Educational Supervision: Reflections on Its Past, Present, and Future

Stephen P. Gordon
Texas State University, SteveGordon@txstate.edu

Educational Supervision: Reflections on Its Past, Present, and Future

Stephen P. Gordon[1]

Abstract

The author shares summaries of the supervision literature along with personal reflections and recommendations to discuss supervision's past, present, and future. Topics from the past include the heyday of clinical superevision, the University of Georgia's Department of Curriculum and Supervision, important concepts introduced by supervision scholars, and groups associated with supervision. Consideration of the present encompasses current scholarship, other recent influences on supervision, and the resurgence of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS). The part of the article on supervision's future consists of hopes and recommendations for the future, with discussions of the _Journal of Educational Supervision_ as well as recommendations for political action, teacher leadership, and fully functioning professional development schools. The author also recommends an expanded COPIS as well as partnership among scholarly groups focused on educational supervision, school districts and schools, and supervision scholars from around the world.

Keywords

educational supervision; instructional supervision; instructional leadership

[1] Texas State University, Texas, USA

Corresponding Author:
Stephen P. Gordon (Educational and Community Leadership Program, CLAS Department, Texas State University, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, Texas, 78666, USA)
Email: sg07@txstate.edu

Introduction

These reflections on the past, present, and future of supervision are based on a mix of my personal history in relation to the field of supervision, supervision literature, external influences on the field, and ideas for enhancing supervision. It is impossible to discuss every supervision scholar, theory, model, or study in an article like this one, and the lens I use to select the topics I address are based on the people and ideas that have had the greatest impact on my own thinking, teaching, and scholarship. Hopefully this article will prompt you to reflect on the past, present and future of supervision based on your own experiences, study, and dialogue with others interested in the field.

Supervision's Past

In my review of supervision's past, I focus on the history of supervision but primarily on the relatively recent past, at it is the more recent past that has defined my own concept of supervision. I discuss clinical supervision, the University of Georgia's contributions to the field, some of the scholars that have influenced me (and many others), and groups associated with supervision.

Clinical Supervision: In the Middle of the Hourglass

Sullivan and Glanz (2013) describe eight historical eras of supervision based on the model of supervision that was dominant in each era (inspection, social efficiency, democracy, scientific, leadership, clinical, changing concepts, and standards-based). My introduction to supervision came in a master's course in the era of clinical supervision. Indeed, that course was entirely focused on clinical supervision. For my fellow students and myself, supervision *was* clinical supervision. Flanders' interaction analysis (Amidon & Flanders, 1971) was popular at the time and was viewed by many as an excellent data gathering tool for the observation phase of clinical supervision. I recall spending several weeks learning about Flanders' 10 observation categories, how to code classroom behaviors using those categories, and how to interpret results.

It was not until I was a doctoral student that I read the original works on clinical supervision by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) and developed an understanding of the principles underlying the clinical model. I also read such diverse works as Mosher and Purpel's (1972) ego-counseling approach to clinical supervision, Acheson and Gall's (1980) technical approach, Eisner's (1982) artistic approach, and Smyth's (1984) critical approach. I saw Joyce and Showers' (1982) technical coaching and Costa and Garmston's (1985, 1986) cognitive coaching as variants of clinical supervision, with the latter more consistent with the original concept. I considered the Hunter model of clinical supervision (1980, 1983), so popular at the time, to be the least consistent with Cogan and Goldhammer and in many respects a danger to supervision and teaching. I found Garman's (1982) chapter on clinical supervision in an ASCD yearbook on supervision to be especially enlightening. Garman identified four key concepts underlying clinical supervision—collegiality, collaboration, skilled service, and ethical conduct—and provided thoughtful discussions of each of those concepts.

As I began my career in higher education, later works expanded my understanding of clinical supervision. Zeichner and Liston's (1987) supervision for reflective teaching, Holland's (1988,

1989a, 1989b) hermeneutic approach, and Bowers and Flinders' (1991) culturally responsive supervision all led me to consider new possibilities for the clinical model. A book edited by Anderson & Snyder (1993) included chapters on clinical supervision by key scholars in the field.

It was Pajak's (1993) book that placed the growing number of approaches to clinical supervision into perspective. He classified each of the approaches into one of four families—original, humanistic and artistic, technical and didactic, and developmental and reflective—and provided a comprehensive description of each alternative. Eventually, Pajak (2002, 2003) would match each of the four clinical supervision families with one of Jung's paired psychological functions—Sensing-Feeling (S-F), Intuition-Feeling (N-F), Intuition-Thinking (N-T) and Sensing-Thinking (S-T)—and specific models of clinical supervision with paired functions that emphasized one member of the pair. For example, Goldhammer's model was matched with "N over T" and Cogan's model was matched with "T over N". Pajak theorized that, based on the teacher's Jungian dialect, different types of clinical language (from the four different supervision families) would be best matched with different types of teachers—and specific models of clinical supervision would be best matched different subtypes of teachers.

I consider clinical supervision to be a powerful tool for the enhancement of teaching and learning. When I teach the course "Supervision of Instruction," my students practice clinical cycles with one another in the university classroom, conduct clinical supervision with teachers in PK-12 schools, and write reflective papers on their performance as clinical supervisors. However, I believe the field, or at least a significant portion of the field, was mistaken in equating supervision with clinical supervision. If supervision is about assistance for the enhancement of teaching and learning, then it was and is unwise to focus on a single process for providing that assistance. Historically, supervision involved a variety of processes. For example, in the early 20th century Burton (1922) included "the selection and organization of subject matter" (curriculum development) and "the improvement of teachers in service" (professional development) as concerns of supervision (p. 10), and Barr, Burton, and Brueckner (1938) defined supervision as "the study and analysis of the total teaching learning process through many diverse functions…." (p. 23). For the most part, the supervision literature has returned to the earlier, broad view of supervision, with recent supervision texts addressing clinical supervision as a powerful vehicle for enhancing instruction but also presenting a variety of other supervision processes (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2018; Nolan & Hoover, 2011; Sergiovanni, Starratt, & Cho, 2014; Sullivan & Glanz, 2013; Zepeda, 2017). The metaphor of an hourglass comes to mind, with the narrowing middle of the hourglass representing the heyday of clinical supervision, and the top and bottom of the hourglass representing the broader view of supervision that preceded and followed that period.

The University of Georgia's Department of Curriculum and Supervision

I enrolled in the doctoral program at the University of Georgia because of its reputation as the best graduate program in supervision in the nation, and I was not disappointed. Faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision while I was a student included Robert Alfonso (a visiting professor) and Gerald Firth, who with Richard Neville had authored the popular *Instructional Supervision: A Behavior System* (1975, 1981). Carl Glickman and Edward Pajak were young faculty members, already considered rising stars. Carl had recently published his

classic monograph on developmental supervision (Glickman, 1981) and had begun writing the first edition of his supervision text (Glickman, 1985), now its 10th edition. One line of Ed's diverse body of scholarship, the application of selected aspects of psychology to teachers and supervision, was well underway (Pajak, 1986; Pajak & Blasé, 1982; Pajak & Seyfarth, 1983), and during my years at Georgia, Ed also began his research on central office supervisors. Ray Bruce and Edith Grimsley were known as practitioner-oriented faculty who focused on school-based supervision. They were the professors who took primary responsibility for a program that prepared large numbers of instructional lead teachers for PK-12 schools, and they were heavily involved in work with professional organizations at the state and national levels. Ray and Edith also edited two editions of the book *Readings in Educational Supervision* (Bruce & Grimsley, 1987; Grimsley & Bruce, 1982). Virginia Macagnoni was recognized for her expertise in curriculum theory as well as supervision, and she argued that the fields of curriculum and supervision are interrelated at the classroom level (Hunt, 2008).

One of the great things about being a student in supervision at the University of Georgia was the number of courses in supervision that were available. These included courses on an introduction to supervision, staff development, group development, trends and issues in supervision, critique of the literature on supervision, supervision theory, and research on supervision. Cognate areas within the department for those majoring in supervision included curriculum and instructional design; thus, the graduate student's course of study was broad. One theme running through the supervision coursework was an open invitation for students to define—and redefine—the term supervision. Students learned about different views on supervision, not only from the diverse faculty in the department, but also from other luminaries in the field. I recall regular phone conferences between students in Ray Bruce's class and major scholars from across the nation.

The scholarship and leadership from the supervision scholars who were my teachers at the University of Georgia continued for many years to come. Glickman edited the 1992 ASCD yearbook *Supervision in Transition* and wrote landmark books like *Renewing America's Schools: A Guide for School-Based Action* (1993), *Revolutionizing America's Schools* (1998), and *Holding Sacred Grou*nd (2003). Glickman's work expanded beyond supervision to such areas as school improvement, educational reform, and democratic education, but his later works all had implications for supervision. Firth and Pajak edited the *Handbook of Research on School Supervision* (1998), a tome with 51 chapters that addressed all aspects of supervision. Pajak wrote the book *The Central Office Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction* (1989) and the two editions of the aforementioned *Approaches to Clinical Supervision: Alternatives for Improving Instruction* (1993, 2000) while at the University of Georgia, and his book *Honoring Diverse Teaching Styles* (2003) was published after he had moved to Johns Hopkins University. Duncan Waite joined the department in 1990 and his book, *Rethinking Instructional Supervision: Notes on its Language and Culture*, was published in 1995.

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision and the Department of Educational Administration were merged in 1991 into the new Department of Educational Leadership. By the year 2001, all of the aforementioned scholars from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision had either retired or moved to another university. Although the Department of Curriculum and Supervision is gone, supervision scholarship at the University of Georgia lives on, primarily due to the prolific scholarship of Sally Zepeda, who joined the Department of

Educational Leadership in 1999 and is now a professor in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy.

A few years ago, my wife Jovita and I were honored with lifetime achievement awards by the College of Education at the University of Georgia. In my acceptance at the award ceremony, I told the audience that the three best decisions I had made in my life all were concerned with the University of Georgia. One was to enter the doctoral program in curriculum and supervision. The second was to accept Carl Glickman's offer to be his graduate assistant. The third was to ask Jovita, who I met in a class at the university, to be my wife. I have no doubt that working as Carl's graduate assistant laid the foundation for my career in higher education. Jovita and I were honored to become co-authors of Carl's supervision book beginning with the third edition, and in the early 2000s my colleagues and I were thrilled to welcome Carl as an endowed chair for two years at Southwest Texas State University (now Texas State University).

Additional Scholars

The scholars mentioned in my discussions of clinical supervision and the Department of Curriculum Supervision at the University of Georgia all have had an influence on my own work in educational supervision. Here, I discuss additional scholars who have influenced me and many others. I begin with 10 important concepts introduced by supervision scholars in past decades, with the caveat that several of these scholars are still quite active in the field.

Jeffrey Glanz and the History of Supervision

Glanz (1977, 1990, 1991, 1995, 1998) showed that the history of supervision has been marginalized because of a general lack of attention to supervision, a lack of clarity in defining supervision, and the ahistorical nature of the field. He also provided convincing arguments for conducting historical research—by studying supervision's history, we can understand how its past affects present theory and practice. Glanz provided his own history of supervision, with particularly enlightening reviews of supervision in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Glanz's exploration of historical conflicts between bureaucratization and professionalization of supervision, tensions between administrative expectations for supervisors to support the system and supervisors' desire to support teachers, and gender discrimination toward female supervisors are eerily similar to current issues, and provide evidence supporting Glanz's contention that we need to understand the past in order to understand and improve the present.

Kimball Wiles' Human Relations Supervision

One of the most empathic books on supervision I have read is the original edition of Wiles' *Supervision for Better Schools* (1950). The central theme of Wiles' book is summarized in the following quote:

> A supervisor should exhibit a belief in the worth of all individuals, respect for the wishes and feelings of others, the will to see that all live and work in harmony, plus skill in working with individuals and groups in such a way that these ends are promoted. (p. 86)

Wiles proposed that the supervisor promote human relations by developing self-confidence, inspiring self-confidence in others, and respecting others. He believed the supervisor should promote teacher creativity and teacher leadership. Wiles also emphasized the supervisor's facilitation of groups: "…persons contribute more when they have a part in establishing purposes, planning procedures, and evaluating results, the official leader must help a group of individuals establish processes through which they can participate in these activities" (p. 132). Wiles argued that the supervisor should bring teachers, pupils, and parents together in collaborative efforts toward a common purpose. His ideas for facilitating group process included the supervisor coordinating educators and community members working together for both school and community improvement. Wiles favored teacher self-evaluation and suggested that the supervisor visit the teacher at the teacher's invitation, either to observe projects the teacher was experimenting with or to co-teach. Wiles also urged the supervisor to engage in self-evaluation, and to invite teachers to assist in that self-evaluation by assessing the supervisor's performance in helping the school community move toward its collective goals.

Peter Oliva and Issues in Supervision

Working from 17 issues identified by a working group created by ASCD, Oliva (1989) focused on 11 issues and took a position on each of them. All of those issues remain relevant today. Oliva's purpose in discussing the various issues was not to persuade others to accept his views, but to encourage them to reflect on the issues and formulate their own positions. A few issues particularly relevant for today follow:

- Is supervision necessary?
- Is supervision staff development?
- Is supervision curriculum development?
- Is supervision evaluation?
- Should supervisors work with groups of or with individual teachers?
- Should supervision be carried out by supervisors based in the central office or in the individual schools?
- Should school systems organize for supervision by employing generalists or by hiring specialists? (pp. 32-33)

In 1997, Glanz and Neville carried on the tradition by asking pairs of authors to take yes-no positions on 12 issues in supervision. Examining and debating such issues in supervision continues to be a valuable growth activity for practitioners, graduate students, and professors of supervision.

Arthur Blumberg and The Private Cold War:

Blumberg's (1980) classic book, *Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War* focused on the human relationships between teachers and supervisors, which he considered problematic. He argued that teachers considered the supervisory process as trivial and unhelpful, and supervisors saw some teachers as overdependent and others as uncooperative. Blumberg concluded that both teachers and supervisors were frustrated with what they considered an artificial supervision

process. He shared research that teachers favored supervisors who recognized their achievements and potential and provided sincere assessment and assistance, and that supervisors had the need to influence teachers and teaching, be viewed as a source of assistance, and be considered effective consultants in the problem-solving process. Blumberg proposed that to transform supervision supervisors needed to become "interpersonal interventionists" focused on assisting the teacher to address classroom problems by generating valid data concerning the problem, allowing for informed teacher choice, and fostering internal teacher commitment to carry out the chosen solution. He proposed that supervisors focus on making schools centers of inquiry into teaching, and in the epilogue to the second edition of his book, suggested that supervisors and teachers join together in inquiry on supervision itself, negotiating their respective needs, studying their interpersonal behavior in conferences, assessing the quality of supervision, and engaging in professional development to develop their interpersonal skills.

Thomas Sergiovanni's Community Theory of Supervision

Although both Sergiovanni and Starratt wrote about communal supervision in several editions of their popular text, I review this theory under Sergiovanni's name because of his separate scholarship on the topic (Sergiovanni, 1994a, 1994b, 1997, 2004). At the foundation of this theory are the concepts of gemeinshaft and gesellshaft. Gemeinshaft means community, in which people are tied together through relationships, place, and mind. Gesellshaft is characterized by rationality, policies and rules, conditional acceptance, competitive relationships, and self-interest (Sergiovanni, 1994a, 1997).   Sergiovanni argued that the modern school organization is an example of gesellshaft, and that a primary function of the supervisor should be to help transform schools from gesellshaft-type organizations to communities. He suggested that to assist such transformation, the role of the supervisor needed to change from inspection to stewardship. He also recommended that supervision adopt pastoral and pedagogical dimensions. Sergiovanni (1994a) believed that supervisors and teachers should become a community of learners, especially through the use of inquiry.

Sergiovanni also argued that the educators in a school should become a community of leaders. He maintained that it is the beliefs, ideas, and goals that the school community shares that represent the real authority for action. Sergiovanni maintained that there are a number of relational factors that must be present for a community of leadership to fully develop, including openness to others and to others' ideas, the courage to express one's beliefs, pedagogical knowledge, and care for other educators and students. He advised that the concept of leadership needs to be continuously redefined as the community develops. Regarding the specific functions of supervision, Sergiovanni (1997) urged that they become the joint tasks of supervisors and teachers. He also suggested that the responsibilities of professional development be shifted from external experts to teachers.

Robert Starratt's Ethics and Morality in Supervision

As with the topic of community, both Sergiovanni and Starratt wrote about ethics and morality, but here I focus on Starratt's work. For Starratt (2004), ethics and morality are distinct but related: "Ethics is the study of what constitutes a moral life…. Morality is the living, the acting out of ethical beliefs and commitments" (p. 5). Starratt (1991) also distinguished the ethics of

critique, justice, and caring, but unlike many authors, he did not consider these three ethics antithetical. Rather, he described the three ethics as complimentary—sometimes the supervisor needs to view a situation through one ethic or another, sometimes the supervisor needs to balance all three ethics.

Writing with Howells, Starratt proposed three qualities of moral agency: autonomy (freedom to be oneself), connectedness (to other individuals as well as one's historical, natural, and social context), and transcendence (to a cause beyond one's self). Starratt and Howells (1998) discussed both teaching and supervision as moral action. For teaching, aspects of moral action include continuous learning, stressing to students the moral purpose of learning, compassion for individual students, and developing a learning community. The teacher supports the moral character of learning by developing a caring relationship with the student, immersion in the curriculum, and bringing the student and curriculum into dialogue through meaningful learning experiences. Aspects of supervision as moral action include promoting meaningful learning, empowering teachers and students, and fostering democratic community (Starratt, 2005).

Starratt (2004) argued that supervisors need to practice and promote three virtues: responsibility, authenticity, and presence. The supervisor is responsible for developing authentic relationships, promoting a positive environment for teaching and learning, and supporting civic virtue for all members of the school community. The supervisor practices authenticity by making a moral choice to shape her or his own life, developing reciprocal relationships, supporting others' authenticity, and promoting authentic teaching and learning. Finally, a supervisor's presence should be affirming, critical, and enabling—affirming by showing unconditional regard for others, critical by identifying a problem with another and engaging in mutual problem solving, and enabling through respecting, encouraging, and empowering others.

Sergiovanni and Starratt's Supervisor's Educational Platform

Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) defined an educational platform as "a floor of beliefs, opinions, values, and attitudes that provides a foundation for practice" (p. 70). For Sergiovanni and Starratt, the issue was not whether one's platform was right or wrong. What is important is that the educator know the platform, be able to compare the platform to teaching and identify any discrepancies between the two and recognize differences between one's platform and another educator's platform. For a teacher or supervisor, recognizing the difference between one's platform and one's behaviors may lead to a change in beliefs or behaviors. Sergiovanni and Starratt discussed eight elements of an educational platform, including beliefs about the "aims of education, views of knowledge, social significance of the student's learning, the image of the learner, the image of the curriculum, the image of the teacher, the preferred pedagogy, [and] the preferred school climate" (pp. 78-79). Beyond these general elements, Sergiovanni and Starratt recommended that the supervisor develop her or his platform, adding personal beliefs on the preferred purpose and process of supervision. The authors stressed the importance of the supervisor and teacher knowing not only their own but the other's platform.

When I teach a supervision course, early in the semester I have my students write their supervision platform (which encompasses their educational platform). Then, after they complete a field-based clinical supervision cycle, I have them review recordings of the conferences during

the clinical supervision and compare their supervision platform to their behaviors during the conferences. Additionally, at the end of the semester I ask the students to review their platforms and identify any changes they would like to make in the platform as a result of what they have learned in the course. Sergiovanni and Starratt's supervisor's educational platform has been an important tool in my teaching of supervision and, I believe, an important vehicle for my students' learning.

Helen Hazi and the Teacher Evaluation-Supervision Dilemma

In the early 1980s, Helen Hazi (1980, 1982) began to build an important body of work on the relationship of school law, teacher evaluation, and supervision, and the inherent quandary presented by that relationship. Hazi (1994) argued that, while supervision scholars and supervisors distinguish supervision from evaluation, teachers do not, and that attempts by those in the field to differentiate supervision and evaluation through "linguistic maneuvering" only lead to additional entanglement. Hazi (1998) described classroom visitation, curriculum work, and staff development as three functions of supervision, and predicted increased regulation of all three functions "because these three aspects of supervision are interconnected and focus on teacher quality and student learning" (p. 981).

In 2009, Hazi and Arredondo Rucinski reported that states had increased control over local teacher evaluation procedures and the types data used in evaluation. They concluded that increased state involvement was making evaluation more ritualistic, further confusing the relationship between evaluation and supervision, narrowing the meaning of professional development, and restricting the definition of teaching and learning. Hazi and Arredondo Rucinski also expressed concern about the increasing use of technology to track particular aspects of teacher and student performance: "We are concerned that such technology promotes surveillance, restricts access to data gathered, and perpetuates the illusion of objectivity" (2009, p. 13). Regarding the increasing emphasis on test data to measure both student learning and teacher quality, the authors stated, "…what is most disturbing is the false confidence that accompanies numbers, as if they can replace professional judgments about teaching" (p. 14). The concerns expressed by Hazi and later by Hazi and Arredondo Rucinski about increasing state control, the use of high stakes test results as part of teacher evaluation, and the entanglement of supervision and evaluation are all highly relevant issues in supervision today.

Patricia Holland and the Hermeneutic Perspective

Holland (1990) described three principles of the hermeneutic perspective. First, hermeneutics seeks to interpret and understand a work of human intentionality through dialogue. Second, the work under study is considered a "text" even if it is not the written word, "because it can be read and interpreted for meaning" (p. 252). Third, through the aforementioned dialogue, participants seek a *shared* understanding of the text. Holland argued that hermeneutics is relevant not only for clinical supervision but also for supervision scholarship and the field of supervision as a whole. In clinical supervision, hermeneutics calls for the teacher and supervisor to engage in dialogue to construct the meaning of classroom events and implications for changes in classroom practice (Holland, 1988). Holland (1989) also argued that a hermeneutic approach to research on the practice of supervision allows not only for the interpretation of teachers' experiences with

supervision, but also for envisioning alternative, more positive experiences, as well as the development of a professional community that develops common values for supervisory practice and considers collective action to realize those values. Finally, Holland (1990) proposed that, through hermeneutics, supervision scholars can both "give language to practitioners' local theory and make it available to a larger community of supervision for analysis, interpretation, and understanding" and "use the text to bring to conscious awareness discrepancies in practice between practitioner's espoused theory and their theory in action" (p. 254). Holland suggested that doing this would promote dialogue between supervision scholars and practitioners, help scholars and practitioners to develop shared understandings, and allow practitioners to become part of a community of scholars.

Sally Zepeda and High Stakes Supervision

Sally Zepeda has been a prolific author of scholarship on supervision, including multiple editions of a popular supervision text. One of her many works that stands out to me was a 2006 article on what was, and continues to be, an urgent situation in PK-12 education. This situation is due to a combination of the federal mandate for highly qualified teachers, a large number of teachers retiring or approaching retirement age, and the loss of many early career teachers, especially from schools serving communities with high poverty levels. To approach this situation, many school districts have hired large numbers of alternatively certified teachers and assigned many teachers to out-of-field teaching assignments. Zepeda called for intensive supervision to meet the diverse needs of these teachers: "Attrition within high-risk teaching populations (e.g., first-year, alternatively certified, out-of-field) calls for an 'emergency supervision' plan to assist teachers entering the profession without requisite knowledge" (p. 65). She argued for job-embedded and coordinated learning opportunities for such teachers, including mentoring, peer observation, and professional development, with opportunities for collaboration, reflection, and dialogue. Zepeda also recommended differentiated supervision for new teachers, especially alternatively certified and out-of-field beginning teachers, due to the beginners' different ages, career backgrounds, levels of preparation, and professional needs. She also warned, "the teaching force is at-risk across the continuum from novice to veteran, and all the while the accountability bar keeps rising" (p. 67); and thus, recommended intensive support for mid-career and veteran as well as novice teachers. Zepeda proposed that teachers become instructional resources for their colleagues, and "learning periods" be embedded in the instructional day to support peer supervision and job-embedded learning. Zepeda concluded, "High stakes supervision is not a model, but an imperative for school communities to strive relentlessly to help their adults grow in ways that can help them accept the challenges they face" (p. 31).

There is, of course, much important historical scholarship beyond the 10 authors and concepts discussed above. Space does not allow for mentioning all of the scholars and scholarship that have impacted supervision over the years, so here I mention only a few additional works edited or authored by supervision scholars that have influenced me, and I believe the field. First is the newsletter *Wingspan*, edited by Robert Anderson for a quarter of a century, which often included essays on supervision. Important ASCD yearbooks focused on supervision were edited by Sergiovanni (1982) and Glickman (1992). Glanz and Neville (1997) edited *Educational Supervision: Perspectives, Issues, and Controversies*, and a number of scholars within the field contributed to my edited book, *Standards for Instructional Supervision* (Gordon, 2005).

Influential books not previously mentioned (often with multiple editions) include those by Beach and Reinhartz (2000), Blase and Blase (2004), Daresh (1989), Glatthorn (1990, 1997), Harris (1975), Lucio and McNeil (1969), Mosher and Purpel (1972), Neagley and Evans (1980), and Wiles and Bondi (2004). Practitioners and scholars new to the field of supervision who have not read these works may wish to choose a few for review—they will be richer for doing so.

Groups Associated with Supervision

The scholarly group most closely associated with instructional supervision has been the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS). The first annual meeting of COPIS was in 1975. The first three meetings of COPIS were held as part of the annual meeting of ASCD. Beginning in 1978, COPIS began having annual fall meetings hosted by COPIS members and their universities, and for a number of years there was a COPIS session at ASCD's spring conference as well (COPIS Archives & History, n.d.). These meetings have been devoted to sharing scholarly papers and discussing issues in the field, and also have provided opportunities for doctoral students in supervision to interact with professors of instructional supervision. In recent years scholarships have been offered to doctoral students for outstanding research (first in the name of Arthur Blumberg and more recently in the names of Blumberg and Edward Pajak). The number of participants at COPIS meetings has never been large and has fluctuated over the years. For example, 21 participants attended the first meeting in 1975; there were 62 participants in 1979; 35 attended in 1981; and 29 were present in 1986 (COPIS Archives & History, n.d.). At times the low number of participants has been problematic. For instance, the 2001 annual conference was cancelled because of the low number of registrants. COPIS has dealt with some controversial issues over the years. For example, for many years those involved with the supervision of student teachers were not welcome in COPIS, a rule that kept a number of outstanding scholars from joining COPIS and expanding both the Council's horizons and its membership.

ASCD (formerly the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development) has historic ties to COPIS. Indeed, COPIS was born out of discussions among professors of supervision attending ASCD's annual conference (COPIS Archives & History, n.d.). In addition to the COPIS sessions at ASCD, COPIS members regularly presented on supervision at ASCD's annual conference. Supervision scholars inside and outside of COPIS often wrote articles for ASCD's practitioner journal, *Educational Leadership*, and in addition to the aforementioned ASCD yearbooks on supervision, ASCD published a variety of books, monographs, videos, and CDs about supervision. One book, edited by Leeper and Wilhelms (1969), included 65 articles on supervision that had been published in *Educational Leadership* over the previous decade. And most of the articles in the previously mentioned editions of *Readings in Educational Supervision* (Bruce & Grimsley, 1987; Grimsley & Bruce, 1982) were articles originally published *Educational Leadership*. The heyday of ASCD's association with the field of supervision was ASCD's *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, a scholarly publication that became the primary journal for supervision theory and research. The journal was published from 1985 until 2005. Despite these ASCD products, there was a longstanding concern among supervision scholars and practitioners that ASCD did not place as much emphasis on supervision as it did on curriculum (see, for example, Krajewski, 1976), and eventually ASCD ceased to be a major supporter of supervision in its publications, conferences, and other activities. This shift

away from supervision was no doubt largely due to a shift in marketing strategies. The association sought to increase teacher membership and participation in its various endeavors, and supervision apparently was not a field that ASCD believed would help to bring teachers into the organization.

Another group historically associated with instructional supervision is the Supervision and Instructional Leadership Special Interest Group (SIG) (originally the Instructional Supervision SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). Beginning in the early 1980s, this group has sponsored paper sessions, round tables, and a business meeting at AERA, with the business meeting often including a presentation by a prominent supervision scholar. The SIG periodically has given awards to outstanding research papers on supervision and its Distinguished Achievement Award to members who have had a significant impact on supervision scholarship. The SIG has also sponsored an annual newsletter for its members.

Supervision's Present

The "present" can mean anything from the present moment to the present era. For the purpose of this paper, however, I define it as the current decade. My discussion of the present includes current scholarship; influences on supervision such as the accountability movement, the need for culturally responsive teaching, the field of adult learning, and action research; and the rejuvenation of COPIS.

The Scholarship Continues

New editions of popular supervision texts published in this decade include books by Costa and Garmston (2016), Glickman et al. (2018), Nolan and Hoover (2011), Sergiovanni, Starratt, and Cho (2014), Sullivan and Glanz (2013), and Zepeda (2017). The book *Supervision: New Perspectives for Theory and Practice*, edited by Glanz and Zepeda 2016), features both veteran and emerging scholars. The most extensive tome of the decade, edited by Zepeda and Ponticell (2019) is *The Wiley Handbook of Educational Supervision*. The new handbook is in five parts that address the context, intent, process, enactors, and outcomes of supervision, with 25 chapters written by eminent scholars in the field.

There have not been a great many articles focused directly on instructional supervision published in this decade. Examples include articles on prospective supervisors in a professional learning community focused on equity (Jacobs & Yendol-Hoppey, 2010), supervision and evaluation (Burns & Badiali, 2015; Mette et al., 2017; Mette & Riegel, 2018), the art of dialogue in supervision (Kelehear, 2010), solution focused strategies in clinical supervision (McGhee & Stark, 2018), strength-based coaching in supervision (Haberlin, 2019), and supervision of curriculum development (Gordon, 2019). Additional examples include articles on supervision and culturally relevant teaching (Willey & Magee, 2019), tasks and practices of preservice teacher supervision (Burns, Jacobs, & Yendol-Hoppey, 2016a), the pedagogical skills of supervisors (Burns & Badiali, 2016), reform in preservice teacher supervision (Burns, Jacobs, & Yandol-Hoppey, 2016b), elementary preservice teacher supervision (Jacobs, Hogarty, & Burns, 2017), and the state of the field of supervision (Glanz, 2018; Glanz & Hazi, 2019).

The Accountability Movement

While I have nothing against the concept of accountability, the current accountability movement, featuring the high-stakes achievement test, has in my opinion had extremely negative effects on supervisors, teachers, and students, and especially on historically marginalized students. In many schools, teaching has been reduced to drill and kill, and supervision has been reduced to walkthroughs, completing evaluation rubrics, and admonishing teachers on the need to improve test scores. Thus, to the concept of the accountability movement deskilling teachers we must add the idea of the accountability movement deskilling supervisors. The current accountability movement, of course, did not start in the present decade, but the full force of its negative effects are now being felt. State-mandated curriculum; high-stakes tests intended to enforce that curriculum; scripted lessons intended to prepare students for the test; and threatening students, educators, and schools with sanctions all are barriers to implementing what we know constitutes good teaching and good supervision. These barriers can be navigated, but not without expending significant time and energy that would be better spent on other endeavors to improve teaching and learning.

Supervision for Culturally Responsive Teaching

Stated briefly, culturally responsive teachers understand culture in general, their own culture, and other cultures. They believe that a culturally diverse classroom is a resource for themselves and their students, and they utilize their students' cultural assets to enhance teaching and learning. Culturally responsive teachers believe that every student can learn, and they assume responsibility for that learning. They develop positive relationships with their students and their students' families and communities. Culturally responsive teachers understand that students from different cultures communicate differently, and they adjust their communication accordingly. They differentiate instruction and allow students to demonstrate their growth in different ways. Culturally responsive teachers help students to value academics and equip them to succeed in the real world, but also prepare them to change that world.

Supervision has been a late comer to this critical area—it has not kept pace with the research on the need for culturally responsive teaching or with the growing body of knowledge on how to engage in culturally responsive teaching. In recent years, however, supervision texts by Glickman et al. (2018) and Sergiovanni et al. (2014) as well as chapters in edited supervision books (Arnold, 2016; Jacobs & Casciola, 2016; Yendol-Hoppey, Jacobs, & Burns, 2019) have addressed cultural diversity, equity, and culturally responsive teaching. Gordon and Espinoza (2019) propose ways that culturally responsive teaching can be fostered by clinical supervision, both as a stand-alone process and in combination with other supervision processes such as classroom equity audits, professional development, professional learning communities, curriculum development, and action research. Culturally responsive teaching always has been a critical need, but with our rapidly changing demographics it has become increasingly critical. The field of supervision has now recognized this reality and is beginning to make important contributions to scholarship and practice in this area.

Incorporating Adult Learning and Development into Supervision

We know that the enhancement of teaching is a learning process for teachers, and since teachers are adults, the principles of adult learning apply. We also know that human development does not stop when one reaches adulthood; adults go through life events, transitions and stages of development that influence their teaching. Sergiovanni, et al. (2014) point out that beneath the professional growth of teachers in content knowledge and pedagogical skills lies "the human development of teachers as they stretch into a fuller, more mature human being" (p. 53). Two recent texts on supervision (Glickman et al., 2018; Zepeda, 2017) include chapters on adult learning and development, and in a chapter in the recent *Wiley Handbook of Educational Supervision* (Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2019) is focused on fostering the cognitive and moral development of teachers as well as facilitating adult learning in schools at the individual, group, and organizational levels. Zepeda (2017) recommends principles of adult learning for the supervisor to follow when working with teachers, including making learning authentic, motivational, and transformational as well as providing a supportive and participative learning environment. Educational supervision is paying increasing attention to adult learning and development and adapting theory and research from those areas to help teachers grow and develop in ways that ultimately will improve their teaching and their students' learning.

Action Research as a Function of Supervision

Chapters in several texts published in the current decade (Glickman et al., 2018; Nolan & Hoover, 2011; Zepeda, 2017) as well as a chapter in the 2019 the *Wiley Handbook of Educational Supervision* (Glanz & Heimann, 2019) are devoted exclusively to action research, indicating it has been accepted by scholars in the field as a function of supervision. Glanz and Heimann (2019) point out that action research is best suited to constructivist and democratic supervision. Nolan and Hoover (2011) note that action research can focus on a variety of subjects intimately related to teaching and learning, including students, teaching practices, teachers, the curriculum, and the school. Action research has the potential to do a variety of things that supervision has always tried to do, including enhancing teacher reflection, problem solving, decision making, collaboration, collegiality, and ultimately, teaching and learning (Glickman et al., 2018; Nolan & Hoover, 2011; Zepeda, 2017). Nolan and Hoover (2011) point out that, beyond answering a particular question or solving an immediate problem, action research can help teachers develop an inquiry stance that can continuously be drawn upon to improve instruction. Research on more and less effective action research indicates that the supervisor has a vital role to play in the research. In effective action research the supervisor consults with the teachers doing the research throughout the process, and provides both moral and material support, with the latter including things like professional development, funding, and time to engage in the research. The supervisor also provides opportunities for teachers engaged in action research to share their research with colleagues (Glickman, et al., 2018).

The Resurgence of COPIS

I have noticed a resurgence of COPIS in recent years, not so much in terms of numbers of professors attending the annual conference but with regard to the variety of topics covered and the spirit of the conference. The single greatest factor I attribute this resurgence to is the fact that

professors focused on the supervision of preservice teacher field experiences are now welcome as members of COPIS. If we view teacher development on a continuum (preservice teachers—beginning teachers—experienced teachers, for the simplest example), then it makes sense that professors who supervise preservice teachers should be part of the COPIS family. Both the professors who focus on in-service teacher supervision and those who concentrate on preservice teacher supervision have much in common, and both groups are better served by engaging in dialogue about the common threads of supervision. At the same time, both groups have some areas of supervision they have paid more attention to, and that the other group could in many cases adapt to their area of specialization. Such adaptation would be most successful if preceded by reviewing the scholarship of and engaging in dialogue with colleagues from the other specialization. Also, mutual engagement of the two groups can lead professors from preservice and in-service supervision to initiate crosscutting research that will benefit both domains. Of course, it is not simply the welcoming of preservice teacher supervision scholars that has revitalized COPIS, but the outstanding new scholars—from both preservice and in-service teacher supervision—who have joined the group.

Another factor that I believe has helped to rejuvenate COPIS and supervision in general is the attendance at the annual conference of increasing numbers of doctoral students. This includes doctoral students coming not just as members of the audience but as presenters. These doctoral students, of course, are potential future members of the group. One addition to the COPIS agenda that has contributed to the increased presence of doctoral students is the pre-conference mentoring session in which students at various stages of their doctoral research engage in dialogue about their research with COPIS members.

Supervision's Future

I never have been very good at predicting the future; thus, this section will be a combination of hopes and recommendations rather than a forecast. I'll discuss the *Journal of Educational Supervision*, the need for political action, teacher leadership as supervision, supervision and professional development schools, a recommendation to grow COPIS, and a call for partnership.

The Journal of Educational Supervision

Although the first issue of the *Journal of Educational Supervision* was published in 2018, I discuss it here in the section on the future because of its tremendous potential for disseminating supervision scholarship and for both defining and promoting the field in the years to come. Supervision scholars who develop theory and conduct research now have a journal they can submit their work to that is exclusively devoted to supervision. A quality journal devoted to a specific field gives credibility to that field, and allows easy access to students, scholars and practitioners wishing to make themselves familiar with literature from the field. All of us who have a keen interest in educational supervision owe a debt of gratitude to Ian Mette for starting the journal, and we need to support the journal by spreading the word about it, submitting manuscripts, and encouraging others to do the same.

The Need for Political Action

Supervision, teaching, and learning are all placed at risk by policy makers who have reduced schooling to preparing for tests that do not measure authentic learning. We do not have adequate funding for public education, and this deficit is made worse for marginalized cultural groups because of the inequitable dispersion of the funds that are available. The effort by both some politicians and some corporations to move the nation away from public education and toward private education subsidized by government funding poses a real threat. Inside our schools, we still have inequitable treatment of different cultures based on misunderstanding, miscommunication, and deficit thinking. Given all of these realities, those of us in the field of supervision have an obligation to become politically involved for the purpose of changing both policy and practice.

I tell my graduate students that they are the next generation of educational leaders, and they will have opportunities throughout their educational careers to change a system that most of them admit is not working for all students. Those of us in higher education make political statements and influence the present and future political activism of our students in every class we teach. We also can influence political decisions through our research and writing. Our service to school districts and state organizations also can influence the politics of education; I see my colleagues influencing district and even statewide political decisions on a regular basis.

Groups like COPIS and AERA's Special Interest Group in Supervision and Instructional Leadership are small, but size does not release us from our obligation to do what we can, and there is much we can do. For example, we should not refrain from issuing formal statements that address issues of injustice on a national level. In the day of the Internet, we might be surprised at how many people read such statements, and how many minds we change. Of course, political action by our supervision groups would be more powerful if we took such action in concert with other like-minded—and perhaps larger—groups, but there is no reason why supervision groups could not initiate common political action.

Teacher Leadership

Given the wide variety of supervision processes described in the supervision literature— mentoring, clinical supervision, peer coaching, professional development, curriculum development, and community building, to name a few, there is no way that school administrators, with all of their other responsibilities, can provide the breadth and depth of supervision that is called for. If we define supervision as assistance for the enhancement of teaching and learning, then there is no reason why teachers cannot provide supervision to each other, with the supervision program coordinated by school administrators. Some teachers desire formal leadership roles within the school (department chair, instructional team leader, peer coach, assigned mentor, curriculum developer, professional development leader) and others prefer to provide informal leadership (assisting colleagues with classroom practice as needed, sharing resources and materials, serving as teaching role models, informal mentoring, leading groups in conversations on instructional improvement, advocating for and assisting students on a schoolwide basis). Regardless of the preferred type of leadership, we have reached a point where teachers can no longer be concerned only with their own students, their own classrooms,

their own teaching. The improvement of teaching needs to take place schoolwide and needs to be a collegial and collaborative endeavor.

Regardless of whether teachers are engaged in formal or informal teacher leadership, research by colleagues and myself has found certain capacities that the supervisor should foster in teacher leaders, including pedagogical knowledge and knowledge of content in general and the school's curriculum in particular; the ability to develop empathetic, trusting, and collegial, relationships; and work management, communication, collaborative, and problem-solving skills (Jacobs, Gordon, & Solis, 2016; Gordon, Jacobs, Croteau, & Solis, 2018). One of the responsibilities of the supervisor is to help current and potential teacher leaders to develop these capacities. An added benefit of a focus on these leadership capacities is that they all are capacities that also will improve classroom teaching. To summarize, future supervision should be communal supervision, with formally designated supervisors, formal teacher leaders, and informal teacher leaders working together to enhance teaching and learning throughout the school.

A Call for Fully Functioning Professional Development Schools

The potential of professional development schools (PDSs) to enhance the preparation of teachers is well documented (Damore, Kapusta, & McDevit, 2011; Helms-Lorenz, van de Grift, Canrinus, Maulana, & van Veen, 2017; Watson, Miller, Johnston, & Rutledge, 2006). What I am arguing for here is a broader view of the PDS, a view that I believe is entirely consistent with the original concept. The PDS I envision would include all of the following:

1. The PDS would be committed to the renewal of teacher preparation and supervisor preparation as well as the enhancement of schools, supervision, teaching, and student learning. This means that not only the supervisors of pre-service teachers but aspiring supervisors of pre-service and in-service teachers and university faculty members who teach those aspiring supervisors would be present in schools, and all of these groups would be working together to reach the goals listed above.
2. Academic and clinical experiences would be integrated for both preservice teachers and aspiring supervisors.
3. University personnel would assist in the continuing professional development of the school's in-service teachers and supervisors.
4. University and school personnel would be engaged in collaborative research. This research would take two tracks: action research to improve practice at the classroom, team, and school level; and more traditional research (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) to share the processes and outcomes of the PDS with scholars and practitioners outside of the school.
5. The PDS, in time, would become an exemplary school that would serve as a model of teacher preparation, supervisor preparation, supervision, teaching, and student learning. Once the school reached exemplary status, it would be open for visitation by outside practitioners, faculty from other universities, and policy makers.
6. Continuous improvement of university teacher and supervision preparation programs would be based on experiences with, research at, and feedback from PDSs.

None of the ideas in the above list are new. It is the successful integration of all of these ideas that will lead to fully functioning PDSs, and more successful university preparation programs.

The Need to Grow COPIS

COPIS need not be a huge organization to be a viable one; indeed, many would argue that it would lose its character if it became too large. Still, there is room for growth. Beyond expanded recruitment efforts, one idea is to welcome practitioner-scholars with a strong interest in supervision—not just as guests at the annual conference, but as full-fledged COPIS members. Another idea is to have a doctoral student membership that would stay in place as long as the member was a doctoral student. This would allow doctoral students to not only engage in dialogue with supervision professors from other universities but also to develop relationships that might lead to ongoing mentoring or future collaboration.

Beyond growth in membership, COPIS could grow as an organization by expanding its activities from the annual conference to those of a group that communicates and collaborates throughout the year. A regular online newsletter, a frequently updated blog, and periodic electronic meetings are all examples of this type of growth. Another idea, more appropriate for some states than others, is the forming of state COPIS affiliates. COPIS members could found such state affiliates with COPIS approval. Affiliates could meet once or twice a year and focus on state issues and initiatives concerning supervision. New affiliate members, of course, would be potential members of the national organization.

Partnership

The professional development schools and COPIS state affiliates discussed earlier would, of course, be types of partnership, but let us continue with the idea of alliances here by considering additional potential partnerships that could enhance the field. In AERA, the Supervision and Instructional Leadership Special Interest Group (SIG) could partner with other SIGs to offer joint sessions at AERA's annual meeting. These sessions might involve presentations and dialogue on areas of common interest. Partnership with other SIGs might allow large enough audiences to invite national and international guests. For example, I recall the Supervision and Instructional Leadership SIG and the Leadership for School Improvement SIG co-sponsoring a talk on adult development by Robert Kegan. The large meeting room was packed, with not only members of the sponsoring SIGs but also many other AERA members attending a presentation that Kegan had tailored to common interests of the sponsoring SIGs.

Existing groups focused on supervision should consider partnerships. For a modest proposal on how such a partnership might be initiated, AERA's Supervision and Instructional Leadership SIG, the fledgling SIG of the same name in the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and COPIS could create an annual cross-group newsletter that included information about activities in each group, essays on supervision, and invitations for cross-group projects. The partnership between ASCD and COPIS was a long and fruitful one that is no longer in place but given the thousands of supervisors who belong to that association, a renewal of that partnership in the future should not be ruled out. There are other national organizations

concerned with the supervision of preservice or in-service teachers that might be open to partnership with either COPIS or the AERA SIG on Supervision and Instructional Leadership.

One of the existing supervision groups (perhaps COPIS) could develop partnerships with a small group of schools or school districts that either have or are in the process of developing innovative supervision practices, invite representatives from those districts to annual meetings, send delegations of COPIS members to the district/school sites to observe and document supervision practices, and provide scholarly expertise to the district/school upon request.

At the international level, based on my reading of scholarly works, supervision (although it often does not go by that name) seems to be quite popular in many nations around the globe. It makes sense for the supervision groups based in the U.S. to reach out to supervision scholars in other parts of the world, at first to simply establish lines of communication, but eventually to expand the international presence in groups like COPIS and AERA's Supervision and Instructional Leadership SIG, and to open the door to research partnerships among supervision scholars from different parts of the world.

Conclusion

As I said at the beginning of this article, I hope it will cause the reader – whether you are a veteran like me or relatively new to the field – to engage in your own reflection on supervision. The literature on supervision can help us to better understand the past, act in the present, and prepare for the future. However, scholarship alone is not enough. My colleague Carl Glickman once commented, "Supervision is a practitioner's profession." What this means to me is that, to really understand and assist in the enhancement of supervision, the supervision scholar must interact with supervisors and teachers on a regular basis, and that interaction should include reflective dialogue on theory, research, and practice. It is in the nexus of theory, research, and practice that we improve supervision, teaching, and learning.

References

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1980). *Techniques in the supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications.* White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing Group.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R., & Neville, R. F. (1975). *Instructional supervision: A behavior system.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R., & Neville, R. F. (1981). *Instructional supervision: A behavior system* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Amidon, E. J., & Flanders, N. A. (1971). *The role of the teacher in the classroom: A manual for understanding and improving teacher classroom behavior* (rev. ed.). St. Paul, MN: Association for Productive Teaching.

Anderson, R. H., & Snyder, K. J. (1993). *Clinical supervision: Coaching for higher performance.* Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company.

Arnold, N. W. (2016). Cultural competencies and supervision. In J. Glanz & S. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice* (pp. 201-220). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Barr, A. S., Burton, W. H., & Brueckner (1938). *Supervision: Principles and practices in the improvement of instruction.* New York, NY: D. Appleton-Century.

Beach, D. M., & Reinhartz, J. (2000). *Supervisory leadership: Focus on instruction.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Blumberg, A. (1980). *Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Bowers, C. A., & Flinders, D. J. (1991). *Culturally responsive teaching and supervision: A handbook of staff development.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Bruce, R. E., & Grimsley, E. E. (Eds.). (1987). Readings in educational supervision from *Educational Leadership*. (Vol. 2). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Burns, R. W., & Badiali, B. J. (2015). When supervision is conflated with evaluation: Teacher candidates' perceptions of their novice supervisor. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(4), 418-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2015.1078757

Burns, R. B., & Badiali, B. J. (2016). Unearthing the complexities of clinical pedagogy in supervision: Identifying the pedagogical skills of supervisors. *Action in Teacher Education, 38*(2), 156-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1155097

Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016a). The changing nature of the role of the university supervisor and function of preservice teacher supervision in an era of clinically-rich practice. *Action in Teacher Education, 38*(4), 410-425. https://doi.org10.1080/01626620.2016.1226203

Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016b). Preservice teacher supervision within field experiences in a decade of reform. *Teacher Education & Practice, 29*(1), 46-75.

Burton, W. H. (1922). *Supervision and the improvement of teaching*. New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision.* Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin Company.

COPIS Archives and History (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.copis.org/historyarchives

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. (1985). Supervision for intelligent teaching. *Educational Leadership, 42*(5), 70-80.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. (1986). Cognitive coaching: Supervision for intelligent teaching. *Wingspan, 3*(1), 38-42.

Costa, A. L, Garmston, R. J. (2016). *Cognitive coaching: Developing self-directed leaders and learners* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Damore, S. J., Kapustka, K. M., & McDevitt, P. (2011). The urban professional development school network: Assessing the partnership's impact on initial teacher education. *The Teacher Educator, 46*(3), 182-207. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.582929

Daresh, J. C. (1989). *Supervision as a proactive process.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Eisner, E. W. (1982). An artistic approach to supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching* (pp. 53-66). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Firth, G. R., & Pajak, E. F. (Eds.). (1998). *Handbook of research on school supervision.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Garman, N. B. (1982). The clinical approach to supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching* (pp. 35-52). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glanz, J. (1977). Ahistoricism and school supervision: Notes toward a history. *Educational Leadership, 35*(2), 148-154.

Glanz, J. (1990). Beyond bureaucracy: Notes on the professionalization of public school supervision in the early 20th century. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5*(2), 150-170.

Glanz, J. (1991). *Bureaucracy and professionalism: The evolution of public school supervision*. Rutherford, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University press.

Glanz, J. (1995). Exploring supervision history: An invitation and agenda. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 10*(2), 95-113.

Glanz, J. (1998). Histories, antecedents, and legacies of school supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak, *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 39-79). New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Glanz, J. (2018). Chronicling perspectives about the state of instructional supervision by eight prominent scholars of supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision. 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.1.1.1

Glanz, J., & Hazi, H. M. (2019). Shedding light on the phenomenon of supervision traveling incognito: A field's struggles for visibility. *Journal of Educational Supervision, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.1.1

Glanz, J., & Heimann, R. (2019). Encouraging reflective practice in educational supervision through action research and appreciative inquiry. In S. Zepeda & J. Ponticell (Eds.). *The Wiley handbook of educational supervision* (pp. 353-377). Medford, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Glanz, J., & Neville, R. F. (1997). *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Glanz, J., & Zepeda, S. J. (Eds.). (2016). *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1990). *Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1997). *Differentiated supervision* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

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

Glickman, C. D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach.* Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Glickman, C. D. (Ed.). (1992). *Supervision in transition: The 1992 ASCD yearbook.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glickman, C. D. (1993). *Renewing America's schools: A guide for school-based action.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C. D. (1998). *Revolutionizing America's schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C. D. (2003). *Holding sacred ground: Essays on leadership, courage, and endurance in our schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach.* New York, NY: Pearson.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Gordon, S. P. (Ed.). (2005). *Standards for instructional supervision: Enhancing teaching and learning.* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Gordon, S. P. (2019). Supervision's new challenge: Facilitating a multidimensional curriculum. *Journal of Educational Supervision, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.1.2.2

Gordon, S. P., & Espinoza, S. (2019, April). *Clinical supervision and other supervision processes for promoting culturally responsive teaching.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, ON.

Gordon, S. P., Jacobs, J., Croteau, S. M., & Solis, R. (2018, October). *Informal teacher leaders: Who they are, what they do, and how they impact teaching and learning.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision, Orono, MA.

Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2019). Foundations of adult development and learning: Implications for educational supervision. In S. Zepeda & J. Ponticell (Eds.). *The Wiley handbook of educational supervision* (pp. 45-73). Medford, MA: Wiley & Sons.

Grimsley, E. E., & Bruce, R. E. (Eds.). (1982). Readings in educational supervision from *Educational Leadership.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Haberlin, S. (2019). Something always works: A self-study of strengths-based coaching in supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision, 2*(1). https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.2.1.3

Harris, B. M. (1975). *Supervisory behavior in education* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hazi, H. M. (1980). An analysis of selected teacher collective negotiation agreements in Pennsylvania to determine the legal control placed on supervisory practice. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41:2423A.

Hazi, H. M. (1982). Should labor law define instructional supervision? *Educational Leadership, 39*(7), 542-543.

Hazi, H. M. (1994). The teacher evaluation-supervision dilemma: A case of entanglements and irreconcilable differences. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 9*(2), 195-216.

Hazi, H. M. (1998). Policy and legal considerations in supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.) *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 968-986). New York, NY: Simon and Schuster Macmillan.

Hazi, H. M., & Arredondo Rucinski, D. (2009). Teacher evaluation as a policy target for improved student learning: A fifty-state review of statute and regulatory action since NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 17*(5), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v17n5.2009

Helms-Lorenz, M., van de Grift, W., Canrinus, E., Maulana, R., & van Veen, K. (2018). Evaluation of the behavioral and affective outcomes of novice teachers working in professional development schools versus non-professional development schools. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 56*, 8-20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.10.006

Holland, P. E. (1988). Keeping faith with Cogan: Current theorizing in a maturing practice of clinical supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 3*(2), 97-108.

Holland, P. E. (1989). Stories of supervision: Tutorials in a transformative practice of supervision. *Peabody Journal of Education, 66*(3), 61-77.

Holland (1990). A hermeneutic perspective on supervision scholarship. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 59*(3), 252-254.

Hunt, M. E. (2008). *A history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia, 1968-1991* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia). Retrieved from https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/hunt_melvin_e_200812_edd.pdf

Hunter, M. (1980). Six types of supervisory conferences. *Educational Leadership, 37*(5), 408-412.

Hunter, M. (1983). Script taping: An essential supervisory tool. *Educational Leadership, 41*(3), 43.

Jacobs, J., & Casciola, V. (2016). Supervision for social justice. In J. Glanz & S. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice* (pp. 221-239). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jacobs, J., & Hogarty, K., & Burns, R. W. (2017). Elementary preservice teacher field supervision: A survey of teacher education programs. *Action in Teacher Education, 39*(2), 172-186. doi: 10.1080/01626620.2016.1248300

Jacobs, J., Gordon, S. P., & Solis, R. (2016). Critical issues in teacher leadership: A national look at teachers' perceptions. *Journal of School Leadership, 26*(3), 374-406. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461602600301

Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2010). Supervisor transformation within a professional learning community. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 37*(2), 97-114.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership, 40*(1), 4-8, 10.

Kelehear, Z. (2010). Instructional supervision as dialogue: Utilizing the conversation of art to promote the art of communication. *Current Issues in Education, 13*(2), 1-26.

Krajewski, R. J. (1976). Putting the "S" back in ASCD. *Educational Leadership, 33*(5), 373-376.

Leeper, R. R. (Ed.). (1969). *Supervision: Emerging profession.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lucio, W. H., & McNeil, J. D. (1969). *Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

McGhee, M., & Stark, M. (2018). Promoting collegial teacher supervision: Applying solution-focused strategies in a clinical supervision cycle. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 21*(6), 726-740. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2018.1463458

Mette, I. M., Range, B. G., Anderson, J, Hvidston, D. J., Nieuwenhuizen, L., & Doty, J. (2017). The wicked problem of the intersection between supervision and evaluation. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 9*(3), 700-724.

Mette, I. M., & Riegel, L. (2018). Supervision, systems, thinking, and the impact of American school reform efforts on instructional leadership. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 21*(4), 34-51. https://doi.org/10.1177/1555458918759696

Mosher, R. L., & Purple, D. E. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Neagley, R. L., & Evans, N. D. (1980). *Handbook for effective supervision* (3rd. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Nolan, J. F., & Hoover, L. A. (2011). *Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Olivia, P. F. (1989). *Supervision for today's schools* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Pajak, E. E. (1986). Psychoanalysis, teaching, and supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1*(2), 122-131.

Pajak, E. (1989). *The central office supervisor of curriculum and instruction: Setting the stage for success.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Pajak, E. (1993). *Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Pajak, E. (2000). *Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction* (2nd ed.). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Pajak, E. (2002). Clinical supervision and psychological functions: A new direction for theory and practice. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 17*(3), 189-205.

Pajak, E. (2003). *Honoring diverse teaching styles: A guide for supervisors*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Pajak, E. F., & Blasé, J. J. (1982). Teaching, the loss of innocence, and the psychological development of a professional self. *Educational Horizons, 60*(2), 65-72.

Pajak, E., & Seyfarth, J. T. (1983). Authentic supervision reconciles the irreconcilables. *Educational Leadership, 40*(8), 20-23.

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

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994a). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994b). Organizations or communities? Changing the metaphor changes the theory. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(2), 214-226. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X94030002007

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1997). How can we move toward a community theory of supervision? Wrong theory/wrong practice. In J. Glanz & R. F. Neville (Eds.), *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies* (pp. 264-284). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2004). Building a community of hope. *Educational Leadership, 61(8)*, 33-37.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Sergiovanni, T. J., Starratt, R. J., & Cho, V. (2014). *Supervision: A redefinition* (9th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Smyth, J. W. (1984). Toward a "critical consciousness" in the instructional supervision of experienced teachers. *Curriculum Inquiry, 14*(4), 425-436. doi: 10.2307/3202265

Starratt, R. J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 27*(2), 185-202. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X91027002005

Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Starratt, R. J. (2005). Cultivating the moral character of learning and teaching: A neglected dimension of educational leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 25*(4), 399-411. https://doi.org/10.1080/13634230500197272

Starratt, R. J., & Howells, M. L. (1998). Supervision as moral action. In G. Firth & E. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 987-1005). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2009). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2013). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Waite, D. (1995). *Rethinking instructional supervision: Notes on its language and culture.* London, UK: Falmer Press.

Watson, S., Miller, T., Johnston, L., & Rutledge, V. (2006). Professional development school graduate performance: Perceptions of school principals. *The Teacher Educator, 42*(2), 77-86. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730609555395

Wiles, K. (1950*). Supervision for better schools*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (2004). *Supervision: A guide to practice* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Willey, C., & Magee, P. A. (2019). Whiteness as a barrier to becoming a culturally relevant teacher: Clinical experiences and the role of supervision. *Journal of Educational Supervision 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.1.2.3

Yendol-Hoppey, D., Jacobs, J., & Burns, R. W. (2019). Improving teacher practice-based knowledge: What teachers need to know and how they come to know it. In S. Zepeda & J. Ponticell (Eds.). *The Wiley handbook of educational supervision* (pp. 511-532). Medford, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 23-48.

Zepeda, S. J. (2006). High stakes supervision: We must do more. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 9*(1), 61-73. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120500448154

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

Zepeda, S. J., & Ponticell, J. A. (Eds.). (2019). *The Wiley handbook of educational supervision.* Medford, MA: John Wiley & Sons.

Author Biography

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