difficult to conduct research in schools and in PDS contexts, which could hurt the relationship between the school and the university.

If I did not care about Helen or the PDS context, then my decision would be easy, but I do care and I have to recognize that ethic of care I have to her as the primary participant, the context as a context for inquiry, and the existence of future quests for the search for meaning.
Since I cared about Helen as a person and the PDS context, I was wrought with anxiety over how to tell the story of Helen without jeopardizing relationships and future research. Ultimately, I was able to reconcile them as best as I could. Helen and I had several conversations over the analysis through member-checking. It was during those times that she was able to see some insight into her supervision without compromising the confidentiality of the other participants’ views. I still do not know if I was able to preserve future research opportunities in this context, but my hope is that over time, Helen will understand the tremendous contribution she has made to the fields of supervision, teacher education, and professional development schools. She is a pioneer who deserves recognition for her bravery in this pursuit. Ultimately, these complexities of conducting intimate, authentic, and rigorous research were very apparent as this study came to a close, and I was unable to understand the depth of these ethical dilemmas until I actually experienced them.

**Implications**

The purpose of this case was to understand novice supervision in a PDS context. It was designed to offer a first glimpse of this function in this context because few images at present exist. In the case of Helen, I have tried to present a rich description of novice supervision. The study presents three realities of her supervision in order to construct an image of supervision. Telling the story from one perspective would eliminate any conflicting, competing, or confirming stories and, therefore, would not offer as comprehensive of an understanding. The case of Helen has implications for the scholarly fields of teacher education, supervision, and professional development schools, which are the fields that intersect in her case.
Perpetuating the Status Quo

The image of novice supervision presented in this case is limited to a superficial level of supervision, which is not unexpected to some degree. First, it is well documented in the literature that when teacher candidates first learn to teach, they possess a superficial understanding of teaching. As students of teachers, they have watched and experienced masterful teachers teach effortlessly being unaware of the complexity of teaching. Lortie (1975) called this an apprenticeship of observation, and this apprenticeship of observation prevails in supervision.

When Helen was a teacher, she spent time watching and experiencing supervision from a learner’s point of view being unaware of the complexity of supervision. She entered the role of novice supervisor and practiced supervision from the lens of experiencing it as a teacher, meaning that she operated using personal theories derived from experience as a teacher and not necessarily grounded in literature. That means that individuals can become captive to their own experiences. Without a stance towards inquiry and reflection, supervision could continue to be practiced in ways that could be unprincipled. Just as novice teachers begin with a limited understanding of teaching and spend a career of learning about teaching, the same should be true for novice supervisors. Helen, as an example, began with some but a limited understanding of supervision and could spend a career of learning about supervision. However, if supervisors enter with this limited focus and they are not engaging in novice supervision in a community of practice, it is possible, and even likely, that their learning will plateau and remain at this limited, superficial understanding. It is this superficial understanding that has given supervision in teacher education a poor reputation.

The literature on supervision in schools dominates the literature on supervision in teacher education. One of the reasons for this lack of attention on supervision in teacher education could be because of the manner in which supervision is practiced or at least is characterized as practiced in teacher education. The caricature of supervision in teacher education that prevails is that of a
university supervisor who visits the classroom of a teacher candidate, sits in the back of the room, records information on a sheet noting areas of strength and areas of improvement, and then leaves with little to no contact with the teacher candidate or the teacher. This depiction is troublesome because it shows that supervision in teacher education is simply about evaluation, and it is that view that is very narrow resulting in a lack of credibility in the scholarly field of supervision and educational leadership.

This caricature also shows that evaluation is very hierarchical in nature, a practice that historically has created tensions between supervisors and teachers (Blumberg, 1980). This manner of practicing supervision primarily as evaluation implies that there is a more knowledgeable other whose expertise is considered superior. These images of supervision are rooted in bureaucracy, the industrial era, and the most hierarchical forms of supervision where supervisor is expert and her responsibility is to fix teachers (McNeil, 1982). Power resides with the supervisor and the teachers, as subjects, are required to respond to authority. These practices of hierarchy and power disempower teachers and continue to perpetuate the status quo. Moreover, if we want teachers to be reflective practitioners and develop a stance towards inquiry where they are empowered to systematically examine their own practice and learn for the betterment of students, then we must prepare teacher candidates to develop those same dispositions. By limiting supervision to evaluation, by telling individuals, the onus of reflection and work relies primarily on the supervisor—the supervisor uses her judgment to determine the effectiveness of a particular lesson or strategy. When this occurs, teachers become the passive participants and engage in supervision that devalues their own expertise, disempowering them and making them dependent upon those who hold more power in a bureaucratic system. By practicing supervision in this same manner in teacher preparation, we are beginning the oppression of teachers and contributing to a system designed to perpetuate control, hierarchy, and power.
While the image of novice supervision in the PDS context presented in this study has hues of these tendencies, there is evidence to suggest that by engaging in a powerful, role taking experience in a community of practice, the novice supervisor is learning. Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall (1983) suggested that cognitive function of teachers could be improved by engaging in a role-taking experience, and the evidence in this study suggests that being a hybrid educator in a PDS context does impact a novice supervisor. Without the presence of conceptual and procedural mentors as created by the community of practice, superficial supervision and notions of hierarchy and power would pervade.

**PDS Context as a Laboratory of Practice for Supervisors**

The professional learning of supervisors is not well attended to. Meaning, the literature suggests that professional development has traditionally focused on teacher learning and if supervisors are engaged in professional learning, it is typically in the form of training (Areglado, 1998). If supervisor learning is not addressed and fostered in meaningful ways, then we run the risk of perpetuating the status quo as I have outlined previously. Creating meaningful learning opportunities could be difficult considering the fact that in many contexts, supervisors are geographically dispersed and isolated from other supervisors, leaving limited opportunity for collaboration and a focus on self-learning. However, this study showed that the PDS context existed as a laboratory of practice not just for teacher candidates and teachers to learn, but also for supervisors to learn from their practice and the practice of others. Linda Darling-Hammond (2012) called for the reframing of teacher education to be from learning to practice to learning from practice. While Darling-Hammond was referring to the preparation of teachers, the same idea is applicable for supervisors. They should not be learning to practice supervision, but rather they should be engaged in meaningful preparatory contexts that support their learning from the practice of others and themselves throughout their careers.
This study showed that in a robust PDS context, multiple pedagogies were in existence. This image of novice supervision showed that her understanding of practice was very strong, her understanding of teacher education was limited, and her understanding of supervision was very limited, but she was learning herself through the complex nature of the supervision that was being enacted around her as a novice supervisor. This novice supervisor was engaging in supervision in a context designed to promote powerful learning through experience, but experience was with support both conceptually and procedurally. Impacting an individual’s personal theories takes time, sustained effort, critical reflection, and prolonged experience with complex forms of supervision designed to support, while simultaneously challenging the deeply held beliefs, assumptions, and values in an individual. The data in this study suggested that the PDS context is a powerful laboratory of practice for supporting the professional learning of supervisors in developing their pedagogy, their pedagogy of teacher education, and their pedagogy of supervision. I contend that like teacher education, supervision has a specific knowledge base and skill set. Supervisors must have an understanding of supervision, the processes of supervision, and the enactment of supervision, all of which compose a pedagogy of supervision.

**Pedagogical Insights into Supporting Novice Learning**

In Chapter 4, I identified a series of skills of which Helen held tacit knowledge. Those skills included seeing, marking, ignoring, intervening, pointing, unpacking, and processing-for-action. In that chapter, I defined each of those skills and I gave examples from Helen’s practices as illustrations. While I argued that these skills are necessary skills in enacting a pedagogy of teacher education, I also recognized that potential existed for these skills to be more universal than described in this case. It is possible that these are pedagogical insights into expert’s pedagogical vision, and once understood, we can use these skills as a framework for
understanding supervisor or expert decision-making and we can focus on developing these skills as a form of professional learning.

Helen was a wonderful illustration of a pedagogical expert who could see instances in her mentors and interns practices, and she used this ability to “see” to support her interns’ learning. While Helen also engaged in the other skills, she only sometimes unpacked and she rarely processed-for-action, but this case shows that such skills exist and they have implications for understanding novice learning. For instance, why an expert chooses a particular path demonstrates the metacognitive nature of supervisor expertise; it sheds light into the processes and complexities of supervisor decision-making. For example, what reasons would cause a supervisor to ignore a particular incident that she has seen? What depth of knowledge must she have about the content (of pedagogy, of teacher education, and of supervision), the learner, the context, and the forethought of the implications of this decision to ignore? Perhaps a supervisor chooses to ignore because the learner does not have the readiness to address the incident or perhaps she chooses to ignore because shedding light on this particular incident could jeopardize relationships. Either way, the supervisor is engaging in critical reflection-in-the-moment to determine the next course of action. Any of the skills could be substituted in this example; I just selected ignoring as one illustration of this complexity. Exploring the sophistication of this decision-making at any of the junctures—meaning what a supervisor sees and why she selects a particular path at any of the crossroads—are areas of future research.

While Helen performed these skills as a teacher educator, these skills could also be applied to her as a supervisor. It would be helpful to understand what an expert supervisor sees and the insights she uses to make critical decisions to support novice supervisor learning. For example, what instances would she choose to mark, ignore, or intervene when she sees a critical moment in another supervisor’s actions? What knowledge must she have and what sophisticated knowledge does she use to make those decisions? Under what conditions would she select a
certain path? If we can understand the pedagogical vision of expert supervisors, we can shed greater light and understanding into supporting supervisor learning.

**Image of Possibility: Supervision in PDS as Visionary Leadership**

Previously no conceptual framework for understanding supervision in a PDS context existed. In order to understand novice supervision, this study resulted in a beginning model for explaining the complex leadership occurring in a partnership context. This study showed that supervision is highly complex, even at the novice level and especially in a partnership context where the stakeholders and organizational needs are greater than any one institution. In fact, the model created for this study offered an explanation for understanding how leadership in this collaborative space could be the vehicle for simultaneous renewal, which has been described in the literature as the expected outcome of the PDS movement. However, the literature is largely theoretical offering no realistic applications for these visions or a mechanism or systemic explanation for achieving simultaneous renewal. This case study grounded that literature; it showed an operation of the ideas in practice and it offered one such vehicle—supervision in this context exists to be this vehicle to bring about the desired educational renewal. Although at the novice level, supervision as practiced in this case was more superficial, but the leadership that was occurring with and to the novice supervisor indicated that more complex forms of leadership were at work.

Previously, understanding of the nature of novice supervision in this context was nonexistent. This study offered an initial image of what some might consider a relatively typical supervisor—this supervisor was a veteran teacher with an enormous amount of practitioner knowledge and teaching experience who enacted her supervision in ways at which she most likely experienced it being in a bureaucratic system for almost thirty years as a teacher and sixteen years as a student. This means that the masterful supervision in the PDS context aimed at supporting
the professional learning of a supervisor and of a veteran teacher as teacher educator supervisor is combating almost half a century of indoctrination in a bureaucratic system, and yet these complex forms of supervision are impacting these deeply seeded personal theories and practices. This study offered an image of possibility; it showed an actual portrait of supervision in a PDS context. The literature in PDS describes ideals, principles, and essentials of collaborative work aimed at renewing schools and universities, but until now, no realistic portraits of the leadership necessary to accomplish those goals existed. Although the image presented in this context concerns novice supervision, it is an image of the beginning—of what supervision looks like at the very early stages of learning, understanding, and experiencing supervision in a PDS context. No longer are the ideals and principles simply theoretical, but this image offered a practical application of those ideals. It showed that there is possibility in this vision of renewing schools and universities, and although this case of novice supervision is not yet at that stage, it does offer the idea that supervision in the PDS context has the potential to be complex and visionary leadership that extends beyond the previous conceptions of supervision in schools and supervision in teacher education.

Further Areas of Exploration

Although this case was examined through multiple perspectives, it still was a single case. As a robust, thorough, and comprehensive depiction of novice supervision in a PDS context, it offered an example of one potential kind of novice supervisor. Previously, there was no language to describe or understanding of novice supervisors in this context. This study offered a first step in exploring these areas of research. More cases of novice supervision should be conducted in order to study the various images of novice supervision that could be present in this context. These multiple images could then offer an opportunity to reconsider Sergiovanni & Starratt’s (2007) archetypes for supervision in schools. In addition to novice supervisors, studies of other
supervisors should be conducted especially of those individuals who are enacting supervision at more complex and masterful levels. By understanding their pedagogies of supervision, we can begin to understand more deeply supervision in this context.

Moreover, the presentation of the conceptual model of supervision in this context is a beginning model and is largely theorized. More research needs to be conducted in order to consider, reconsider, and revise this model so that the field of supervision has a more robust construct for understanding supervision in this context, in schools, and in teacher education. However, this conceptual model offers a structure for mapping individual supervisors and documenting transformation. Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall (1983) claimed that engaging in a role-taking experience would improve teachers’ cognitive functioning and Burns (2011) stated that the role-taking experience of the reassigned teacher in a PDS context was a transformative role, yet until now there was no structure for mapping out these ideas of transformation. This conceptual framework offers this opportunity because it could be used to document supervisors when they enter this role, as they are engaging in it, and at the end of their tenure in order to identify specific areas of change. The purpose of using this framework as this kind of tool should be used to support supervisor inquiry into her own practice and track personal growth; it should not be misused as a mechanism for external evaluation.

This study was also bounded by one year—the first year—of supervision. More studies need to be conducted to understand the depth and breadth of the transformations that occur and that which do not occur now that we have a language and framework for understanding supervision in this context. While this study examined just the first year, longitudinal studies should be conducted to truly understand and document supervisor learning and growth.

The journey for understanding supervision as visionary leadership in this context is at its infancy, and opportunity abounds for further exploration of understanding. What we do learn
from this case is that supervision in the PDS context deserves attention; it is leadership that is much more complex and visionary than previously conceived.
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APPENDIX A

The Espoused Platform Conference for Supervisors in a PDS Context

1. What do you see as your role as a PDA (supervisor)? What is the role of the intern in supervision?
2. What are the most important needs of the interns? What are your goals for your interns?
3. Describe for me a positive experience in supervision.
4. Describe for me a negative experience in supervision.
5. What metaphor would you use to describe the intern as a learner? What metaphor would you use to describe your PDA role as supervisor?
6. What makes for a positive relationship between interns and PDAs?
7. What would the three most important things you want your interns to know from their time with you as their PDA? Why should interns learn that information?
8. As your intern, what would I experience when I interacted with you? What types of activities should be part of our supervision?
9. As one of your interns, what can I expect from you as my PDA and what can you expect from me as your intern?
10. How do you help people learn?
11. What knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values are possessed by successful PDAs as supervisors?
12. When the interns leave this year and go on to have their own classrooms, what do you want them to say about you as their PDA?

Adapted from Badiali (2006), Nolan & Hoover (2005), and Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon (2001)
APPENDIX B

Interview Protocol: Interns

1. What suggestions would you give to a new PDA?
2. Tell me a story about how your PDA has supported you during your internship. What more could your PDA be doing to support you?
3. Tell me a story about how your PDA has supported your mentor during this year. What more could your PDA be doing to support you?
4. Tell me a story about how your PDA has supported other staff or other functions in the school. What more could your PDA be doing to support your colleagues or the school in general?
5. Suppose I had never participated in a supervisory conference. Start at the beginning and describe it to me so that I would know what to expect.
   - Who is present?
   - Where is it conducted?
   - What is discussed?
   - What roles do each of us have?
6. Think of a word to describe your PDA’s role.
   - Why did you use that word?
   - What does that word mean to you and this experience?
   - What are the PDA’s roles and responsibilities?
7. Talk about a positive supervisory experience.
   - What made this experience positive?
   - What did your PDA do or say that gave you a positive experience?
   - What feelings did you experience during this interaction with your PDA?
   - What happened in your interaction with your PDA that caused you to feel this way?
   - What did this experience mean to you?
   - In what ways was this experience typical or atypical to other interactions you have had with your PDA?
8. Talk about a supervisory experience with your PDA that was not so positive or that you wish would have been handled differently.
   - What made this experience not so positive?
   - What did your PDA do or say that gave you this kind of experience?
   - What feelings did you experience during this interaction with your PDA?
   - What happened in your interactions with your PDA that caused you to feel this way?
   - What did this experience mean to you?
   - In what ways was this experience atypical to other interactions you have had with your PDA?
9. How is the supervision you are experiencing now (after May) different from the rest of the year?
10. How does your experience this year compare with some of your classmates? What wishes would you have had for this year regarding your supervision?
11. What should I have asked you that I didn’t think to ask?
APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol: Mentors

1. How many years have you been a mentor?
2. How many PDAs have you had?
3. How many interns have you had?
4. For how long have you been teaching? How many years at this grade?
5. For how long have you been involved in the PDS? Why are you involved in the PDS?
6. Tell me a story about how your PDA has supported your intern during this year. What more could your PDA be doing to support your intern?
7. Tell me a story about how your PDA has supported you during this year. What more could your PDA be doing to support you?
8. Tell me a story about how your PDA has supported other staff or other functions in the school during this year. What more could your PDA be doing to support your colleagues or the school in general?
9. Think of a word to describe your PDA’s role.
   a. Why did you use that word?
   b. What does that word mean to you and this experience?
   c. What are the PDA’s roles and responsibilities?
10. Talk about a positive supervisory experience.
    a. What made this experience positive?
    b. What did your PDA do or say that gave you a positive experience?
    c. What feelings did you experience during this interaction with your PDA?
    d. What happened in your interaction with your PDA that caused you to feel this way?
    e. What did this experience mean to you?
    f. In what ways was this experience atypical to other interactions you have had with your PDA?
11. Talk about a supervisory experience with your PDA that was not so positive or that you wish would have been handled differently.
    a. What made this experience not so positive?
    b. What did your PDA do or say that gave you this kind of experience?
    c. What feelings did you experience during this interaction with your PDA?
    d. What happened in your interactions with your PDA that caused you to feel this way?
    e. What did this experience mean to you?
    f. In what ways was this experience atypical to other interactions you have had with your PDA?
12. What suggestions would you give to a new PDA?
13. Would you ever consider the PDA role? Why or why not?
14. What should I have asked you that I didn’t think to ask?
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