ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation:	BRINGING TEACHER ASSISTANCE AND EVALUATION UP TO PAR: FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO SUPERVISION IN PEER ASSISTANCE AND REVIEW.
	Donna Redmond Jones, Doctor of Philosophy, 2004
Dissertation directed by:	Professor Linda Valli, Department of Curriculum & Instruction

Peer Assistance and Review (PAR), a program initiated by teachers' unions to place teachers in charge of promoting teaching quality, rotates high-performing veteran teachers (called consulting teachers, or CTs) out of the classroom to assist and evaluate all first-year teachers, as well as any veteran teachers who fail to meet district performance standards. This study examines the experiences of five, first-year high school English teachers who worked with consulting teachers in a large, suburban school district during the 2001-02 school year. Data from interviews, documents, classroom observations and conference observations address (a) how the district introduced PAR to the first-year teachers, (b) how the relationship between the CTs and the first-year teachers developed, (c) how the first-year teachers experienced PAR as evaluation, support, and/or professional development, (d) how the first-year teachers used school-based supervisors for assistance and (e) how participating in PAR informed the first-year teachers' practices.

Findings indicate that some first-year teachers were apprehensive about working with a CT at the outset of the school year. As the year progressed, six elements influenced the relationship between the first-year teachers and the CTs: (1) the frequency of the CTs' visits, (2) the nature of the CTs' feedback, (3) the CT's assistance with instructional planning and materials, (4) how the CTs defined their evaluative roles, (5) the CTs' abilities to identify with the first-year teachers and (6) how the CTs shared the supervisory function with school-based supervisors. The data, which were analyzed using Sergiovanni's (1992) model for sources of supervisory authority, suggest that when CTs supervised using mostly bureaucratic and technical-rational sources of authority, the first-year teachers' practices were narrowed, and they tended to express more negative sentiments about PAR or about their interactions with their CTs. However, when CTs drew more from professional sources of authority, they established a relationship with the first-year teachers that lent itself to promoting teacher growth. How the CT negotiated the school context also influenced whether first-year teachers expanded or narrowed their practices. Coordinated supervision is suggested as a means of increasing the likelihood that first-year teachers in PAR will expand their instructional repertoires.

BRINGING TEACHER ASSISTANCE AND EVALUATION UP TO PAR:
FIRST-YEAR TEACHERS' RESPONSES TO SUPERVISION IN PEER
ASSISTANCE AND REVIEW

By

Donna Redmond Jones

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2004

Advisory Committee:
Professor Linda Valli, Chair
Professor Jacqueline Cossentino
Professor Sheryl Cozart
Professor Betty Malen
Professor Jeremy Price

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this work to my husband, Rendell, whose constant love,

patience and support fills me with immeasurable happiness.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my deep gratitude to all of the participants in this study who opened their professional lives to me. I am a better educator because of the rich stories they told and the marvelous insights they possessed.

Next, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Willis Hawley for providing me with the idea to examine Peer Assistance and Review within the district that is the site of this study. My experiences in the classes I took with Dr. Hawley as well as the writing that I did with him significantly broadened my understanding of teachers' unions and teaching quality.

I must also thank my committee members for pushing me to clarify my thoughts and assumptions about first-year teachers' participation in PAR. Dr. Sheryl Cozart guided me to think carefully about my identity in this study. Dr. Jeremy Price taught me everything I know about qualitative methods, and provided me with teaching opportunities that added a new dimension to my understanding of what it means to teach diverse learners. Throughout my data analysis Dr. Jacqueline Cossentino provided me with detailed feedback that helped me consider important questions about the organization and orientation of this work. Dr. Betty Malen took me under her wing during my first year of doctoral studies and provided me with opportunities to conduct, present and publish research as a member of an interdisciplinary team. Beyond giving me so many opportunities that enriched my graduate studies, she was just a whole lot of fun! Finally, my advisor, Dr. Linda Valli, endured dozens of last-minute drafts and visits at her home to help me move closer to a polished product. Linda encouraged me to chose the University of Maryland, peaked my interest in the professional development of teachers

and provided me with guidance that added to the quality of my academic and professional life. I am grateful for her high expectations, her meticulous work and her warm and caring nature.

Lastly, I must acknowledge that this work is a result of a support system that began well before I started my doctoral studies. My parents, Wayne and Harolyn Redmond, along with my sister, Rachelle Redmond, always encouraged me and gave me the confidence to know that any great achievement I wanted to attain was well within my reach.

My husband, Rendell, no longer has to bear the scowl that came over my face whenever his friends inquired, "When *is* she going to graduate?" That time has finally come. And, to all of my supporters, I say, "thank you" and "well done."

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Optimism, enthusiasm and a creative urge to invent the most engaging learning environment I could imagine oozed from my pores on the first day I stepped into my classroom as a newly hired high school English teacher. The force of my optimism quickly diminished as I faced the prospect of teaching books I had never read, teaching students who were not interested, and contending with colleagues who smirked at my blind fervor. I bristled at the hoards of well-intentioned advice that seemed to flow in from all directions. I was competent, after all. Competent teachers did not have to be consumed with improvement or rely on their colleagues for assistance. A well-mannered, quiet classroom of students satisfied the parade of supervisors who visited my classroom that first year. Their "well done" served only to confirm my suspicion that measuring up was less about fostering achievement in diverse learners and more about maintaining classroom control. Not once that year did I engage in a professional dialogue about my concept of what it meant to teach English or how that concept played out in my classroom. Supervision from my perspective was less about improvement and more about getting a nod from my administrator or department chair that I met some minimal standard of proficiency.

This study addresses the problem of first-year teachers' access to meaningful supervision by exploring the experiences of five, first-year high school English teachers who participated in an assistance and evaluation program for new teachers called Peer Assistance and Review (PAR). PAR was a program initiated by a collaboration between the teachers' union and the school district as a way of not only enhancing teachers'

supervision experiences, but also of placing high-performing, veteran teachers in charge of assisting and evaluating their colleagues.

PAR was directed to the needs of all first-year teachers in the district and any veteran teachers who failed to meet the district's performance standards. Both sets of teachers were paired with consulting teachers, who were tenured teachers the district had identified as exemplary practitioners. The district released the consulting teachers from their regular teaching assignments to observe or confer with the new or underperforming teachers throughout the year. At the end of the year, the consulting teachers gave a recommendation to an independent panel of teacher and administrator representatives regarding whether the contracts of the new or veteran teachers should be renewed. The teachers' union was a strong advocate for PAR, claiming that the program would improve teaching quality by supporting teachers who worked on improving their practice and removing teachers who consistently performed poorly.

The press to address teaching quality has gained momentum within the last few years. Research indicating that improving teaching quality is the single most important school factor in raising student achievement has been the catalyst of considerable debate about what must change in the training, recruitment and retention of teachers to enhance teaching quality (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996). While this debate ensues, projections for the number of new teachers who will be hired in the next decade continue to climb. Recent estimates suggest that nearly two million new teachers will be hired by 2010 to fill vacancies left by the teachers retiring from public elementary and secondary schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2001). It

follows then, that any effort to enhance teaching quality overall must necessarily attend to the specific issues that affect the quality of first-year teachers' practices.

One facet in the discussion of improving new teacher quality that has garnered considerable attention from researchers focuses on the degree of instructional support that districts offer new teachers. Research suggests that new teachers have unique needs for assistance and evaluation (Peterson, 1990). With the staggering increases in the numbers of new teachers, principals striving to meet high state and district accountability standards will have to address their new teachers' concerns. This means finding a way to overcome the historical challenge of giving new teachers the support they need to succeed, while simultaneously holding them accountable to standards of highly effective practice. Teachers' unions believe that Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) addresses this two-fold responsibility.

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

The purpose of this study was to understand the experiences of five, first-year English teachers who participated in a union-initiated PAR program. The main research question guiding the study was: What were first-year teachers' experiences in Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)? The subsidiary questions were: (a) What preparation did the district give first-year teachers to use PAR to enhance their professional growth? (b) What were the characteristics of the relationship between first-year teachers and consulting teachers? (c) How did first-year teachers see their participation in PAR as a form of evaluation, support, and/or professional development? (d) What sources of assistance and assessment did first-year teachers draw upon outside of PAR? (e) How did participation in PAR inform the first-year teachers' practices?

Context of the Study

In the following section, I discuss the national, state and local contexts in which the participants in my study were situated.

State and National Context

"The kids have changed," is a phrase that one might hear frequently from educators and non-educators alike who lament the deterioration of students' behavior and performance in schools. Others would argue that the idea that kids have changed is an expression that glorifies an ideal past which never existed (Ayers, 1993, Tyack & Cuban, 1997). Regardless of which side of the argument appears more valid, national expectations for what students should know and be able to do have changed, particularly in the wake of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation signed by President George W. Bush in 2002.

One wave of the trend to focus on student achievement began with the publication of "A Nation At Risk" (1983), which declared that American students were ill-prepared to compete with their international counterparts. Transformations in the types of skills employers are seeking have also contributed to changing demands on education. Because employers are taking a greater interest in students who possess the abilities to analyze, problem-solve, and work within teams, instruction that comprises mostly information memorization and regurgitation is becoming increasingly less congruent with job market demands (NCTAF, 1996). The No Child Left Behind legislation has virtually forced every state to test students at regular intervals in reading as well as other core subject areas to ensure that all students meet a standard level of proficiency before graduating from high school.

Changes in expectations for what students should know and be able to do have translated into changing expectations for what teachers should know and be able to do. Teachers who build students' analytical skills help their students understand the underlying assumptions of their subject matter. In addition, these teachers help students see how different subjects connect with one another so that students will gain a holistic view of what they are learning and will be able to transfer the skills they learn to other settings (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999, Cohen, McLaughlin & Talbert, 1995).

Beyond the changing expectations for what students should know and be able to do, are the changing expectations of *which* students should be able to achieve. One aim of the NCLB legislation was eliminating the notion that some students can learn and be successful, while others cannot. While in the 1960s and 1970s federal laws focused on every child gaining access to education, NCLB focuses on every child achieving high academic standards. Agencies at all levels of government are instituting standards for students and schools, and both students and schools are being held accountable to meeting these standards.

In the state where this study was conducted as in many states, accountability has taken the form of "high stakes testing," which will eventually require students to pass subject-specific, standardized tests for graduation. In addition, the state holds schools accountable for achieving high passing rates on state tests by imposing the threat of state takeover, or reconstitution, if student achievement scores in a school are consistently low.

As higher standards of accountability are being set and the public demand for school accountability increases, schools are becoming more socioeconomically, ethnically, and linguistically diverse. Thus, at the same time that the federal government is raising the

bar for teachers to increase the depth and complexity of the subject matter they teach, teachers must also attend to developing the dispositions and skills necessary to teach students with varying cultural backgrounds. For a well-seasoned teacher these demands can be daunting, but for a new teacher they can be completely overwhelming. This study explored the sources and content of assistance and evaluation for first-year teachers as they worked within a climate of high-stakes tests and increasing student diversity.

District Context

I conducted this study of five, first-year English teachers' PAR experiences in a Mid-Atlantic school district notable for its influential, reform-oriented teachers' union, its access to substantial human and fiscal resources, its diverse student population and its considerable size. For the purposes of this study, I will refer to the district by the pseudonym Elizabeth County Public Schools (ECPS). In November of 1999, the ECPS superintendent issued a charge to the district which hinged upon improving overall student achievement, and closing the gap between black/Hispanic student performance and the performance of their white and Asian counterparts. Student achievement in the district is measured by state-mandated tests (administered at elementary and secondary levels) and the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT), administered at the high school level. Students at the secondary level are also given district-wide semester and final exams in selected subjects (English, mathematics, science, and social studies) to ensure that teachers are covering the district curriculum, which is modeled after the end-of-course, state-mandated tests. In three to four years, the state intends to mandate that students pass the end-of-course tests in order to graduate, thus school leaders in the district are under tremendous pressure to improve student performance.

The superintendent of this district articulated and implemented a "workforce excellence" plan designed to broaden employees' opportunities for leadership and expand their openness to change. Through "workforce excellence" the superintendent planned to align professional development with system-wide student achievement goals. The Peer Assistance and Review program, budgeted at over 2.2 million dollars in FY 2002, was one significant facet of the "workforce excellence" initiative.

Any effort in the district that involves changes in the way teachers are trained and evaluated must have the consent of the local teachers' union, the Elizabeth County Education Association (ECEA). Every three years ECEA develops a contractual agreement with the Board of Education which outlines their agreed upon salaries and working conditions for teachers. In 2000, ECEA began devoting a section of their contract to the professional development of teachers. The section outlined ways to provide the resources (particularly time and money) for teachers to engage in ongoing professional development. The inclusion of this section in the contract represented the union's acknowledgement that improvement is a requirement--not an option--for teachers in the system. At the same time it represented the union's assertion that for teachers to be professionals they must work within school and district contexts that support professional growth by providing enough time for teachers to work collaboratively and by providing enough money to duly compensate teachers for their efforts. The ECEA was praised by Bob Chase, the former President of the National Educators Association, for negotiating a contract which "attends to the teachers' professional needs, providing more days for professional development, a voice in the curriculum, and stronger support for new and at-risk teachers. It also

increases salaries 5 percent each year for three years" (Chase, 2001). Gaining an understanding of the strength of the local union's role in this district's PAR program, and of the mechanisms by which the union balances its commitment to improving teaching quality and improving work conditions, was useful in examining the underlying goals and purposes of PAR.

Research Methods

I conducted a case study of five first-year high school English teachers participating in PAR in Elizabeth County Public Schools (ECPS). ECPS formed an agreement with its teachers' union (an NEA affiliate) to pilot PAR in a limited number of schools during the 2000-01 school year. I studied the program in its second year (Phase II of the district's implementation), during which the district expanded the number of schools participating in PAR from 35 to 129. Of the 129 schools participating in 2001-02, 16 were high schools, 23 were middle schools, and the rest were elementary schools. PAR, targeted specifically to assist and evaluate new and underperforming veteran teachers, was only one aspect of the district's total Professional Growth System.

Furthermore, the consulting teachers assigned to first-year teachers were only *one* source of support for teachers new to the district. New teachers were also assigned mentor teachers. The mentor teachers worked at same school as the first-year teachers. The district defined the role of the mentor as the person who offered first-year teachers emotional support by familiarizing them with the school and community context (e.g., telling them about places to live or showing them where to find instructional materials). In addition, each school in the district was allocated 1.4 staff development teacher positions in the 2001-02 academic year. Within secondary schools, this

allocation was typically parceled out among the resource teachers (department chairs). The resource teachers' course loads were reduced with the expectation that they would spend their extra time assisting the teachers in their departments. Principals expected resource teachers to help new teachers understand departmental priorities, such as how to prepare students for state-mandated, standardized tests.

Thus, the key role of consulting teachers in high schools was to help first-year teachers achieve the district's performance standards. These six standards, based on National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and the work of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) are: (1) teachers are committed to students and their learning, (2) teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students, (3) teachers are responsible for establishing and managing student learning in a positive learning environment, (4) teachers continually assess student progress, analyze the results, and adapt instruction to improve student achievement, (5) teachers are committed to continuous improvement and professional development, and (6) teachers exhibit a high degree of professionalism (ECPS Teacher Evaluation Handbook, 2001-02).

I used the case study method as a means of understanding the connections between the first year teachers' working relationship with their CTs and changes in their beliefs or practices. In my analysis I focused on how the first-year teachers responded to the supervision provided by their consulting teachers. The experiences of the five first-year English teachers in PAR comprised a bounded system which lent itself well to case study research. The case study method is also appropriate for examining complex issues such as the connections between policy and practice and the meaning of

the conversations in which the first-year teachers and consulting teachers engaged. These phenomena could not be separated from the context in which they occurred. Thus, the case study method allowed for the inclusion of the multiple elements at play in the first-year teachers' PAR experiences (Stake, 2000).

Although PAR targeted both first-year teachers and underperforming veteran teachers, my focus was on the experiences of first-year teachers in the program. This choice not only reflected my personal interest in the experiences of new teachers, but also reflected the district's concern about maintaining the confidentiality of veteran teachers involuntarily placed in PAR. Furthermore, the district did not believe that veteran teachers identified for assistance would be willing to participate in my study.

Data Sources

As a way to begin understanding how the district introduced first-year teachers to PAR and as a way of selecting participants for my study, I attended the district's orientation for new hires the week prior to the beginning of school. Throughout the 2001-02 school year, I observed the first-year teachers' meetings with their consulting teachers, including post-observation conferences and planning meetings. I also observed the first-year teachers' classrooms consistently throughout the year not only to understand how working with the consulting teachers possibly informed the first-year teachers' practices, but also to develop my own ideas about what would have been most useful to teachers in terms of the content of the assistance the CTs provided. To gain a clearer understanding of the way first-year teachers and consulting teachers related, I collected all documentation of the PAR process. This documentation included written feedback consulting teachers gave to first-year teachers, written communications initiated

by first-year teachers that related to the program, and any memoranda initiated by the school or district concerning PAR. I conducted four interviews with each first-year teacher to unravel the meanings that they constructed of their participation in PAR, to understand how they viewed the connections between their participation in the program and their classroom practices, and to determine what they viewed as the source of changes that occurred in their practices. I also conducted two interviews with each of the consulting teachers and one interview with the first-year teachers' resource teacher.

Data Analysis

I began my study with a broad focus on understanding the PAR experiences of the five, first-year English teachers. I intended to conduct a close analysis of the first-year teachers' instruction, looking for any noticeable changes in their teaching that I could somehow connect to their work with their consulting teachers. However, attributing change in a teacher's actions and beliefs to his or her work with a single person was far more complex than I had originally believed. For instance, I was relying primarily on my participants' self-assessments of whether and how they changed their beliefs or approaches to instruction. Yet, as one of my participants accurately acknowledged, it can be difficult for a person to pinpoint what led to a change in his or her beliefs or instructional approaches. In addition, a person might articulate that changes have occurred when in fact that is not the case.

Beyond having difficulty with attributing a change in the first-year teachers to a particular source (such as participation in PAR or work with a consulting teacher), I found that I had observed very few conversations in which the consulting teachers inquired about the first-year teachers' beliefs about instruction. The absence of talk about

deeply-held beliefs contributed as much to my understanding of the first-year teachers' experiences in PAR as did the substance of the conversations that I did observe. As I analyzed my data I found few instances that spoke to ways that the consulting teachers changed their clients' beliefs. Stronger themes emerged regarding the relationship that developed between the first-year teachers and the consulting teacher. What I had documented were approaches that the consulting teachers had taken in supervising their clients as well as how the first-year teachers had responded to those approaches.

Changes (or the lack of changes) in the instructional practices of the first-year teachers were part of those responses to supervision, but those changes did not tell a complete story of the data I had collected. My data told a story of how the first-year teachers viewed the CTs' supportive and evaluative roles, how the CTs' visits and feedback influenced the way first-year teachers perceived the value of PAR, how the CTs' ability to identify with the first-year teachers influenced the teachers' openness to the CTs' ideas and how the consistency of the CTs' messages with the first-year teachers' school-based supervisors served to affirm or undermine the legitimacy of the CTs' advice.

After I had finished collecting data, I acquired a staff development teacher position in the district that is the site of my study. Although the school-based position was not located at one of the schools where I collected data, my new role did have an influence on how I understood and analyzed my data. As a staff development teacher, I had many occasions to interact with first-year teachers, consulting teachers and other supervisors at my own school. I served as someone who coordinated support among the various supervisors for first-year teachers, particularly in cases where the first-year teacher was struggling in his or her practice. My experience in coordinating supervision certainly

influenced my perspective on the importance of that role for supporting first-year teachers.

Interest in the Phenomenon

My initial interest in new teacher supervision sprang from a fascination with my own first-year teaching experience. A critical part of that experience was the trusting relationship I developed with my mentor, who was in no way involved in my evaluation. Perhaps it was for that very reason that I felt comfortable talking to my mentor about everything from my initial shock that my ninth graders were inquiring into my sex life, to the time that I failed to hear the bell and arrived ten minutes late to my own class. My mentor not only helped me organize my gradebook, but also helped me organize my instruction, giving me practical advice about what to teach and how to teach it.

In contrast, my experiences with supervision and evaluation were considerably less remarkable. In a typical scenario, one of three assistant principals would arrive in my classroom unannounced and stay between five and thirty minutes. The minimal feedback would include suggestions such as "insist that students maintain appropriate posture in class." I recall receiving substantive feedback on my instruction on only one occasion, and that was the result of a special visit paid to me by my curriculum specialist. The portion of the evaluation dedicated to professional growth included my documentation of the time I spent collaborating with teachers in other subject areas. On the day before this record of interactions was due, I would sit down with the teachers I had agreed to work with and fabricate dates on which we had "collaborated." Thus, from my perspective as a first-year teacher, supervision and evaluation were superficial tasks mandated by the district that neither administrators nor teachers seemed to have the time to do.

This study examined a union-initiated program purported to make evaluation, supervision, and professional growth more meaningful for teachers. According to PAR advocates, first-year teachers have access to consulting teachers, who serve as instructional mentors or coaches. At the same time these consulting teachers write reports on the performance of first-year teachers that will lead to the ultimate decision of whether the contract of that teacher is renewed for the next school year. Because my own experiences with evaluation, supervision and professional growth during my first year of teaching were so disconnected, I became intensely interested in a process which seemed to combine the concepts in a way that would provide first-year teachers with high levels of support.

In addition to focusing solely on the first-year teachers participating in PAR, I limited my study to those first-year teachers specializing in secondary English. My own experience as an English teacher assisted me in understanding how the district's standards for teacher performance translated into effective practice in the English classroom.

Beyond my interest in first-year English teachers' experiences in PAR, I had a strong interest in the influence of teachers' unions on the professional development of teachers. I was naturally drawn to a program that is extolled by unions as a symbol of the new direction in union-management relations. According to unionists, Peer Assistance and Review programs exemplify labor-management collaboration, placing teachers' unions in an advanced posture to control the quality, not merely protect the interests, of the teaching profession. I wanted to closely examine how much the rhetoric of the unions matched the reality of the experiences of PAR participants.

Need for the Study

Historically, some school reform advocates have viewed teachers' unions as impediments to school improvement. Their perspective stems from the unions' traditional engagement in activities seeking to raise teachers' salaries, improve teachers' work conditions, and protect teachers' jobs without placing much emphasis on how well teachers perform. However, in the wake of current research about the importance of teaching quality for student learning (NCTAF, 1996), and in response to sharp criticism from school reformists, teachers' unions are articulating a new commitment to promoting teaching quality (Kerchner, Koppich, & Weeres, 1997).

One example of this new focus is the unions' initiation of Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) programs in several districts throughout the nation. Traditionally, teachers' unions have entered into agreements with their districts which specify procedures for teacher evaluation. Unions develop these specifications to ensure that administrators conduct evaluations in a uniform way across school sites and that the employment decisions administrators make using evaluations follow due process (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). However, some researchers have argued that the union's focus and insistence on strict personnel procedures prevented districts from developing and using teacher evaluation programs which contribute to teachers' professional development (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). Teachers' unions claim that PAR serves both to encourage continuous teacher professional development and to identify and remove teachers failing to meet district standards of effective teaching practice (American Federation of Teachers & National Education Association, 1998; Black, 2000). This study tested those claims through the lenses of five first-year English teachers who worked with consulting

teachers for the 2001-02 school year. My analysis indicates how the first-year teachers perceived the consulting teachers' supportive and evaluative roles, as well as how working with consulting teachers influenced or failed to influence the practices and beliefs of the new teachers.

As we move through the next decade, analysts predict that districts will be losing almost half of their teaching force due to retirement. Districts increasingly will be relying on new teachers to provide the quality instruction that is linked to improved student achievement. Proponents of PAR claim that it enables districts to be more purposeful about improving the quality of new teachers by placing them in collaborative working relationships with veteran teachers. In addition to decreasing the effects of inexperience on the practice of new teachers, districts must attend to retaining highly effective new teachers. According to Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (1999), approximately one-fifth of new teachers leave within the first three years of teaching, and 9.3% leave before completing the first year of public school teaching. Some researchers suggest that there is a correlation between new teacher retention and successful induction programs (RNT, 1999). Advocates of PAR claim that the program increases new teachers' desires to remain in the field. In this study, I systematically examined claims that participating in PAR improves the initial experiences of new teachers, a claim that is only supported by anecdotal evidence at this time.

Beyond the claims that PAR is useful in the induction and retention of new teachers, unions argue that PAR reflects the characteristics of effective teacher evaluation. According to Danielson and McGreal (2000), teachers are typically evaluated by school administrators who observe their classrooms once a year to complete a checklist that

indicates whether the teachers displayed certain behaviors. They contend that teacher

evaluation conducted in that way is more of a time-consuming, superficial ritual than a

practice that is useful to teachers or administrators. According to McColskey and

Egelson (1997), effective teacher evaluation results in the professional growth and

development of teachers. The research questions posed in this study explored if and how

first-year teachers experience PAR as professional development. The findings speak to

the efficacy of PAR as a teacher evaluation system that can contribute to first-year

teachers' professional growth.

Although PAR has been in existence since 1981, only a handful of districts across the

nation are implementing it. One reason few districts are willing to invest in this form of

teacher evaluation might be that there is very little documentation of the outcomes of

PAR. Most books or articles on PAR have described the dynamics of the program or

described the mechanism by which districts come to adopt the program (Anderson &

Pellicer, 2001; Rogers & Threatt, 2000; Stedman & Stroot, 1998). Other publications

speak to the practical dimensions of the way PAR plays out in a variety of districts

(Bloom and Goldstein, 2000). Research which has looked at the perspective of PAR

participants focuses on: the experiences of consulting teachers (Knight, 1990), the

perceptions of recently tenured teachers (Murray, 2000), and how first-year teachers in

PAR articulate their professional and emotional needs (Stroot, Fowlkes, Langholz,

Paxton, Stedman, Steffes, & Valtman, 1999). No studies of PAR thus far have addressed

how the program influences teachers' supervision experiences with the potential to

change their instructional practices. Without data that suggest PAR makes a difference in

teacher practice, districts struggle to demonstrate that implementing the program is worth

the cost. In this study I examined the classroom practice of first-year teachers who
participated in PAR, attending to whether their work with the consulting teachers enabled
them to question their instructional beliefs or improve their practices.

<div align="center">Literature Base and Conceptual Framework</div>

I collected and analyzed data for this study using a lens that views teachers as
professionals and teaching as a complex act. I reviewed literature in teacher evaluation,
teacher induction, peer assistance and review and teacher supervision. In reviewing the
literature my assumption was that a knowledge base for teaching exists, and that
that knowledge base can be expanded through teachers' ongoing reflection, inquiry, and
collaboration. Such a view sits in opposition to one which reduces teaching to the
mastery of technical skills which can be prescribed and that are universally applicable,
regardless of context.

Viewing teachers as professionals, and teaching as a complex act sets up two tensions
that I wrestled with throughout this study. The first tension is between the legitimate
time and fiscal constraints of school and district personnel charged with supervision and
the substantive supervision experiences of teachers. Given the constraints of time and
money, schools have traditionally engaged in brief or superficial evaluation,
development, and induction practices such as using checklists to complete teacher
evaluations, implementing one-shot professional development workshops, and inducting
teachers with one-day orientations. Research suggests that these practices rarely result in
feedback or experiences that contribute to teachers' professional growth. Nonetheless,
the real constraints of time and money cannot be completely ignored. I analyzed my
data according to my beliefs as well as the research base that spoke to what school-based

supervisors *should* do. At the same time, I always had the sense that what they *could* do was limited given the constraints they face.

The second tension surrounded the consulting teachers' use of standards. Consulting teachers perceived standards as ways of ensuring that students in all schools consistently received quality instruction. From the perspective of the first-year teachers, the standards constrained their practices and suggested a "one size fits all" approach to teaching. I struggled with how the consulting teachers used the district's performance standards. I knew that students in all classrooms were not receiving high-quality instruction, and I believed that standards could help uncover those inequities. However, I also understood that the teachers desired and deserved flexibility in the way they implemented instruction. I settled on the notion that broad standards are important for establishing what the district values in teaching and learning, while the particular ways of applying those core values to classroom instruction should be left to teachers.

In addition to wrestling with tensions that spoke to the way I conceive the complexity of teaching, I entered the field expecting to extend the findings of Stroot et. al's study of first-year teachers in PAR. Stroot et. al (1999) found that the perceived needs of entry-year teachers participating in PAR change significantly as the school year progresses. They not only studied teachers new to the profession, but they also studied teachers new to the district (who had between 1-20 years of prior teaching experience). The results of their close-ended survey indicate statistically significant downward trends in entry-year teachers' perceived assistance needs from the beginning to the end of the year in the areas of classroom management, instructional resources, student assessment, instructional effectiveness, and parent communication. An open-ended survey administered to the

same set of teachers at three different points in the school year asked teachers about their

perceived needs, greatest concerns, and improvement goals. Fifteen categories of

variables resulted, indicating that although the perceived assistance needs and concerns of

entry-year teachers in PAR*decreased* in the area of classroom management from the

beginning to the end of the year by over 50%, their perceived needs in the areas of

instruction, instructional resources, and professional development increased substantially.

Such findings suggest that while entry-year teachers in PAR are most concerned about

issues of classroom management at the beginning of the school year, they become more

concerned about issues of instruction during the second part of the year (Stroot et al.,

1999). I had expected possibly to replicate those findings by discovering that the

consulting teachers in my study also helped the first-year teachers focus more quickly on

instructional concerns. As it turned out, my findings spoke to the questions of *how* and

under what conditions the consulting teachers could establish working relationships with

their clients that opened the door for a shift in the concerns of first-year teachers to occur.

Significance

As the focus of school reform is dominated by attention to higher standards and

increased accountability for districts and schools, this study contributes to the theory of

how first-year teachers experience combined assistance and accountability systems. The

findings speak to the question of how supervision and evaluation influenced the beliefs

and practices of first-year teachers (if at all), and whether these changes (if they occurred)

improved teaching quality. A longstanding tension exists regarding the efficacy of

combining assistance and accountability mechanisms, with the prevailing argument that

combining the roles of mentor and evaluator will reduce the trust that is critical to first-

year teachers' willingness to share serious problems and set high goals with their consulting teachers. The findings of this study speak to the question of whether supervision and evaluation can co-exist, and if so, under what circumstances.

On a national level, the findings of this study can help teachers' unions understand the implications of the Peer Assistance and Review policies and practices they advocate. Beyond articulating PAR primarily as a mechanism to enhance teacher leadership and professionalism, unions can draw on my findings to speak to ways that teacher supervision in PAR can shape the experiences of first-year teachers.

On a district level the results of this study are informative in a number of ways, particularly since PAR is only in its fourth year of implementation. My data analysis reveals what consulting teachers did that provided first-year high school English teachers with the most assistance, what the consulting teachers could have done more, and what they could have done less. The findings also offer implications for training consulting teachers in approaches to supervision. They emphasize the significance of the messages the district gives first-year teachers in preparing them to understand and experience PAR. Overall, the analysis and the implications for policy and practice present considerations for maximizing the benefits of PAR for high school teachers.

Finally, the results of this study can be used by each of the school sites in understanding how the school context as well as the approaches of school-based supervisors contribute to the way first-year teachers experience supervision in PAR. My findings make a case for the coordination of CT and school-based support to provide consistent messages to first-year teachers.

Definitions of Key Terms

Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) is a method of teacher evaluation that a district

typically uses for teachers who fit into one or more of the following categories: (a) they

are new to the profession, (b) they are new to the district, or (c) they are veterans who are

struggling in their practice. Teachers meeting one or more of these criteria are paired

with consulting teachers, who are tenured teachers the district has identified as exemplary

practitioners. The district releases consulting teachers from their regular teaching

assignments to observe and confer with the new or struggling teachers throughout the

school year. At the end of the year, the consulting teachers give the district a

recommendation regarding the continued employment status of the new or struggling

teachers. A PAR Panel that consists of administrators, district leaders, and union

members, oversees the PAR program through the selection and evaluation of consulting

teachers and through the review of employment recommendations submitted by

consulting teachers.

This study will also make reference to the terms summative and formative to describe

the assessment of teacher performance. The term "summative" describes assessments

that districts use to inform their decisions regarding the continued employment status of

their teachers. The term "formative," on the other hand, describes assessments that

provide teachers with information about their classroom practice and that will only be

used for that teacher's professional growth. Formative assessments will not affect a

teacher's employment status.

Inconsistent definitions of the terms teacher evaluation and teacher supervision exist

in the research literature.   I will define teacher evaluation as strictly a summative

assessment of teacher performance. Teacher supervision from my perspective is a broader term that can involve evaluation, but that has the primary purpose of providing teachers with specific, instructional feedback and relevant resources that will contribute to their professional growth and augment their abilities to help students achieve.

The term first-year teachers in this study refers to teachers in their first year in the profession.

Limitations

Although PAR involves multiple stakeholders at the district and school levels, this study focused only on the experiences of first-year English teachers who participated in PAR. Because first-year teachers in this district were automatically assigned to PAR, their initial dispositions towards the program and their experiences within the program were likely to differ substantially from those of veteran teachers whose inadequate classroom performance led to an involuntary assignment to PAR. Thus, my findings cannot speak to the experiences of underperforming teachers who were assigned to work with consulting teachers.

The study is also limited in that my analysis focused on how the consulting teachers' approaches to supervision influenced the first-year English teachers' experiences. This is not to say that the prior dispositions, experiences and values of the first-year teachers did not have just as much to do with the way they experienced supervision. However, in terms of implications for practice, I believe that the district has more control over shaping the CTs' approaches to supervision than over shaping the prior beliefs and experiences of its newly hired teachers. Thus, I chose to look at ways the consulting teachers exerted influence.

As with many case studies, my findings are limited due to the scope of the study. Although first-year elementary and secondary teachers in a variety of school and district settings participate in PAR throughout the nation, I looked at five, first-year high school English teachers in one district. In addition, all of the English teachers were assigned to consulting teachers who had previously taught English. The experiences of my participants, then, do not necessarily reflect the experiences of those who teach other subject areas, who are located in other districts, who teach at the elementary level, or who were assigned to consulting teachers who lacked teaching experience in their field.

Likewise, I attended specifically to how the first-year English teachers experienced supervision in PAR. However, a great deal of data about the assumptions, processes and outcomes of Peer Assistance and Review remain undocumented. This includes, but is not limited to, the role of the PAR Panel in making decisions about a teacher's status in the Professional Growth System, the experiences of principals and administrators who share supervision of teachers in their buildings with consulting teachers, and the experiences of districts that transition to PAR from a more traditional teacher assistance and evaluation structure. As districts gain more experience in implementing Peer Assistance and Review, I would urge researchers to examine these topics as a way of continuing to improve the way that teacher supervision is conceived and implemented.

CHAPTER TWO

Peer Assistance and Review as the Intersection of Teacher Evaluation, Induction and Supervision

Peer Assistance and Review is a program that combines the elements of teacher evaluation, induction and supervision. Beyond standing out as a program that embodies a web of elements that have the ability to influence the growth experiences of first-year teachers, PAR also stands out as a symbol of the unions' new stance towards promoting quality teaching in favor of routinely opposing initiatives which threaten teachers' livelihoods. While both the AFT and NEA have called for widespread adoption of PAR within local districts as a way of increasing teacher professionalism, research analyzing teachers' experiences in PAR in light of best practices in evaluation, induction, supervision and professional development is scarce.

In structuring this literature review, I first explore the context in which Peer Assistance and Review emerged as a union initiative. The brief history places the union's initiation of PAR within the framework of a movement to professionalize teaching and to strengthen the union's role in improving teaching quality. Next, I unravel how the research in teacher evaluation and induction speaks to the way that the supervision of first-year teachers in PAR is conceived and practiced. Then, I turn to literature currently available on PAR to identify the empirical questions yet to be addressed in the existing body of research. Finally, I review the literature on supervision, explaining the model I used to analyze my data for the ways that first-year teachers experienced supervision in PAR.

The Rhetoric of Teachers' unions Takes a Turn

This section of the literature review begins by examining the teachers' unions recent shift towards a more clearly defined focus on teaching quality. An examination of the original motivations and intents of the union in creating PAR is helpful in developing a broader perspective of the choices the union makes in implementing PAR at the local level. Since the local teachers' union of the district involved in this study is an NEA-affiliate, particular attention will be given to the changes that occurred within the NEA.

Teachers' Unions Emerging Interest in Teaching Quality

Most sources characterize union interest in teaching quality as an interest that evolved over time. Teacher strikes, which gained unions notoriety in the 1960s and 1970s, fueled a widespread notion that union members put their own interests before the good of their students. Such a sentiment became even more pronounced upon the release of the 1983 report "A Nation At Risk," which indicted public schools and public school teachers for failing to provide students with the knowledge and skills to become competitive in the world market (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Throughout the eighties and nineties communities expressed considerable dissatisfaction with the quality of public schools and public school teachers, particularly those in urban areas (Miner, 1999). Unions representing teachers in urban schools were coming under fire for blocking reforms that stood to improve student achievement in favor of supporting measures that sought to protect the jobs and improve the wages of some teachers who lacked the knowledge and skills to promote student learning (Miner, 1999).

Among the recommendations in *A Nation At Risk* was a call for changing teacher

compensation and evaluation in ways that link directly to teacher performance.

According to the report,

> salaries for the teaching profession should be increased and should be professionally
> competitive, market-sensitive, and performance-based. Salary, promotion, tenure,
> and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes
> peer review so that superior teachers can be rewarded, average ones encouraged, and
> poor ones either improved or terminated (NCEE, 1983).

Thus, embedded within the report was a challenge to unions to become advocates for

linking teacher compensation to performance and for placing teachers in charge of

policing their own profession through peer review. Both pay-for-performance (a pay

structure that rewards teachers for the extent to which they are involved in school

improvement and ongoing professional growth rather than awarding pay increases based

solely on the amount of time a teacher has served in the profession) and Peer Assistance

and Review would become hallmarks of the press for union reform.

As the cry for union reform gained more momentum, union leadership at the national

levels faced increased political incentives to heed the call. For example, within the NEA,

local affiliates with large membership numbers were taking the lead in union reform

initiatives. In 1996, just prior to the election of the NEA President, Adam Urbanski of

the Rochester Teachers Association (an AFT affiliate) and Helen Bernstein of the United

Teachers of Los Angeles (an AFT affiliate) founded the Teacher Union Reform Network

(TURN). Urbanski, along with Roger Erskine of the Seattle Education Association (an

NEA affiliate), were co-directors of the organization. TURN, which at its founding had

twenty-one members, now comprises twenty-five NEA and AFT affiliates which have

mobilized local resources to expand union leadership in the areas of teaching quality and

student achievement (see Table 1). TURN seeks to enhance the dialogue between local

union affiliates and local school districts about issues such as teacher preparation,

induction, professional development, and pay-for-performance. With such a significant

portion of the NEA membership invested in changing the focus of unions, union reform

became the primary issue on NEA presidential candidates' platforms in the Summer of

1996.

Table 1
Teachers' Union Reform Network Membership

Albuquerque Teachers Federation	Poway Federation of Teachers
Bellevue Education Association	Rochester Teachers Association
Boston Teachers' union	San Diego Education Association
Cincinnati Federation of Teachers	San Juan Teachers Association
Columbus Education Association	Seattle Education Association
Denver Classroom Teachers Assn	Syracuse Teachers Association
Hammond Teachers Federation	Toledo Federation of Teachers
Memphis Education Association	United Educators of San Francisco
Minneapolis Federation of Teachers	United Federation of Teachers
Montgomery County Educ. Assn.	United Teachers of Dade
Mt. Diablo Education Association	United Teachers Los Angeles
Pinellas Classroom Teachers Assn.	Westerly Teachers Association
Pittsburgh Federation of Teachers	

Bob Chase and New Unionism

   That summer, Bob Chase was elected NEA President. Once in office, Chase wasted

little time in articulating his vision of a new union. In a November 24, 1996 column in

the *Washington Post* entitled "Sleeping With the Enemy?" Chase wrote, "our challenge is

to break free of the adversarial style and constricted scope that now characterize

collective bargaining in public education. The new collaboration [between labor and

management] is not about sleeping with the enemy; it is about waking up to our shared

stake in reinvigorating the public education enterprise" (Chase, 1996). By suggesting

that the union make strides to work with management instead of working in opposition to

management, Chase knew that he was proposing a measure that would be less than palatable for traditional unionists who were skeptical that labor and management could ever be in one accord. Yet, Chase also knew that the public was losing its tolerance for teachers' unions that seemed to work aggressively against reform that could improve student achievement.

In fact, Chase not only had to worry about the public's distaste for union business as usual, but he also had to be concerned about his membership. In Bascia's (1994) case study on the impact of teacher unions on the professional communities of three schools, she found that one local union experienced a dramatic increase in membership when the district-union relationship became less adversarial and when the union took up issues such as peer assistance and review and professional development. Some newer teachers, too young to relate to a time when union leadership had to force districts to meet even the most basic standards in hiring/firing practices, working conditions, and compensation, were turned off by the image of a highly contentious, political organization that values the protection of individuals more than the advancement of teaching quality and student achievement. Instead, these teachers desired a union that would assist them in becoming effective practitioners. Thus, one significant reason that Chase felt that the NEA must transform its focus was to increase and retain its membership.

Dissatisfaction with traditional unionism also glared at Chase in a report issued by the Kamber Group in February of 1997. Chase had hired the group to conduct an external review of the NEA to assess how the organization could improve its public image. In its report entitled, "An Institution At Risk: An External Communications Review of the National Education Association," the Kamber Group urged the NEA to become proactive

on issues of school and teacher quality as a means of combating union critics (Moo, 1999). The report emphatically stated that the NEA's survival would depend on its ability to become initiators of school reform and that its image would depend on its ability to place teachers at the forefront of the crusade to protect public schooling (Moo, 1999). Additionally, the report suggested that the NEA take immediate steps to articulate its support for standards for student achievement and accountability for teacher performance (Moo, 1999).

That same month, in a February 5, 1997 speech to the National Press Club, Chase called for "new unionism." He defined new unionism as an effort which requires local union affiliates to work collaboratively with school districts to establish and implement school reform. Chase relayed the increasing public demand for improvements in public schools. He said that, in his belief, teachers' unions could meet that demand by stepping out of their traditional adversarial relationship with school districts and forging partnerships in which they were working with districts to lead the charge of ensuring that only effective teachers were employed in our nation's schools. Chase admitted that such a stance would require a change in the roles that the unions have typically filled in reform efforts aimed at improving teacher quality. He said, "The fact is that we [the unions] have used our power to block uncomfortable changes, to protect the narrow interest of our members and not to advance the interests of students and schools" (Chase, 1997). His words not only echoed the sentiments of TURN as well as local union affiliates, but they also set the stage for the NEA to push for national policy statements endorsing a reform such as Peer Assistance and Review.

The History of Peer Assistance and Review in Local Districts

Peer Assistance and Review did not spring forth from Chase's calls for new unionism. On the contrary, a number of local union affiliates were implementing PAR long before Chase's election. However, before "new unionism," the NEA's national organization had not endorsed PAR for a number of reasons which will be elaborated on later in this review.

PAR was generated within the local union affiliates in 1981 from the ideas of Dal Lawrence, who was president of the Toledo Federation of Teachers, an AFT affiliate. Lawrence was deeply concerned about the quality of new teachers in the district. Since 1973 he had tried to convince his school district to implement some form of mentoring program for new teachers, but, to no avail. The district had long viewed the union as an adversary and believed that Lawrence's proposal was a union attempt to gain power. Finally, in 1981 a new district representative convinced the school board to set up a mentoring program for new teachers if the union would agree to help the district intervene with tenured teachers who were performing poorly in the classroom. Both the union and the district agreed to these conditions and "The Toledo Plan," which would later become a model for PAR programs across the county, was established (Bloom & Goldstein, 2000).

In 1986, the Columbus Education Association (an NEA affiliate) began implementing PAR under the leadership of its president, John Grossman. Their implementation, which drew heavily from The Toledo Plan model, now stands as an exemplary program within NEA. The Columbus Education Association hosts training conferences each year to instruct districts which hope to initiate PAR programs.

The Establishment of A National Union Policy Endorsing PAR

Although PAR was occurring within local affiliates, the NEA did not have a national

policy supporting it until the Summer of 1998. After much debate, the NEA developed a

policy statement which gave its local affiliates the option of initiating PAR. The

resolution states that,

> the National Education Association believes that high standards within the
> teaching profession and continuous improvement in professional practice are
> cornerstones of the profession. Some local affiliates may conclude that, under
> certain circumstances, a peer assistance or peer assistance and review program is
> an appropriate mechanism for achieving these objectives. The primary purpose of
> any such program should be to provide "assistance" –to improve professional
> practice, retain promising teachers, and build professional knowledge to improve
> student success. A local affiliate may, at its option, also decide to include a
> "review" component in the program—involving the evaluation of performance
> (NEA, 1999).

The adamant opposition to a national policy on PAR was somewhat pacified by

policy language that left PAR as an option for local affiliates, rather than a mandate. The

policy language also emphasized PAR's primary purpose as a program that improves

teaching while de-emphasizing PAR as a mechanism through which to dismiss poorly

performing teachers.

The following fall, at the 1998 AFT/NEA Conference on Teacher Quality, both

organizations endorsed Peer Assistance and Review and provided a case for the program

to be adopted by local affiliates. In anticipation of the arguments of PAR opponents, the

AFT/NEA addressed the primary concerns that had been raised about Peer Assistance

and Review. The first concern was that teachers who evaluate other teachers would be

too lenient. However, based on anecdotal evidence, teachers who are peer evaluators

apply more stringent criteria to their peers than do administrators because the evaluators

believe that incompetence within the profession hinders them in two ways: (1) it reflects

poorly on the quality of the entire profession and (2) it obligates them to deal with students who have been inadequately prepared by the poorly performing teachers (AFT/NEA, 1998). The second concern raised was that principals believe that teacher evaluation is their exclusive realm of authority. Although principals might see teacher evaluation as a part of their job description alone, many administrators lack the time and subject matter knowledge to provide teachers with useful feedback. According to Stodolsky (1990), supervisors who evaluate teachers should have teaching experience in the same subject as the teacher being observed due, in part, to the high number of inferences evaluators have to make. A third concern was that if principals choose the peer evaluators, they will choose teachers for the position whom they have the ability to influence. To prevent principals from using favoritism in deciding which teachers are chosen to be peer evaluators, most PAR programs are governed by a panel comprised of equal numbers of teachers and administrators who make decisions regarding who will fill the consulting teacher positions (AFT/NEA, 1998). A fourth concern was that teachers who are peer evaluators are supervisors and should not be represented by the union. The AFT/NEA addressed this concern by showing that consulting teachers could not be excluded from union representation if the affiliate's contract used the appropriate language. The fifth and final major concern raised was that if the union endorsed policies that led to a teacher's termination, the union would be failing to exercise its duty to fairly represent teachers whose jobs were at stake. However, the law did not require unions to follow through on every grievance, so the unions would not be in violation of their duty of fair representation obligations (AFT/NEA, 1998).

While at the outset NEA's national policy statement on PAR generated considerable strife, since 1998 PAR has become a more common practice among local affiliates. The NEA and AFT encourage their affiliates to include language about Peer Assistance and Review in their contracts. In addition, two states, Ohio and California, have legislation which allocates funds for Peer Assistance and Review programs.

Union Capacity to Initiate PAR

Although the way in which unions negotiate and relate to district management might have to undergo substantial changes to promote a district-union collaborative that is supportive of PAR, advocates of "new unionism" argue that union participation in teachers' professional development and evaluation increases teacher capacity to take a leading role in managing their own profession. According to Kerchner, Koppich and Weeres (1997), "if peer review is linked to an ongoing system of professional development, teachers gain a real purchase on defining their own occupation" (p. 196). Thus, from the union perspective initiating PAR is equivalent to asserting teacher professionalism.

Other advocates of increased union participation in promoting teaching quality initiatives such as PAR also contend that the unions are in one of the best positions to influence and sustain systemic reform. First of all, unions have access to the large numbers of teachers who comprise their membership. While these teachers are not always in agreement with union initiatives, they do represent a captive audience for the ideas union leaders put forth (Kerchner, Koppich, & Weeres, 1997). In addition to the unions' access to large memberships, their dependence on these memberships demand that they be particularly responsive to teachers' desires in terms of professional

development (Bascia, 2000). Because union leaders are held accountable by their

members, union initiatives are more likely to be in line with what teachers view as the

substantive changes that should take place in schools. Finally, unions are well-positioned

to reform schools because they can be one of the most stable policy actors in the

landscape of school reform. In some districts, key leadership positions such as the

superintendency or school board membership turnover with such frequency that teacher

unions can provide some sense of connectedness between ever-changing school and

district administrations (Kerchner & Koppich, 2000).

The Tension Between Improving Teaching and Protecting Teachers

    Although there is strong support in both the NEA and AFT for increased union

participation in initiatives that aim to improve teaching quality, some more traditional

unionists harbor significant doubt that the relations between unions and district

management can ever be amiable (Johnson, 1984; Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988). They

believe that the union's role should be one of protecting the interests of its members under

the assumption that all teachers are doing the best they can given the conditions in which

they work. Even union members who are supportive of union involvement in the areas of

professional development and evaluation expect that unions will respect their

commitment to ensuring better working conditions and better pay for their members

(Bascia, 1994). The president of one local affiliate said union involvement in teaching

quality issues becomes more controversial when union members "see [it] as a retreat from

the bread and butter issue. But, if you keep both, keep the focus enough on the bread and

butter issue to get decent salaries while doing these things [initiatives to improve teaching

quality], then teachers are going to support it, particularly the young teachers, I think"

(Simon, personal communication, 2000). Thus, when issues of protecting the individual rights of teachers seem to conflict with the aim to ensure a high quality teacher for every student, teachers' unions find themselves in a bit of a quandary.

Summary

The history of Peer Assistance and Review sits within a broader union effort to change the public's perception of the union's relationship with management and the union's stance on school reform. Teachers' unions now strive to promote themselves as initiators of school reform that improves teaching quality, as opposed to adversaries of school reform which threatens teachers' jobs. Such a turnaround in union platforms means that local union affiliates have to work collaboratively with their districts to create contracts that promote the shared interests of labor and management.

While the large, consistent membership in teachers' unions places them in a good position to exert leverage in sustaining district reforms, more traditional unionists continue to doubt the viability of amicable labor-management relations. Furthermore, traditional unionists believe that their organizations are pulling away from the issues of teachers' wages and work conditions, which continue to hamper teacher recruitment and retention. Thus, union leadership finds that they must strike a delicate balance between promoting teaching quality initiatives and insisting on improved compensation and working conditions for their members. And in striking that balance, unions uphold PAR as an attempt to professionalize teaching and empower teachers to make and enforce decisions about what constitutes effective practice.

Teacher Evaluation

I will now begin to examine the literature in teacher evaluation and teacher induction to understand how this literature speaks to the assumptions and practices of first-year teachers' supervision in PAR. This section discusses ways that underlying assumptions and purposes of teacher evaluation are changing in some districts, partly as a result of recent attention to standards and accountability in education. As one of the more contemporary models of teacher evaluation and assistance, PAR is heralded by its advocates as a program which uses evaluation to enhance teachers' professional growth. However, PAR skeptics question whether traditional conceptions of teachers' work along with the traditional structures of districts and schools can be altered enough to provide a context where PAR can thrive.

The Purposes of Teacher Evaluation

Darling-Hammond, Wise, and Pease (1983) argue that depending upon its uses in different contexts, methods of teacher evaluation can represent divergent conceptions of teaching work. Drawing from the work of Kerchner and Mitchell (1983), they delineate four underlying assumptions districts make about teaching when they develop evaluation programs. When districts see teaching as *labor*, their evaluation systems are characterized by supervisors who scrutinize teachers' lesson plans, classroom performance, performance data with the belief that quality teaching will result from a rigid, concrete way of judging a teacher's performance. When districts view teaching as a *craft*, they believe that teachers who master technical skills will enhance their performance. These districts evaluate teachers against their use of specific techniques that district leaders believe will result in improved teaching quality. When districts view

teaching as a *profession*, they believe that teaching quality is enhanced when teachers apply skills using their own judgment. According to Darling-Hammond, Wise, and Pease (1983), in this model, "standards for evaluating professionals are developed by peers, and evaluation focuses on the degree to which teachers are competent at professional problem-solving; the school administrator is seen as an administrator whose task it is to ensure that teachers have the resources necessary to carry out their work" (p. 291). Finally, districts who view teaching as an *art* believe teaching is unpredictable and support teachers' desires to use techniques creatively in ways that best match their instructional circumstances. When teaching is viewed as an art, evaluation takes the form of self-assessments and high-inference critical assessments by others.

Darling-Hammond (1986) has argued that more traditional forms of teacher evaluation are products of a bureaucratic conception of teachers' work. She lists five features which characterize "bureaucratic evaluation": (1) administrators have the primary responsibility for planning and implementing evaluation, (2) the quality of teachers' performance is based on a limited number of classroom activities, (3) the quality of teachers' performance is determined using a checklist of generic teaching behaviors, (4) all teachers are evaluated on the same schedule (typically once per school year), using the same process, and (5) this one process is expected to encourage professional discussions about teaching, enhance professional development, and inform personnel decisions. In bureaucratic conceptions of teachers' work, teachers do not plan or inspect their practices; they merely do what administrators and curriculum specialists tell them to do (Darling-Hammond, 1986).

While the more traditional, bureaucratic ideas about teacher evaluation stand at the center of school reformists critique of teacher evaluation, Darling-Hammond (1986) argues that these bureaucratic perspectives have functioned to ensure the efficiency and uniformity of teacher evaluation, and to hold public schools accountable. At the same time she argues that prescribed measures of effective teaching have resulted in diminishing teacher capacity to exercise judgment about the type of instruction that would be best for their students. And, just as a singular approach to instruction will not necessarily be beneficial to all students at all times, a singular approach to teacher evaluation can not be expected to address the professional growth of all teachers within all contexts (Darling-Hammond, 1986).

Solving the Problems of Bureaucratic Conceptions of Teacher Evaluation

One Size Does Not Fit All.   Critics of the bureaucratic model of teacher evaluation argue that the type of evaluation most useful for teachers varies based on the teacher's stage of development. From this perspective, a district striving to promote teachers' professional growth should not evaluate competent teachers on their ability to meet minimal standards of effective practice (Duke & Stiggins, 1990; Duke, 1993). Similarly, new teachers would not be expected to exhibit the skills of well-seasoned teachers (Peterson, 1990). Advocates of a developmental model suggest that teacher evaluation ideally would involve three separate strands: (a) an induction strand for new teachers, (b) a remediation strand for struggling veteran teachers, and a (c) professional development strand for competent teachers (Stiggins & Duke, 1988). A bureaucratic approach to evaluation that insists upon all teachers being treated uniformly requires administrators to evaluate all teachers the same way every year, and could therefore

reduce the amount of time an administrator can attend to any one teacher (Darling-Hammond, 1986). According to these researchers, instead of providing for a careful evaluation of all teachers, bureaucratic systems promote teacher evaluation that is largely perfunctory (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 1986).

On its face, the model of evaluation being piloted at the site under examination in this study provides for varying evaluation processes depending on the teacher's developmental stage—PAR for teachers who are new or in remediation, and a Professional Growth Cycle for competent teachers. At question then, is how much variation of assistance occurs within those three groups. That is, do consulting teachers provide all new teachers with the same type of assistance, or does the content and amount of assistance vary based on the stage of the first-year teachers' development?

Qualifications of the Evaluating Administrators. In a bureaucratic conception of evaluation, the administrator has the primary responsibility for conducting teacher observations. However, administrators might not necessarily have experience in the grade or subject matter of the teachers they are evaluating. Administrators conducting observations out of field might not be able to provide substantive assistance to teachers regarding subject-specific pedagogy. As a result, "evaluation can attend only to the form rather than the substance of teaching and to the immediate rather than the long-term effects of teaching" (Darling-Hammond, 1986, p. 534).

The PAR program assigns consulting teachers at the secondary level according to subject matter. In this sense, the program appears to be designed to provide subject-specific assistance to teachers. In observations for the purposes of evaluation where there

is high inference on the part of the observer, it is particularly important for the evaluator's

teaching assignment to match that of the teacher being observed (Stodolsky, 1990).

Multiple Sources of Data. Another reason that administrative evaluation can fail to be

useful for teachers is that the evaluations are typically based only on classroom

observations alone. This traditional pattern of an administrator conducting observations

bound by the pre- and post-observation conferences, is called clinical supervision

(Stronge, 1997). Although classroom observations are an important source of

information about teacher performance, they exclude other critical aspects of teaching.

Darling-Hammond (1986) argues that isolated classroom observations do not help

evaluators:

> attend to matters of pedagogical knowledge or judgment, such as the
> appropriateness of teaching objectives for meeting certain goals or for different
> types of students; the appropriateness of the goals themselves; the relative
> effectiveness of alternative strategies for presenting particular types of content;
> the relationship among lessons taught throughout the course of a week, a month,
> or a semester; the variability of teaching techniques; the theoretical soundness of
> content and strategy decisions; or the depth of subject matter knowledge the
> teacher possesses and imparts to students (p. 534).

She concludes that the bureaucratic view of teacher evaluation privileges those aspects of

teaching that are most measurable, regardless of whether those aspects are the most

critical (Darling-Hammond, 1986).

Looking at teacher evaluation through the lens that views teachers as professionals

means using a wide variety of data to measure a teacher's overall quality (Darling-

Hammond, 1986; Peterson, 1990; Stiggins & Duke, 1988; Stronge, 1997). Data sources

other than classroom observation feedback can include: student performance data, client

feedback (e.g. evaluations of a teacher's performance by students or parents), peer

assessment, and teacher tests (Peterson, 1990; Stronge, 1997). Multiple data sources not

only provide teachers with a fuller picture of their performance, but they also tend to be more valid, more reliable, and legally defensible (Stronge, 1997).

Consulting teachers at the site for this study were trained to take literal observation notes so that they could provide their clients with specific evidence in the form of direct quotes when conferring with them after an observation. In pursuing this study, I became interested in how consulting teachers used sources of data beyond classroom observations in assisting and evaluating teachers. And I wondered how the sources of data the consulting teachers used influenced the way the first-year teachers perceived the legitimacy of the suggestions or observations their consulting teachers made.

Promoting more than one approach to teaching. Traditional teacher evaluation privileges the model of direct instruction (Darling-Hammond, 1995). When evaluators enter a room and see students working in groups or working independently, they often choose to come back on another occasion when they can see teachers lecturing to their students (Darling-Hammond, 1986). As ideas of what it means to teach change, teacher evaluation must change. Thus, a more professional conception of teacher evaluation would value a teacher's judgment as to what models their lessons should take given the learning objectives. And, when teachers chose more constructivist or cooperative learning models, evaluators would support those options by examining how the teacher's planning facilitated students' abilities to take responsibility for their own learning.

Problems that the Professional Conception of Teaching Fails to Solve

Although Darling-Hammond (1995) argues for a more professional and less bureaucratic conception of teacher evaluation, there is some evidence that teachers themselves choose quick, less meaningful activities to fulfill evaluation requirements

over opportunities for growth. One focus of Murray's (2000) study of recently tenured teachers' perceptions of "new unionism" was how teachers view Rochester's teacher evaluation program, which is called Performance Appraisal and Review for Teachers (PART). PART is the strand of teacher evaluation in Rochester focused on tenured teachers whom the district deems as competent. Through PART tenured teachers can choose to participate in a peer review process or in a more traditional administrator-directed evaluation process.

The peer review process is a three-year cycle in which teachers write a professional development plan that details the goals they will work toward for each school year. In addition, teachers invite at least two of their peers to conduct regular observations in their classrooms over the course of the three years. Each year the teacher in this process creates a portfolio or some other form of documentation which shows his or her progress throughout the school year. At the end of the third year, the teachers submit a detailed, summative report to a group of peer reviewers (whom the teachers themselves have chosen) documenting the steps they've taken to achieve their professional growth goals. Based on the report and the artifacts (such as classroom observation feedback, student evaluations, or parent communications), the peer reviewers issue a report that states whether or not the teacher has successfully met district standards. If the reviewers believe the teacher has been successful, another three-year cycle ensues, but if the teacher's performance is not judged acceptable, the review panel can recommend the teacher for remediation, and the teacher could be denied his or her salary increase that year.

In her interviews with 18 recently tenured teachers (teachers in their fourth through seventh year of teaching), Murray (2000) found that only half had chosen a peer review model of evaluation. Several teachers interviewed thought that the peer review process was too time-consuming, paperwork laden, and subject to bias. Some of the teachers expressed concern about whether the annual assessments they prepared were ever reviewed by anyone. In addition, many did not possess a full understanding of the process. Some teachers also expressed a real desire to have traditional administrative evaluation so that the administrators knew what kind of job they're doing in the classroom. On the other hand, some teachers who had elected the administrative review reported that required classroom observations were not always conducted, and when they were, the teachers questioned how qualified the administrators were to be doing the evaluations. Murray (2000) concluded that "neither administrative review nor peer review were seen [by recently tenured teachers] as ideal" (p. 20). Her study indicates that aspects of the bureaucratic conception of teacher evaluation are not only prized by districts, but also by teachers who desire the most streamlined evaluation process available. In this study I attended to how much teachers value their participation in PAR and how much they feel PAR is simply "another thing to do." These conceptions of PAR proved to be connected to how the CT defined his or her supportive and evaluative roles.

The Elements of Teacher Evaluation Leading to Professional Growth

Outside of examining teacher evaluation in terms of the ideology underlying various approaches, researchers look specifically at characteristics of teacher evaluation that lead to teachers' professional growth. Stiggins and Duke (1988) argue that the five keys to effective evaluation are: the teacher, the evaluator, the procedures, the feedback, and the

context of evaluation. In the case studies they conducted, the teachers who experienced growth related to evaluation were those *competent professionals* who were open to constructive feedback, possessed high expectations for their performance, expressed a willingness to change, possessed knowledge of how to teach their subjects, and had experienced useful evaluations in the past. The most effective evaluators in the study established credibility with their clients, exhibited patience and built trust, were skilled in the art of persuasion, frequently modeled lessons, and had a good overall track record among teachers. Evaluation procedures that contributed to teachers' professional growth included the existence of clearly communicated performance standards that teachers had agreed were important for measuring instructional effectiveness. Evaluators used several sources of data on teacher performance, including classroom observations, school records, and student achievement indicators. The feedback they gave was specific, frequent, descriptive, timely, and relevant. Finally, the contextual factors which influenced the quality of teacher evaluation included the relationship between the teachers' union and the district, the amount of time devoted to evaluation, and the amount of resources allocated for growth opportunities (Stiggins & Duke, 1988).

Stiggins and Duke's (1988) characteristics provided an outline of areas for me to attend to as I collected data on first-year teachers' experiences with PAR. The characteristics raised a few questions: (a) how can teachers who do not exhibit all of the attributes they listed experience growth through evaluation? (b) how can districts ensure that evaluators are trained in the skills necessary to promote evaluation for growth?

(c) how much does the district's access to substantial fiscal resources influence the quality of evaluation? And, how can districts that lack ample fiscal resources develop effective teacher evaluation programs?

Characteristics of Effective Beginning Teacher Evaluation

By focusing particularly on the evaluation of first-year teachers, Peterson (1990) supplements Stiggins and Duke's (1988) findings regarding the general characteristics of effective evaluation. According to Peterson (1990) first-year teachers' evaluations are often plagued by feedback which lacks precision and significance, given by principals who serve as both supporters and judges. When summative and formative feedback are given to new teachers at the same time by the same person, the new teachers can feel too threatened to engage in meaningful professional development. Instead, they just strive to please their supervisors (Peterson, 1990). Peterson (1990) argues that "first-year teachers should be given some protection and privacy in early evaluations to manage the level of threat" (p. 108). In addition, he notes that first-year teachers crave assurance from their administrators that they are doing well[1] (Peterson, 1990).

Peterson also argues that first-year teachers need a thorough *assessment* of their instructional practices, even more than veterans do. He distinguishes assessment from evaluation in the same way that formative evaluation is distinguished from summative evaluation. Assessment is strictly for the purposes of improving a teacher's practice, without imposing a penalty for practice that needs improvement. He argues that this assessment should take the form of student achievement data, student and parent surveys, observation feedback, and records of the teacher's planning and practice. In addition, he argues that the first-year teacher should control what documents are chosen for the

---

[1] This is quite similar to Murray's (2000) findings in her study of recently-tenured teachers.

assessment (Peterson, 1990). It appears, then, that first-year teachers require many of the same considerations as veterans when it comes to evaluation, but that they especially desire the psychological support that comes from ongoing, specific assessment and feedback from their supervisors (Peterson, 1990).

Summary

Traditional evaluation has focused more on the routines of school organizations than on the professional development of individual teachers. Approaches to evaluation using this bureaucratic concept of teachers' work have resulted in superficial practices that neither assist individual teachers with their professional growth, nor account for the multiple facets of instructional practice.

Because teachers instead of administrators have the responsibility for conducting teacher evaluations, PAR seems to fit within the conception of teaching as a profession. When teachers control evaluation they exert their capacity to set and enforce the standards of their profession. Nonetheless, even teachers themselves can be wed to the more streamlined form of administrator-directed evaluation. A particular tension exists for new teachers who might not devote ample time for reflection and assessment, but who are at a stage of psychological and professional development that calls for regular feedback on the quality of their instructional practice.

<div align="center">Teacher Induction</div>

Advocates of Peer Assistance and Review not only claim that it is a better way of evaluating teachers than more traditional evaluation systems, but they also claim that PAR provides first-year teachers intensive assistance. In this sense, advocates claim that PAR can be a professional development tool for new teachers. This section of the

chapter reviews research on teacher induction in order to see how that knowledge base can inform PAR as a form of professional development for new teachers.

The Need for Beginning Teacher Assistance

The first year of teaching is well documented as a demanding experience in which new teachers face the "reality shock" (Veenman, 1984) of time and resource constraints and workplace isolation (Lortie, 1975). Far from fulfilling their expectation that teaching would serve as the venue through which they could change the world, most new teachers struggle to survive initial teaching assignments which more than likely include teaching the most challenging students and sponsoring the most time-consuming extracurricular activities. Some new teachers have the additional burden of being assigned to teach a subject that it out of their field (Jerald & Bosser, 2000). Furthermore, many new secondary teachers do not have classrooms to teach in and are forced to fit all of their belongings onto a rolling cart. Such working conditions create unforeseen challenges for the new teacher who might shun away from seeking help, believing that admitting frustration equals admitting failure.

What Induction Programs Can Accomplish

A number of studies have discuss the benefits of induction programs. Perhaps, the most recent trend in the aims of these programs is to help recruit, develop, and retain new teachers (RNT, 1999). Huling-Austin (1986) arges that districts designing and implementing induction programs must recognize that these programs are limited in what they can do. If they meet specific conditions, induction programs can improve new teachers' performance, increase new teacher retention, improve new teachers' well-being, and weed out poorly performing new teachers. Huling-Austin (1986) cautions that

induction programs can be expected to improve new teacher performance only if they provide *ongoing support and assistance* to help new teachers meet *clearly defined standards*. Furthermore, induction programs can be expected to weed out poorly performing new teachers only if there is an evaluation component involved. On the other hand, Huling-Austin warns that induction programs cannot be expected to help new teachers completely overcome contextual factors such as being assigned to teach out-of-field or being assigned to overcrowded classrooms. In addition, induction programs will not magically transform new teachers who do not possess the background, training, or personal characteristics to be successful in the profession. Finally, induction programs cannot be expected to retain teachers on a long-term basis since factors such as low pay, low status, poor working conditions, and scant leadership opportunities play a significant role in good teachers leaving the profession (Huling-Austin, 1986).

Using Huling-Austin's set of criteria, Peer Assistance and Review has the potential to improve new teacher performance if consistent, ongoing assistance is provided to new teachers. PAR could also weed out poorly performing teachers since a formal evaluation component is involved. What Huling-Austin fails to provide is a clear description of the kind of assistance most beneficial to new teachers. This study attempted to identify connections between the source of authority consulting teachers used in supervising their clients and the changes in the first-year teachers' instruction. Such findings have the potential to inform districts not only of what induction programs can do, but also of *how* and *under what conditions* they can do it.

In another study designed to collect data on the potential of teacher induction programs, the California legislature gathered some specific information about the

potential of beginning teacher support and assessment programs. The study was

conducted in large part to garner support for allocating state funds to teacher induction

programs. Bartell (1995) reviewed the results of a four-year pilot study conducted in

multiple districts on the outcomes of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) which

emphasized assistance and assessment for first- and second-year teachers in the state.

Outcomes of the study were defined within the confines of (a) new teacher performance,

(b) new teacher retention, and (c) new teacher satisfaction. Over the course of four years

approximately 3,000 first- and second-year teachers participated in the study.

Researchers issued questionnaires to teachers who did and did not participate in CNTP,

principals of teachers who were CNTP and non-CNTP participants, and experienced

teachers who collaborated with CNTP participants.   Interviews were conducted with

selected CNTP and non-CNTP teachers, as well as staff development specialists and

support providers who had worked closely with new teachers who did and did not

participate in CNTP.   In addition, teachers within and outside CNTP were rated on their

use of instructional practices which research linked to student achievement. Finally,

researchers collected documentation on the planning and activities that occurred which

related to the implementation of CNTP.

    The findings of the study indicate that when compared with first-year teachers who

did not participate in CNTP, the CNTP participants were more likely to: (a) use

instructional practices that research has linked to student achievement, (b) use

instructional practices that encourage students to think critically and work

collaboratively, (c) use long-range planning to ensure that students were exposed to all of

the skills indicated in that year's curriculum, (d) encourage diverse students to construct

knowledge, and (e) engage ethnically diverse students in challenging activities and curricula at the same rate at which they engaged ethnically homogenous students in rigorous coursework (Bartell, 1995). Features of the induction program which the researchers connected to these outcomes include: (a) providing new teachers with well-trained experienced teachers to assist them, (b) providing time for the new and experienced teachers to collaborate, (c) providing instruction to new teachers that is especially tailored to their concerns in this stage of their careers, and (d) providing opportunities for experienced teachers to follow-up with new teachers after their instruction to help the new teachers solve dilemmas that occurred in their implementation of new instructional approaches (Bartell, 1995).

While the results of this study lend a great deal of support for investing in induction programs, the study does not reveal enough about the quality of the particular induction programs under investigation. By comparing CNTP participants to first-year teachers who did not have any type of formal induction experiences, the study merely shows that when new teachers get *something* in the way of induction, they are better off than if they get *nothing*. The findings from my study, on the other hand, answers the question of the substance of assistance that was most beneficial to the five, first-year teacher participants.

A similar need for a more clearly defined link between induction processes and new teachers' instruction characterizes Schaffer, Stringfield, and Wolfe's (1992) study of a two-year program in North Carolina called the Teacher Induction Program (TIP). Faculty from the University of North Carolina, Charlotte along with local district employees collaborated to supervise first-year teachers in the participating school districts. During the first year of the program, for at least three hours per week, new

teachers received instruction in a variety of instructional methods recognized as successful by teacher effectiveness research. The new teachers also received constant feedback, and were frequently engaged in problem solving sessions to help them work through the dilemmas of classroom practice. In addition, the supervisors presented new teachers with data from the Stallings Observation System (SOS), a low-inference observation system used to measure how teachers make use of their class time with students. After reviewing the SOS results, the new teachers worked in groups to see how they could use the data to improve their classroom performance.

Schaffer, Stringfield, and Wolfe (1992) measured changes in new teachers' instructional behaviors over time by examining SOS data that indicated how much time the new teachers spent on "all academic statements" versus time spent on "all organizing statements" or "all behavior-related statements." "All academic statements" are positively correlated with increased high student achievement, and should, according to Stallings (1980), comprise at least 80% of the class time. Stallings (1980) also found that students are more likely to have higher achievement when no more than 12% of class time is spent on organizing statements, and no more than 3% of class time is taken up with behavior-related statements.

Schaffer, Stringfield, and Wolfe (1992) found that teachers participating in the induction program increased their number of all academic statements from 73.6% to 80.9% within the first year. New teachers who participated in the induction program over the course of two years increased their number of all academic statements from 70.8% at the beginning of their first year to 82.6% by the spring semester of their second year. Schaffer, Stringfield, and Wolfe argue that having access to ongoing support over time

made their new teachers more likely to exhibit masterful instructional skills, particularly after the second year of induction. By their own admission this conclusion fails to control for changes in the new teachers instruction that occurred simply as a result of their trial-and-error experiences in the classroom.

Existing State and District Induction Programs

Findings from the 2000 Edition of *Quality Counts, Education Week*'s state-by-state report of existing issues in educational reform, reveal that statewide teacher induction programs are "underdeveloped and underfunded" (p. 45). The survey uncovered that although 28 states require induction or provide funding for it, only 19 states ensure that *all* first-year teachers are able to participate in induction programs, and only 10 states provide some or all of the monies to support induction. Mentoring is a key aspect of the induction program in 27 states, and six states also provide new teachers with a full support team (Education Week, 2000). Other studies have documented the success of collaborations between universities and school districts to induct new teachers (Colbert & Wolff, 1992; Schaffer, Stringfield, & Wolfe, 1992).

Recruiting New Teachers (RNT) conducted a survey of 118 school districts representing 35 states to determine whether those school districts had formal induction programs in place and to determine the scope of those induction programs. In addition, RNT made site visits to ten districts that were surveyed and reported on their programs in detail. RNT also collected data from states regarding the level of funding they provide for teacher induction. The major findings of the study indicate that while most districts have some form of induction program for new teachers, the comprehensiveness and depth of those programs vary considerably. Nonetheless, 94% of the districts surveyed self-

reported having induction programs which can be described as "formal, in-depth, and sustained" (RNT, 1999, p. 39), and only seven of the districts reported having induction programs which consisted of isolated orientation activities. Forty-eight percent of the districts said that they controlled induction programs without external partners, while 31% of the districts reported that they run induction programs in conjunction with local universities and 20% reported that they work with teachers' unions[2] (RNT, 1999).

Different districts also cite various purposes of their induction programs. Among the most important purposes of induction, according to 92-96% of the respondents, was helping new teachers "build a sense of professionalism, provide [new teachers with] personal support, promote collaboration among teachers, improve new teachers' knowledge, skills, and performance, develop inductee self-confidence, and ease the transition into teaching" (RNT, 1999, p. 41). Induction goals rated least important by most districts were to "train unlicensed teachers, prepare inductees for (external) assessment leading to licensure, evaluate and screen out unacceptably poor performers for termination" (RNT, 1999, p. 43). Of the 19 districts surveyed that rated new teacher evaluation as an important or very important goal of induction, at least five of them had Peer Assistance and Review programs in place.[3]

Three of the sites where RNT conducted visits, Cincinnati, Minneapolis, and Rochester, had implemented Peer Assistance and Review programs. Both Cincinnati and Rochester had the common elements of assigning an outstanding veteran teacher, called the consulting teacher (CT), to all new teachers (and some teachers new to the district) and to those veteran teachers who had failed to meet district standards. The consulting

---

[2] Survey respondents were able to indicate their work with multiple partners, thus these statistics do not necessarily represent distinct districts.
[3] Those five districts are Toledo, Cincinnati, Columbus, Minneapolis, and Rochester.

teachers worked with their clients for a full year, helping them obtain instructional supplies, familiarizing them with district policies, and assisting them with planning instruction. Consulting teachers also conducted regular classroom observations of their clients and summarized their clients progress in summative reports. At the end of the year, the consulting teachers either recommended that their clients' contracts be renewed or terminated. In Minneapolis, the idea of peer review was just gaining attention due to a new state mandate for peer evaluation. At the time of RNT's reporting, Minneapolis had a well-defined induction component, and a peer review component in the developmental stages.

Cincinnati's program, called the Peer Assistance and Evaluation Program (PAEP), was established in 1985. Five years later Cincinnati integrated PAEP with the Career in Teaching Program, which is a career ladder which categorizes teachers into four levels: intern teachers, resident teachers, career teachers and lead teachers. Teachers receive $1,000-$5,000 salary increases for attaining the career teacher and lead teacher levels. All teachers new to Cincinnati Public Schools are classified as interns. They are paired with consulting teachers, and they are expected to successfully complete the internship phase within two years (although many move through this phase in one year).

RNT interviewed a number of Cincinnati's interns about their experiences in PAEP. Most interns reported that consulting teachers were helpful to them because: (a) the CT taught the same subject or grade level as the intern, (b) the CT helped the intern find instructional materials, and (c) the CT helped the intern develop "job targets" (or written professional goals, required by the district). Another aspect of the program interns found particularly beneficial was the opportunity to visit and observe other teachers. One of the

interns interviewed was unhappy with having to identify job targets so early in her first year, and not being allowed to change the targets as the year progressed. Other interns commented that they had heard rumors of CT-intern relationships that were not positive, and they were curious about what interns could do about keeping their jobs if they did not get along with their CTs. Finally, according to the RNT report, one intern, Mary, "can't say whether she owes it to her CT, but she constantly reflects on her practice" (RNT, 1999, p. 149).

While the interviews that RNT conducted help to reveal some important aspects of PAEP, RNT failed to get a more comprehensive view of the program by reviewing findings from interviews of the consulting teachers that worked with these interns. Furthermore, RNT did not conduct classroom observations of the interns over time, so it is unclear what kind of impact participating in the program had on the interns' instruction. RNT also failed to give a balanced account of the negative experiences of interns within the program. The reader is only provided with hearsay regarding rumors of negative intern-CT experiences. Without a balanced view, the findings seem overwhelmingly positive, and thus may represent an unrealistic view of first-year teachers experiences in PAEP.

Characteristics of Effective Mentoring in Induction Programs

Whether induction programs include or exclude an evaluation component, most all induction programs involve the new teacher's assignment to a mentor. Odell (1986) found that mentoring is related to higher new teacher retention. According to Little (1990), mentors can "alleviate the shock of entry into teaching, hasten the pace of learning to teach, model favorable professional relations among teachers, and reinforce

teachers' loyalty to the profession" (p. 322).   Other researchers argue for "educative mentoring," which is not focused on the technical aspects of teaching as much as it is focused on developing teachers' long-term potential to engage in systematic inquiry about their practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

The National Commission on Professional Support and Development for Novice Teachers, a joint venture of the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) and Kappa Delta Pi (KDP) has developed a framework for quality mentoring. The framework lays out six dimensions of mentoring programs: (1) program purposes, (2) school, district, and university cultures and responsibilities, (3) mentor selection and mentor/novice matching, (4) mentor preparation and development, (5) mentor roles and practices, and (6) program administration, implementation, and evaluation. Dimension five is divided into three different components: (a) mentor's view of role and relationship to novice, (b) mentor-teacher participation in preparation and ongoing development, and (c) focus of mentor/novice work. Overall, this dimension emphasizes the mentor's role as one who engages new teachers in the process of reflection and problem solving by modeling these processes. Mentors should also model a commitment to ongoing professional development by continuing to learn more about teaching, while simultaneously learning more about mentoring. Finally, mentors have the responsibility for facilitating new teachers' ongoing inquiry by encouraging them to observe other teachers, collaborate with other teachers, and keep written records of their reflections (Odell, Huling, Resta, Feiman-Nemser, Schwille, Bartell, Day, DeBolt, Dynak, Head, Nagel, Reiman, Sweeny, & Wolfe, 2000).

A case study of a mentor who possessed these attributes was conducted by Feiman-Nemser (2001), who characterized the mentor she studied as exemplifying the idea of "educative mentoring." This mentor teacher clearly defined the purpose of mentoring as a mechanism for helping novice teachers develop their own professional identities, and as a way to help novices build their practice around what is known about what it means to teach all children. He rejected the idea that mentoring is one-directional (in the sense that the mentor is feeding knowledge to the novice teacher) and embraced the idea of the mentor as a new teacher's "co-thinker." He assisted new teachers by engaging them in posing questions which were aimed at finding the underlying causes that contribute to new teachers' typical challenges, such as classroom management. In addition, he helped his clients examine their own thinking about their students and their work Thus, he encouraged them to think analytically about their practice. In providing the new teachers with feedback, this mentor was explicit and often modeled lessons for them. After modeling lessons, he would have conversations with teachers to help them distinguish the elements of the lesson which were exemplars of effective teaching and those which were merely characteristics of personal style. In this sense, he hoped that new teachers would not simply mimic what he did in the classroom, but think about how they could adapt those elements of effective teaching into their particular teaching style (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Feiman-Nemser (2001) concludes that, "situated in practice and in a relationship with an experienced educator, mentoring has the potential to foster powerful teaching and to develop the dispositions and skills of continuous improvement" (p. 28).

These findings suggest the importance of attending to the content of the assistance consulting teachers give to first-year teachers in PAR. Are the consulting teachers

helping the first-year teachers develop their own professional identities, or are they

encouraging (even unwittingly) new teachers to mimic their practices? And, how much

do the conversations between consulting teachers and their clients push the new teachers

constantly to pose questions about their instruction?

As the body of research on the characteristics of effective mentors grows, more

researchers are questioning the type of training that mentor teachers receive. Huling-

Austin (1992) argues that mentor teachers should be trained in schema theory. By

understanding schema theory, mentor teachers would see the importance of explaining

not only what they do with kids, but also the rationale behind what they do as they work

with their clients. New teachers' knowledge tends to be less specific and less well-

organized than the knowledge of expert teachers, thus, to be effective, mentor teachers

must be explicit about how they organize what they know (Huling-Austin, 1992).

Mentor teachers also need to be well-grounded in subject-specific pedagogy in order to

help first-year teachers anticipate what aspects of the subject matter students are likely to

find confusing (Huling-Austin, 1992). Finally, Huling-Austin (1992) recommends that

mentor teachers use case studies to help new teachers begin to problem-solve.

While a good deal of literature argues for the importance of mentor training,

considerably less research has been done to discover what preparation the new teacher

needs to develop the most productive relationship with his or her mentor. Findings from

Gratch's (1998) study of beginning teacher and mentor relationships suggests that the

lack of value first-year teachers place on collaboration may inhibit their ability to

maximize the benefits of having a mentor. Furthermore, Tellez (1992) found that when

new teachers were experiencing serious problems they were *less likely* to turn to a mentor

to whom they had been formally assigned and more likely to turn to a close friend or family member for help. Tellez (1992) notes that "first-year teachers appear to seek help from sources they perceive as least threatening" and the most caring (p. 218) . In addition, he found that first-year teachers might be willing to go to their mentors for some forms of help, but not for others. He attributes this finding to first-year teachers' embarrassment about having to seek help and to the possible inaccessibility of the mentor (Tellez, 1992).

These findings suggest that unless first-year teachers are prepared to make use of their mentors by possessing dispositions that value collaboration and help-seeking, the relationship between first-year teachers and their mentors might be superficial at best. This study asked the question, "how did the district prepare first-year teachers to use and make sense of PAR?" in order to examine how the new teachers' initial understandings of their relationship with the consulting teachers influenced the quality of the interactions that occurred.

Negotiating the Roles of Helper and Evaluator in Mentoring

Tellez's (1992) findings also highlight how important it is for first-year teachers not to feel threatened by the mentors to whom they are supposed to turn for help. Peterson (1990) argues that "well-trained mentors serve as guides, consultants, and advocates; they should not be evaluators" (p. 109). According to Stroble and Cooper (1998), "when the mentor must not only coach the beginner—encouraging, advising, befriending—but also referee the beginner—evaluating, appraising, judging—the most beneficial aspects of a mentor-novice relationship are strained. A confusion of helping and evaluating roles places disparate demands on the mentor and erodes the beginner's trust" (p. 233). This

raised a critical issue in my study. If consulting teachers were as responsible for writing their clients' summative evaluations as they are for assisting their clients, how much would first-year teachers be willing to share the real problems they faced in their practice? How much would that critical element of trust be a basis for the relationship between the CT and the first-year teachers?

Duke (1993) argues that teachers' professional growth is inhibited when districts write summative evaluations based on whether or not the teacher met his or her professional development goals. Teachers in this predicament will be unwilling to take risks or stretch their abilities when setting goals. Instead, the teachers are more likely to identify professional goals that they have already achieved (Duke, 1993).

Odell, Huling, and Sweeny (2000) support a standards-based approach for new teacher induction. In their model new teachers would engage in self-assessments, mentor teachers would provide assistance and formative assessment, and the school administrators would be responsible for formative and summative assessment. As applied to PAR, this model would relieve consulting teachers of negotiating the conflicting roles of help provider and evaluator. At the same time, the model would leave principals in charge of summative evaluation, undermining the key element in PAR that places teachers in control of enforcing professional standards. On the other hand, it would give principals a clearer role in the evaluation of new teachers.

Summary

Within the last decade teacher induction has received considerable attention from educational researchers as a means to increase new teacher retention and to improve new teacher performance. While many states require some form of teacher induction, the

quality, nature, and intensity of the induction programs vary considerably. There is also considerable variation in the purposes of induction programs. Some programs concentrate only on introducing new teachers to the characteristics of the school or district in which they work. Other programs provide ongoing assistance to new teachers throughout the first year, through the assignment of one mentor or a group of support personnel. Still other programs use induction as a way to both assist and assess (formatively and summatively) new teachers.

Although a significant body of research is evolving around the characteristics of effective mentoring within induction programs, less has been studied regarding how to prepare new teachers to benefit from their relationships with mentors. And, a number of studies do not support the idea of mentors taking on both an assistance and evaluative role. This study explored how first-year teachers saw the usefulness of their mentors and examined how much new teachers viewed their participation in PAR as an opportunity to grow professionally versus as a mandate to be judged. The questions of how the relationship between beginning and consulting teachers developed and what that relationship meant to first-year teachers and their practices was a focus of my analysis.

Peer Assistance and Review

Although PAR has been in existence since 1981, the amount of systematic inquiry conducted on PAR programs has been scarce to say the least. This section of the literature review discusses several studies which have looked specifically at aspects of Peer Assistance and Review programs (as opposed to providing only brief snapshots of PAR within the context of evaluation and induction).

The Changing Needs of Entry-Year Teachers Participating in PAR

A previous study of PAR that is most relevant to this study was conducted by Stroot et

al. (1999). They studied 67 entry-year teachers' experiences in Columbus, Ohio's PAR

program. Teachers defined as "entry-year" included those who had never taught before,

as well as those who had never been taught before *in the district*. The questions guiding

their study were:

- Were there differences in the needs of entry-year teachers based on their prior experience?
- What were the needs of beginning and experienced teachers, and how did they change over time?
- What were the specific goals and concerns of the entry-year teachers, and how did they change throughout the year?
- What was the overall impact of the collaborative Peer Assistance and Review model on entry-year teachers? (Stroot et al., 1999, p. 29).

That this was a study of a *collaborative* PAR model refers to the fact that the College of

Education at The Ohio State University formed a partnership with the PAR program in

Columbus. Faculty in the College provide assistance to entry-year as well as consulting

teachers. In addition, the College offered workshops to entry-year teachers and a course

for graduate credit to all teachers in the Columbus school district.

Data sources for the study included a 10-question survey (based on a 5-point Likert

scale) of entry-year teachers' perceived needs in the following categories:

- Managing the classroom.
- Expectations of Me as a Teacher
- Obtaining Instructional Resources and Materials
- Planning, Organizing Time and Work
- Assessing students
- Motivating students
- Effective Teaching Methods
- Individual Students Needs
- Communicating with Colleagues
- Communicating with Parents (Stroot et al., 1999, p. 30-31).

In addition to the survey, open-ended questions were administered to the consulting teachers to obtain more detailed information regarding the teachers' perceived needs and areas of concern. Consulting teachers then used the completed surveys to set goals for what the entry-year teachers would work on. This sequence of survey administration followed by the consulting teachers' planning meetings with their clients occurred three times during the course of the school year (at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year) for the purposes of data collection (Stroot et al., 1999).

Stroot et al. (1999) found that the entry-year teachers' perceived assistance needs and concerns changed significantly along some variables during the course of the school year. According to the results of the close-ended survey, in the time period from the beginning until the middle of the year, entry-year teachers in PAR identified significantly less of a need to obtain help with understanding (1) what is expected of them from the district, principal, students and parents they work with (job expectations), (2) how to access instructional resources and materials, (3) how to assess and evaluate their students, (4) how to motivate their students, and (5) how to deal with students' individual needs (differentiating instruction). The assistance needs of entry-year teachers in PAR were also reduced significantly from the beginning to the end of the year in the areas of classroom management, job expectations, instructional materials, student assessment, teaching effectiveness, and parent communication. Finally, from the middle of the school year to the end, entry-year teachers' needs for assistance were significantly reduced in the areas of job expectations, teaching effectiveness, differentiating instruction, colleague communication, and parent communication (Stroot et al., 1999).

The three open-ended questions the researchers posed were:

- ▪ Are there any areas in which you need assistance?
- ▪ What is your greatest concern as a teacher at this time?
- ▪ What are your goals to improve your teaching at this time?[4]
  (Stroot et al., 1999, p. 32).

While "management" (a researcher-generated category which encompassed discipline,

classroom organization, student motivation, and time management) was the most frequent

response to all three questions, there was a sharp decrease from the first to the last survey

in the percent of teachers who named management in response to the "needs assistance"

or "greatest concern" questions (questions one and two). While management needs

appeared to decrease drastically from the beginning to the end of the year, there was a

significant increase from the first to last survey in the percent of teachers who requested

assistance with instruction, and an increase in the number of instructional goals teachers

set as the year ensued. However, a small number of teachers named instructional issues

as their greatest concerns, and even as requests for management assistance decreased and

requests for instructional assistance decreased, management remained the dominant issue

teachers thought about as they reflected on their overall needs in their first year. In

addition to the increase in instructional needs as the year progressed, teachers also

increasingly indicated a need for resources and for professional development.

   Finally, Stroot et al. (1999) asked teachers to comment on the impact of the

collaborative PAR model on their first year of teaching. Of the 154 responses, 139 were

positive, six were neutral, and nine were negative. The researchers developed categories

for those items which teachers indicated the PAR had most influenced. The top three

categories were: resources, emotional impact, and teachers' professional development.

All but two comments in resource category were positive. These comments referred to

---

[4] The third time the open-ended survey was administered, the last question was what goals entry-year teachers had for the beginning of the next year.

the value of the assistance in obtaining instructional materials. The negative comments both referred the workshop's lack of usefulness for the individual teacher. All comments falling into the emotional impact category were positive, and referred to the teachers' increased comfort in knowing that they were not alone. And, all but three comments in the professional development category were positive. Positive comments indicated that PAR had helped teachers examine their practice more closely, and negative responses indicated that PAR had made no useful contribution at all to the teachers' professional growth. Almost none of the respondents indicated that PAR had had an impact on either their classroom management or on their instruction (Stroot et al., 1999).

From these findings, the researchers concluded that the needs of entry-year teachers in PAR changed markedly from the beginning to the end of the school year. They argue that new teachers who receive assistance take care of management issues at the beginning of the year, so that by the end of the year they are more focused on instructional issues. This supports Odell's (1986) findings that teachers who receive assistance move more quickly from management to instructional concerns. Stroot et al. (1999) also argue that when assistance programs address entry-year teachers' emotional needs, the programs provide an environment conducive to engaging teachers in professional growth.

One weakness of the Stroot et al. (1999) study is that there is no indication that the entry-year teachers in the study would have progressed any more slowly through stages of new teacher development if no assistance had been provided. While the findings of Stroot et al. (1999) provide some evidence that PAR influences the experiences of teachers who participate in it, the findings do not delve into *how* that influence occurs or *what the nature* of PAR's influence on teachers' instruction comprises. If entry-year

teachers who have access to assistance are more quickly focused on issues of instruction,

what types of instructional issues interest them the most? How does working with the

consulting teachers influence the amount new teachers engage in reflection, and how

does the participation in PAR influence what new teachers reflect about?

The Impact of PAR on Consulting Teachers' Professional Experiences

The majority of the studies on PAR focus not on the experiences of first-year teachers,

but on the professional experiences of teachers who are in the consulting teacher role. In

a study of the leadership role taken by PAR consulting teachers in the Columbus PAR

program, the same program studied by Stroot, et. al (1999), Knight (1990) posed the

following questions:

> (1) How is the role of Peer Assistance and Review consultants one of teacher
>   leadership?
> (2) What personal and developmental factors influence the classroom teacher to
>   explore and ultimately assume the Peer Assistance and Review consulting
>   role?
> (3) How do the contextual factors related to the consultants sense of efficacy
>   motivate and/or impede the Peer Assistance and Review consultants in
>   effectively carrying out their role?
> (4) How do the contextual factors of influence, power, and authority affect the
>   Peer Assistance and Review consultant in relationship to administrators, their
>   personal, leadership, and role relationships with other teachers, and their
>   relationships with each other? (p. 10).

As a research associate at The Ohio State University, Knight worked with the

collaborative PAR program. Thus, as part of her data collection she used her fieldnotes

from assisting in the PAR office on campus and assisting with the preparation of the

graduate course for consulting teachers. In addition, Knight followed consulting teachers

to some of their client visits and observed the intern or veteran teachers in the program as

well as the post-observation conferences conducted between consulting teachers and their

clients. Nineteen of the twenty-two consultant teachers in the Columbus PAR program

agreed to participate in Knight's (1990) study. In addition to observations, Knight (1990) used interviews, a questionnaire, a pilot study, written profiles, and documents as sources of data.

Knight's (1990) findings were divided into the categories of role factors, leadership factors, personal factors, and contextual factors. In the category of role factors, she found that consulting teachers simultaneously took on the roles of mentor, colleague and evaluator. Mentors' roles with first-year teachers, with whom they primarily assisted in orientation to the urban work environment, was completely different from their roles with veteran teachers who had been identified for remediation. For instance, veteran teachers rarely felt that there was a problem with the way they taught. Although consulting teachers served as evaluators, they often felt they had very little power in determining their clients employment status because the PAR Panel made the final decision (Knight, 1990).

In the category of leadership, consultants believed that the key leadership attributes necessary to be successful in their roles were: "(1) interpersonal skills, (2) knowledge about teachers and learning and/or being an expert teacher, (3) organizational ability, (4) being able to 'read' people, (5) a sense of humor, and (6) skill in written communications" (Knight, 1990, p. 295).

In the category of personal factors, Knight (1990) found that teachers chose to be consulting teachers in order to "give something to others, give something to themselves, and test their leadership abilities" (p. 296). She also found that in their personal relations with first-year teachers, the consulting teachers had very few problems exerting influence. However, their relations with teachers in remediation were considerably more

challenging because these teachers tended to be less open to receiving assistance (Knight, 1990).

Finally, in the category of contextual factors, Knight (1990) found different aspects of the context that detracted from or added to consulting teachers' sense of efficacy. Lack of time to do all aspects of their jobs well was cited as one problem that threatened the consulting teachers sense of efficacy. Other problems included loneliness, lack of positive feedback, and ineffective communications with the PAR Panel. However, consulting teachers discovered a greater sense of efficacy as a result of their "opportunity to help other teachers…collegial interaction, and their own personal and professional growth" (Knight, 1990, p. 301). In addition, consulting teachers were motivated by their ability to influence first-year teachers and accelerate their professional growth. Consulting teachers seem to take great pleasure in this aspect of their jobs as opposed to the idea of exerting power or authority over others (Knight, 1990).

Knight (1990) concluded that the professional development of the consulting teachers in PAR needs to be more consistent, that the consulting teachers need a reduced number of clients at a reduced number of schools, and that better lines of communication need to be established between consulting teachers and members of the PAR Panel.

While Knight's (1990) focus on the experiences of consulting teachers is valuable, gathering data on consulting teachers' perceptions without getting feedback from their clients can result in biased or unbalanced data. For example, although the consulting teachers cited their influence on first-year teachers as one of the most fulfilling aspects of their jobs, there is no evidence of the first-year teachers' views. Furthermore, the observations conducted in the study were not used to get a sense of the quality of

instruction in the first-year teachers' classes. Instead, the observations were used to understand the work of consulting teachers.

In an earlier study, Benzley (1985) interviewed 39 consulting teachers in Salt Lake City, Utah to understand "the personal dimensions of being a reviewer and the impact of the peer review process on professional relationships" (p. 3). The results of her study indicate that consulting teachers saw their own teaching improve as they exchanged ideas with their colleagues. In addition, the consulting teachers developed an increased knowledge and understanding of the complexities of teaching. Problems identified by consulting teachers concerned the amount of class time they missed to serve as a peer reviewer. Thus, the Salt Lake City program at that time differed from the program in this study in that consulting teachers were not released from their classroom responsibilities. As in Knight's (1990) study, Benzley (1985) concentrates on the perspective of consulting teachers without getting the views of their clients. Thus, after reading the study, questions still remain about how valuable the consulting teachers' assistance was to their clients. Was the value of that assistance, for example, worth the time the consulting teachers spent out of their own classrooms? Or, was the achievement of the consulting teachers' students being jeopardized for a program that was not making a significant difference for the new or veteran teachers involved?

Peer Assistance and Review as a Union Attempt to Establish Legitimacy

Beyond investigations of the perspectives of consulting teachers, Kelly (1998) conducted a study of "peer review as a response to the increasing pressure for educational accountability as well as a method of reconciling the competing criteria of legitimacy to which teachers and their unions are held" (p. 1). He looked at four PAR

programs, two AFT affiliates and two NEA affiliates, which were well-established. His

data collection involved conducting individual interviews with key actors representing

different levels of the programs. Thus, at each site he interviewed a superintendent's

representative, the union president, a school board member, a consulting teacher, and a

PAR participant. In addition, he conducted group interviews of elementary, middle, and

high school teachers in the districts (whether or not these teachers participated in PAR is

unclear). In total, he interviewed 79 participants. The question guiding his study was,

"how do teachers' unions reconcile the competing criteria for legitimacy of the

institutions of professionalism and unionism to which they are held?" (Kelly, 1998).

He found that by increasing the number of poor teachers who are dismissed from their

jobs, some unions were successful at using PAR to reconcile the competing criteria for

legitimacy. His findings also suggested that the public no longer accepts ceremony and

ritual as evidence of public schools' legitimacy. Instead, the public is demanding schools

to become more technically productive, with the expectation that schools show

measurable increases student achievement. Thus, unions are obligated to move away

from an industrial model of unionism in order to address public concerns about the

quality of teaching professionals (Kelly, 1998).

Summary

The small number of systematic studies of PAR to date indicates that a great deal is

left to be known about whether PAR is related to changes in teachers' instruction and,

ultimately, changes in student achievement. By gaining a more clear understanding of

the experiences of first-year teachers in PAR, researchers and educators can continue to

unravel the most promising strategies for improving teaching quality in the nation's schools.

Teacher Supervision

Taking elements from both teacher evaluation and teacher induction, Peer Assistance Review seems to be a process that districts use in shaping teacher supervision. Thus, I turn now to the literature in teacher supervision. First, I discuss the inconsistencies in the way that supervision is defined. Then, I look at the models of supervision offered by some researchers, and finally I examine sources of authority in supervision.

Defining Supervision

One challenge of discussing PAR as a form of teacher supervision is that the literature on supervision is inconsistent about how supervision should be defined. The purpose of supervision has been defined simply as to "improve the education provided by schools for children" (Tanner & Tanner, 1987, p. 30). Yet, for some, supervision is an ongoing dialogue with teachers about how to improve teaching and raise student achievement (Sullivan & Glanz, 1999). Others see it as a way to work cooperatively with teachers, while refraining from judgments about teacher competence or efforts to control teachers (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986).

Bolin and Panaritis (1992) insist that the literature only loosely suggests a consensus about two aspects of supervision—that supervision is important work and that the purpose of supervision is chiefly about improving classroom practice. In recent years supervision has been discussed as a collaborative process. Beach and Reinhartz (2000) define supervision as "a complex process that involves working with teachers and other educators in a collegial, collaborative relationship to enhance the quality of teaching and

learning within schools and that promotes the career-long development of teachers" (p. 8-9). Meanwhile, Gordon (1997) calls for a paradigm shift in the way supervision is defined. He wants to see the following five changes in the way people think about supervision:

> (1) [Supervision as] a collegial rather than a hierarchical relationship between teachers and formally designated supervisors.
> (2) Supervision as the province of teachers as well as formally designated supervisors.
> (3) A focus on teacher growth rather than teacher compliance.
> (4) Facilitation of teachers collaborating with each other in instructional improvement efforts.
> (5) Teacher involvement in ongoing reflective inquiry (Gordon, 1997, p. 116).

Gordon's plea for supervision to focus on growth rather than teacher compliance brings me to the longstanding debate about the appropriate role of evaluation in supervision. Nolan and Hoover (2003) argue that there are distinctions between supervision and evaluation along five dimensions. They view the purpose of evaluation as attending to teachers' satisfactory performance, whereas the purpose of supervision is to promote growth beyond the teacher's present level of performance. They see the scope of evaluation as broad, whereas the scope of supervision is narrow. The rationale for evaluation, as they define it, is that state obligations must be met, whereas the rationale behind supervision is that teaching is a complex act. They perceive the process for evaluation as instrument driven, while the process for supervision is individualized. Finally, in evaluation they see the evaluator as expert, but in supervision they see shared expertise.

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) argue that supervision should not be about making judgments. They view supervisors and administrators as having very different roles in supervision. The role of supervisors in their perspective is to give teachers feedback for

their professional growth, while the role of administrators is to provide a school climate that fosters honest dialogue about improving instruction. Hoy and Forsyth base their claims partly on the work of Blau and Scott (1962) who viewed schools as formal organizations possessing hierarchies that reduce the social interaction and support between administrators and teachers. This social interaction and support, they argue, is critical in the development of the relationship between supervisors and teachers that will lend itself to the teacher's professional growth.

Yet, Holland (2004) argues that principals can balance their roles as supervisors, acting on both managerial and professional values. She argues that principals can accomplish this by understanding managerial values (such as oversight, standards and applications) as defining their desired ends, while understanding that professional values (such as trust, judgment and interpretation) define the means for realizing those ends. In her study, administrators were able to balance both sets of values.

McQuarrie and Wood (1991) also argue that the processes of supervision, staff development and evaluation should not be viewed in isolation. They argue that misunderstandings about the nature of the three processes can keep districts from understanding how the three are necessarily interconnected. The best cycle for teacher growth from their perspective would start with staff development, be followed up by supervision, and be gauged by evaluation.

Models of Supervision

In addition to researchers defining the purposes of supervision in different ways, they have also developed a number of models for supervision. Pajak (1993) provides a comprehensive overview of different models of supervision, delineating clinical models

of supervision from humanistic and artistic models, technical and didactic models and developmental and reflective models. Goldhammer (1969) devised the cycle of clinical supervision that is still used at least in part by many schools today. In his cycle, the first stage of clinical supervision was the pre-observation conference, the second stage was the observation, the third stage was analysis and strategy, the fourth stage was the supervision conference, and the final stage was the post-conference analysis. Another clinical model of supervision focuses on ego counseling (Mosher & Purpel, 1972), which is a way to counsel first year teachers to distinguish their professional identities from their personal identities.

Blumberg (1980) advocated for the Interpersonal Intervention Model of supervision in which the relationship that develops between the teacher and the supervisor is key in supporting the teacher. Acheson and Gall (1992) suggest a more technical model of teacher supervision in which supervisors should draw upon four specific techniques in post-observation conferences. The techniques are: "providing feedback to the teacher, eliciting opinions, feelings and inferences, encouraging the teacher to consider alternatives, and providing the teacher with opportunities to practice and compare" (Pajak, 1993, p. 173-174). Glickman, Ross, and Ross-Gordon (2004) discuss developmental approaches to supervision in which the degree to which the supervisor is directive in working with the teacher depends upon where the teacher falls in his or her professional development. They believe that supervisors should be more directive with teachers who have far to go in refining their professional skills and dispositions, but increasingly non-directive with teachers who function at higher levels of personal and

professional development. The cognitive coaching model advocated by Costa and Garmston (2002) advocates a more non-directive approach for all teachers in supervision. The various models or approaches to clinical supervision exhibit a range of thinking about what is most important in providing supervision that leads to teachers' professional growth.

Sources of Authority in Supervision

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) define authority as a "legitimate kind of power" (p. 4). They provide three characteristics of authority relationships within schools. Those characteristics are: "a willingness of the subordinate to comply, a suspension of the subordinate's criteria for making decisions prior to directives, and a power relationship legitimized by group norms" (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986, p. 4).

Sergiovanni (1992) views authority as a factor that supervisors can define in their relationships with teachers. His model delineates five sources of authority from which supervisors typically draw: bureaucratic, personal, technical-rational, professional or moral. Although he acknowledges that supervisors necessarily draw on all five sources, he argues that the source supervisors choose to rely upon most will influence teachers to either expand or narrow their practices. He argues for a movement toward relying mostly on professional and moral sources of authority. In professional sources of authority, expertise for teaching and learning lies within teachers, and supervisors promote an ongoing dialogue with teachers. When supervisors draw from moral sources of authority, shared professional values within the supervisor's community of teachers encourages teachers in supervision to expand their practices.

I used his model for sources of supervisory authority to analyze my data in part because he and I share the view that supervisors do have choices about how they exert their authority in working with teachers. Furthermore, I tend to agree with Sergiovanni's assertion that the source of authority the supervisor draws upon the most influences whether a teacher's practice is expanded or narrowed. Such an assertion rests on the assumption that supervisors possess the capacity to influence teachers' beliefs and practices, an underlying assumption that also seems embedded in the district's theory of how Peer Assistance and Review can lead to changes in instructional approaches that will ultimately improve teaching quality.

Summary

Although no standard definition for supervision seems to exist in the literature, most researchers see the purpose of supervision as improving teaching. The disparate ideas about what supervision should mean are represented in the variety of models or approaches to supervision. The analysis I conducted for this study looks at sources of authority in supervision as a way of understanding first-year high school English teachers' responses to supervision.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

Peer Assistance and Review combines the elements of teacher evaluation, teacher induction and supervision to provide what school districts hope will be an unparalleled system of support for first-year teachers. Teachers' unions advocate PAR as a means of placing teachers in charge of ensuring the quality of their own profession. At the same time, PAR symbolizes a new union commitment to protecting teaching and learning rather than merely protecting teachers' jobs. Current scholarship on PAR programs tends

to focus on the experiences of teacher leaders, with particular attention being given to the way in which PAR blurs the line between traditional roles of teachers and administrators by placing evaluation and supervision in the hands of consulting teachers. In this study, on the other hand, I examine the experiences of first-year teachers who are being evaluated and supervised by consulting teachers to move closer to an understanding of whether PAR makes a difference in what the teachers believe and do in their classrooms. And, if my data indicate that participating in PAR could improve the experiences of first-year, high school English teachers, I want to understand the processes and the conditions under which the consulting teachers could make a positive difference in the practice of the teachers they serve.

CHAPTER 3

Background and Methods

The purposes of this chapter are to provide a detailed description of the setting in

which my study was conducted, to explain the parameters of Peer Assistance and Review

as it was implemented in the district and to outline the methods that were used to address

my research questions. I begin by laying out the reasons the site was an appropriate one

in which to study first-year teachers' experiences with Peer Assistance and Review.

Next, I provide a description of what Peer Assistance and Review looked like in the

district under study. Finally, I offer a rationale for using the case study method to

understand the experiences of first-year English teachers' who participated in Peer

Assistance and Review.

The research question that guided this study was: What were first-year teachers'

experiences in Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)? The subsidiary questions were: (a)

What preparation did the district give first-year teachers to use PAR to enhance their

professional growth? (b) What were the characteristics of the relationship between first-

year teachers and consulting teachers? (c) How did first-year teachers see their

participation in PAR as a form of evaluation, support, and/or professional development?

(d) What sources of assistance and assessment did first-year teachers draw upon outside

of PAR? (e) How did participation in PAR inform the first-year teachers' practices?

Setting

I conducted this case study in Elizabeth County Public Schools[5], a district in the Mid-

Atlantic states that is among the twenty largest school districts in the nation. In 2001-02

the district served 139,000 students comprised of the following ethnic backgrounds:

---

[5] All references to names and places are pseudonyms.

44.6% white, 22% black, 18.7% Hispanic, and 14.3% Asian. Approximately 22.3% of these students participated in the Free And Reduced Meals (FARMs) program, and 35.7% were eligible for FARMs at some time. The average teacher salary was $50,647, one of the highest in the metropolitan area.

I selected this particular district for a number of reasons. First, the district had a 10,000 member teachers' union, called the Elizabeth County Education Association (ECEA), that had the resources of full-time staff members who devoted their time to union initiatives. Through collective bargaining, ECEA formed an agreement with the school district to initiate a Peer Assistance and Review program. It was one of only a handful of local union affiliates in the nation implementing the program. In the 2000-2001 school year, Elizabeth County piloted PAR in 34 of its 189 schools. Ten elementary and ten secondary teachers were selected by a panel of teachers, administrators, and union leaders to serve as consulting teachers. Another 98 schools began the program in the 2001-02 academic year, and the number of consulting teachers increased to 40. Beginning in the 2002-03 school year, all schools began participating in the new Professional Growth System.

Beyond its usefulness as a site where the teachers' union was initiating the new teacher assistance and evaluation program, Elizabeth County was a large school system made up of students with diverse cultural backgrounds.

<div align="center">Peer Assistance and Review in Elizabeth County[6]</div>

According to the president of the Elizabeth County Education Association (ECEA), the union had made efforts to initiate PAR in Elizabeth County as early as 1987.

---

[6] Information about the operation of Peer Assistance and Review in Elizabeth County is from the 2001-02 Elizabeth County Teacher Evaluation Handbook

Principals' opposition to the idea kept the union from moving forward because the superintendent was apprehensive about initiating a plan that aroused negative feelings from principals. According to the person presiding over ECEA at the time the data for this study were collected, "principals were against it because they control teacher evaluation right now…that's a major part of their job description, and they thought that it reflected badly on them to say that anybody but them should do it." Yet, other sources suggested that principals were skeptical about PAR because it eliminated the roles of the school administration and resource teachers (department chairs) in the supervision and evaluation of the two most vulnerable groups of teachers within schools—first-year teachers and underperforming veteran teachers. Some principals felt that although PAR would diminish their authority to supervise and evaluate these teachers, the district would still hold them accountable for the teachers' performance. In addition, principals were unclear about how school administrators and resource teachers would be kept in the loop about the progression of the PAR participants.

Nevertheless, union officials continued to pursue their desire to implement PAR in the district, and in its 1997 contract negotiations union members once again expressed their concerns about the teacher evaluation system that was in place. District leaders agreed to a provision in the 1997 contract to establish a joint work group (made up of representatives from the teachers' union, the principals' union, and the district) to design a PAR program. The work group wanted to present their program to the Board of Education in 1999, but a number of principals in the district continued to reject the idea of PAR. For several months the president of the teachers' union negotiated with the president of the principals' union until they had developed a document that was agreeable

to both parties. On February 23, 2000, the Board of Education voted to move forward with the program.

The union and the district agreed to a three-year phase-in of PAR, which would be one aspect of the district's new Professional Growth System. PAR was designed specifically to assist teachers who were new to the profession or in need of remediation. Separate tracks of the professional growth cycle were designed for the continued growth of teachers at different points in their careers who were meeting the district's performance standards.

According to one source, schools which had the least number of new initiatives and programs were selected to be the first to begin participating in the new Professional Growth System. In the 2000-01 school year, four high schools, seven middle schools, 22 elementary schools, and one specialty school entered the new system. During the 2001-02 school year, 12 high schools, 16 middle schools, 65 elementary schools, and two specialty schools were added. By 2002-03 all Elizabeth County schools began participating in the new Professional Growth System. In the first year of PAR, the district budgeted $906,965 for 20 consulting teachers, and $11,379 for release time for members of the PAR Panel. In the second year of the program, when more schools began participating, the district budgeted an additional $1,310, 341 to add 20 consulting teachers and one secretary to support PAR.

According to the 2001-02 Teacher Evaluation Handbook, the purpose of PAR was

> to assist all teachers to meet standards for proficient teaching. It provides intensive support for experienced teachers who have been identified as performing below ECPS standards of proficiency, experienced teachers new to ECPS who need assistance, and all teachers new to teaching. As a result the PAR program is the ECPS mechanism for maintaining system-wide quality control and ensuring that all ECPS teachers responsible for teaching students are functioning

at or above high ECPS standards of performance (Elizabeth County Teacher Evaluation Handbook, 2001-02).

Within the structures of PAR, several groups had key roles. They were: the PAR Panel, the consulting teachers, and the principals.

The PAR Panel

In the first year of the program, the PAR Panel consisted of six teachers recommended by the ECEA and six principals recommended by the Elizabeth County Association of Administrative and Supervisory Personnel (ECAASP), the local principals' union. Each panel member committed to serving a two-year term, with the option of being reappointed by his or her respective organization. The PAR panel had oversight for the entire program. The panel's specific duties included conducting a rigorous selection process to choose the consulting teachers. In addition, the panel decided whether recommendations made by consulting teachers regarding classroom teachers' continued employment were forwarded to the superintendent. If a consulting teacher's recommendation was in conflict with the desires of the school's principal, the PAR panel mediated the dispute. Ultimately, it was the superintendent who decided whether a teacher's contract would or would not be renewed. Equal numbers of ECEA and ECAASP members were added to the PAR Panel as the program grew in subsequent years.

The Consulting Teacher

Consulting teachers (CTs) were veteran teachers in the district who were released from their regular classroom assignments to assist and evaluate all new teachers, as well as those veteran teachers who failed to meet the district's performance standards. The PAR Panel appointed consulting teachers to serve for three years. The consulting

teachers agreed to return to a teaching position for a minimum of two years after they had rendered their service. To prepare for their roles, consulting teachers engaged in intense training throughout the summer. Research for Better Teaching, an educational consulting firm hired by the district, assisted in the consulting teachers' training. The training, which I have detailed in the section of this chapter that describes my pilot study, included coursework on observing and evaluating instruction, working with adult learners, and accessing employee assistance services.

Consulting teachers were housed in the Office of Staff Development and were typically assigned to no more than five different schools. The district attempted to keep consulting teachers' caseloads at approximately 15.0 units. New teachers counted as 1.0 unit, and tenured teachers in remediation count as 1.5 units. The difference reflected the district's expectations regarding the amount of time working with new versus veteran teachers would consume. According to a district employee, the district expected that new teachers would be more open to feedback and more amenable to change, while veteran teachers who had been identified as failing to meet standards could find it more difficult to alter their classroom practices.

Consulting teachers worked with a number of other school employees who were likewise charged with improving the quality of teaching at their schools. The district already employed resource teachers (department chairs), staff development teachers, and mentor teachers to provide on-site assistance to the teaching staff at its schools. The role of the consulting teacher was meant to supplement rather than replicate the work done by other resource staff. For example, the intended role of mentor teachers was to help new teachers with their transition to the working environment of the building, or with personal

needs such as finding housing in the area. Money allocated for the staff development teacher position in secondary schools was either divided to give several resource teachers an additional course release so that they could assist other teachers in their departments, or put into hiring one full-time, school-based staff developer. The role of resource teachers was to assist new teachers with the curriculum or with issues such as how to prepare students for high-stakes tests.

The role of the consulting teachers, according to the district's definition, was to focus more on helping new teachers with all aspects of instruction. They conducted a minimum of two formal observations in the first-year teachers' classrooms per semester, but typically visited informally on a weekly basis, particularly during the first semester. During the second semester the CTs reduced their visits to approximately twice per month. They were trained to assist new teachers by giving demonstration lessons, engaging in team teaching, and providing information about instructional resources.

Consulting teachers documented their work with new and veteran teachers throughout the year with written accounts of their formal observations. In addition to writing the formal observation reports, consulting teachers issued a report to the PAR Panel in December that described the progress of their clients. They submitted a second report in March that provided the PAR Panel with a recommendation regarding the continued employment of the teachers in their caseloads. By April, consulting teachers received principals' reports listing the names of veteran teachers whom the principals wanted to be admitted to PAR during the next school year. Consulting teachers were required to conduct two classroom observations of these teachers in May and June to determine if the teachers were indeed good candidates for remediation. If, after conducting the

observations, the consulting teacher agreed with the principal's recommendation, the veteran teacher was admitted to the PAR program for the next school year. If there was a disagreement between the consulting teacher and the principal, the principal could appeal to the PAR Panel.

The Principal

   In crafting the PAR program, leaders of the teachers' and principals' unions worked to maintain a critical role for the principal in the teacher evaluation process. As PAR was only one aspect of the full Professional Growth System, it would be useful to examine the overall system and to see how PAR fit within it. In lieu of requiring principals to conduct summative evaluations for all teachers on an annual basis, the district asked principals to conduct evaluations in a teacher's 2nd, 5th, 9th, and 14th year of teaching. After the 14th year, the principal would conduct an evaluation of the teacher every five years. During a teacher's first and second year, he or she is considered probationary, or non-tenured. The principal's evaluation in the teacher's 2nd year determined whether the teacher was offered tenure. In the years when the principal was not scheduled to conduct an evaluation, the teacher was to be documenting his or her individual growth as it related to his or her Professional Development Plan (PDP). The principal reserved the right to conduct observations of a teacher at any time if there was a concern about the teacher's performance. In addition, the district expected the principal to stay abreast of a teacher's progress throughout every school year.

   All first-year teachers were automatically placed in PAR, but after receiving tenure, teachers were recommended for PAR only in cases that the principal had determined (as a result of the evaluation) that the teacher was not meeting district standards. Principals

---

Table 2: *Performance Standards and Criteria*

Standard I: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

    A. Teachers act on the belief that every student can learn and that all can master a curriculum with appropriate accommodations.
B. Teachers set quantifiable learning outcomes for students and hold the students and themselves accountable for meeting those objectives.
C. Teachers produce measurable growth in student achievement towards goals they have set on system-wide accountability measures.
D. Teachers recognize individual differences in their students and adjust their practices accordingly.
E. Teachers understand how students develop and learn.
F. Teachers extend their mission beyond the academic growth of students.

Standard II: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

A. Teachers understand the content of their subject area(s) and how knowledge in a subject field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
B. Teachers demonstrate subject area knowledge and convey their knowledge clearly to students.
C. Teachers generate multiple paths to knowledge.

Standard III: Teachers are responsible for establishing and managing student learning in a positive learning environment.

A. Teachers create a classroom climate that promotes openness, mutual respect, support and inquiry.
B. Teachers establish and maintain respectful, productive partnerships with families in support of student learning and well being.
C. Teachers orchestrate learning in a variety of settings.
D. Teachers integrate technology and research into planning and implementing lessons.
E. Teachers involve all students in meaningful learning activities.

Standard IV: Teachers continually assess student progress, analyze the results and adapt instruction to improve achievement.

A. Teachers use a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques.
B. Teachers analyze student results and plan instruction accordingly.

Standard V: Teachers are committed to continuous improvement and professional development.

A. Teachers continually reflect upon their practices in promoting student learning.
B. Teacher draw upon educational research and seek the advice of others whenever possible as they reflect upon their practices.
C. Teachers are members of learning communities.

Standard VI: Teachers exhibit a high degree of professionalism.

A. Teachers understand and support the vision of the school system.
B. Teachers view themselves as leaders in the educational community.
C. Teachers contribute to the smooth functioning of the school environment.

Note: from the Elizabeth County Public Schools Teacher Evaluation Handbook

were required to submit their PAR referrals by May 1 so that the consulting teachers

could conduct at least two observations of these teachers.   If the PAR Panel rejected the

principal's referral as well as his or her subsequent appeals, the principal had to take the

responsibility for the remediation and evaluation of the teacher.

Performance Standards

   To ensure consistent expectations among all the stakeholders in the PAR program, the

district developed six performance standards for teachers. These standards were an

adaptation of those from the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards

(NBPTS, 1987) and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium

INTASC (See Table 2). A rubric was also developed for consulting teachers to use in

evaluating teachers. This rubric includes specific traits that are identifiable as either

meeting or failing to meet performance standards (See Appendix A).

<div align="center">Methods</div>

    This section of the chapter describes my case selection and sampling, and my

approaches to data collection and data analysis. I give particular attention to my rationale

for using the case study as a method of addressing my research questions.

Gaining Entrance

   In the Spring of 1999 when my interest in how unions contribute to teacher

professional development began to emerge, I started interviewing a number of local

union presidents to learn more about what their associations were doing in the area of

professional development. One of the local presidents I interviewed was the ECEA

President, who has provided national-level leadership in the union reform movement.

Along with giving me a detailed overview of the association's initiatives in professional

development and teacher evaluation, he gave me a number of documents that helped me understand the background of those initiatives. He provided me with: (1) the ECEA 1999-2001 contract with the Board of Education, which for the first time included language about the structures and content of professional development, (2) the "white paper" created by the joint work group on PAR, and (3) a number of editorials and press releases about the association's initiatives.

As a result of a follow-up call I made to the association's president that Fall, I was invited to an October 14, 2000 Leadership Briefing where union representatives, along with the district's Associate Superintendent for Human Resources and several consulting teachers presented the rationale for PAR to state department of education representatives, local university representatives, educational researchers, and parents. The consulting firm used by the district, Research for Better Teaching, led a portion of the morning session. A panel of consulting teachers and PAR Panel members addressed questions from the audience. Notes from the briefing are included in Appendix B.

Several months later (in January 2001) I began participating in an administrative internship at one of the high schools in the district. As a result of my internship, I had three specific experiences that gave me a broader understanding of PAR within the district context. First of all, I participated in a six-day, district-facilitated class called Observation and Analysis of Teaching I (OAT I). Consulting teachers were all required to take this course during the summer before the school year in which they began. Principals, assistant principals, and other district staff were also required to take the class. In the course, which was conceived by Research for Better Teaching, administrators and resource teachers learned a common language for the observable instructional strategies

teachers use in the classroom. They looked for teachers to use these strategies as they took literal notes during classroom observations. From the notes, they wrote a highly descriptive report of the observation, justifying their claims and interpretations with evidence. This was the process of classroom observations that the district adopted for use by consulting teachers who evaluated PAR participants, and school administrators, who evaluated all other teachers.

In addition to participating in OAT training, I also shadowed my principal at the monthly, district-wide Administrative and Supervisory (A&S) meetings for principals. At the first A&S meeting I attended in February, the ECEA President, along with the consulting teachers, the Associate Superintendent for Human Resources, and principals of schools participating in PAR (Phase I schools), led a breakout session on the new teacher evaluation program in the district. At the meeting I re-introduced myself to the association president, and I also met the PAR-Panel co-chairs, the district coordinator for PAR, and a number of consulting teachers and principals associated with PAR.

At that meeting I asked the PAR Panel co-chairs for their permission to audit the regular consulting teacher (CT) meetings, which contained *no references* to particular teachers' cases. After writing to the Deputy Superintendent for Instruction, I was granted permission to audit these meetings. Attending the meetings gave me the chance to meet the consulting teachers who worked with English teachers, and to observe the process by which all consulting teachers work to improve the program. I also met one-on-one with the Lead Consulting Teacher to talk about the prospects for my study. He provided me with considerable assistance in using language within my research proposal that most

accurately reflected PAR in the district. He also sent me regular updates on upcoming CT meetings through electronic mail.

Once my research proposal was approved by my dissertation committee, I modified the document and submitted it to the district's Office of Shared Accountability. By the evening of Wednesday, July, 11, 2001, I received permission via email to conduct my study in the district.

Selection of the Participants

The unit of analysis for this case study was five, first-year English teachers who were assigned to consulting teachers for the 2001-02 school year. I examined how the first-year teachers experienced PAR, and I framed my analysis of those experiences in terms of how the participants responded to their consulting teachers' supervision.

The selection of the participants occurred through purposeful, convenience and snowball sampling. According to Merriam (1998), purposeful sampling, "is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight, and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (p. 61). I began by enlisting the participation of consulting teachers who were veteran English teachers. This ensured that my first-year teacher participants would be matched with a consulting teacher who had experience teaching English in the district. I believed that I could learn the most about the program when first-year teachers and consulting teachers were matched by subject area, the kind of pairing that the district deemed to be ideal. As noted earlier, I had been attending the consulting teacher meetings (as an administrative intern) for some time prior to the official start of my data collection, so by the time I asked the CTs to participate in my study, they were already familiar with me and with

some aspects of my research. In August, my task was then to find first-year teachers who had been assigned to the three consulting teachers. I purposefully selected high school English teachers based on my own experiences as an English teacher, and my belief that as a researcher I would have the most insight about the challenges and concerns of other high school English teachers.

At the same time, I was limited to choosing first-year teachers who would consent to participating in my study. To find them, I attended the district's three-day orientation in mid-August for newly hired high school teachers. The new hires spent most of their time grouped by subject area to review curriculum. At one of the English curriculum gatherings, I gave a five-minute overview of my study, asked for volunteers and distributed the informed consent forms to interested teachers. I also actively "worked the room" throughout the three days, talking with the new hires one-on-one about my study to generate interest. A number of teachers expressed interest in participating in the study, but these numbers slowly whittled down as I discovered some of them would not be assigned to consulting teachers (because they were a part of special district-university partnerships *or* because they were new to the district and not new to teaching) and because one of the principals refused to allow me to work with his first-year teachers (he believed that my frequent observations would overwhelm them). Ultimately, then, I sampled the first-year high school English teachers in PAR to whom I could gain access (Merriam, 1998).

My original aim was to work with four first-year teachers, and while the district representative at the Office of Shared Accountability granted me approval to work with that number, she suggested that I choose a couple of "back-ups" in case the original four

teachers grew tired of my frequent visits. Thus, although I had actually selected four

teachers for the study—two males (Nym Oh and Chris Parker) and two females (Michelle

Table 3

Description of Participants

Teacher	Age	Sex	Race/ Ethnicity	Highest Degree	Initial Assignment	School Demographics
Alexis Burton	22	F	African-American	B.A., Duquesne University	(2) 9th grade honors/ (3) 9th grade "on-level"	1612 students; 35.86% white 35.36% African-Amer. 21.77% Asian Amer; 6.76% Hispanic 9.93% free/red. lunch .19% ESOL
Michelle Newman	26	F	White	M.A., Teachers College	(2) 9th grade honors/(3) 9th grade "on-level"	1400 students; 52% White 27.5% African-Amer.
Nym Oh	32	M	Korean	M.A., University of Maryland, College Park	11th and 12th grade "on-level"	11% Asian Amer.; 9% Hispanic 8.5% free/red. Lunch; .07% ESOL
Chris Parker	22	M	White	B.A., Penn State	9th/10th grade literacy program 11th grade "on-level"	1099 students; 48.59% white 18.56% Hispanic; 18.47% African-Amer. 14.01% Asian Amer. 18.38% free/red. Lunch; 7.55% ESOL
Chad Wolf	24	M	White	M. A., Johns Hopkins University	9th and 10th grade "on-level" and honors; 11th grade "on-level."	1989 students; 61.3% White 30% Asian Amer. 4.47% Hispanic; 3.97% African-Amer.; 2.2% free/red lunch .20% ESOL

Newman and Alexis Burton)—I conducted initial interviews with six teachers. As the

school year got underway, I became more and more confident that my four participants

had no intention of dropping out of the study. I had established good relationships with

each of them, and my presence did not disrupt their classes. Thus, I did not conduct

classroom observations of the two extra teachers. However, around the first of

November, one of the consulting teachers asked me if Chad Wolf was participating in my study. She believed that he would be an excellent participant because he taught in a way that was different from anything she had ever seen. I had already conducted an initial interview with Chad, so I contacted him about being a participant in the study, and he agreed. I began observing his classes on Veteran's Day.

In Chapter Four, I provide a detailed description of both my first-year teacher and consulting teacher participants. Table 3 illustrates the diversity of my participants in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, teacher preparation, and initial school and classroom assignments. For core subject areas such as English, the district tracks its students into two basic groups—"on-level" and "honors." Honors students are typically high performing students, while students placed in "on-level" classes tend to struggle with either the prerequisite skills necessary for the course, classroom behavior, or both. Schools populated predominantly by students with a high socioeconomic status tend to offer more honors courses than other schools.

The Pilot Study—How the Consulting Teachers Were Trained

Pilot studies in the case study method serve less as a pretest of the larger study and more as a tool to assist the researcher in refining the research design (Yin, 1994). To develop a clearer picture of the particular aspects of PAR that would be most significant in the experiences of the participants, I shadowed the three English consulting teachers during the Summer 2001 training week for CTs (July 10th –13th). I was only able to attend three of the four days because on Tuesday afternoon, I was sent an email revoking the verbal permission that I had been given to attend. I was pulled from the field because the district office did not want to set a precedent by allowing a researcher to begin

collecting data before receiving official written notice that the study had been approved. By Wednesday evening, my official approval arrived via email, and I was able to return to the field on that Thursday. Despite the disruption I was able to gain some insight about what the consulting teachers experienced prior to working with their clients.

The first day of training opened with an explanation of the differences between the new Professional Growth System and the old system. There were two presenters—the Vice-President of ECEA and the Coordinator of the Professional Growth System (a position created specifically to launch PAR). They said that the old evaluation system was a "one size fits all" model in which administrators merely got a "snapshot" of what was happening in the classroom. Furthermore, they said that different supervisors came into the classroom "with a different understanding of what teaching is." They outlined the underlying beliefs of the new system—that teachers deserve enormous respect and that the teaching profession must be elevated.

Next, a considerable amount of time was spent reviewing the Professional Growth System handbook, the contents of which I outlined in the "background" section of this chapter. When discussing the consulting teachers' roles in teacher evaluation, the ECEA Vice-President said that "consulting teachers shouldn't view themselves as evaluators. We bring the PAR Panel information. The CT is gathering data after having provided support." At that time she mentioned that 29 veteran teachers were accepted into PAR for remediation for the 2001-02 school year, and an additional 20 veteran teachers still needed to be reviewed (to potentially be placed in remediation).

A number of CTs, mostly the veteran CTs who were in their second year of service, raised several questions. One issue seemed to be that school administrators would

frequently ask to use the formal observations written by the CTs in their own evaluations of teachers. In response, the ECEA Vice-President said, "CTs' work is separate from the principal's work. Principals can't quote from the CT's observations. They need to do their own." She also noted that the evaluations by school administrators and the CTs should be independent of each other because "we want CTs in a supportive role. You are an intensive level of support for new and veteran teachers." The PGS Coordinator chimed in, saying "you're a fresh set of eyes…you're impartial," implying that with CT involvement a teacher could not blame poor evaluations on the fact that the school administrator did not like him or her.

Another interesting facet of the presentations on the first day was the ECEA President's discussion about the role of the CT as an advocate for teachers, and as a measure of the effectiveness of teacher-led initiatives in the district. He said, "everything else in the school system is implemented through the management structure of ECPS. There is nothing in ECPS like PAR. The entire credibility of the program rests in your hands. You are an independent judge capable of disagreeing with the principal. Your rendering of an independent judgment has to be above reproach….You are the guardians of the quality of teaching." Using words and a tone that most likely left the CTs inspired and a bit nervous, the union president charged the CTs with an awesome responsibility. He mentioned that the 20 new CTs in the room had been selected from 113 applicants, so he believed that the people in that room represented the best of the best.

Throughout the rest of the day, a panel of teachers who had just finished their first year with consulting teachers came in to provide the CTs with information about the aspects of PAR that had helped them the most. One teacher commented that the CT

"took her to other schools to visit other teachers" and "brought resources to her and helped her with the government curriculum." She said that she "never felt criticized," that the CT was "positive about her teaching" and that she wanted him to come in even more often because he was so warm. Other panelists talked about differences between the mentor and the CT, with one teacher noting that the mentor "helped [her] with school processes [and] helped her adapt socially to the school," but the CT talked about curriculum and lesson plans in a deeper way than either her mentor or her resource teacher.

On the second day of training that I was unable to attend, the consulting teachers were introduced to the idea of cognitive coaching (Costa & Garmston, 2002), in which the supervisor asks teachers a series of questions to see if the teacher can solve his or her own dilemmas instead of relying upon a directive from the consulting teacher. The CTs were also provided with a handbook and very practical advice about their day-to-day interactions with clients. On the third day of training, the CTs met with members of the PAR Panel. They were organized into small teams (called PAR Pairs) in which they would work for the remainder of the year. The PAR Pair involved one administrator from the PAR Panel, one teacher from the PAR Panel, and a group of three to four consulting teachers. Throughout the year, at meetings that I could not attend due to their confidential nature, the PAR Pairs would regularly discuss the CTs' cases, and they would work together to provide one another with suggestions about how to proceed with clients. A number of presenters led discussions on the final day of training. The topics included the importance of data collection, how to access employee assistance resources,

state guidelines for the dismissal of teachers, and information about the curriculum changes that were on the horizon.

The summer training week was only the initial training that the CTs received. CTs met several times each month for additional training, to confer with PAR Pairs, and to be updated on initiatives of the Office of Staff Development. Overall, I found the week of meetings in the summer to be extremely valuable in not only understanding how CTs, district administrators, and union officials viewed PAR, but also in getting to know the consulting teachers. Often, people in the meetings assumed that I was a new consulting teacher. Thus, I blended in well and was able to establish a rapport with the CTs, particularly those with whom I would work. This rapport would open the door for the kind of open, honest communication between me and the consulting teachers that truly exceeded my expectations.

The Case Study As A Way of Understanding Teachers' Experiences in PAR

The case study method proposed for this research emanates from the qualitative research tradition. Qualitative research, which is rooted in anthropology and sociology, is typically characterized by substantial fieldwork conducted to assist the researcher in gaining an in-depth understanding of the participants' view of a particular phenomenon (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). In carrying out their fieldwork, qualitative researchers are interested in observing a phenomenon in its natural setting as opposed to manipulating the setting or the conditions in which a phenomenon occurs (Patton, 1990; Creswell, 1994). My phenomenon of study was first-year teachers' experiences in Peer Assistance and Review. By observing teachers in their classrooms and observing their meetings with their consulting teachers, I studied the phenomenon in its natural setting and I was

able to examine how the PAR process worked from the perspective of the first-year teachers (Patton, 1990). Qualitative researchers who study process generally approach their studies without predetermined hypotheses about the positive and negative aspects of the phenomenon, thus I entered the field to understand teachers' experiences rather than to confirm any hypothesis about the value of those experiences for teachers (Patton, 1990).

Observations in the field rely on the researcher as the primary instrument for data collection. Rather than attempting to detach themselves from their research, qualitative researchers recognize their own subjectivity as researchers who possess particular interests, experiences, and perspectives which will necessarily influence what they glean from their inquiries. It follows then, that producing good qualitative research is dependent on the "skill, competence, and rigor of the person doing the fieldwork" (Patton, 1990, p. 13). I approached my data collection in a way that was well-organized, attending to both the consistency and accuracy of the information I collected from each participant. I relied on protocols for interviews and classroom observations, and I strived to visit each of the first-year teachers approximately the same number of times (although the data collection is a bit uneven in this regard).

Case studies are also particularly useful in conducting in-depth qualitative research when the phenomenon being studied is "specific, unique, and bounded" (Stake, 2000, p. 436). The experiences of first-year teachers in PAR were very unique in that the teachers were responding to both supervision and evaluation from a consulting teacher who was very knowledgeable about their classrooms, but simultaneously disconnected from their schools. In addition to being useful for studying bounded systems, case studies are

appropriate for studying particularly complex phenomena in which the essence of the

phenomena and the contexts in which they occur are inextricably linked. According to

Merriam (1998),

> the case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomena. Anchored in real-life situations, the case study results in a rich and holistic account of a phenomenon. It offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers' experiences…Educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice. Case study has proven particularly useful for studying educational innovations, evaluating programs, and for informing policy (p. 41).

Understanding first-year teachers' experiences in PAR required understanding how the

first-year teachers viewed and related to their consulting teachers, how they negotiated

the various sources of assistance at their school sites, and how they responded to their

consulting teachers' supervision in terms of their beliefs about teaching and learning and

their classroom practices. Understanding only one of these facets would have provided a

view of the teachers' experiences so incomplete that it would have failed to be useful to

policymakers or practitioners.

Although it is of value in studying complex phenomena, many researchers question

the contribution that studying a single case can make to the field. According to Patton

(1990), there are four reasons to consider conducting an individual case study: (a) case

studies allow for the consideration of outcomes related to *individual needs*; (b) case

studies uncover the *interdependence* of the different variables contributing to the

program; (c) case studies can examine *process;* and (d) case studies can provide

empirical definitions of a phenomena if no definitive description exists (p. 101, italics

added).

The experiences and outcomes of participation in PAR were different for each of the five teachers in my study. My use of the case study method enabled me to capture their different experiences and provided me with a deeper understanding of the factors that influenced how first-year teachers responded to supervision in PAR. For example, I was able to compare what the first-year teachers said to me with how they performed in the classroom and how they interacted with their consulting teachers. I continued to make these comparisons over time to understand what changes occurred in the teachers throughout the year, and draw inferences about who or what influenced the changes. Likewise, I was able to capture when change did not occur, and collect information from different sources that spoke to the reasons the teachers beliefs or practices remained unchanged. As stated previously, the multiple variables that combined to create the first-year teachers' experiences in PAR were inextricably linked. Using the case study method, I was able to examine the intersection of the first-year teachers beliefs and practices, with careful attention to the way their beliefs influenced their interactions with their consulting teachers. Simultaneously, I examined how the consulting teachers, in providing supervision, either considered or seemingly failed to consider the first-year teachers' values and dispositions. Thus, I began to understand how the consulting teachers' approaches to supervision influenced their relationships with their clients, and in particular, how the first-year teachers responded to the CTs' supervision.

The case study method also helped me gather implications for policy and practice. My research was able to move beyond *what the first-year teachers experienced* to recognize *what influenced those experiences*. In this sense, the case study enabled me to attend to the process by which consulting teachers influenced first-year teachers, as

opposed to focusing only on the outcomes of the teachers' work with CTs (without examining how those outcomes possibly came about).

Finally, the limited body of research that currently exists on PAR emphasizes how the program operates or what the program means in terms of professionalizing teaching (Goldstein, 2003a). Through this case study, I described how the consulting teachers used authority in supervising their first-year teacher clients, and I suggested ways that the sources of authority the consulting teachers used influenced the relationships they developed with their clients. Thus, the case study method helped me define authority as it utilized in the supervision of first-year, high school English teachers in a Peer Assistance and Review program.

Data Sources

According to Yin (1994), another strength of the case study method is its flexibility in using multiple sources of data. Case study researchers rely on observations, interviews, documents, and other artifacts (Yin, 1994). In addition, case study researchers can draw upon traditionally quantitative measures such as surveys (Yin, 1994; Merriam, 1998). This study drew upon a number of data sources.

Observations. According to Adler and Adler (1998), "qualitative observation is fundamentally naturalistic in essence; it occurs in the natural context of occurrence, among the actors who would naturally be participating in the interaction, and follows the natural stream of everyday life" (p. 81). In this sense, observations are a mechanism of purposefully and systematically gathering data on a phenomenon in an unobtrusive way (Adler & Adler, 1998).

Throughout the school year I conducted observations of my participants both in their classrooms and in conferences with their consulting teachers. The classroom observations helped me to understand (1) how the first-year teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning played out in their approaches to instruction and interactions with students, (2) which elements of planning or instruction the first-year teachers adopted related to recommendations from the consulting teacher, (3) how students responded to the first-year teachers' instruction, (4) how well the first-year teachers understood their curriculum, (5) how adept the first-year teachers were in teaching their curriculum to all students. Thus, observing classroom instruction not only helped me understand how working with the consulting teachers possibly informed the first-year teachers' practices, but the observations also helped me develop my own ideas about what would have been most useful to teachers in terms of the content of the assistance the CTs provided.

In developing my understanding of the five factors above, I relied on the performance standards set by the district, which fit well with my own ideas about key aspects of teaching and learning. Specifically, I entered classrooms looking for evidence that the teacher was (1) building a learning community within his or her class, (2) using techniques to find out what students know, misconceive, and want to know about the subject matter, (3) motivating students to learn, (4) clearly stating objectives for students' learning, (5) using instructional approaches which matched those objectives, (6) accommodating students' individual needs, (7) using instructional approaches associated with students' understanding, (8) encouraging all students to engage in critical thinking and problem-solving, and (9) organizing instruction and managing class activities in meaningful and logical ways.

Table 4
Record of Data Collected

1st-yr teacher pseudonym	Number of Classes Observed/ (Date Range)	Interviews w/ 1st-yr teacher	Interviews w/ Consulting Teacher	Interviews w/ Resource Teacher	Documents Collected	Conferences with CTs Observed
Alexis Burton	13 (10/01 – 5/02)	5	2	1	4	6
Michelle Newman	12 (9/01 – 4/02)	4	2	1	14	3
Nym Oh	15 (9/01 – 4/02)	4	2	1	11	2
Chris Parker	17 (10/01 – 5/02)	4	2	1	6	4
Chad Wolf	10 (11/01 – 5/02)	4	2	0	12	3

I took detailed notes of all classroom observations, and I audio-taped and cataloged each observation in case I had to retrieve specific quotes to include in my findings. I attempted to be unobtrusive when conducting my classroom observations, which occurred approximately once every two to three weeks, between September and May. I was careful to dress casually, typically in jeans and a t-shirt to avoid being perceived by the students or the teacher as an evaluator.

In addition to classroom observations, I observed meetings that occurred between the consulting teachers and their clients. These meetings were typically the formal post-observation conferences in which the consulting teacher reviewed his or her written report with the first-year teacher. I relied totally on the consulting teachers and first-year teachers to tell me when these meetings were scheduled. Most of the time I would find out about the meetings, but occasionally, the meetings occurred before I discovered that they had been scheduled. This led to some variation in the number of conferences I observed between the CTs and their clients. This variation also reflects the fact that the CTs had more conferences with teachers who experienced the most difficulty (See Table

4). Observations of these meetings helped me understand how the consulting teacher interacted with the first-year teacher, including (1) what priorities the consulting teachers communicated to the first-year teachers in terms of their growth, (2) how the consulting teacher made recommendations, (3) how and if the consulting teacher explored the first-year teacher's values, beliefs and dispositions, (4) how and if the consulting teacher and first-year teacher engaged in a dialogue, and (5) how and if the first-year teacher initiated topics with the consulting teacher. I also attended planning meetings that occurred with two of my participants and their CTs. In one of these meetings the CT and the first-year teacher were preparing to team teach a lesson. In the other meeting the CT and the first-year teacher were making plans for the second semester. In both meetings, I continued to focus on the interactions between the CT and the first-year teacher, giving particular attention to the content of the assistance that the CT provided. By "content of the assistance provided," I mean whether the assistance given centered on understanding the curriculum, exploring instructional practices, attending to individual students, etc.

One weakness of using observations as data sources is the time-consuming nature of conducting them (Yin, 1994). In addition, the researcher only sees selected aspects of the environment (Yin, 1994). Because I had limited time to invest in making classroom observations, I decided to observe one full class period (approximately 45 minutes in length) each day I came to the school. I observed that particular class period all semester, and I decided which class I would observe by asking the first-year teachers to tell me which class they found to be the most challenging. I made the request with the belief that consistently observing the teachers' most challenging classes would allow me to see the issues that the consulting teachers would most likely be addressing. At the semester

break, I flip-flopped the time that I observed the classes, in cases in which the school's master schedule permitted. For example, if first semester I watched a teacher's ninth grade, on-level class in the afternoon, the next semester I would attempt to watch a ninth grade on-level class in the morning. In two instances, the first-year teachers requested that I come to observe a different class, at least once, to get a sense of how much better their lessons went with different students. I obliged, and watched an 11th grade class (as opposed to his ninth grade class) of one participant, and an honors (as opposed to on-level) class of another participant. With the realization that time limited me to concentrating on the first-year teacher's experiences with one set of his or her students, and that the set of students was the teacher's most challenging, I made an extra effort in my analysis to provide an even-handed account of both the strengths and challenges the first-year teachers possessed.

Another problem that can occur with observations is that the participant's behavior might change due to the researcher's presence. As I mentioned earlier I dressed casually when making my observations, and I was careful during interviews or informal conversations with the teachers not to make any judgments about what had happened in the classroom, nor offer any advice. I emphasized my role as a student who was there to learn from them. In addition, I scheduled each visit with the teachers so they were not caught off guard by my presence. Given the consistency of what I observed for each teacher, I do not believe my presence changed their behaviors. Likewise, my presence seemed to have little if any influence on the behaviors of the students. One teacher said of his students, "they're not even curious as to why you're there. You might as well be invisible. It's very odd. They never ask me who you are." Occasionally, students who sat

near me did strike up a conversation with me, sometimes providing me with an evaluation of the teacher. Other times they would ask me about why I was taking so many notes and tape-recording the class (once, a student even expressed glee that I had gotten what the teacher said to him on tape). And once, students asked me if I was a friend of the basketball players at my University. Overall, I believed that I blended well into the classes, causing minimal disruptions to the teaching and learning that naturally occurred there.

Documents. Documentary data are not only easily accessible, but they also provide a means to track the history of the teacher assistance and evaluation initiatives in the school district (Hodder, 1998). Documents are also useful because they serve as a stable source of data that does not change as a result of the researcher's presence (Merriam, 1998). In addition, documents allow the researcher to investigate unobtrusively, and often contain more precise information (exact names, dates, times) than can be recalled by participants (Yin, 1994).

I collected all documents relating to PAR that were initiated by the district, the union, the consulting teachers, or the first-year teachers. In particular, I attempted to collect copies of all formal and informal post-observation write-ups done by consulting teachers. I also attempted to collect both reports (mid-year and final) submitted by the consulting teacher to the PAR Panel that described the progress of the teachers. In collecting the consulting teachers write-ups, I had to rely completely on the first-year teachers. Consulting teachers would have broken rules of confidentiality by giving me the reports. Thus, the extent to which I collected all reports that were written depended on whether the first-year teacher could find them.

Other disadvantages of relying on documentary data stem from the fact that documents were not created with the purposes of the researcher in mind (Merriam, 1998). Problems that stem from that fact include: (1) documents are not necessarily written in a form that the researcher will comprehend or find useful, (2) documents may not fit easily into the conceptual framework the researcher develops, and (3) the accuracy of documents is not guaranteed. Furthermore, the researcher may not know enough to judge the document's accuracy (Merriam, 1998). Due to my insider status during my analysis of the documents, I found them to be both comprehensible and accurate. My biggest challenge was getting access to the documents since I relied totally on the first-year teachers to provide them.

Interviews. Significant portions of my data came from what Jerome Murphy (1980) calls the process of "intensive interviewing, which reveals what actually happened, why, and with what impact" (p.77). According to Murphy (1980), intensive interviews are most useful as data sources in studies in which the researcher is (a) looking at a process or how something evolved, (b) exploring the reasons behind complex events, and (c) unable to anticipate all of the important questions that will have to be posed. Interviews are beneficial not only because they can be targeted to the specific focus of the study (Yin, 1994), but also because they can provide insight such as the participant's thoughts, beliefs, or intentions, which are not observable (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994).

Murphy (1980) defines key informants as participants who provide the most information and the most candid information through informal interviews. The key informants for my study were the first-year teachers and the consulting teachers. Murphy

notes that regular interviewees, with whom the researcher conducts more formal interviews on a less frequent basis, also provide information important to the study.

Using my conceptual framework (see Figure 1), I created the initial interview protocol for the first-year teachers (See Appendix C). As the study unfolded, I created additional protocols for subsequent interviews with the first-year teachers, as well as for interviews with the consulting teachers and resource teachers (See Appendix D). The probes that follow the questions helped me get participants to clarify or elaborate on their responses, as well as providing the teachers with the encouragement to continue expanding on the point they were making (Murphy, 1980).

My interviews served multiple purposes. For the first-year teachers, I wanted to understand their beliefs and dispositions about teaching and learning. I also used the interviews to allow them to discuss their particular instructional approaches, how they perceive their students, and how they perceived the curriculum. After discussing these matters, I honed in on questions about their work with their consulting teachers. I got a vivid sense of whether they viewed the consulting teacher in a positive or negative light, how they believed the consulting teacher had helped them, and how they perceived the consulting teacher's evaluative role. I also asked them to discuss what their schools were like, and how they perceived their colleagues and school-based supervisors. Towards the end of the school year, I asked about the direction that they believed their careers would take.

As indicated in Table 4, I conducted four interviews with each first-year teacher (with the exception of Alexis, with whom I requested a fifth interview due to a particular occurrence detailed in Chapter 5), and two interviews with each consulting teacher.

Figure 1. Initial Conceptual Model for Understanding Influences on First-Year Teachers Practices

Student Characteristics, % ESOL, reduced lunch, mobility	
Parent Involvement	School Context
Faculty characteristics faculty size; yrs experience	
Match between certification area & teaching assignment	Initial Assignment
Extracurricular activities	
Consulting teacher	
School-initiated induction activities	Sources of Support
Other colleagues: resource teacher, mentor teacher, admin. and others	
PAR participation	
Relationships with Students	Expectations
Overall job	
Opportunities for Collaboration	School Culture
Opportunities for Reflection	
Consulting teacher	
Supervising Administrator	Accountability
Resource Teacher	

Teacher Development → Teacher Practice

When the data suggested that other sources of support (such as the resource teacher) were critical to gaining a full understanding of the first-year teachers' responses to supervision, then I requested to interview those sources as well. I wanted to interview Chad Wolf's resource teacher, but her busy schedule prevented us from finding a good time to meet.

I audio-taped and then transcribed all interviews (Yin, 1994). In addition, I took detailed, handwritten notes during interviews. These notes helped me considerably when I was filling in remarks that might not have been clear on the tape. However, for the purposes of this study I bought a high-quality tape recorder, thus the sound quality on the vast majority of my tapes was very good. None of the participants expressed reluctance about having their interviews taped. In several instances, however, participants would preface what they said with a request that the particular remark not be included in my report. I honored all requests for confidentiality.

While interviews can be one of the most useful sources of data, problems with using interview data include: (1) obtaining unbalanced or inaccurate data due to poorly constructed questions, (2) receiving biased responses from the participants, (3) obtaining inaccurate data because of the participant's poor memory, (4) having participants who choose to alter their responses because of the researcher's presence (they either tell the researcher what they think he or she wants to hear or they tell the researcher what they think is morally or procedurally correct, rather than what actually occurred) (Yin, 1994).

I tried to avoid these pitfalls by asking open-ended questions, and attempting to contain my reactions to the participants' responses. I worked hard in interviews to show the participants that I was listening to them. I tried not to insert my opinions, but this did not always work out as well as I had hoped. I will discuss this more in the ethical

considerations section of this chapter. My interview data were very consistent with the

data I collected from classroom observations, observations of post-observation

conferences, and documents. The only conflict that I recall occurred in the perceptions of

the consulting teacher and other participants about how school-based supervisors had

assessed one of the first-year teachers. Outside of this incident, the information from my

data sources was remarkably consistent.

   To avoid having participants tell me what they thought I wanted to hear, I avoided

discussing any of my own expectations about what their experiences would be.

Participants were informed of my intention to study their experiences within the PAR

program, but they were not necessarily aware of my conceptions of what it means to

teach and learn. They were also not apprised too much about my background, other than

the fact that I had been an English teacher outside of the district, and that I was at that

time a full-time doctoral student. As I indicated earlier, I entered the field as a graduate

student conducting research, rather than as an authority figure. I met most of my

participants on my own during the summer orientation for new teachers. In at least one

instance, the resource teacher introduced me to the first-year teacher, but there were no

instances in which a school administrator introduced me to the teacher.

Validity

   Wolcott (1990) argues that in qualitative studies, the more information one uncovers

about a phenomenon, the more one realizes that there is a great deal more to be

understood. Thus, qualitative description will always be somewhat incomplete. While

 acknowledging that this incompleteness means that qualitative researchers will not get it

"all right," Wolcott (1990) suggests ways that researchers can at the very least not "get it

Table 5.
Relation of Data Sources to Research Questions

Research Questions	Data Sources
What were first-year teachers' experiences in Peer Assistance and Review (PAR)?	-observations of meetings between the first-year teacher and his or her consulting teacher -interviews with the first-year teachers
What preparation did the district give first-year teachers to use PAR to enhance their professional growth?	-observations of district-mandated training for beginning teachers prior to the start of the year -interviews with first-year teachers about how they perceive PAR and what they recall from the district's training.
What were the characteristics of the relationship between first-year teachers and consulting teachers?	-observations of meetings between the first-year teacher and consulting teacher -interviews with first-year teachers -interviews with consulting teachers -informal written communications between first-year teachers and consulting teachers throughout the year
How did first-year teachers see PAR as a form of evaluation, support and/or professional development?	-interviews with beginning teachers --observations of meetings between the first-year teacher and his or her consulting teacher
What sources of assistance and assessment did first-year teachers draw upon outside of PAR?	-interviews with beginning teachers -interviews with resource teachers (as deemed necessary given the content of the first-year teachers' responses)
How did participation in PAR inform the first-year teachers' practices?	-observations of meetings between the first-year teacher and his or her consulting teacher -interviews with the first-year teachers -classroom observations of the first-year teachers -analysis of formal and informal post-observation feedback from the consulting teacher

all wrong" (p. 127).

To avoid "getting it all wrong," I attempted to use approaches in my study to increase

its internal validity. The question of internal validity is the question of "do the findings

ring true?" Merriam (1998) suggests six ways to enhance the internal validity of the

qualitative case study:

(a) triangulation—the use of multiple investigators, multiple data sources, or
    multiple methods to check for the consistency of the findings

(b) member checks—taking preliminary findings to the participants to see if they believe the findings are an accurate representation of their experiences

(c) long-term observation—collecting data over an extended period of time

(d) peer examination—allowing a colleague to examine your findings

(e) participatory or collaborative modes of research—engaging the study's participants in all of the processes of the research (from conceptualizing the study to writing the final report)

(f) researchers biases—making the researcher's views and assumptions clear at the outset of the research (pp. 204-205).

I triangulated my data by using multiple sources of data, and by analyzing the consistency among what beginning teachers said, what their consulting teachers said, and what I observed as it related to the first-year teachers' experiences. I had hoped to receive feedback about my work from the first-year teacher participants. I knew how to contact four of the five teachers who remained employed with the district, and those four teachers received copies of Chapter Four. However, I was unable to produce a draft of Chapter Five quickly enough to submit it to the teachers and receive feedback on my findings. I will still send them copies of Chapters Five and Six, and consider their comments for the final version of this document. I heard from two of the four teachers regarding Chapter Four. Both teachers said that they found the chapter enjoyable to read.

This study was conducted over the course of one full school year, thus, it would be considered a long-term study. And, I have attempted to be explicit about my conceptual framework and underlying assumptions about the nature of teaching (See Chapter 1, Conceptual Framework and Literature Base), both of which shaped what I regarded as the most important data to collect.

Ethical Considerations

When I first thought about my role as the researcher in this study, I was focused on my relationships with the first-year teachers. I concentrated on avoiding the role of yet

another person who served as a source of assistance or advice. Patton (2002) discusses a tension in how qualitative researchers interact with their participants. On the one hand, it is important to build a rapport with participants. In building this rapport, I shared my experiences as a first-year English teacher with the teachers, and I tried to comfort them if they perceived their frustrations to be out of the ordinary. Yet, as Patton (2002) argues, "the purpose of a research interview is first and foremost to gather data, not change people." Thus, I had to be careful that my dialogue with the first-year teachers would not somehow change the outcomes in my study. Overall, in working with the first-year teachers, I think I was successful in establishing rapport without being intrusive. Alexis Burton much more than my other participants asked me for suggestions, and I would respond to her (or even commiserate with her) with examples from my own teaching. I hope that these informal conversations that we engaged in, typically during an interview, did not add to Alexis feeling overwhelmed. I honestly do not think that they did. However, it was not as easy as I thought it would be to avoid being a source of advice for a new teacher who sought my guidance.

Yet, the role that the consulting teachers wanted me to play was what really caught me off guard. I was prepared for the first-year teachers to seek my advice. I was completely unprepared for the consulting teachers to do so. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) discuss the fear of qualitative researchers that somehow their findings will be used in unintended ways, or particularly in ways that could have negative consequences for the participants. All three consulting teachers in this study had occasions to ask me if I saw what they saw in terms of the first-year teachers' classes. In one instance when there was a question of whether the consulting teacher would recommend renewal of the first-year

teacher's contract, the consulting teacher looked to me for verification of the gravity of the problems he had observed. I refused to render my judgment about challenges the first-year teacher faced, but I did verify that the types of occurrences he saw, I also observed. At the time, I believed that not answering or to say that as a researcher I was unable to comment would have built a wall between me and the consulting teacher that would have prevented him from being as honest with me about his experiences as he was. Another consulting teacher asked me if I thought there was anything else that she could have done to assist her client. I responded that the first-year teacher had not told me anything more than she had told her. Both of these consulting teachers were distraught over the difficulties their first-year teachers were having, and both viewed it as *their* failure that the teachers were not being successful. Neither consulting teacher ended up recommending non-renewal, as every first-year teacher in my study received a "meets standards" rating on his or her final summative report.

The idea of having my findings being used in a way that I did not intend not only applied to my interactions with the consulting teachers, but also applies to the current stage of my research. It is now time for me to report my findings to the district, and I will do so with two concerns. First, I am concerned that in an environment of fiscal constraints where people question the significant expense of the Professional Growth System, that somehow, an aspect of my findings taken in isolation could be used to justify a decision that I would not support. To address this issue, I will begin sharing my findings with people who I know and trust, and I will seek their guidance about the dissemination of the full dissertation. To fulfill the reporting requirements of the district, I will write a succinct executive summary of my findings, hopefully reducing the chance

that some small piece of data could be taken and misused. My second concern as an ambitious employee of the district is that I could present findings or recommendations that might offend people who could influence the progression of my career in years to come. And, although that small fear was in the back of my mind as I conducted my work, it did not prevent me from telling an honest, accurate story of five, first-year teachers' experiences in Peer Assistance and Review.

Data Analysis

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), there are three primary strands of qualitative analysis: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification. Throughout the data analysis the researcher constantly asks questions and makes comparisons (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Data reduction is the process of making choices about which data will gain the most focus in the study. Data display refers to the use of graphical displays and charts to array the data. Conclusion drawing and verification refers to the process of determining what the data mean, and whether one's explanation of the data rings true.

Data Reduction. The data reduction process involves the researcher deciding what he or she will look at and look for throughout the data collection. One method of focusing the data collection is to look at those aspects of the program that the participants deem most salient (Murphy, 1980). Another method is for the researcher to articulate his or her conceptual framework (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Although qualitative researchers should not go in with a priori categories for the data they collect, it is critical that they are clear about what they expect to find in the field, and about how those expectations might shape what they see. In this sense, qualitative researchers have the responsibility of

acknowledging the conceptual framework with which they are approaching their study, with the awareness that the framework will change as the study proceeds (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Developing a conceptual framework was particularly useful in my study because I collected data for a full academic year, and amassed vast amounts of data. According to Miles and Huberman (1994) in cases such as these, "if you don't know what matters more, everything matters" (p. 55), and the data organization and analysis could have continued without end.

My study of the experiences of first-year teachers participating in PAR was certainly influenced by my dispositions regarding the experiences and support structures which have an impact on the development and practice of beginning teachers (Huling-Austin, 1986). Thus, as I collected data on the aspects of the first-year teachers' experiences that contributed to their development and practice, I initially focused on areas such as school context, initial assignment, sources of support, expectations, accountability and school culture. I particularly attended to how factors which relate to the first-year teachers' participation in PAR seemed to influence the rate that the teachers progressed through stages of development (Stroot, et al., 1999).

As my interest became more about the first-year teachers' responses to supervision, I began to concentrate more on the interactions between the first-year teachers and their CTs using Sergiovanni's (1992) model for sources of supervisory authority. What happened in the classroom was a significant part of my examination, but I analyzed those data in terms of how the teachers approaches to instruction did or did not relate to their interactions with the consulting teacher. Classroom observations alone were not enough

to gauge what connections, if any, existed. I used classroom observations, along with self-reports by the first year teachers.

   To begin analyzing my documents, transcriptions, and observations, I used a system of open coding in which "data are broken down into discrete parts, closely examined, and compared for similarities or differences. Events, happenings, objects, and actions/interactions that are found to be conceptually similar in nature or related in meaning are grouped under more abstract concepts termed 'categories'" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 102). I coded the interview and post-observation conference data sentence by sentence, to ascribe meaning to the text.

    The next step in the coding process was axial coding, which is "the process of relating categories to their subcategories, termed 'axial' because coding occurs around the axis of a category, linking categories at the level of properties and dimensions" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 123). Axial coding helped me begin to make meaning from my data in an in-depth way. By thinking about how categories related, I began developing a picture of what the data meant in a broader sense (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

    Finally, I coded my data for process. Coding for process enabled me to attend to ways that actions and interactions of first-year teachers and consulting teachers evolved over time, within the context of the school (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). In this sense, I was be able to see a "moving picture" of what happened at my sites, instead of merely a "snapshot" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 179). Processes that I observed at the sites occurred as the result of participants' strategic planning (e.g., planned visits by the consulting teachers), unexamined routines (the first-year teachers' classroom routines), or automatic responses (the first-year teachers' responses to students and the CTs). To

attend to these occurrences, I "purposefully look[ed] at actions/interactions and note[d] movement, sequence, and change as well as how it evolve[d] (changed or remained the same) in response to changes in context or conditions" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 167). I examined, for example, how the conversations between the consulting teachers and the beginning teachers changed over time, and how those conversations were shaped by different stages of the evaluation process (e.g. how conversations between first-year teachers and consulting teachers at the beginning of the year compared to those at the time of year when consulting teachers were writing their summative reports). Such an analysis was useful in understanding the ways that the evaluation component of PAR influenced the assistance that the first-year teachers requested.

Data Display. A data display is a "visual format that presents information systematically, so the user can draw valid conclusions and take needed action" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 91). By displaying the data, researchers can view their data sets holistically, see where more analysis needs to be done, and make comparisons among the data sets (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Data displays help make the data more accessible to the researcher. Throughout my fieldwork and data analysis, I kept a notebook in which I would make informal charts and displays to become clearer about the way I was thinking about the data. I used these charts not only as a way of clarifying the data, but also as a way of clarifying what I perceived as the implications of the data.

Conclusion Drawing and Verification. Miles and Huberman (1994) offer thirteen different tactics that qualitative researchers can use to begin drawing conclusions about their data:

(1) noting patterns and themes	(8) subsuming particulars into the general
(2) seeing plausibility	(9) factoring

(3) clustering   (10) noting relations between variables
(4) making metaphors   (11) finding intervening variables
(5) counting   (12) building a logical chain of evidence
(6) making contrasts/comparisons   (13) making conceptual/theoretical coherence
(7) partitioning variables   (p. 246).

Of the methods he lists, I found noting patterns and themes, making contrasts and comparisons, building a logical chain of evidence and making conceptual/theoretical coherence to be the most useful. From the axial coding and the coding for process, I started to formulate larger themes in my data about the interactions between the consulting teachers and their clients. These themes became the six elements that I describe as those which seemed most influential in how the relationship between the CT and the first-year teacher developed. I also made contrasts and comparisons among the cases, looking at ways that teachers who faced similar challenges in the classroom had different responses to the supervision that their CTs provided. Unpacking these differences helped me develop a chain of evidence leading to my argument that supervisors who draw on professional sources of authority are more likely to build relationships with first year teachers that lay the foundation for professional growth experiences.

In developing conceptual and theoretical coherence of my data, I found that memos I had written to myself throughout the data collection process were quite useful. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) note that "memos can provide a time to reflect on issues raised in the setting and how they relate to larger, theoretical, methodological and substantive issues" (p. 161). During the data collection, as an idea or question occurred to me, I kept a notebook where I recorded it. These ideas served as the foundation for my thinking about how to make sense of the large amounts of data that I had. I also used memos to record

important details of informal conversations I had with my participants. I often found that rich information would come out during walks to the parking lot, or in the time spent with my participants waiting for a meeting to begin. The memos I wrote alerted me to important issues that I needed to revisit in my thinking.

In the next chapter, I introduce my first-year teacher participants and consulting teacher participants as a way to begin unraveling the values, dispositions and experiences they brought to bear in responding to and engaging in supervision in the Peer Assistance and Review program.

CHAPTER 4

Introduction of Participants

In the pages that follow I begin to disclose the results of my year-long inquiry by presenting the first-year English teachers who were my five primary participants, along with their consulting teachers . The function of this chapter is to provide a glimpse into the backgrounds and dispositions of the major participants. A familiarity with the first-year teachers' personal interests, career preparation and attitudes about assistance lend clarity to my interpretations of how participating in PAR influenced their teaching. By nothing less than good fortune, I studied five very different, very interesting first-year teachers who viewed and used PAR in an assortment of ways. Allow me to introduce you.

The First-Year Teachers

Christopher Parker: Stonegate High School

For some teachers, high school athletics is dessert—a delightful addition to the academic program which is even more gratifying when flavored with the sweet taste of victory. But for Christopher (Chris) Parker sports was an integral part of the high school experience. His interest in pursuing a teaching career sprung from his frequent work with children at athletic summer camps. In fact, his own best memories of school centered around his season-to-season participation in soccer, wrestling, and baseball. Reflecting on the finer moments of his schooling experiences, Chris said, "sports would be the best thing for me…that got me involved with the most people and luckily I was pretty decent at it, so you know you gain kind of a reputation, I guess…you gotta play sports." It's not surprising, then, that the idea of coaching a sport his first year of teaching was appealing.

With no surplus of teachers to coach athletic teams, the school enticed Chris to take on

J.V. soccer in the fall, then wrestling in the winter. By the second semester of his first

year of teaching, Chris was named as the school's assistant athletic director.

Such a role was no small responsibility for the twenty-two-year-old Penn State

graduate who had been assigned to teach three eleventh grade "on-level" classes, one 10th

grade literacy course and one 9th grade literacy course at Stonegate High School.

Stonegate, with a student population of 1100, was 48.5% white, 18.6% Hispanic, 18.5%

African-American, and 14% Asian American. Approximately 18% of the students were

eligible for free or reduced lunch, and 7.5% of the student population were learning

English as a second language.   The school was housed in a building constructed in 1968

and was scheduled to be remodeled by 2004. Chris, unlike many first-year high school

teachers, had his own classroom.

Teacher Education Experiences. Chris had prepared for the challenges of a career in

teaching by earning a B.A. in Secondary Education with a concentration in English and

Communications through Penn State's four-year teacher education program. While Chris

felt he had come from a very reputable teacher preparation program, he still felt ill at ease

about his subject matter knowledge. According to Chris, "Because I think I took so many

education classes, I missed out on some English content." As Chris recalled the emphasis

of the program, he said, "Technology was huge…using technology in the classroom.

And, using differentiation.[7] I think they [also] emphasize a lot—get to know the kids.

They emphasize being in the classroom. I was in the classroom a lot. It started during

my sophomore year, pretty regularly." By the time he was ready to begin his sixteen

---

[7] Differentiation is a term used to describe a teacher's ability to vary instructional techniques to fit the needs of students with diverse backgrounds or special needs.

weeks of student teaching, he had conducted observations in both elementary and high schools, and he had taught single lessons during some of his practicum experiences.

The school where Chris student taught was a dramatically different place from the school in which he found himself in Elizabeth County. His student teaching occurred in a small-town high school populated with 650 students, and located twenty-minutes from Williamsport, Pennsylvania. Chris saw the school as "out in the middle of nowhere," surrounded by everything from small villages and boroughs to cornstalks and wheat fields. He had been assigned to teach one "high-level" and one "low-level" tenth grade English class, along with two "regular-level" and one honors twelfth grade class. Both Chris and his cooperating teacher had easygoing temperaments, and both placed a premium on building a good rapport with students. Chris seemed particularly fond of his cooperating teacher's grounding in the practical aspects of teaching. He says of the experience, "I think what my cooperating teacher taught me most and what I learned is just theory versus actuality. You know, coming out of college you get all these theories, theories, theories, which, you know, I listened to and stuff, but I always questioned the reality of it. He was a realist. He told me how it was, you know…You get all this theory and all these meanings and stuff, but in actuality what happens in the classroom is different from what everyone says…you can't predict what every kid is going to do." Although Chris and his cooperating teacher had similar dispositions, Chris expressed some disenchantment with his cooperating teacher's approach to helping him learn to teach. According to Chris, "he [the cooperating teacher] was very laid back, which sometimes caused me problems…because I would want help and he'd, you know, he'd tell me to sink or swim…He left me alone a lot…so I was on my own, but then he did his

observations…Sometimes we were lacking in communication because he was so laid back and I wouldn't want to get on his nerves or whatever. But he was a good guy. We still keep in contact."

While the relationship Chris had with his cooperating teacher was amiable, his cooperating teacher failed to assist him professionally. Because the cooperating teacher observed Chris only sporadically, Chris had no one to help him or provide him with feedback when one of his lessons did not go as planned. Consequently, instead of engaging in reflection to gain some understanding of the apparent gap between pedagogical theory and classroom practice, Chris attributed his experiences to the influence of a teacher preparation program that was disconnected from the reality of teaching. From Chris' perspective his teaching preparation pivoted on theories that lacked utility and privileged knowledge of pedagogy over knowledge of content. This left Chris, whose student teaching experiences had more shock value than instructive value, somewhat skeptical about how prepared he was to teach the diverse student population at Stonegate.

Choosing Elizabeth County, Choosing Stonegate. Although a number of school systems visited Penn State to recruit teachers, Chris chose to come teach in Elizabeth County because "they just seemed more up-to-date…They had more resources, they were a lot friendlier…it just felt like a good system…I guess all the resources is my main thing. It's a tremendous county, you know, benefit wise. A lot of people say stuff, but can't back it up. They got everything established. You know, a lot of systems *say* we have a mentor program, but it's not established and this is established." Chris' attraction to Elizabeth County's wealth of resources was not uncommon. The district, compelled

by a very aggressive teacher union, offers teacher salaries that are among the best in the region. What is noteworthy is the importance Chris ascribed to the district's promise of providing multiple supports for new teachers. This indicates that the district can successfully use its mentoring program as a selling point to entice new teachers, particularly when those teachers believe they are somewhat ill-equipped to meet the challenges of the first-year of teaching.

Chris chose to work at Stonegate because the faculty and administrators left a positive impression on him. According to Chris, "All the teachers around here have been great and the administration's been great, too…the assistant principals, the principal, the secretaries…everybody's really nice here. I sensed that interviewing. You know, this isn't the best facility…the holes in the ceiling…a lot of other facilities are [more] impressive, but the people weren't as friendly. I'm very happy with my decision."

Anticipations, Anxieties. The tentativeness with which Chris regarded his preparation for teaching, combined with his outgoing personality led him to seek considerable input from his colleagues in the English department about what to expect from his students. Chris noted that, "overall the kids are supposed to be great. All the teachers say the kids are great—respectful, nice. The literacy program I'm running I know will be lower level kids, so I'm worried that the behavior might be lower." In terms of his expectations for student mastery of the curriculum, Chris said, "I've heard a lot of kids struggle with the writing, but whether that's true or not, I don't know. A lot of teachers say the kids don't like the poetry, but I think I've done a lot with poetry." Chris believed that his ability to build strong, positive relationships with students was one of the greatest strengths that he brought to teaching. He said, "I'll be able to talk to them and joke around with them and

still get their respect, knowing that they're here for education…You know, I can relate to them. I listen to the same type of music and stuff…"

Whereas Chris saw relating to students as one of his greatest strengths as a classroom teacher, he feared that he fell short on his facility with the subject matter. He acknowledged, "The content for me is going to be tough. Not knowing and not being, I guess, an expert on the content." His concern that he lacked expertise in English content was only compounded by the fact that the English curriculum centered around the use of primary sources. There were no textbooks, nor any teacher guides to help him determine what to teach or when to teach it. He explained, "This is a theme-based curriculum, there's no textbooks …the first theme is 'textures' and there's ten novels, 20 short stories, 20 poems, and basically the teacher has the freedom to go and pick what they want to cover and what they don't… so I'm interested to see how it goes, 'cause I never taught it like that before. I'm not even sure what I'm doing past the first two weeks."

For the first two weeks of school, at least for his eleventh graders, Chris planned to start with a poetry unit. He said, "That's what I think everyone is starting off with…and then we jump into novels and plays. There's anthologies somewhere, but they just gave me one set. I have a non-fiction essay book and that's my only text. Everything else I'm going to have to photocopy." Chris had a number of materials thrown at him, but he was unsure of which editions were written in ways that increased student understanding. Furthermore, with only one class set of anthologies he would be unable to give out-of-class reading assignments. Thus, even before the school year began, the problem of having access to ample instructional materials became apparent to Chris. Nevertheless, he was intent upon creating a jovial classroom environment in which students were

excited about learning and felt comfortable expressing their thoughts. He noted, "I'm one of those people who can't stand to sit in one place for a long time, so hopefully they get out and have different activities each day. I want to have open discussion in the classroom. Hopefully, they all feel comfortable, and you know you got to develop that early on…just through being myself. I want it to be educational, but I want them to have fun." The idea that "educational" and "fun" may be mutually exclusive proved to loom large as an issue in Chris' instructional practice. His struggle to quell the tension he saw between the two often ended with him privileging one over the other.

Nym Oh: Midway HS

"Did you ride your motorcycle to school today, Mr. Oh?" one of Nym Oh's eleventh graders inquired after class. The young man brimmed with interest in the life of the 33-year-old English teacher, who years ago had ditched medical school to ride his motorcycle cross country. Far from the typical path to a career in teaching, Nym Oh had been a doctoral student, medical student, band member, CD Rom producer and had worked for an accounting firm all prior to his decision to pursue a master's degree in education. Born in Korea, Nym came to the United States when he was four, lived on the East Coast for several years, and then moved to Los Angeles. By the time he was ready for high school his family had moved back to the East Coast, where he eventually graduated from a Catholic school. He describes his existence since then as "more or less nomadic. I haven't done any one thing for any long period of time."

After earning a B.S. in chemistry from Georgetown University, dabbling in a number of different jobs and deciding that medical school was not for him, Nym returned to Washington, D.C. to pursue an advanced degree in English. It was his somewhat

unfulfilling experiences as a graduate assistant teaching college students which led him to think about a career as a classroom teacher. According to Nym, "When I was teaching at college…Introduction to Poetry, I didn't feel that I really made a difference in the lives of my students. So I thought, you know, maybe teaching middle school, elementary school may be the thing for me. But my academic background is such that I want to focus on literary criticism, and for that reason I think high school fits me better." Nym's dissatisfaction with college teaching, combined with a more fulfilling experience he'd had tutoring an English-speaking Mongolian boy, convinced him to consider a career in teaching seriously. With his wife of nine years and his two-year-old daughter giving their full support, Nym began the year-long Master's Certification program at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Teacher Education Experiences. For Nym the Master's Certification Program, which was designed to help professionals without education backgrounds earn a master's degree and teacher certification in one year of full-time study, affirmed his own beliefs that teaching English is a political act. According to Nym, "I've always known that the study of English is very political and very politicized…it's a very social discipline…[One professor in the program] was very, very activist in his approach to teaching…and that was a big influence [on me]." Nym's commitment to helping his students understand the political nature of the content that he taught was apparent in many of his lessons. Nym's rationale for his emphasis on grammar, for example, was that "my students have to understand that writing and speaking have everything to do with power. I mean, people judge you [based on] the way [you] speak, the way [you] write…people make judgments all the time."

Outside of reaffirming Nym's own notions of the ways power relates to the teaching of English, professors in the Master's Certification Program introduced Nym to a variety of instructional approaches that he was able to execute with great success. Nym remarked that "[one professor] stressed the importance of storytelling, and I tried that in my student teaching and it turns out that I'm a pretty good storyteller. And, the things that I could get my students to do with these stories was pretty phenomenal…Like one student didn't like to read, but he liked to write lyrics, so he took Brittany Spears' songs, changed the lyrics and a did a character analysis of *The Great Gatsby*. I think it's through storytelling that he gets the confidence to perform because when I'm storytelling, I'm performing also." Nym's flare for performing enticed his eleventh graders not only to analyze literary characters, but also to analyze how people use the English language…tasks that most likely would have otherwise been labeled by the students as "boring."

Nym student taught 11th grade honors and 12th grade "regular" English classes from November to April in a suburban Maryland school district. From his perspective one of the most positive aspects of his student teaching was the freedom his cooperating teacher gave him to try a variety of instructional approaches. According to Nym, "I had a supportive cooperating teacher who allowed me to do what I wanted to do…which gave me the confidence to plan my own lessons, tap into what my strengths are…and she just threw me in there, and for a person like me I think it was a good thing…I realized that I can't ever really teach like somebody else. And, if I try to do that, it only comes out awkward." While Nym was pleased with his cooperating teacher's openness to his exploration of a variety of instructional techniques, he disagreed with her about what

content was appropriate for his students. Nym recalled that "during my student teaching I had a little bit of grief for bringing literary criticism into class because a lot of teachers are of the opinion that bringing sample writings of Freud or sample writings of Marx is much too difficult for high school students. But, to me this sounds a little ludicrous because once they go to college, they're exposed to this all at once anyway." From Nym's perspective, conducting critical analyses of literature and examining literary critiques were essential to providing students with rigorous schooling experiences. According to Nym, "I want [my students] first and foremost…to have fun, but I want it to be hard. I want to stress that in order to have fun in whichever endeavor they decide to take, they need to be disciplined practitioners on a daily basis." Throughout his first year, Nym expected that high level of discipline from every one of his students, whether they had been labeled "honors" or "on-level."

Anticipations, Self-assurance. That Nym held high expectations of his students was apparent from his very first interview. A week before the first day of school, Nym expressed great confidence in his students. He said, "I don't know…maybe I'm too optimistic, but I think everything will go well with these students. I don't think I'll have any disciplinary problems, not ones which I will not be able to handle myself. I don't think I'll need to send a child to the vice-principal's office or…take any administrative [action], you know, like suspension…I don't think anything like that will happen." To a large degree his high expectations were predicated upon his beliefs that he had the capacity to motivate even the most challenging students to learn. Among his primary strengths he listed his "eclectic background." According to Nym, "I guess it sounds

conceited, but I'm a very interesting person, and I think because I'm an interesting person and I know a little of a lot of things…I can tune into the interests of my students."

The confidence Nym possessed in his ability to capture his students' interests was only matched by his confidence in his own deep understanding of his subject matter. He said, "I think my greatest strength is that I'm knowledgeable in the field that I'm about to teach…I've always loved literature."   Of his possible weaknesses, Nym reported that his classmates in his master's program "accuse [him] of being too much of a conservative." In particular they were referring to Nym's views about interpreting text and they expressed concern that he might not find all of his students' interpretations acceptable. According to Nym, "I believe that there are a number of correct interpretations to a text, but…I don't think all interpretations are equal. I don't take this democratic view of interpretations, and certain interpretations cannot be correct. [Nym laughs]. And, I am quite adamant about this, so I think it may be my weakness." Nym's views of textual interpretations as well as his subject matter expertise was most likely due in no small part to the time he spent studying English literature in a doctoral program. The depth of his knowledge about English language and literature was striking, and seemed to far surpass that of a typical high school teacher. He was the only participant in the study whose classes made me feel less like a researcher recording field notes, and more like a student uncovering complex literary and linguistic devices.

The complexity of the concepts Nym taught often seemed to take his very diverse group of eleventh-graders by surprise as well. Approximately 1400 students crowded the halls at two-year-old, cherry brick Midway High School that overlooked a rapidly developing suburb. A modern building nestled within newly constructed townhomes,

Midway High School had a student body that was 52% white, 27.5% African-American, 11% Asian-American, and 9% Hispanic. Approximately 8.5% of the students at Midway received free or reduced lunch, and .07% were learning English as a second language. The school's interior was laid out like a baseball field and adorned with cherry-stained doors, a winding staircase, and a media center that was circular in design. Just as Midway's appearance stood in stark contrast to the overwhelming disrepair of Chris Parker's Stonegate High School, the self-confidence that Nym possessed sat opposite from the diffidence upon which Chris embarked his first year of teaching.

Michelle Newman: Midway HS

Across the hall from Nym, twenty-six-year-old Michelle Newman taught a very animated set of ninth graders. Michelle, a petite white female who had majored in English literature at Colgate University, pursued a career in teaching after two unfulfilling years as a marketing director for an internet company, where she managed educational research. Her experiences teaching church school, directing children's plays, and supervising educational research whet her appetite for the teaching profession. While she worked at the internet company, she began tutoring students after school and discovered that what she felt after a forty-hour week at the office fell far short of the satisfaction she experienced in the one hour per week she spent assisting a struggling student.

While for some the "commitment to teach all students" is no more than a job interview mantra that is guaranteed to please, Michelle embodied the sentiment in her entire approach to teaching. Although she attended a 750-student high school in West Point, New York where she can only recall two minority students, she recognized that "I was

extremely comfortable [and] everyone was like me, [but] the real world was not like my safe haven." She had grown up watching her mother, a veteran teacher, work three hours a day with her younger brother who was diagnosed with a learning disability. Observing the way her parents attended to her younger brother gave her "patience and perspective." According the Michelle, "I saw that not everyone learns the same way." Michelle hoped that teaching would give her the chance to channel her energy, creativity and enthusiasm into fostering an environment to help students who had not met with success in traditional classroom settings. Michelle said, "My aim is to reach out to multiple intelligences, to keep things varied, and to work on [students'] weaknesses." She envisioned herself as the type of teacher who would draw from multiple texts and a wide array of resources to uncover the relevancy of the subject matter to the lives of her students.

Teacher Education Experiences. Michelle's commitment to diversity was not only a fine match with the demands of the student population at Midway High School, but it also fit well with the philosophy of her year-long master's program at Teachers College. Michelle recalled that the program focused on diversity as it relates to race, gender, sexuality, and economic background. Reflecting on these issues served as a catalyst for Michelle's initial interrogation of the structure of schools and schooling. She began to question how well traditional methods of teaching and assessing students served the urban teens at the school where she did her student teaching.

During Michelle's first semester at Teachers College she conducted observations at a local middle school in which seventh and eighth grade students were organized into houses, or teams. With second semester came her student teaching assignment at

Vanguard High School in Spanish Harlem. Vanguard was designed for students who had not succeeded in traditional schools. Michelle taught a 10th and 11th grade combined class of 15-20 students. A hallmark of the school was the use of portfolios (as opposed to tests and quizzes) to assess student progress. Michelle said of her cooperating teacher, "She and I were very different. The students were in tune with her method. She was Latino, and if she was losing a student, she would start speaking Spanish. That's what they spoke in their homes. She was also very in their face. She was motherly, but she would yell." Michelle, who spoke in a quiet, yet unwavering voice was very concerned about how well students would respond to the way she communicated.

Her fears were assuaged as she began working with the students and found that they were responsive to her communication style and instructional tactics. In a lesson that was particularly memorable for her, she used students' interest in blues music as a way of helping them think about two novels. The students had to take a theme from each novel and write a blues song about it. Afterwards, they were to write reflections on the experience. "The students loved it," Michelle recalls, "but [this type of assessment] is not always accepted because [people believe] with essays and tests it's clear if the students got it." Michelle's experiences suggest, however, that alternative forms of assessment uncover levels of student understanding that are missed by teachers' over-reliance on traditional objective and essay tests.

Navigating Differentiation. Whereas I interviewed most participants in this study prior to their first day of class, Michelle and I sat down for the first time towards the end of the first week. Thus, we focused our discussions more on what she had not quite anticipated rather than what she expected of her students. Without a doubt Michelle was

most surprised at the wide gaps in reading levels of students who were all "homogenously" grouped in her "on-level" classes. She noted, "even though classes say they're the same level, they're extremely diverse. In one class I have maybe three kids who have read the book. In the others there's maybe a handful that haven't finished." In Michelle's very early assessments of possible problem areas for students, the students wrote that "writing is a weakness. What they haven't admitted," said Michelle, "is that self-confidence is also an issue." Michelle said that already one student had been in tears due to frustration and another student had attempted to dominate discussions and lead the class off topic. Michelle hoped to ameliorate some of these issues by involving students in small group work. The first day of class began with "get to know you" activities for students, and the next few days Michelle explored the idea of social location with students, as a means of introducing them to the first unit in the curriculum called "Independence."

Michelle identified her organizational skills as one of the greatest strengths she brought to the classroom. She said, "Organization is particularly helpful for ninth graders, but it's easy for teachers to get overwhelmed with setting up different folders for students, etc. Sometimes teachers take too much responsibility away from students. Instead of doing it for them, I plan to teach them to organize on their own." When thinking about possible challenges she might face, Michelle said, "I've actually worried about classroom management. I know that when someone comes in [to observe], it's not always clear where the boundaries are, but that hasn't been a problem yet." Another challenge Michelle envisioned was trying to get through all of the curriculum that was mandated by the district. She noted that the common tasks required by the district at the

end of each unit take considerable amounts of prewriting to be executed properly.

Although Michelle looked favorably upon the curriculum overall, she recognized that

"Elizabeth County's curriculum is so structured, it will be a challenge to negotiate."

Ultimately, Michelle was confident in her ability to succeed with her students because of

her commitment to "learning about my students as individuals." Her attention to the

obstacles facing individual students would prove to be one of her most valuable qualities.

Alexis Burton: Glen Lee HS

In a high school library overwhelmed by the pungent mixture of enthusiasm and fear

that a new teacher orientation would typically conjure up, I spotted Alexis sitting quietly

at a round table with a dark-haired white woman who looked about fifteen years her

senior. I must admit that I sought Alexis out and gave her my strongest pitch to

participate in the study because she was one of only three African-American teacher

inductees in the room. The other two, I had learned, were not new to teaching (only new

to the district), and would therefore be ineligible for the study. Alexis captured my

attention not only because we likely shared a heritage, but also because her key fob

donned the crest of the sorority I had pledged as a junior in college. We had an instant

connection.

I would come to learn that Alexis was a twenty-two year-old graduate of Duquesne

University where she had earned a bachelor's degree in secondary English education.

She was also an alumna of Elizabeth County Public Schools, and upon accepting the job,

had moved in with her grandmother. And, although Alexis's hairstyle made it

unnoticeable until the third time I saw her, she wore hearing aids behind both of her ears.

I never felt comfortable enough to ask her how the hearing loss had occurred, or whether

it was something she had dealt with since birth. She typically talked quickly, with speech that was just slightly slurred, and she always had a lot to say. In our first encounters she was often apprehensive, wondering if she was speaking too fast or saying too much. I tried to put her at ease.

According to Alexis, she decided to become an English teacher because "I love the literature, and I love being able to share what I know about the literature with others and to encourage students to become apt readers and to encourage them to, you know, do well in school…I feel I can reach every student…I just like the role of, you know, being able to play such an influential role in their life and help them to make positive choices." She noted that some members of her family had been less than pleased with her decision. She said, "most of their concerns had to do with the money and how much teachers get paid these days…But I think my family wants [their children] to do the best they can and be the best they can. The best in some people's eyes is a doctor or a lawyer or somebody that makes a whole lot of money…I might not be the best doctor, [and] I might not be the best lawyer, but I might be one of the best teachers, you know what I mean?" Despite those who tried to dissuade her, Alexis believed she could help students avoid some of the pitfalls she experienced in high school. Because she entered high school in ECPS after attending private schools for the elementary and middle school grades, she was forced to adjust to a different environment, with students and teachers who were strangers. In addition, Alexis said, "I always felt I could do better [in high school], but I was lazy…I regret it. I could have done more for myself…And that's another thing I wanted to try to tackle as a teacher…how to get to those students who know they could do better."

She would be given the chance to do so when she was assigned to teach at Glen Lee High School, which had 1612 students, 36% of whom were white, 35% of whom were black, 22% of whom were Asian American, and 7% of whom were Hispanic. Approximately 10% of the student population at Glen Lee qualified for free or reduced lunch, and only **.**19% spoke English as a second language. Alexis taught two "honors" and three "on-level" ninth grade classes.

Teacher Education Experiences. According to Alexis, teacher preparation at Duquesne consisted of taking "a batch of education [classes] and a batch of just English [classes]." She noted that, "Teaching Reading and Teaching Secondary English were the only English education classes. However, I wish that I did it the other way around and got an English degree and an education degree. I would have had more experience and more courses and more coursework, you know? But at the time I didn't know. They don't tell you that stuff." Of the things that stand out the most about the philosophy of her teacher education program, Alexis points to a strong emphasis on developing rubrics for student assessment. She noted, "I think that rubrics is a new thing and that's probably why it really stuck out in my thoughts. They wanted the new teachers to go in knowing about rubrics and knowing what they're doing." Alexis also fondly remembered her Politics of Teaching class because it raised her awareness of issues in teaching that she had never considered. Reflecting on the mindset of her and her classmates, Alexis said, "we thought about just going into the classroom, teaching and leaving. We didn't really think about all the other political things like…accountability…[or] what's happening in our schools with our safety being jeopardized and things like that."

She student taught for six weeks in the second semester of her senior year. Her assignment was to teach a college preparatory English course in a Pittsburg high school to 10th grade students who were mostly white. Towards the end of her first year when she looked back on her experiences, she thought about why she might not have been as well-prepared for the set of students she currently had. She recalled, "my cooperating teacher [had] already set the tone for his classroom, so when I got there, everything was fine and dandy. I really had no problems with students turning in work. They were all motivated. The projects that I got from them were [of] better quality than [those] I've ever gotten…this year…Their parents were pretty much involved." Her comments call into question the practice of assigning student teachers to classrooms with highly motivated students in the middle of the school year, when expectations and routines have already been set. Such practices avail student teachers of few, if any, opportunities to observe a successful veteran's method of establishing routines and expectations from the very first day of school.

Alexis had only positive recollections of her cooperating teacher, commenting that, "He was very supportive, very nice, he gave me lots of feedback. He made me feel confident in being a teacher and pursuing that career. I still keep in contact with him." Yet, the content of Alexis's comments about her teacher education program overall questions the utility of her preparation in her initial teaching assignment. As the year wore on it seemed clear that the strokes of confidence her cooperating instructor gave as a form of encouragement would be inadequate artillery for her future battles with low student motivation and inappropriate student behavior.

Anticipations, Optimism. Buoyed by her perceived success during student teaching, Alexis entered her first year full of optimism about what she would be able to accomplish with her students. She said, "I would like my students to see school as a place for learning new things, exploring new things, discovering things for themselves about the world [and] other students…a time and a place where they can use their creativity…where they can feel comfortable and encouraged and motivated to learn." She was very pleased with the ninth grade English curriculum, which she felt was built around themes to which the students could easily relate. When asked what students might find difficulty with in the curriculum, Alexis replied, "I don't see anything that they will have a conflict with yet. I just can't see it because the main headings for all these [units] are independence, choice, conflict, communication, relationships and change. They can all relate to that…There's something in each of these units…that they will have some prior knowledge of dealing with and where they will have something to bring to that unit…so I don't right now, as a new teacher,…see any conflicts." Beyond not readily identifying areas where students might struggle with the curriculum, Alexis was unable to predict her own strengths and weaknesses as teacher. In response to my question, she said, "I don't even know…I have no clue. I really don't know. .I am comfortable with teaching, but not to the extent where I can say, 'well, this is my strength and this is my weakness.' I can't pinpoint those because I haven't gone through all those emotions or things like that yet." This response stood out in my mind because Alexis was the only one of my participants who couldn't effortlessly identify the personal assets and liabilities that she brought to this job. I wondered then, if she did not yet have a

notion of her strengths and weaknesses how she would be able to maximize her strong points and overcome her challenges as the year progressed.

She had begun the first day of school by giving students a questionnaire so that they could share their feelings about the curriculum. Alexis noted that, "They've [the students] asked me a lot of questions dealing with what they were going to be learning and even though some of them may ask negative [things], 'well I don't want to do this' or 'poetry is boring,' when they see you get into it, they're like 'oh yeah, o.k. cool.' You know, it starts to be good stuff then. Stuff that they can do." Thus, as Alexis was entering the third week of school, she continued to be very positive about being able to capture and hold students' interest. However, a downturn in her optimism about her students and her own ability to help them learn was lurking in the weeks and months to come, and her once refreshing optimism would later seem to forebode a first-year of teaching filled with disappointment and misery.

Chadwick Wolf: Jefferson High School

Eighteen miles away schooling occurred as if it was happening in a entirely different world. Nestled within one of the wealthiest areas of the district, Jefferson High School was a newly remodeled Blue Ribbon school. Of its nearly 2000 students, 61% were white, 30% were Asian American, 4.5% were Hispanic, and 4% were black. Only 2% qualified for free or reduced lunch and just **.**2% spoke English as a second language. Chad Wolf knew unequivocally that if he was going to take a job in this district, it would be at one of the schools that looked like this.

I knew that I wanted Chad for this study as soon as I saw him at new teacher orientation. Although there were a number of white males who seemed to be around 24

years of age as he was, Chad conspicuously showed little interest in what was happening

at the orientation. Whereas others participated vigorously, posing several questions and

taking many notes, Chad sat in a chair physically separated from most of the group and

rested his head on the table for the better part of orientation week. The way he ran his

classroom would be no less than scintillating, making it almost hard to believe that this

was not Hollywood. It was real life as interpreted by Chad Wolf.

Having missed his first day of classes first semester, I knew I would not make the

same mistake again when Chad greeted a whole new group of students for second

semester. Always wearing a dress shirt and tie, along with dress pants adorned with the

chain of his pocket watch, Chad was fit, attractive, and very charismatic. Once

attendance was taken that first day in his sole "on-level" class of juniors, Chad stood up,

removed his tie and said, "Alright, so let me explain something to you guys. We can put

you in a much easier English class than this one…If you're here for an 'on-level' class,

get out. [students chuckle] Seriously….I don't teach 'on-level' classes." Later in the

class period he would ask members of his captivated audience to tell why they had not

always succeeded as much as they could in school. A male student yelled out "I'm lazy."

Chad responded, "That is an honest answer. So, here's what I'm going to teach you. I'm

going to teach you how to be lazy at the right times…No one in this room parties like I

do 'cause it's fun. English isn't fun. English is stupid. I'm not here to teach you English.

In fact, if somebody asks you what you have seventh period, just tell them Wolf. Because

I really don't care if you remember a damn thing you read this year. What I do care

about, though, is if somehow you leave my classroom still thinking there's no difference

between me and whatever the hell is going on in that room [Chad points next door and

students burst into laughter]….You've been in how many other classes today? [students respond, "six'] Of those six classes, how many have excited you to the point where you feel that you're going to make a change in your life? [student responses vary] Understand this, I'm here for one reason. I'm here for the few people in this room, if any, that still have a desire to make a change in their lives." Chad's teaching style and choice of literature would leave few, if any, of his students untouched.

Perhaps part of his magnetism stemmed from the fact that he was a screenplay writer who used his writing experiences as a driving force in designing his classes, or perhaps it was his confidence and his sense of adventure. At the same time, it could be the vast discrepancies between Chad Wolf and any other first-year teacher I'd met. From spending weekends in Vegas to grading students based on a one-million point grading scale, Chad was an uncommon character to behold.

After multiple changes in his undergraduate major, Chad settled upon a major in journalism and a minor in English at the University of Richmond, graduating in 1999. According to Chad, he decided to pursue a career in teaching because "I wanted to do something that was not sort of like arbitrary. Like, I didn't want to work for some company, selling some kind of product, or sitting behind a desk…I wanted to do something that gave back. And also I wanted something that was going to allow me some time to write and travel and stuff like that and the teaching schedule during the year and especially the summer break gives me a lot of opportunity to do both." He lived with his parents who were about a 50-minute commute from Jefferson, and said that they were both pleased that he had begun a career in teaching. His mom had taught for 26 years

and was at that time a principal in a neighboring district. His father, according to Chad, was "just happy that I have a job that is legal and regular."

Teacher Education Experiences. Since Chad had not picked up an education degree during his undergraduate studies, he decided to enter the 13-month SIMAT (School Immersion Master of Arts in Teaching) program at Johns Hopkins University, where he interned for the entire year and took education classes at night. His student teaching assignment was at Randallstown High School, located in the western suburb of Baltimore. He taught 12th grade English to a class that was 99% African-American. The community in which the school was located was affluent, but according to Chad 33% of the students were foster children from the city of Baltimore. Thus, Randallstown High still contended with problems mirroring those of urban schools.

Among the most vivid themes from his teacher education experiences, according to Chad, was that "all kids can learn." He recalled the program stressing the importance of "developing a learning community so that teachers are developing themselves along with students and each group is learning from the other…[and] applying things to the real world…When you teach something to kids, you should ask yourself the reason why you're teaching it to them." Chad often marveled at the way his cooperating teacher breathed animation into these values in working with students.

Citing his internship experience as the most influential force that shaped how he approached teaching, Chad said that his cooperating teacher, a twenty-seven-year-old African-American man, believed that "you set standards for [students] and you don't allow them to fall below those standards…If they choose to opt out of success, then you want to make it a very, very unpleasant choice." According to Chad, his cooperating

teacher's "biggest thing was giving kids a sense of confidence about themselves, saying that 'you can acquire the ability to read and write, and it can be a tool for you and you can be successful.'" Chad recalled that "there was nobody more in tune to what kids were listening to on the radio. There was nobody who could talk to them in a way they understood better than he could. He was the most feared, most respected, and most liked teacher all at the same time. So, that really was a model for me."

High Expectations, Glaring Confidence. If the way Chad interacted with his students was a result of what he had learned while he practiced teaching, then the curriculum that he taught his students was the result of what he had learned while he practiced writing. For the first semester Chad was assigned one "on-level" and two "honors" ninth grade classes, along with two "honors" 10th grade classes. Second semester he was given four 10th grade "honors" classes, and one 11th grade "on-level" class. Regardless of grade or level, Chad was very clear that all of his students would learn his system for critiquing and writing about literature, a system based upon the process he used to write his screenplays. He said, "What I try to do is I try to get the kids to think the way that I do because I do a pretty good job at thinking. And, you know, it's arrogance, but the important thing is …it's yielding results out of kids."

For the first week of school Chad taught all of his students his system for identifying ways that writers use patterns in their writing to convey and develop certain ideas. Chad said that he introduced his "patterns system" prior to beginning the district's prescribed ninth and tenth grade curricula because "I want them to have the foundation of writing before they start tackling their own separate curriculums." This system of identifying patterns in literature would dominate Chad's entire approach to teaching. His singular

focus on his self-created process would protrude as a sizeable concern for his consulting teacher who sought evidence that Chad could teach the district curriculum by using a variety of instructional strategies to address individual learning styles and levels of proficiency.

Yet, in his mind, Chad's departure from the curriculum expressed his fervent belief that "all kids can get to the same place." More specifically, Chad believed that all of the kids who attended Jefferson could get to the same place. He said, "I set a very, very high expectation for behavior because they're going to need every ounce of concentration and focus that they have to meet my expectations for them. Because these kids are very bright…I'm going to make them use every ounce of that gray matter. I have very high standards for them." Never to be found hanging out by the copier or in the teachers' lounge, Chad possessed an unconventional teaching style that would raise the eyebrows of some of his colleagues. Nonetheless, the vast majority of his students viewed Chad's class quite favorably.

Towards the middle of the period during that first day of second semester that I observed Chad, a counselor came in and cut the class short, announcing that all of the eleventh graders had to leave to complete a scheduling exercise. The students who might typically have been thrilled to leave class early, instead reluctantly gathered their belongings and straggled along behind their counselor. As he left I heard one male student groaning, "I don't want to go. This is my favorite class."

The Consulting Teachers

In addition to the five first-year teachers who were the primary participants in my study, I worked with three consulting teachers. The veteran CT in the group was assigned to Michelle, Nym and Chad. A first-year female CT was assigned to Alexis, and a first-year male CT was assigned to Chris.

Experience is a Good Teacher: The Veteran CT

With one year of CT experience under her belt, Vivian Conley distinguished herself as the only CT in my study who had been a part of PAR since its inception. Not only had she been a CT in the program's first year of implementation, but she had also served on the district committee that conceptualized and developed PAR. Her interest in serving on the committee and eventually in applying for the job of CT stemmed from her "dismay at how unprofessionally teachers were treated and regarded." According to Vivian, "decisions were made by 'important' people like principals and central office people, and the people who were in the classroom, who really knew the most about what was going on, were treated like interchangeable cogs in the machine."

Apart from her conviction that teachers were the experts when it comes to improving instruction, Vivian brought to her role as CT 15 years of classroom experience as a high school English teacher in four schools that served students with a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds. She saw herself as a good match for the CT position because she was "non-threatening, a good listener, flexible, and very tolerant." In addition, she noted that, "I have a pretty wide knowledge base that I can draw from when I work with teachers." She was assigned to Nym Oh, Michelle Newman and Chad Wolf, along with four other new teachers, one tenured teacher in remediation and one third-year

teacher. The nine teachers on her caseload were located at six different schools throughout the district. It was perhaps Vivian's experience as a CT that made her stand out as the most confident CT in my study. She knew what she could expect from her first-year teachers, and she knew how to organize her workload to avoid being overwhelmed. And, interestingly enough, none of her clients that were in my study encountered the type of problems that would make them vulnerable to a recommendation for non-renewal. The other two CTs were not that fortunate.

Experiencing Another First-Year: The New CTs

Selected from 113 applicants, Karen Carter and Paul Simms were two of twenty CTs who were new to the position. Karen had taught English in the district for 24 years (19 of which were at one high school) when she decided to pursue the job. For Karen teaching was "very much about encouragement." She noted that, "so much of anything you do in the classroom is about telling the kids that you believe in them." Her decision to become a CT was prompted both by her desire to help teachers and to reenergize herself. She said, "at a certain point you feel as if there are things you've learned as a teacher that you'd really like to pass on. And even though I'm not looking to retire in the very near future, it felt like a nice way to reinvigorate myself." Karen believed that being a CT would be a good fit for her because she saw herself as "perceptive" and felt that she "[knew] enough about teaching to recognize positive and negative things." Furthermore, she said that "I think, I hope, that I have the kind of manner that can pass on information in a non-threatening way because I see this job as requiring a lot of very important interpersonal skills." She acknowledged that when she was teaching she "never felt particularly comfortable being observed," thus she wanted "to try to diffuse that" when

she conducted her own observations throughout the year. She was assigned to Alexis Burton, who turned out to be one of the most challenging clients in her caseload. She was also assigned to eight other first-year teachers, and three second-year teachers. Her cases were spread across five different schools.

Earlier in his own career as an educator, Paul Simms decided that he wanted to be a consulting teacher. He had spent seven years teaching 9th and 11th grade English as well as journalism at one of the high schools in the district. Before entering the field of education, he had worked in New York for both an advertising agency and a video company, making good use of his undergraduate degree in television, radio and film production. A career in teaching, which Paul had initially shunned due to educators' modest salaries, seemed more palatable to him when he realized that he "wasn't really happy in advertising even though [he] was making a lot of money." For him, being a CT meant that he could help other teachers as well as stretch his own skills as an educator. He said, "My personality is that if I master something or feel like I've mastered something, I get bored. So I wanted a new challenge, and I really believe in PAR. I think it's the most innovative thing to hit teaching in a long time because instead of throwing poor teachers to the wolves the first year, they really have some support and I thought it would be exciting to be involved in that." Having served as a cooperating teacher for three student teachers while he was an English teacher, Paul found "the experience of working with them…to be really rewarding because not only did they learn from [him], but [he] also learned from them." Paul noted that, "just talking about the teaching profession I found very satisfying and involving." He believed that his experiences as a cooperating teacher during the school year, along with summers spent writing English

curriculum and questions for the state assessments would be valuable to him as a CT. He was assigned to Chris Parker, along with nine other first-year teachers at five different schools at the outset of the school year. Chris' case quickly became one of Paul's most challenging.

In the next chapter I examine both how the first-year teachers were introduced to PAR and how their relationships developed with their consulting teachers. In considering the data I am attempting to understand how the first-year teachers responded to the CTs different approaches to supervision.

CHAPTER 5

Experiencing the Multiple Faces of Supervision in Peer Assistance and Review

This study began as an exploration of how the five first-year teacher participants experienced Peer Assistance and Review. I wanted to know how the district introduced the program to the first-year teachers, how those teachers developed relationships with their consulting teachers, what meaning the first-year teachers made of their participation in PAR, and if that participation influenced the first-year teachers' practices. As I analyzed my data, I found that the way the first-year teachers experienced and perceived PAR was closely tied to the relationships they developed with their consulting teachers. During the analysis, I found distinct connections between the approaches taken by the consulting teachers and the responses of the first-year teachers not only in terms of how useful the first-year teachers viewed their participation in PAR, but also in terms of how the first-year teachers thought about and practiced instruction. Although the role of the consulting teacher took a range of forms from that of mentor to that of evaluator, I found Sergiovanni's (1992) model of the sources of authority for supervisory leadership to be useful in understanding how the first-year teachers in my study responded to working with their consulting teachers. According to Sergiovanni (1992), the source of authority a supervisor chooses to draw upon shapes a teacher's response to supervision. He describes five sources of authority from which supervisors typically draw: bureaucratic, personal, technical-rational, professional and moral. He argues that although supervisors will necessarily draw upon a combination of these five sources as they work with teachers, the source of authority supervisors rely upon most heavily will make the most impact on a teacher's response (Sergiovanni, 1992).

In delineating the five sources of authority, Sergiovanni notes that when supervisors rely on bureaucratic sources of authority, they emphasize the need for the teacher to comply with policies and directives set by the school and district, or face the consequences of non-compliance. Supervisors who rely on their own personal authority, however, use charisma and interpersonal skills to win over teachers. By forging strong interpersonal relationships with their teachers, these supervisors expect that teachers will do as they say out of a desire to please them. On the other hand, supervisors drawing on technical-rational sources of authority attempt to prescribe instructional approaches to teachers based on a single "truth" that is derived from what research indicates is best. This differs from the approach of supervisors who draw upon professional sources of authority. Supervisors who rely on their authority as fellow professionals view research as a tool to inform rather than to prescribe teacher practice. They view teachers as legitimate sources of knowledge, and they expect teachers to respond to expertise and beliefs that are generated and shared among their colleagues. Finally, supervisors who rely most heavily on moral authority see teaching as a set of responsibilities driven by broadly shared principles and ethical standards. According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), these supervisors expect teachers to respond to "shared commitments and to the felt interdependence that comes from these shared commitments" (p. 27).

As I analyzed my data, I examined the sources of authority most used by the consulting teachers in working with the first-year teachers, and I found that consulting teachers in my study relied most heavily upon three sources of authority—bureaucratic, technical-rational and professional. As I detected these patterns, my quest then became focused on how the first-year teachers responded to the dominant faces of supervision I

had observed. What did it mean for the relationship that developed between the consulting teachers and their clients? How did the first-year teachers respond to the consulting teachers' authority in terms of the observable changes in their practice as well as changes in their beliefs about their practice? How did the source of authority drawn upon by the consulting teachers differ from that of the school-based personnel assigned to assist the first-year teachers (i.e. the consulting teacher, the mentor, and the resource teacher), and what did those differences mean for the way the first-year teachers responded to their various assistance providers?

In taking my first steps at unraveling what it meant for first-year teachers to participate in PAR, I began at the beginning. I examined how the district initially introduced PAR, and I attended particularly to the message that this introduction sent about the nature of the program. Would first-year teachers view PAR as a program that honored them as professionals, providing them with opportunities for growth, while acknowledging and building upon the experiences that they brought to their new positions? Would they view it as yet another bureaucratic construct, a hoop that they must jump through as a rite of passage into the district's circle of dutiful employees? Would first-year teachers see the consulting teachers as people who facilitated professional growth or as people who enforced district mandates? In other words, which faces of supervision emerged when PAR made its debut to the first-year teachers?

PAR Introduced

I learned one of life's most important lessons during my very first, wide-eyed visit to a college library. Although a wealth of information might lay right at one's fingertips, it is all worthless if there is no guidance about how to access and use it. Thus, my

exploration for this study began with an attempt to gain insight into how the district prepared first-year teachers to use PAR for their professional growth. Prior to the consulting teacher coming to observe, the first-year teachers had two glimpses of what PAR was all about. The first was at the New Educator Orientation, and the second was when the consulting teacher dropped by the school to introduce him- or herself to the first-year teacher (a meeting that typically lasted 15 minutes or less).

The teachers first heard of PAR on Monday, August 20, 2001, the first day of the new teacher orientation for high school teachers. Billed as the "collegial community skit," the thirty-minute presentation was designed to introduce the new teachers to the people at the school and district level who were charged with supporting them in their first year. In other words, as the title of the skit suggests, the district hoped to show new teachers how they would be supported by the various elements of the Professional Growth System, with the suggestion that this system would help to create a culture of professionalism and collegiality within the school and the district. As I recorded the session and feverishly took handwritten notes, the puzzled new teacher seated beside me repeatedly gave me a disapproving stare. Finally, I confessed that I was a doctoral student studying this program, not a new teacher. "Oh," he sighed, "For a minute there, I was worried."

The Collegial Community Skit

The first-year Consulting Teacher who moderated the skit nabbed one of the new hires (who had been his student teacher the previous year) from the audience and brought her on stage to read the cue cards of questions that first-year teachers might have. Two other women sat on the stage, one with a sign that read "Staff Development Teacher" and the other with a sign that read "Mentor Teacher." The Consulting Teacher introduced the

skit by saying, "the purpose of the skit is to introduce three different people—the Consulting Teacher, who is myself, the Staff Development Teacher and the mentor. And we will help you to make a distinction between their different roles. I'd like to also mention that in all high schools, there are also Resource Teachers—we forgot to put them in the script, but they are there to help you also. So, please don't think that we left them off intentionally."

    With that said the new hire proceeded to read the following questions from her cue card: (1) "I feel overwhelmed, what should I do? (2) Who can [help me] align my lessons with school goals? (3) My [supervisor] told me that I'm not writing my objectives correctly. Help! (4) Can you explain the attendance policy? (5) What do I do on special half days that my friend told me about? (6) Is there a particular format that I should use for lesson plans? (7) What if I want to observe another teacher? and (8) How do I find out about training?" After she read each question, the appropriate new teacher supporter would chime in, noting how he or she could assist the teacher with the problem. In the end, the skit suggested that the consulting teacher was responsible for helping new teachers with *instructional* issues. The CT would be the one to assist the new teacher with writing lesson objectives and lesson plans. The CT would also suggest other teachers in the district that the new teacher could go to observe. The Staff Development Teacher (SDT), on the other hand, was responsible for anything falling under the realm of *professional growth*. Thus, his or her role would be to help the new teacher align lessons with school goals, find ways to use in-service days, and obtain a substitute teacher when observing master teachers at other schools. Finally, the mentor teacher was in charge of answering the new teacher's *school-specific questions*, as well as providing the new

teacher with *emotional support*. The skit instructed the new teachers to turn to their mentors if they felt overwhelmed, needed information about the school's attendance policy, or had questions about lunch or where to park.

The skit concluded with each participant summarizing his or her role and telling whether or not he or she was school-based. As it turned out, both the SDT and mentor teacher were based at each school, while the CT traveled among many schools. In his concluding remarks the CT made the first mention of PAR. He said, "I have been hired…and they have in my script as the master teacher, but that makes me uncomfortable…who works with the Peer Assistance and Review program, PAR for short. The Peer Assistance and Review program was a program that was established as part of the teacher evaluation system. Those teachers who are new to teaching, not teachers who are new from another county and who are in Phase I and Phase II schools, that's jargon to you…I'll try to explain that…will be receiving a consulting teacher. Phase I and Phase II schools, we have three phases in the county…Phase I schools were the first schools that phased into the new evaluation system. Phase II are being phased in this year and Phase III next year…If you're not sure if you're in a Phase III school, you'll find out from your colleagues very soon, I'm sure. But if you're in a Phase III school, you're not going to be receiving a consulting teacher this year or next year because you won't be a new teacher. And, as I said only those who are new to teaching will have consulting teachers." Finally, the CT recommended that all of the first-year teachers read Harry and Rosemary Wong's *The First Days of School*, and he opened up the floor for questions.

The new teachers' concerns included whether or not their CT would be familiar with their subject area, whether or not they would be assigned a mentor if they were in a Phase III school, and whether they should go to school personnel with their questions before asking the CTs in order to prevent people at the school site from feeling that the new teacher was "going over their heads." Among the clarifying remarks he made, the consulting teacher added that "I did leave a part out about consulting teachers. Also, teachers who are underperforming, and this is going to be applied to all three phases, not just Phase I and Phase II schools…If you're under…um…a teacher who needs help, this is a more delicate area, so I'm trying to walk carefully…a teacher who is underperforming can be referred to the PAR program—Peer Assistance and Review. This should not affect any of you in this room, so that's why I left it out, but they [referring to the underperforming teachers] will also be working with consulting teachers. So, you may be in a Phase III school and see consulting teachers in there, but that's not because you were left out, it's because they're working with a teacher who has been recommended for the Peer Assistance and Review panel." At the conclusion of the questions, the consulting teacher ended the session by saying, "I don't want to give you the impression that we're all flocking around, overwhelming you. We are here for your benefit…I look forward to working especially with the first-year teachers because I think it's just going to be an exciting and fulfilling year for both of us because not only am I going to be able to help you, I'm going to be also able to learn from you…It's a whole process of sharing information and caring about kids and trying to do the best that we can to help those students learn…We are here for you and I hope that you do not find that

we're adding to your stress. You know, our purpose is to relieve that stress and to make your first year of teaching as successful and rewarding as possible."

Unstitching the Skit

In analyzing and reflecting upon the performance that day, I cannot say what influenced my reaction to it more—that which was included in the presentation or that which was conspicuously omitted. As this district unveiled its million-dollar, state-of-the-art professional growth system to the very patrons that the program serves, where was the fanfare?   Where was the high-tech video showcasing each of these new teacher supports in action? Where were the slick, colorful handouts that delineated the roles of the mentors, staff development teachers and consulting teachers? Where were the testimonials from last year's "new teacher success stories" who had made great strides as a result of having these supports in place? In short, where were all of the symbolic indicators that would signal to this new cadre of teachers that they were about to be a part of something that would dramatically enhance their experience and performance as first-year teachers in this district?

Perhaps throughout all of the frenetic planning and scheduling, coordinating and problem-solving, this thirty-minute piece was lost. The absence of the resource teacher in the skit as well as my speculation that the stumbling performers were reading their lines for the first time both suggest that this was a rush job. Or, perhaps orientation organizers did not want to make too much of a fuss over this new system that by design was only operational in two-thirds of its schools. A third explanation could be that the district depended on the consulting teachers, mentors, and staff development teachers to provide a thorough review of their roles when they met with new teachers at their

individual schools. Whatever the reason, this preface to the professional growth system

for new teachers lacked clarity and coherence, and would generate in my estimation more

confusion for new teachers than anything else.

In addition, the content of the skit focused so much on demarcating the roles of the

consulting teacher, mentor teacher and staff development teacher that there were few

suggestions about how the three roles fit together or overlapped.   The tone of the skit

reminded me more of a budget meeting in which all three positions had to be justified

than a testament to the collegial nature of the school and district environments. In fact

only once, during a question about how to get information on training, was a clear

connection made among what all three supports could do.

New Teacher: How do I find out about training?

Consulting Teacher: This is something we all can help with. As we work

together, you and I can identify specific training goals and ways to meet them.

Staff Development Teacher: And here as staff development teacher I'm a good

resource for course information and procedures for enrolling in courses.

Mentor Teacher: I took a great course last year that you might want to look into.

The message here is that training is the only area in which the role of the CT, SDT and

mentor could be complementary. There were no references to ways that the CT, SDT

and mentor could work together to provide in-class instructional support through

modeling lessons, providing feedback or assisting with classroom organization. Overall,

the skit lacked the qualities that would have made it informative to new teachers. It was a

first impression that would fare better passing than lasting.

First-Years' First Impressions of PAR

I had neither identified nor recruited participants for this study by the time the first day

of orientation took place. I was, after all, attending orientation primarily for the purpose

of finding participants. Thus, while I cannot provide the immediate reactions of the

participants to the information shared about PAR during orientation, I did ask each one of

them to tell me what they knew about PAR when I conducted my initial interviews with

them. The responses ranged from a complete lack of knowledge about how the system

worked and what it would mean for them as first-year teachers to utter dread of the

standards to which they would be held accountable and the number of people to whom

they would be accountable. None of the five participants expressed any decidedly

positive sentiments about the program, and near the end of the study one of the

participants cited her introduction to the program as misleading.

When I first interviewed Chris Parker, he had only had a brief initial encounter with

his consulting teacher. We had the following conversation about how he planned to use

resources from the district:

> DRJ: Now, what about the training that the county offers? Did you take any
> training from them?
>
> CP: Well, I had that orientation last week, and I've had meetings. I know there
> are all these programs and numbers, and I have them all in my desk somewhere.
> If I have to, I'll go to them, but I don't really want to because I think it's better to
> go to the direct people within your system cause they'll have a better sense of
> what's going on. I doubt I'll ever go to the county for help, like actually the
> consulting teacher, 'cause he's not around…and is that the P-A-R? the P-A-A-R?
>
> DRJ: PAR, yeah. P-A-R, PAR, uh-huh.
>
> CP: Yeah, you know, you hear about all this stuff and they're probably great
> programs, but just being in the school I'd rather go to people here who have a
> better idea what's going on.

DRJ: That was actually my very next question. If anything, what do you know about PAR, Peer Assistance and Review, and how did you get the information?

CP: …going to all these orientation meetings, you hear it. All I know about it…it's just kind of another resource to help you out. Tell you the truth, I get all those things confused.

Alexis Burton, who had not yet met her consulting teacher by the time of our first interview expressed a similar confusion about the tremendous amount of information provided at orientation. When I asked her if she had heard about Peer Assistance and Review, she responded

Peer Assistance? No, I don't think so. If I did [hear anything about PAR] it went through on the left side and went out the right side of the brain. I don't remember…there were so many papers and so many things, it's like I just junk it all together, kind of sort it through when I get the chance. But I don't remember that.

While Alexis and Chris seemed to have an unclear sense of even the most basic facets of Peer Assistance and Review, Nym and Michelle were more clear about the nuts and bolts of the program, but were not particularly thrilled with what they knew. For example, in his initial interview with me in August, Nym expressed concern that the CT would add yet another layer to his responsibilities as a new teacher. He said,

I work best when there's not a lot of people aiding me, which is why I don't like this PAR already. If PAR was the only thing that I was exposed to, I would think it was a wonderful thing. I would like it. But there are so many other teachers to whom I have to speak to, meet with, discuss things with…I feel like I'm being stretched out at a time when time is the utmost resource.

Specifically, Nym felt like he would have to serve too many masters, and he actually worried about how he would respond if the different sources of assistance expected different things of him or gave him conflicting messages. According to Nym, having

access to "every conceivable [form of] assistance" generated more angst than comfort for

him. He said,

> I'm still a little confused…what if I ask the resource teacher [a question]. I get the
> answer I want. It works out well. Then, the consulting teacher may feel like I
> have no questions for her. So, it seems a little disingenuous, but I would almost
> have to pretend like I didn't know and ask the same question again. And, then, if
> I get a different answer, then I am forced to try two different things, which is time
> consuming, you see. So, this type of thing is what's giving me anxiety.

Beyond his concern about negotiating the various sources of assistance, Nym was

skeptical about the qualifications of the people who would decide whether or not to

recommend that his contract be renewed. He said, "I'm sure they [the CTs] have my

resume. They have my education background, yet I don't have access to their education

background. I don't know what school she graduated from, what training she received.

How did these consulting teachers get picked? How are they evaluated? Do we get to

evaluate them?"

   I easily managed to avoid these semi-rhetorical questions by nodding (to agree with

him that these issues were important ones) and moving on. Michelle Newman, who

shared Nym's CT, seemed more struck by the amount of power bestowed upon the

consulting teachers. She expressed these concerns to me only towards the end of the

school year, when she laid out the wide disparities between her initial thoughts about

what it would mean to have a CT and her actual experiences. She said,

> I think they did a horrible job in the summer and in the early days of [the]
> consulting teacher relationship of communicating her [the consulting teacher's]
> role. They really positioned it as this person who has sole control over whether
> your contract is renewed. They expect you to know the indicators[8]. They expect
> you to know the state and county goals. And that's so far from the truth. It was
> extremely intimidating and there was no need for that, particularly for a first-year
> teacher. They need to know that these people are an advocate and that they are

---

[8] *Indicators* are the specific outcomes for student learning as stated in the state guidelines and the district's curriculum.

there to help you and they're there to serve as a resource for you and they're not a judge.

She blamed a considerable amount of her confusion on the skit presented to them at the new teacher orientation. Michelle's recollections of the skit were that

This guy got up on the stage and he had two other people and they had poster boards saying who they were and they moved around the stage as if they were the relationship. And, I can't remember exactly what their words were, but I know what I came away with was that the consulting teacher is someone that I should fear because they have ultimate control over whether you continue beyond one year. Another [thing] that I came away with from that was that their presentation was not very well rehearsed. One of the people that was up there was actually the student teacher of the teacher that was organizing the whole presentation. It seemed like it was thrown together loosely without anyone thinking about what the overall impression of it was and how a new teacher, new to the county would interpret it. I think some more thought could have been put into it.

As an observer of the skit, I thought that the lack of clarity about who would receive a consulting teacher and who would not (based on whether the first-year teacher's school had been phased in to the new Professional Growth System) was particularly confusing. Although there were references to Phase I, II and III schools, there was no list of which schools were in what phases. When I asked Michelle about this portion of the skit, she said, "I had no idea what phase my school was in. I didn't even know we had phases [laughter]!"

While Nym and Michelle expressed some apprehension about what it would mean to work with a consulting teacher, Chad who was assigned to the same CT, was pretty laid back about the prospect. In August when I asked him what he knew about PAR, he said half jokingly, "I know absolutely nothing about it, except for the fact that something called a consulting teacher is supposed to consult with me at some point. Um, let's see…that's about it." Always up for giving me a good laugh, he seemed serious when he

added that, "I'm all for going to people when I need it, but I think I generate a lot of what I do myself…But, you know, if someone can do something for me to help me do what I'm trying to do for the kids, then absolutely…I'm not against it."

A Little Bit of Knowledge Can Be A Dangerous Thing

Even though Chad's lightheartedness was always refreshing, it occurred to me that the district had most likely hoped that new teachers would show an enthusiasm for PAR that differed from being "not against it." By neglecting to think carefully about how first-year teachers should be introduced to PAR, the district presented PAR as a bureaucratic construct. In the eyes of the participants in this study, PAR was something that the first-year teachers would at best have to tolerate and at worst, have to fear. Such perceptions have the potential to hamper the efforts of consulting teachers who are attempting to build a relationship with their clients that would lend itself to honest dialogue about the effectiveness of the first-year teachers' instruction.

Chris seemed to think that his CT would be someone who he would see infrequently, and someone who would lack utility as a result of not being school-based. The issue of the consulting teacher not being someone in the school seemed to influence how Chris perceived the validity of the CT's claims throughout the year. By March, Chris reported that "there's no one in the school that really respects him [the CT] and anything, which kind of stinks for him." Chris always saw his consulting teacher as an outsider, in part because the district did not communicate the value or rationale for having someone outside of the school context serve as the CT.

Michelle entered the relationship with her CT with some trepidation. She saw the CT as someone who was responsible for ensuring that she was in compliance with district

policies. In September, Michelle said that she was "confused about [the] relationship" between her and the CT because although what she said to the CT was supposed to be "confidential," Michelle was always aware that the CT "work[ed] for the county." Prior to arriving in the district, Michelle had heard of PAR, but only knew the program as it applied to assisting underperforming teachers. As Michelle got to know her CT, she felt very differently about PAR, and she viewed her CT as her advocate. Michelle, however, was a highly proficient teacher from the start of the year. If her performance had not been as strong and had instead called for the CT's intervention, would Michelle so easily have been able to put aside her initial concerns in order to develop a productive working relationship with her CT?

Nym experienced anxiety rooted in a different cause than Michelle's about his work with the CT. He was concerned about being pulled in too many directions from all the sources of assistance that he was provided as a first-year teacher. In addition, he seemed skeptical of the CT's right to judge him, when he was never apprised of what qualified her to sit in judgment. By December, Nym described his relationship with his CT by saying, "I find it to be a very supportive relationship. I think I find it supportive because things are going well. I'm interested in knowing what would happen if things were not going well." In other words, if the feedback Nym was getting was not always as positive, would his initial questions about the CT's qualifications and authority have become issues in the way that he responded to her?

Neither Alexis nor Chad expressed any particularly positive or negative feelings initially about their work with the CT. In their cases their general attitudes about seeking assistance seemed to dominate their relationships with their CTs throughout the year. For

instance, Chad noted that "I generate a lot of what I do myself." Indeed, as I analyzed his work patterns with the CT, his own ways of interpreting the curriculum and implementing instruction almost completely dominated his approach to teaching. Similarly, Alexis, noted in our initial interview that "[she doesn't] have a problem asking other people for their ideas on lessons, but [she] might have a problem with things that [she] might not know about," indicating her reluctance to ask for help with curricular material that she simply does not know or understand. In fact, Alexis did struggle with her basic knowledge of the curriculum throughout the year, but she did not receive any assistance with understanding the texts in the curriculum until January, which was very late in her relationship with the CT. In addition, the help she received was initiated by the CT. Thus, although Alexis had known that she would struggle with the curriculum from the outset of the year, she never requested subject matter assistance from her CT. Asking for help with what she did not know seemed too hard for Alexis to do. Perhaps, if from the beginning of the year Alexis had clearly perceived her CT as a trustworthy advocate whose role was to assist with curriculum and instruction, she would have felt comfortable enough to ask for help in understanding her subject matter.

What the Face of Bureaucracy Could Prevent

Throughout the study my questions persisted regarding how the first-year teachers' initial understandings of the role of their CTs influenced their relationships with the CTs throughout the year. While I looked for ways that the teachers' perceptions of the CTs transformed and examined what could be at the root of those transformations, I simultaneously sought to understand why some of their initial impressions remained unchanged. Even more importantly I wanted to understand the relationship between the

teachers' initial impressions of PAR and their willingness to seek assistance and take advice from their CTs.   In particular, did an initial encounter with PAR as a structure to comply with rather than participate in leave the teachers not only lukewarm, but leery? Could perceiving PAR as yet another arm entangled in a web of the district's bureaucracy have inhibited some of my participants from asking their CTs for help?

In the sections that follow, I turn to how the relationships between the first-year teachers and the CTs developed. I look first at the standardized structure of PAR that all first-year teachers in my study experienced. Then, I describe how the first-year teachers responded to the CTs' approaches to supervision. At the end of each section I discuss how the CTs' approaches to supervision might reflect their reliance on one source of authority over the others.

On Common Ground: Experiencing the Structure of PAR

Although the three CTs in this study looked different in terms of the sources of supervisory leadership that they chose to draw upon, most of the structures they followed in working with their clients looked virtually the same. All three visited the first-year teachers weekly or bi-weekly throughout the first semester. When conducting observations, the CTs always observed for the entire class period, and typically varied the times of their observations so that they could eventually see all of their clients' classes. Four of the observations throughout the year were designated as "formal," meaning that after the observation the CT would have to write a detailed 3-5 page report that indicated the extent to which the first-year teacher was meeting district performance standards. During the four formal observations, two of which were announced and two of which were unannounced, the CT wrote a transcript of the class and used it as a basis for

reflection in the post-observation conference. The post-observation conference occurred either right after the formal observation (if the teacher had a planning period at that time) or within two or three days of the observation.   The data in the four formal reports served as the basis for the CT's recommendation that a teacher's contract be renewed or non-renewed. After the second formal observation report in mid-November or early December, CTs wrote a mid-year summary that indicated whether or not their client was on track to receive a recommendation for renewal.

All CTs looked for the same set of instructional strategies, which were based on the district's six performance standards (See Appendix A). In addition, they all used the same language to name or describe the strategies that they observed teachers using, or to suggest strategies that teachers could employ. The language was taken from John Sapphire's *The Skillful Teacher,* which the district adopted as the standard for effective instructional practice. Consulting teachers learn this language in the two-part *Observation and Analysis of Teaching* (OAT) in-house course which they took in the summer.

Beyond merely observing the first-year teachers, the CTs arranged for four of the five participants to observe a veteran English teacher at another school in the district. In addition, all of the CTs provided their clients with a number of articles on instructional issues as well as a wealth of instructional materials that could be copied and used with students. After the Winter Break the CTs began to make fewer visits to the beginning teachers who had been consistently meeting standards. By the end of February, the CTs had written the final summative reports for their clients, indicating whether or not the

teacher was meeting district standards. The state deadline to inform teachers that their

contracts would *not* be renewed was March 1st.

<div align="center">Building Relationships with the Consulting Teachers</div>

Compliance with state deadlines and standardized structures is essential to ensuring

that decisions about a teacher's continued employment are neither unfair nor capricious.

Thus, the fact that the CTs followed nearly identical processes in working with their

clients is not surprising.   What began to separate how the first-year teachers experienced

PAR was not the structure of the program, but rather the sources of authority that the CTs

most often drew upon in developing relationships with the new teachers they supervised.

Six specific factors emerged that seemed to influence the relationship between the CT

and his or her first-year teacher client. Those factors are: (1) the frequency of the CT's

visits, (2) the nature of the CT's feedback, (3) how the CT assisted with instructional

planning and materials, (4) how the CT defined his or her evaluative role, (5) how much

the CT could identify with his or her client, and (6) how the CT compared to and worked

with people at the school site who supervised his or her client. Within each of these

categories I identified the sources of authority the CTs seemed to draw upon in their

supervisory leadership, and how the first-year teachers responded to these approaches to

supervision.

<u>Frequency of the CT Visits</u>

One factor identified by first-year teachers as contributing to their comfort level with

the CTs was the frequency of the CTs' visits. Overall, the fact that the CTs visited once a

week during the first semester of school not only put the first-year teachers more at ease,

but also made them feel more confident that their CT had an accurate view of what was happening in their classrooms.

Establishing Legitimacy

Nym Oh named the frequency of his CT's visits as one of the most beneficial aspects of PAR. His CT visited his active group of "on-level" 11th grade students at least once per week during the first semester. In a statement about the value of PAR Nym said,

> The obvious benefit [of PAR] is the observer observed me once a week, [and] is very methodical. The observation is for the whole period, not part of the period. And since it's done very faithfully once a week, the observer has a very accurate picture of what's going on in the classroom, as opposed to let's say somebody who just drops in and sits down for maybe twenty minutes and then maybe like a month later visits again. So, that I like very much.

This change in Nym's attitude from the beginning of the year is significant. Prior to the start of the program Nym had expressed reservations about a consulting teacher's qualifications to judge his proficiency as a classroom teacher. Yet, by second semester he said, "[Vivian] is very experienced. She's a very experienced teacher. She was able to see things which I wasn't conscious of, and her comments were always constructive. They boosted my confidence, gave me direction in things that needed work. On the whole the program was very good." For Nym, the fact that the CT visited often, stayed the entire class period, and provided constructive feedback each time established her legitimacy as someone who knew his style and his students well enough to offer insight that he could use to improve his practice. He did not have the same confidence that any other observer, namely his resource teacher or his supervising administrator, could understand the essence of what happened in his classroom from day to day.

Building Trust

Beyond having the ability to grasp the way teaching and learning unfolded in the classroom on a daily basis, the CTs' frequent visits assured their clients that a summative evaluation would not reflect the occurrences of an atypical day. For example, in my first few visits to Michelle Newman's classroom, it was clear that she balanced a highly structured classroom environment with a wealth of creative activities for students. During the first semester with her ninth graders she covered three thematic units entitled "Independence," "Conflict" and "Choices." In the Independence Unit the students read poems and short stories, and in the Conflict Unit, they read *To Kill A Mockingbird*, and in the Choices Unit they read *A Raisin in the Sun*. Everyday Michelle stood outside of the door to greet students as they walked into the room. Her dry erase board consistently displayed the word of the day, the lesson objective, and the agenda (lesson activities) for the day. The first activity on each day's agenda was a "do now," which students knew to begin as soon as the tardy bell rang. I frequently heard Michelle read the "do now" activity to her students and say, "you have until 12:41 to take care of this." Beyond providing the kind of structure and routines that significantly increased the amount of time students stayed on task, Michelle used a wide variety of approaches to engage her students with the literature. Students participated in literature circles (small group discussions) and completed double entry reader response journals, in which they recorded aspects of the text that stuck out to them, and later reflected on the reasons they had connected with that portion of the text. High structure and student engagement were the norms in Michelle's classes.

Nonetheless, Michelle told the story of a day when Vivian, her CT, visited her and the lesson was not running as smoothly as Michelle would have liked. She said that,

> it was the first day back from [Thanksgiving] break. The students' attitudes were not wonderful. I had a sore throat…it just wasn't a good day. We did a vocabulary review session, and we did it through playing Pictionary. It was more of a student run class, and it looked fairly chaotic. I'm not sure how many kids were getting anything out of it. So, in that instance, I knew that it wasn't the greatest class that I'd ever done, but she [Vivian] knew that too.

Instead of feeling like an outside observer would take what had happened that day and misconstrue it as a representation of the way Michelle's classroom usually flowed, Michelle said that Vivian was understanding. Michelle noted that "[Vivian] is going to know right away if I'm having a bad day. She won't blow that up and say 'well this is obviously something that she's doing wrong.' She's able to put it in perspective." After the experience, Michelle said, "I felt comfortable." By having an observer who visited on a weekly basis, Michelle could trust that her formal write-ups would be less reflective of an isolated moment in time, and more reflective of the skills she exhibited on a regular basis. When she sat down at the table to debrief the observation, she entered the conversation knowing that the CT had a keen awareness of her instructional strengths and weaknesses.

Promoting Professionalism through Frequent Visits

The comfort and confidence expressed by Nym and Michelle regarding the relationship they had with their CT was at least in part a manifestation of their beliefs that Vivian Conley knew their teaching. She knew what strategies they regularly employed, she knew the students they taught, she knew the assignments and assessments they gave, and she knew how they typically reacted to their students. Kerchner, Koppich and Weeres (1997) argue that one benefit of Peer Assistance and Review is that it involves

"intense observation [that] allows a focus on the teacher's entire practice" (p. 91). Such an approach to teacher evaluation through PAR stands in contrast to an approach that judges teacher performance based on a limited number of classroom activities, a view of teacher evaluation that Darling-Hammond (1986) describes as bureaucratic.

I would argue that the same principle applies to supervision. That is to say, the knowledge of the classroom context as well as the individual first-year teacher's style, strengths and challenges enabled the CTs to draw from professional versus bureaucratic sources of authority when working with their clients. By visiting so frequently, the CTs observed the full array of their clients' classroom practices. Thus, they were in the position to provide assistance and feedback that had validity for their clients. Furthermore, when the CTs had to complete a summative evaluation, their clients could rest assured that the CTs had experienced a clearer picture of their teaching than could be gained by any single observation that captures only an isolated moment in time. This led me to question how powerful the frequency of CT visits would become to the first-year teachers as they developed their perceptions of their CT's role. In the eyes of the first-year teachers, would the frequency of CT visits draw a sharp distinction between the CTs and others who evaluated them throughout the course of the year? If so, would that distinction open the door for CTs to develop the type of trusting relationship with their clients that would allow them to engage in genuine dialogue about improving teaching and learning?

Nature of the CT Feedback

According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), supervisors who rely upon their professional authority in working with teachers "promote a dialogue among teachers that

makes explicit professional values and accepted tenets of practice…[and] provide teachers with as much discretion as they want and need" (p. 38), while supervisors who rely more on technical-rational sources of authority "standardize the work of teaching to reflect the best way" (p. 37). As I began to characterize the nature of the CTs feedback, I found that when the CTs (1) gave their clients more opportunities to participate in the post-observation conference discussions, (2) balanced their suggestions for improvement with positive feedback, and (3) remained open to non-traditional approaches to instruction, the first-year teachers expressed more positive sentiments about their relationships with the CTs and seemed more open to their suggestions. On the other hand, when CTs (1) provided less opportunities for their clients to generate their own ideas, (2) placed more emphasis on the first-year teachers' shortcomings, and (3) gave more prescriptive advice, the first-year teachers tended to be ill-at-ease with their CTs' visits and were less likely to internalize their CTs' suggestions.

Limited Opportunities for Discourse

The differences in the ways that the first-year teachers responded to their CTs' feedback based on the opportunities available for dialogue became evident as I compared Christopher Parker's experiences with those of the other first-year teacher participants. On many occasions during first semester when I sat in the back of Christopher Parker's ninth grade "college prep literacy" class to observe, something just did not smell right. Moments after the nauseating stench that soon became familiar, I would hear giggles and squeals from three or four male students, and I would watch as they quickly slid their desks away from the member of the group who had chosen that day to flaunt his flatulence. The young men whom Chris called "his goofballs" frequently took center

stage in the class, which was supposed to expose the twelve students enrolled to specific strategies that would enhance their reading comprehension.

Instructing the students on the strategies had not gone as well as Chris had hoped. In reflecting on the reasons for his difficulties with teaching the reading strategies, Chris said,

> I wasn't familiar with [them], and there was no set material you had to cover. So in order for me to make [the class] successful, I would have to come up with materials on my own, which you know, has its ups and downs. And some of those strategies the kids are bored with. I actually never learned how to teach reading per se and this is supposed to be a reading course. So I didn't really know what levels everyone was on, and it was tough for me. Like, I assumed everyone could read by the ninth grade. Some of them are real bright. They're just behavior [problems] who got thrown in here. Other kids really need reading help. They can't read.

Chris's Resource Teacher (RT) concurred that his initial teaching assignment was a challenging one. She said, "the hardest thing to give a new teacher is what we did to Chris. We gave him a brand new course that nobody knows about, that has not been proven, that has little to no curriculum and so he was really creating it on his own, which he did well." When I asked her the reason that Chris was assigned to teach the literacy course as a new teacher, she said, "you know when you're doing scheduling…that was something that came about kind of near the end. So, I had an opening, [and] that's really what the opening was."

Given the trouble Chris had in managing the difficult students and in finding meaningful ways to teach the reading strategies, the feedback that he received from his CT throughout first semester pointed to the need for a change in Chris's approaches to instruction. In a report dated November 5, 2001 from an observation of the literacy class, Chris's CT concluded that

> Mr. Parker has a good sense of the materials and knows how to teach it. He needs to continue working on classroom management strategies, though. For such a small class, students should be receiving more individual attention, but failure to control the behavior of a few is creating a major distraction for the whole class as well as for the teacher. Mr. Parker needs to raise his expectations for student behavior and the quality of student work.

Although the CT acknowledged in the report that "the curriculum [for the literacy course] is still a work-in-progress, so there is not much guidance for teachers," it was clear that he expected Chris to have higher expectations for both the performance and behavior of the students in such a small class.

The feedback that Chris received about his work with his eleventh grade students was quite similar. In the first formal observation report, dated October 11, 2001, the CT noted that in Chris's 11th grade on-level English class, "Mr. Parker needs to work on his classroom authority." Much like the report on Chris's ninth grade literacy class, this report cited "inconsistencies" in Chris's classroom management techniques, with the specific comment that "the expectation that students needed to be quiet and listen to one another was never made clear." When Chris and his CT reflected on the class in the post-observation conference, Chris admitted that the class "didn't go as well as I had hoped." Outside of that comment at the outset of the conference, Chris mostly listened as his CT gave suggestions. Occasionally, Chris gave explanations of the backgrounds of the specific students to whom the CT referred. Twice, he talked about instructional strategies that he had tried. However, Chris was rarely prompted by the CT to generate possible solutions to his classroom management problems.

Although the CT wrote positive comments in both the first and second observation reports, the post-observation conferences seemed dominated by the discussion of Chris's shortcomings. According to the reports, the bright spots of the lessons included Chris's

facility with "checking for student understanding," "activating [students'] prior knowledge," "engaging students," and exhibiting "good personal relationship building." In the post-observation conferences, however, the CT seemed to focus on the ways that Chris might be going too far in trying to establish rapport with the students. The CT said, "You're trying to win them over by relating to them, which works to a certain extent, but you never at any time had them when they were really dead silent, and that needs to come from the discipline." The CT also said, "You're a pretty laid back kind of guy, you know. That's who you are, and to go against that is difficult and sometimes I think it backfires. What you've got to do, though, is just learn different strategies where you really are getting them silent. And that might take weeks. What's important is that you're consistent."

When I asked Chris to reflect on what his conferences were like with his CT, he noted that, "he'll [the CT] tell me some good things I did and some bad things I did…what I could improve on. He's not going to come out and say I was awful…He kind of helps me out. He gives me suggestions…tells me what I might not want to do, what I need to work on. He might drop off papers or show me the notes he took during class." As far as the aspects of Chris's teaching that the CT looked favorably upon, Chris said only half-jokingly, "things I'm good at [sighs] … far and few between." After pausing, he said "I don't know. I guess being creative and doing different things. I make a lot of analogies in the class for kids to understand, and he thinks that's great for the kids." Outside of his ability to relate to students (an attribute that the CT said Chris sometimes tended to take too far), Chris could not recollect anything that his CT found to be positive about his teaching.

In addition, Chris did not express any sense in which his post-observation conferences produced opportunities for him to generate ideas or see his classroom instruction in new ways. Perhaps, as a result of Chris perceiving post-observation conferences as unidirectional exchanges that were dominated by where he was going wrong in his teaching, he felt very uncomfortable with the CT's visits. Chris said, "by [the CT] coming unannounced and stuff, it still kind of gives me the jitterbugs." These "jitterbugs" were most likely the consequence of Chris's fear that the CT would highlight the downside of his instruction without providing him with the opportunity to contribute to the conversation in any substantive way. This fear could have prevented Chris from taking the risk of asking his CT about problems he encountered. In the post-observation conferences, Chris was rarely proactive in posing questions to his CT or identifying particular areas where he needed assistance. Instead, he sat passively, spending more time reacting to the suggestions the CT gave him, usually by simply nodding his head. Thus, during the first semester, the CT's feedback prompted conversations in which Chris was more reactive than reflective.

By the end of March, Chris admitted that from his perspective his CT "wasn't encouraging," and thus Chris "dreaded having [the CT] come all the time." Chris might have discovered the encouragement he sought if his CT had given him more opportunities to participate in their conversations about how to manage his class. If Chris had been prompted to discuss his own strengths as a teacher during the post-observation conferences, he might have reflected on ways that he could have used those strengths to improve his instruction. Instead, by taking a directive approach that was not tempered with occasions for reflection, the CT unknowingly alienated Chris. Thus, not only was

Chris uncomfortable with visits from his CT throughout the year, but he also failed to become an active stakeholder in reforming his own classroom practices.

Multiple Opportunities for Discourse

Nym's CT took a different approach to discussions about his classroom management difficulties. Reflecting on his first few months as a teacher Nym said, "what has surprised me the most is how difficult it is to manage certain students. Regardless of whether it's administrative referrals or parent-teacher conferences, the behavior of these individuals does not change." From lessons on lexical ambiguity to the use of a psychoanalytic critique to understand literature, Nym always taught high-level content to students who were most likely tracked into his on-level class based on their low motivation, poor skills or inappropriate behavior. Typically, some students were late arriving to class, and then slow to settle and moderately off-task once they had arrived. Thus, Nym's classroom management issues were not as severe as those faced by Chris. Nonetheless, the CT's approach in post-observation conferences did more to encourage Nym to participate in the process of identifying solutions.

For example, the CT began a post-observation conference in December with Nym in this way:

> CT: This is what I would like to do. I'm going to make a statement, and you tell me if this is accurate or inaccurate. It appears to me that you've got a really good handle on the curriculum. You've got lots of creative activities…you're comfortable with the content. Accurate?
>
> Nym: Yes.
>
> CT: O.k. and at this point, if I can be [Nym] for a minute my most pressing issue is dealing with student behavior?
>
> Nym: Yes.

CT: O.k. so, when we look at the script, this is what I would like to do. I'd like to keep these two things in mind. When you're dealing with student behavior, you have to confront it in two directions. One is to deal with the behavior itself. So you teach the rules you want the kids to follow, and then confront the misbehavior when it occurs. But, it can be something as simple as switching your language from negative to positive… The second strand is that you can actually structure the lesson to limit the number of opportunities they have to misbehave. So as we go through the script, I want you to look for places where these two things might come into play, o.k.?

Following this exchange, the CT proceeded to go through her scripted notes of the class,

line by line. As she reviewed the script, she asked Nym what he noticed in terms of ways

he could have responded to students differently. The following is typical of their

dialogue:

CT: The bell rang at 9:12. Students were coming in as the bell rang. You said, 'sit down, please. I need your attention. Sit down, sit down, [student's name], sit down. Hey listen up, [student's name].' 'You don't want to take this quiz in the office, do you?' And a couple of them said, 'Well, no, it's Thursday!' You said, 'Well, I said the Friday quiz would be moved to Thursday.' And, lots of protest. 'Clear your desk. Clear your desk.' And then the PA came on. Students were still talking. 'Sshh…sshh. Class!' And then you shouted at them. 'Listen up, this is the final warning. If I have to tell you again, you'll be sent to the office along with a form I have for problem students. Calm down and take this quiz. We have a lot of things to do today.' And then at 9:15 they were silent, so three minutes basically. O.k.? So, can you tell me if you see anything there in terms of the two things?

Nym: Well, obviously here [points to the place on the script] I'm only pointing out the negative behavior here. Instead…to some of the students that were attentive, I should have, I could have praised those. Like [student's name] was attentive, [student's name] was attentive, [student's name] was attentive.

CT: So, you know, '[Student's name], thank you for being ready on time.' You know? Or even, 'where is the rest of the group?' [Student's name] is waiting for you. [Student's name] is ready. She's waiting for you.' You know, something like that. So, a lot of times it's just that switch in language because as you know…I know you're a linguist…language is very powerful.

Nym: It is.

The CT used three strategies that made the post-observation conference a positive experience for Nym. First, she started by complimenting him on what was working in his classes. She recognized his facility with the subject matter as well as his creative instructional approaches, and she even made connections with his interest in linguistics. Second, she used the actual script from the class to guide their discussion. Instead of choosing pieces of the class that she deemed necessary to highlight, she walked Nym through what occurred in the class step by step so that he could see for himself how he responded to students and he could take the lead in identifying where to make changes. Finally, she provided Nym with a frame for their conversation, but encouraged him to paint the picture. He pointed to opportunities for responding differently to students and for structuring his lesson in different ways. She was there to guide and support him.

When Nym talked about his relationship with his CT, he noted, "she gives me a very detailed narrative of what she saw. And then, she asks whether I agree with what happened, and what my opinions were…we go over that together. Basically, I've gotten good feedback, a lot of praise from her. The only thing she's helped me with really is how to discipline the students more—how to structure the class more. Other than that, she seems pretty pleased with what she's observing." He added that, "she's given me good feedback. I find it to be a very supportive relationship." Thus, even though both Nym and Chris faced problems with classroom management, the way that Nym's CT structured the feedback she gave in post-observation conferences left him feeling supported instead of alienated.

Highlighting the Positive

Although the issues with classroom management faced by Chris and Nym were not equal in gravity, the problems faced by Alexis Burton and Chris were quite similar. However, based on the feedback she received, Alexis possessed high regard for the CT and felt comfortable enough to take some initiative in posing questions to her. In the on-level English class that I observed, Alexis contended daily with 28 ninth-grade students, many of whom were coded for Attention Deficit Disorder or other special education accommodations. Frequently talkative and off-task, many of the students exploited Alexis's hearing loss by speaking softly or covering their mouths as they spoke to her. Students also took pleasure in mocking the things she said and disparaging the way she dressed.

While it was far from uncommon to see students in Alexis's classes talking, walking around or fooling around during instructional time, her CT made an effort to document the most positive aspects of what Alexis was doing in the classroom. During the CT's first formal observation of Alexis's on-level class in October, the classroom atmosphere would have rendered a summative assessment indicating that Alexis was not meeting the district performance standards. Instead of documenting that observation as one of Alexis's formal ones, the CT volunteered to return the next week to redo the formal observation. When she returned, she observed one of Alexis's honors classes, and the observation report was far more positive than it most likely would have been had the CT documented her observation the week before.

Even though the CT chose not to document the first scheduled formal observation, she did sit down with Alexis after the class to reflect upon what occurred. The CT was

nurturing in the feedback she provided, highlighting the positive aspects of the lesson as well as the as the areas that could be improved. During the conversation, the CT noted that "in the big picture you had your agenda, you had your objectives. You were courteous in saying please take your seat, take out your pencils, and so forth." She also praised Alexis for sharing examples of well-done writing assignments with her students, and for the creativity of the assignment itself. Among the CT's concerns was Alexis's ability to (1) get the class working once the bell rang, (2) explain the meaning of the terms so that students could be clear about what they were supposed to do, (3) monitor students' progress as they completed the assignment, and (4) motivate students to complete their work. As the CT gave her feedback, she tended to ask Alexis questions rather than simply make statements. For instance, the CT said, "It took them [the students] a real long time to get quiet. Now, it was after lunch and then you had [to give out] pictures, so you had two things that were getting kids wired…How did you feel about the environment? Are you noticing that they're taking too long to settle?" Although the CT had clearly stated her opinion first, she did provide Alexis with the opportunity to discuss whether or not she agreed that the students were rowdy. As it turned out, Alexis felt differently about the noise and activity level in the class. Alexis believed that the noise level reflected students' engagement in sharing what they had written with one another, even though the assignment had called for them to work independently. Alexis said, "I noticed when I looked back to some of the rows [of seats], that they [the students] were pointing to someone else's [work], so they were helping each other in a way. That's why I wasn't too worried about the class being as active as it was." Regardless of whether Alexis was honestly not concerned about the noise level in

the room, or if she simply made this statement to try to minimize what was apparently a poorly implemented lesson, the CT provided her with the opportunity to talk about her perspective. In so doing, the CT maintained a dialogue with Alexis, and Alexis was empowered to express her feelings, even if those sentiments were in disagreement with those of the CT.

When Alexis talked about her relationship with her CT, she said, "She [the CT] has things I need to work on, things I did well, and she works on that with me. She gives me ideas. I either agree with them or don't, and then we kind of write a little contract of what I will work on and how I'll improve." Alexis admitted that, like Chris, she was somewhat ill at ease when her CT came in, but she recognized the value of the CT's frequent visits. Alexis said that when her CT visits, "you kind of get a little bit straight-backed, you know? When people come in you're like 'Oh gosh, am I doing something wrong?' But then it kind of gives you an opportunity to assess what you're doing." When asked specifically about what her CT did to make her feel comfortable, Alexis said, "she's [the CT] very honest with her feedback. I guess it depends on the feedback after you meet with the person because you know how that person contributes to what they're observing. Like, whether they help you…point out something that you need to work on or whether they just sit there and criticize you the whole time….She offers positive reinforcement. So, I think it makes it comfortable enough for me to not throw up afterwards [Alexis laughed]!" Two aspects of the CT's feedback seemed to enhance the relationship between her and Alexis. First, the CT's feedback was balanced in terms of the amount of praise and the number of suggestions. Although classroom management problems can easily overshadow whatever good might have existed in a lesson, the CT

was able to highlight positive aspects of the Alexis's execution, such as the creativity of

the lesson and the use of models with students. The second aspect of the CT's feedback

that promoted a positive relationship between her and Alexis was the CT's willingness to

ask Alexis questions about how she viewed the lesson implementation. While these

questions did not mask the CT's concern about how the lesson was carried out, they did

give Alexis an opportunity to express her viewpoints and pose questions of her own.

Thus, the CT acknowledged that Alexis's feedback was valued and taken into

consideration as the two of them developed a plan for future lessons.

   The importance of having a CT who highlighted the positive aspects of what was

observed in the classroom was echoed by Michelle Newman, who was very highly skilled

at the outset of her first year of teaching. In commenting about the overall effectiveness

of PAR, Michelle said,

> I think the program works well, but a lot of that has to do with Vivian, her
> personality. You know, she always had positive things to say , and I think that's
> extremely valuable. Just recently coming from student teaching, I had a
> cooperating teacher who the first word out of her mouth would be what I could
> improve. And that just set the whole tone of it, and it wasn't a positive experience.
> Vivian always has something positive to comment on. It's not to say there's
> nothing negative, but she always starts with [the positive] and that makes a big
> difference.

This seems to suggest that first year teachers, regardless of their level of proficiency,

need someone who will highlight the strengths that they bring to the classroom, and who

can offer encouragement to them. Rather than having someone who focuses on

regulations, policies, or the one best way of approaching instruction, the first-year

teachers crave someone who can recognize the talents they bring to the job.

Accepting the Unconventional

Four of the five participants in my study followed daily classroom routines that conformed to the district's curriculum and used lesson planning models that are typically taught in pre-service education training. However, neither the texts recommended by the district curriculum nor strategies for differentiated instruction and writing lesson objectives were of much interest to Chad Wolf. Contradicting the district's tenet that teachers should employ different instructional strategies to address a wide range of student learning styles, Chad Wolf said emphatically, "I pretty much do the same thing with all of the material that we read. I'm teaching them [the students] a system of decoding literature. I call it the pattern system, but I made it up, so it's not like a technical term or anything." Chad's pattern system involved searching through text to find instances in which the author repeats an idea. According to Chad, "good authors never repeat themselves unless they need to. You know, ninth graders aren't going to come into the school knowing about complex metaphors and a whole lot about symbolism and things like that, so you start out by [saying] 'read this piece and look for places where the author literally repeats himself.'" Chad believed that once students started to recognize patterns in literature, they could begin ascribing meaning to those patterns, and eventually begin to identify more complex literary devices used by an author. He held to his fervent belief that this was the way to prepare students for college English classes.

In his classes, he would ask students to identify words that the author repeats, and he would write these words in a list on the board. Then, students would begin to group the words that they felt had some connection in the text, and then they would begin making interpretations about the meaning the author was trying to convey. Students always had

their books on their desks, searching for passages that would support their interpretations.

Most students consistently had their hands in the air, ready to identify a pattern or make

an interpretation.

Although Chad's approach prompted considerable class discussion among his ninth

graders, his CT was concerned that she observed the same instructional practices in every

class. In one post-observation conference, Chad and his CT had the following exchange:

> CT: How do you address those kids, though, that for them that [the pattern system] is not an efficient style of learning?

> CW: For many people that's not the best way…but for everybody it is a possible way. When you get to the University…

> CT: … But not everybody will get there.

> CW: I mean, I make sure that there are many different supports and many different ways to actually get the grade. I want them to get used to this because this is what they're actually going to see. And I'm assuming, you know, that in an honors class at Jefferson High School, 95 to 99% of that class is going to college.

> CT: Right.

> CW: But there are kids that you can forget about any kind of real oral comprehension and stuff like that, and so that's why I use a lot of real simple organization on the board and I also use, I'll reinforce things that we've talked about with those cheat sheets that I showed you that really show the argument visibly on the paper.

What stands out about this dialogue is that it sounds like two colleagues, both with

legitimate arguments, debating about the instructional strategies that will work best with

students. It does *not* sound like a supervisor telling her subordinate that he needs to vary

his instruction. From Chad's perspective, the students he taught (most of whom were

upper middle class or quite wealthy) would be going to college, and should be exposed to

a teaching style that echoes the lecture-discussion style he experienced in college. The

CT, however, wanted to ensure that Chad could be a successful teacher in any Elizabeth

County Public Schools, including those with much more diverse student populations. By asking Chad how he addresses the needs of students with different learning styles, the CT gives Chad something to think about instead of suggesting that his teaching is somehow inadequate.

After this exchange they moved on to a discussion about the high level of student participation in the class. According to the CT,

> The things that I picked out in this class…that really hit me in the face were very similar to what I saw the first time when I did the observation…in fact all the observations that I've done, even the informal ones, and those are…the challenging questions that you asked them…'give me the page number, give me the direct quote.' You said later on, 'What's the crystal quote that really boils it down?' And that you make it, even though you demand that they participate in class, you make it safe for them. When I was watching your 9th grade class do Raisin in the Sun, it was very interesting to me because what I realized then, what I was able to articulate to myself for the first time is that this way that you're doing patterns with them gets them to the exact same place as more traditional discussions.
>
> CW: Exactly.
>
> CT: It's just a way to structure the discussion, really, is what it really boils down to.
>
> CW: …especially for on-level kids, but in general for younger kids, if you ask them to give some sort of gestalt meaning out of a book right away…
>
> CT: No, you can't do it.
>
> CW: You got to give them nuts and bolts, and so this way they're learning from the bottom up. But, the thing that makes it valid to them is that they know they're getting the same product as they would get in another class. I mean, it's better, but they know that it's not some left wing conspiracy.

Thus, even though the CT initially harbored some concerns about the instructional approaches Chad chose to employ (and even though those strategies are very different from those she has used or observed before), she began to come to terms with it once she saw that students were mastering the skills stated in the curriculum.

The CT's acceptance of Chad's teaching methods formed the foundation for a positive

working relationship between the two. According to Chad,

> [The CT] was great for me because I do teach very strangely. It is an odd classroom. It is weird. And a lot of teachers would come in there and be shocked and or appalled. But she was open-minded enough, or you know it's more than that…It's not even that you have to be tolerant. It's the fact that she looked at the ends and she saw what they [the students] were doing, and you know she probably wouldn't do it that way, but even though I got there in a different way, she was very flexible and patient with me, and she was able to see something from a different perspective.

Accepting Chad's "strange" methods did not mean that the CT failed to question him

about how he was reaching all students. But, her questions engaged him in a reflective

dialogue rather than putting him on the defensive. By asking him to respond to

questions throughout the year, she prompted him to think about his teaching methods

from what could have been the perspective of some (even if it was a small number)

students in his class. Simultaneously, she preserved the working relationship between the

two of them, so that Chad would not close himself off completely to the points she made.

Relying on Professional Sources of Authority in Providing Feedback

Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) argue in favor of a developmental

approach to supervision. Their research suggests that the type of approach a supervisor

uses in providing feedback to a teacher should match that teacher's stage of personal and

professional development. In practice this means that a supervisor would employ

"directive control" behaviors (i.e. the supervisor would tell the teacher exactly what to

do) if a teacher possesses very little knowledge, skill or motivation, but use more

"nondirective" behaviors if a teacher is very knowledgeable, highly skilled and well-

motivated. A supervisor's frequent use of directive-control behaviors seems to more

closely align with what Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) define as a technical-rational source of authority.

However, the participants in this study--regardless of their stage of professional development—seemed to respond more positively when their CTs recognized them as sources of knowledge and engaged them in a dialogue in which they brainstormed solutions to their challenges. The ongoing dialogue that occurred between three of the participants and their CTs served as the foundation for a working relationship in which there was trust and mutual respect. Such trust and mutual respect was absent from the relationship between Chris Parker and his CT. Perhaps Chris' CT relied more on directive control behaviors in interacting with Chris due to his perception of the severity of Chris' classroom management problems. The CT could have also made judgments about Chris' capacity to generate solutions to the problems without being told explicitly what to do. Regardless of the impetus for the CT's approach, the result was that Chris did not perceive his CT as an advocate. Thus, Chris tended to minimize or discount the CT's feedback, even when that feedback was valid. The erosion of the relationship between Chris and his CT raises a question about Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's claim. Even if a teacher is functioning at a low developmental stage, should supervisors rely mostly on professional sources of authority as a means of building a working relationship with that teacher? If supervisors choose to begin their relationship with teachers by relying on directive control behaviors, will this approach impede the development of a productive working relationship?

<u>CT Assistance with Instructional Planning and Materials</u>

The first-year teachers in this study seemed the most grateful when their consulting teachers provided them with new ideas, whether it be approaches to teaching the curriculum or resources that they could use in their teaching. Two of the first-year teachers also received assistance with comprehending the texts they had to teach and choosing the important aspects of those literary works. While overall the first-year teachers listened eagerly to their consulting teachers' advice and seemed to agree vigorously with their suggestions, there were variations in the degree to which the teachers used these suggestions in their practice. Such variations were particularly acute when the first-year teachers did not buy into the suggestions made, such as the need to post a mastery objective for their lessons each day or the need to summarize their lesson at the end of each class period. The first-year teachers were also more likely to adopt suggestions that related to the technical aspects of managing their classrooms rather than suggestions that related to changing their basic approaches to (or philosophies of) instruction.   On the whole, however, the assistance the CTs provided contributed to a positive working relationship between them and their clients.

Providing Intensive Assistance

Two of the first-year teachers in my study required intensive assistance from their consulting teachers. Both of the teachers seemed very grateful for any practical suggestions or instructional materials provided by their CTs, however the extent to which the CTs caused the teachers to examine their beliefs and practices in a way that prompted lasting change remained questionable.

Gratitude and Acceptance, Without Internalization. One of the first-year teachers who was appreciative of her CT's assistance, yet seemed only to adopt the most technical aspects of the suggestions provided is Alexis Burton. Early on in my observations of Alexis it was clear that she was having significant problems in managing her classroom. When I interviewed her for the second time, she said that student behavior had been the biggest surprise for her. According to Alexis, "I thought that I would have more students who were motivated to learn. I expected to have some kids [who] really wanted to read a certain novel or learn or pay attention or even just turn in their work…just some signal that tells me that the students really care about their education. I found out not all students value their education." When I asked what she believed contributed to students' lack of motivation, she said, "I have no idea." She also spoke of having a high number of special education students, particularly those students suffering from Attention Deficit Disorder, and she said that she had tried making headway by contacting parents on a number of occasions. She lamented, "I constantly have to tell them [the students] 'such and such a person, please sit down, such a such a person, please sit down. You know what? This is the third or fourth time I'm telling you to sit down!' And, I can't get over that. I have to tell these kids four or five times, 'Could you be quiet? Can you actually calm down and be quiet [and] get on task?' That shocked me."

Alexis's Resource Teacher blamed her student teaching experiences for her lack of facility with addressing student behavior. He said, "her cooperating teacher created an unreal world. She [Alexis] never had to deal with behavior management, [and] she had prescribed lessons from what I can tell." During my observations, I noticed that a lack of clarity and structure in the classroom assignments frequently led to disruptive student

behavior. During one observation, a male student complained, "Man, this is so confusing. I'm not getting this." Seconds later, Alexis had to reprimand another male student for off task behavior. She said, "Do I have to refer you [to the main office]? Stop with the mocking! I'm not stupid."

Alexis admitted that she was frequently so overwhelmed with grading, that her planning would suffer. She said, "I'm always grading things, and so it's hard to plan not only a creative lesson that meets the goals, but something that is meaningful. There are some things you just make and you're like 'it could be better,' and you don't have enough time to make that lesson better." In teaching *To Kill A Mockingbird*, she confessed, "I slacked off. I said 'o.k. I've taught this before, and I've read this before. Maybe I can try to get away with it.' Because I had *so* much to grade, I kind of fell behind in the reading and keeping up with the kids." Her attempts to implement lessons that were not carefully planned combined with her failure to have the details of the literature she was teaching fresh in her mind eroded her confidence in the classroom. She frequently reacted defensively to students' questions, and these reactions tended to undermine her rapport with the kids.

Alexis's Resource Teacher said that teachers at Glen Lee High School who were also the parents of children enrolled in Alexis's classes frequently complained to him about what was happening. In describing the problems that Alexis faced, her resource teacher noted that

> Classroom management was a tremendous weakness, I think. Decision making was weak. The consequences that she provided the kids were in many instances absurd or drastic. She was trying to be too rigid. I don't think she established a rapport with enough kids to create that ground base in many classrooms. Understanding of curriculum, understanding of the content were some weakness

areas. I mean, she would pronounce names of characters, titles of books incorrectly, so now the kids are correcting her.

He went on to note that her hearing loss also presented a challenge to her classroom management. He said that Alexis had a "problem with all the ambient noise…and then she'd pick on the wrong kid who was guilty [of misbehaving in the classroom], and then, it would steamroll. The behavior management went down the hill."

Her problems with classroom management and clarity were also noted in the Mid-Year Summary submitted to the PAR Panel by Karen Carter, her consulting teacher, at the end of November, 2001. First, the report listed five areas of strength. They were that (1) the activities she chose matched the curricular objectives, (2) she communicated the big picture to students, (3) she used rubrics to assess student learning and for peer editing, (4) she clearly communicated her expectations, and (5) she contacted parents and guidance counselors with her concerns about students. Under areas of need, the report listed

- Development of a fuller repertoire of strategies on the attention continuum to address discipline problems.
- Strengthening of clarity in use of explanatory devices, especially in note-taking situations.
- Techniques for maximizing effective classroom participation, including 'calling on' patterns, wait time, and re-directing questions to encourage student-centered learning.
- Use of summarizers to achieve clarity and closure.

Alexis could easily articulate these areas of need when I asked her what she and her consulting teacher were working on together. She said,

> We talked about like the desks…when they were in a semicircle…we talked about how that was affecting my teaching and their learning. So, this way [the current configuration of the desks in traditional rows] kind of works a little better for the students. And so, that's how I've adjusted that to help me. We talked about the attention continuum, addressing the discipline problems. [We talked about] things I would need to do in order to [deal with] those several students, like the one who

has ADHD, the one that talks out too much…keeping the lesson going without that being a big distraction….closing the lesson, summarizing it. She [Karen Carter, the CT] talked about the last few words being the words that they'll [the students] remember…how I wind it down, review what we've talked about today, or talk about what's for homework. But I have to work on those strategies. …Um, the calling pattern…I was only calling on certain students who had the correct answer. But, it's hard because…you have students at different levels—some people who read the book, some who didn't. What do you do with the students who don't read?

What stood out to me in these conversations was that Alexis could only point to a alteration in her actions when it came to the most technical changes that Karen suggested. Karen said that she should change the way the seats were arranged in the classroom, and Alexis promptly changed it. Outside of changing the seating arrangement, Alexis could only articulate the problems that she and Karen had discussed—not any changes she had made to address the problems. When I asked her explicitly about the *solutions* that she and Karen had generated to try to address the issues she faced (for example, strategies to get students to complete their reading assignments), she said, "I can't remember 'cause I've gotten advice from many, many different people." Thus, while Alexis certainly seemed to have a positive rapport with Karen, and while she always displayed a pleasant affect during post-observation and planning conferences, she in fact was never able to integrate anything beyond the technical changes into her practice.

Later in the year Karen articulated a concern about this issue. She said, "When [Alexis] says to me [that] she wants to be consistent [in dealing with student behavior], I don't want her to simplify it so much that she thinks if they all just raise their hands, then that means everything's going to be alright… I think some of her fixes might be quick fixes." My own observations confirmed the notion that Alexis tried to adopt behaviors that she thought would help her gain more control over students without addressing the

more fundamental issues that were leading to student disruption, namely the lack of clarity and lack of teacher-student rapport in her classroom.

Although Alexis struggled to identify the underlying causes of her difficulties and the specific ways to tackle them, she did seem appreciative of and excited about the activities that she and Karen engaged in to help build her repertoire of instructional strategies. For example, she said that she and Karen had visited a veteran teacher's 11th grade English class. She noted that, "[the veteran teacher] had set her management strategies from the first day. And so, the students really didn't give her as much of a problem as I see in my classes. Of course, they're at a different maturity level [referring to the fact that the students were 11th graders]." Thus, even when Alexis visited another teacher and even though she and her CT debriefed the visit afterwards, Alexis had trouble recalling what specific strategies she had learned from the experience, and she attributed some of the on-task student behavior to the age of the students in the class.

Beyond taking Alexis on peer visits to assist her with classroom management, Karen Carter spent a considerable amount of time helping Alexis plan. For example, when Alexis spoke about the prospect of team teaching with Karen, she said, "It's great because we're supposed to plan the beginning of *Antigone* together. Like, the historical part of it--the Greek theater, the gods and what not…activities that I might want to use that meet the goals for the students." Indeed, Karen reported the team teaching experience with Alexis was an extremely valuable one. Alexis had come up with the idea to use a "jigsaw" approach to teaching students the background for *Antigone*. Karen made multiple copies of a large number of documents on the Greek theater, the Greek chorus, the Greek gods, etc., and Alexis decided to divide the students into groups and

allow each group to become an expert on one of the topics. Each group also had to create a poster on their topic and present it to the class. Karen said, "I was impressed with Alexis's suggestion to do it that way because if we had just kind of lectured about all those sheets, which wasn't really something I would have done, we wouldn't have had the kids invested in it. I thought it was a good approach." In addition to the positive experience of planning together, Karen said that after they taught the lesson to Alexis's 3rd period class, they found that they needed to make an adjustment in the way that they divided students into groups. Karen said, "the kids didn't like that we put them in groups because they understood that they would be able to make up their own groups… it was the kind of thing that we kept talking about….you know, how can we cut out this seven minutes of getting the kids in groups and having them argue about it?" Karen and Alexis used a "think aloud" process to work through how they could more easily transition the students into groups. They came up with a viable approach, and Karen said, "it was excellent. It really did improve what happened 7th period."

Alexis also gave a lot of praise to the team teaching experience. When discussing the ways that Karen had helped her, she said, "We team taught. That was really, really good. She [Karen] really modeled some behaviors for me that I picked up." Once again, while Alexis was extremely grateful and very positive about the experience, she was mostly focused on the behaviors that she could imitate. A gap in my own data about the team teaching experience Alexis and Karen shared is whether the two of them sat down afterwards to reflect. I do not know if they took time at the end of the day to think through what worked and what did not work throughout their planning and teaching process. If this reflection time failed to occur, for example, it could explain the reason

that Alexis remained so focused on modeling in-class behavior rather than exploring ways to plan and think about structuring a lesson. As it turned out just after the team taught lesson I became distracted with an incident that happened about a week later—the next time Karen and Alexis saw one another. Alexis had a break down of sorts, which I will detail in the section that discusses how the consulting teachers defined their evaluative roles.

In summary, Alexis only had positive comments about Karen's assistance to her throughout the year. Clearly, the assistance that Karen provided greatly contributed to their collegial working relationship. Alexis said of Karen, "She always sends me materials. She brought me a packet with summarizers and activators… [Karen] was a good support. She was able to help me. We planned a few times…She gave me an idea of how to change and give more variety to the class…She was able to help me with rubrics and with information, especially for *Antigone*. She was able to assist me in ways that I needed."

According to Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), supervisors whose authority is derived from their own experience, and who "make available assistance, support and professional development opportunities" (p. 38) are relying on professional sources authority. By focusing her efforts with Alexis on ways that she could be of assistance and by using her own experience as a basis from which to guide rather than prescribe, Karen relied heavily on professional sources of authority in her supervision of Alexis. Although Alexis had severe problems in classroom management to overcome, Karen did not allow directive behaviors to dominate her interactions with Alexis. This led me to question how much Karen's reliance on professional sources of supervisory authority influenced her ability to

build a working relationship with Alexis. Given the extent of Alexis's challenges her first year, some supervisors might have been inclined to draw more from technical-rational sources of authority. Would that approach have undercut the relationship that formed between Alexis and her CT?   Even if a first-year teacher struggles severely with basics such as planning lessons and managing his or her classroom, is it more productive for the supervisor to draw primarily upon professional rather than technical-rational sources of authority in working with the teacher?

Embracing Practical Assistance, Questioning Professional Advice. Chris Parker experienced classroom management challenges similar to those of Alexis Burton, but to a slightly lesser degree. After the first few months of his first year, Chris was most surprised about poor student attendance and student apathy. He said, "Attendance is a big issue. I didn't realize how much kids don't come to school. And the same kids who don't come to school, don't really care. They just don't care at all."   Chris also did not expect to have to deal with so much paperwork. He noted that "the amount of paperwork in regards to not grading, but just keeping everyone on task…special ed forms…every week I've got to do a report, and because I have low-level kids, I have to fill out so many of them per week. It's that sort of paperwork that's always a pain." In that respect, the facets of teaching that came as a surprise to Chris seemed quite typical.

Although the paperwork seemed to plague Chris the most during his first few months of teaching, he and his CT, Paul Simms, focused more on instructional improvement. Chris and Paul had a relationship that on its face was amicable. Chris spoke respectfully to Paul, responded to Paul's suggestions graciously and showed genuine appreciation for the materials Paul provided. Paul also spoke favorably of his working relationship with

Chris. Paul said, "It's very easy to work with [Chris]... I enjoy working with him. He's a really sweet guy, and I think he's very earnest." As I talked with Chris, however, I noticed that towards the end of the first semester, he really began to wrestle with what he viewed as the contradiction between having fun with students and structuring and implementing instruction in ways that were meaningful. Chris also seemed to struggle with how he could build a rapport with students while simultaneously asserting his own authority in the classroom. Throughout the year, Paul made a number of suggestions to Chris that spoke to these two tensions, but Chris seemed reluctant to take the CT's advice to heart. In fact, Chris did not aggressively begin to make the changes in his practice that Paul suggested until he started to grasp the evaluative nature of his CT's role. Nonetheless, it was Paul's practical assistance with instructional materials that contributed to the positive feelings Chris possessed about working with his CT at the beginning of the school year.

By our second interview, for example, Chris reported that Paul had helped him considerably with instructional materials, particularly for the juniors he taught. Chris said, "He's [Paul] given me a lot of portfolios. We read the book *Fences,* and watched the movie *Death of a Salesman,* [and] wrote a paper. He had a ton of information on that he gave me. And, I just recently started *Macbeth,* and he dropped off a folder for me. He's been great." In addition to the provision of materials, Paul told Chris how he approached teaching difficult literary works to reluctant learners and to students who attend school sporadically. They had the following exchange during one of their October conferences that occurred before Chris's first formal observation:

> CP: I'm worried about *Macbeth*…them being able to understand the words.

CT: What I do with plays like that is have everybody reading by splitting them up in groups…Explain what the scene is going to be. I tended to read the scene first and then show it. The kids have a hard time reading the language. [You could also use] parallel texts. A lot of teacher may just read the modern day language.

CP: What about the kids who are absent the first day?

CT: You start the class by asking who can explain what happened yesterday. They'll go back and read, if at the end of each act you give them a test. Give them comprehension questions, and let them use their books.

Prior to having any formal evaluations, Chris appeared to be very comfortable with Paul. He posed practical questions to Paul about strategies for teaching the curriculum, and he gave Paul insight into some of his concerns about the literature he had to teach. As was the case with Alexis, when Paul drew upon professional sources of authority in assisting Chris, Chris responded enthusiastically to the idea of working with him.

Chris's enthusiasm began to wane however, as Paul gave him advice that Chris found to be less palatable. For example, Paul had tried to convince Chris to decline the administration's offers to coach sports during his first year of teaching. Chris had already agreed to coach soccer first semester, before he had had his first meeting with Paul. By the end of that semester, Paul made it abundantly clear that Chris should not agree to coach any spring season sports. Nevertheless, Chris made the decision to coach wrestling second semester. Paul said, "[Chris] is very willing to help out with school activities. If someone needs a volunteer, [Chris] will be there, but…I *told* him not to take wrestling." Chris, however, believed passionately that coaching not only helped him develop a personal identity, but also helped him relate to the students he had to teach. In discussing the importance of his role as a coach, Chris said

From the beginning it [coaching] was huge for me because I had to go through pre-season with everyone, and it gave me a status…not a status…a role, I guess. I knew familiar faces, which is the most important thing for me. I came to the

school, [and] I was a nervous wreck, but coming in and seeing [familiar] faces in the hallway saying, 'hey, how are you doing?' helped me out so much. And some of the football players found out that I was a coach. I have a lot of football players in my junior classes, and even in my freshman class. They all realized that I was a coach and really was into sports, so then they kind of respect you a little bit more, because they know that you're into sports, you're involved in their lives. Even though they'll never say it…they enjoy that you're a part of their lives outside the classroom, and [that] you're not just a teacher. Like, right now I'm coaching wrestling, and I have a whole new group of guys calling me coach out in the hallway…it's awesome.

Beyond making him feel less like an outsider, and more like a teacher who was a part of fabric of the school, Chris thought that coaching helped him become a more organized teacher. Referring to the way that his time is structured during an athletic season, he said, "it's [coaching] really organizing me, I think, because I go home and I have that set schedule for the season." Chris also talked about being bored at times that he did not coach. He recalled, "I'd go home and I wouldn't have work to do, and I'd look around and bang my head off the walls…hopefully if I get a family and stuff, [so that] I'll have a family to go home to, you know?" For Chris, coaching was not just a hobby, and it was not an extra. Coaching was living.

Chris spoke to me about the different ways his resource teacher and consulting teacher broached the topic of coaching wrestling with him. Chris said, "I'm coaching again, and he [the CT] really suggested to me not to do it, and she [the RT] kind of just said, 'it's your decision.'…She told me, it's going to be hard, it's going to be tough, make sure I make up my mind, whereas he just came across and said, 'I wouldn't do it.' You know, there's something to be said for that." What Chris expressed to me were the different approaches taken by his CT and his RT in trying to influence his decision about whether to coach wrestling. His RT had drawn upon professional sources of authority in talking with him about the decision. She had approached him as a professional, urging him to

examine the costs and benefits of coaching and to make a decision that best fit his own life. Paul, on the other hand, had drawn upon technical-rational sources of authority. According to Sergiovanni (1992), the underlying assumption of the authority of technical rationality is that "values, preferences and beliefs don't count, but facts and objective evidence do" (p. 207). In this case, the CT's approach did not indicate that he had considered how much Chris valued coaching, and the extent to which Chris believed that coaching would improve his relationship with students and his own preparation in the classroom. Although I agreed with Paul that time spent coaching is better spent learning the curriculum, preparing engaging lessons, and assessing students, I had never participated on athletic teams, thus my ability to grasp the meaning of that experience to someone else was limited. Interestingly enough, it was Paul's perception that "[the RT] told [Chris] not to do wrestling." This suggests that the RT had shared Paul's view that coaching wrestling was not necessarily in Chris's best interest, but because she relied on professional sources of authority, Chris felt as though she respected his ability to make the right choice.

Coaching was not the only matter on which Chris and his CT disagreed. It was Paul's opinion that Chris's classroom management problems stemmed partly from the types of relationships he formed with his students. Paul defined Chris's greatest challenges by saying,

> Classroom management has been a big issue with [Chris]. He's had small classes, but he's been too informal with them. There's not been a set, procedural rules for his kids. They come in. It takes at least 5-7 minutes to get the class settled down and started. He doesn't really have any routines. He tries to take attendance. He doesn't have any warm-up activities and his class tends to end early, too. Typically the kids are finished by five minutes before [the bell] and they're standing by the door. So, in terms of just controlling the students, that's probably his biggest issue.

Paul had spoken to Chris many times about the informal ways that he approached his students, but by the end of the first semester, Paul believed the situation was getting worse instead of better. He said, "I haven't seen much of a change with his informalities with the students. That seems to have gotten worse, especially since now a lot of the people he has in his class are wrestling students. And the way you act in the wrestling room is not the way you act in the classroom…that's going to be a huge problem for him." Chris was well aware of Paul's perspective, indicating that, "his [Paul's] big thing with me is controlling the classroom, getting more in charge…Because of my age, it's easy to become friendly and not distinguish my role. He's working with me a lot on that."

However, as much as Paul talked with Chris about being too informal, Chris believed strongly that "getting along with the kids is important." He said that his advice to future teachers would be to "expect the unexpected. [And,] get along with kids; [because] they're most important." The fact that Chris used the words "get along with kids" as opposed to "build a relationship with kids" suggests to me that he believed having a positive relationship with students meant that students always had to like him. Based on my own classroom experiences, however, there are many occasions when students will not like what you tell them, and occasions when students will not have their way. However, I found in these cases that students' initial resentment quickly softened as they realized that I cared enough about them to set limits and discipline them. With Chris being only in his first year of teaching, he had not necessarily had the time to develop these insights. Thus, when his consulting teacher directed him to be more formal with his students, he bristled at the notion, which rubbed against one of his most basic principles of effective teaching. Observing the dynamic between Chris and his CT led me to

question how different Chris would have felt if he could have observed a teacher who

asserted his or her authority with students while simultaneously winning their respect and

affection. Would Chris have experienced a cognitive dissonance that would have guided

his reflections on developing relationships with students? If his consulting teacher had

chosen to show, not tell Chris what it meant to build a relationship with students that was

characterized by mutual respect, would Chris have reacted differently? That is to say, if

the CT had drawn from professional sources of authority more than technical-rational

sources of authority in this case, could he have elicited a different response from his first-

year teacher client?

Facilitating Professional Growth

   Michelle Newman's relationship with Vivian Conley, her CT, was quite different from

the relationship between Paul and Chris. As I have noted earlier, Michelle worked with a

diverse group of students who presented her with a lot of challenges, but her instruction

was both varied and highly structured, and her students were consistently engaged.

Comments that were typical of the feedback Michelle received from Vivian included,

"you communicate your expectations very clearly," "Students were making deep

connections between the questions and the stories. I love your mixture of enthusiasm and

structure," and "I'm not the least bit surprised to see that you've developed an efficient

way to cope with 'floating' from room to room! The imagery activity is a nice way to get

them actively engaged with language." Michelle began the school year as a highly

proficient teacher, and thus could focus more on expanding her already solid repertoire of

skills. She was the only participant in the study who initiated contact with her consulting

teacher, particularly during the second semester, to obtain ideas about new instructional strategies.

Michelle and Vivian communicated regularly via email. The following example from March 6, 2002 is typical of the content of those exchanges:

Michelle's Initial Email to Vivian Conley, her CT:

Good morning! I just wanted to let you know that peer editing (content-only) was very successful yesterday. It was such a breath of fresh air to hear so many students say, 'I don't think I have a thesis statement,' as it is so much more powerful when they come to that conclusion, as opposed to my telling them that!

Some were frustrated by the extreme amount of structure during the lesson itself, but I think they appreciated it today when we were back in the lab and the changes they needed to make were so clear. My Honors students were particularly perturbed when I wouldn't let them edit grammar! I am glad they are so eager!

Thank you very much for the peer editing ideas. It is something that I am going to add to my permanent repertoire of teaching ideas!

Have a good week. I will be sending my reflection question/answers shortly.

-Michelle Newman

Vivian's Reply:

I'm glad it worked so well. Hopefully, you'll see results in their final products! The single best thing you can teach them about editing is that grammar and spelling are the last steps. I've really enjoyed working with you, Michelle. I hope we can continue our professional dialogue.

Michelle described the second semester with Vivian as more "relaxed." She said, "I'll email her [the CT], and I'll say 'I'd love some suggestions about peer editing' or you know, 'how do you suggest working with the language differences in Shakespeare?' And she's wonderful on that. She'll email me things, and then she'll schedule a follow-up meeting with me to go over what it is that she's done in the past and [give] some suggestions." Michelle frequently described her CT as an "advocate." Michelle noted

that, "It's just good sometimes to talk to her and to listen to her say, 'you know what, that's not unusual and there's no magic answer, but here are some things I've tried.'" Thus, Michelle not only used strategies and ideas from her CT in her instruction, she would also follow-up with her CT to reflect on how well the strategies worked.

In other email exchanges that I collected between Michelle and Vivian, Michelle asked for suggestions regarding how to respond to specific students. Early in the school year dealing with the special education students in her classes became a challenge for Michelle. She described how difficult it was to attend to the demands of just one child with special needs in the class I regularly observed:

> There are quite a few [students], particularly [a male student] who is the student
> with Tourette's that constantly needs positive reinforcement before he moves on.
> The problem with that is with thirty students in the room, I can't always be with
> him and he gets stuck, so he might sit there for fifteen minutes, doing absolutely
> nothing because I haven't told him that he filled out the heading correctly, and
> that's so frustrating. And, he's not the only one like that. I try to check in with
> him regularly, but on the same measure one of my goals is to get him to be a self-
> advocate.

Michelle said that in New York, where she learned to teach, aides were provided to teachers based on the numbers of special education students who were assigned to their classes. Michelle noted, "I have several students who are considered special education, but there's no support, so there's no other adult besides me in there…it's very overwhelming." Other specific concerns Michelle had about working with her special education students related to their struggle with following her directions, the frequency with which they called out in class, and their overall distractibility.

Michelle emailed Vivian about her concerns, and Vivian came to their next conference a few days later armed with a number of suggestions. For example, Vivian encouraged Michelle to use "additional clarity strategies such as breaking directions down into

smaller units and the use of guided practice." In addition, Vivian suggested some

specific seating changes, along with giving "tiered assignments so that students are

offered more choices" in the ways that they were assessed. An example of a tiered

assignment would be that some groups of students could be assigned one short story,

while another group was assigned to three different stories. Or, some students could

focus on character development in stories, while other students could focus on theme. By

quickly responding to Michelle's concern about the day-to-day issues she faced in her

classes, the consulting teacher exhibited her commitment to helping Michelle generate

ideas to cope with practical problems. At the same time, Vivian's assistance was not

limited to the technical aspects of Michelle's teaching. Their discussions helped

Michelle reflect, for example, on the meaning of assessment, and on ways that students

could demonstrate knowledge in multiple ways.

   Vivian also addressed the needs of specific students. Referencing the male student

with Tourette's syndrome who impatiently demanded Michelle's attention in class, she

said, "if his IEP says he needs help with organization, keep a special folder for him and

keep extra copies [of the class materials] and just hand it to him [when he calls out]. If

it's not in his IEP, then tell him he must wait until you get the rest of the class started."

Vivian also pointed out the antics of another student whom she believed lobbied for

Michelle's attention in class out of sheer immaturity. Vivian said, "this is so typical of

ninth grade because they're immature and they want to see how much attention they can

get. You may ask them to try this for one minute on their own…One of the ways they

amuse themselves and put off having to do work is to dance with the teacher. It's a

power game and a delay tactic." These discussions seemed to give Michelle a new

perspective about the motivations of students who constantly called out in her classes.

Instead of wrestling with feelings of helplessness because she could not get to all of the

students who required her help, she began to see that some of her students understood

more than they let on. Their calling out was less a cry for help than a cry for attention.

These students wanted to take center stage in Michelle's classes, and by working with

Vivian, Michelle became conscious of the student's games, and changed the way she

responded to them. Michelle spoke about ways that shifting the seating around in her

classes helped her handle one such student. She said,

> I'm sure you've noticed [a female student] who talks all the time. She really has
> some very interesting observations to make, but at the same time she's very
> manipulative, and is always putting on a show. I put her in the back [of the room]
> and that was another suggestion of Vivian's…that she's not right in my face so
> that I will see other students' hands going up, and I can ignore her, but not look
> like I'm actually ignoring her. And that was helpful, and it has allowed her to
> back off a little bit, which is very good.

Michelle appreciated the fact that Vivian could notice "little goings on between students

either positive or negative that [she] might not see." She noted that, "it's helpful to get

feedback on that."

It was clear throughout the year that for Michelle having a consulting teacher meant

having a bountiful resource who could engage her in a dialogue about instructional

practices that were tailored to her specific professional needs. Michelle's comfort with

Vivian sprang both from Vivian's approach to supervision and from Michelle's own

mastery of basic day-to-day operations in her classroom. Vivian provided a balance of

support and guidance, giving Michelle access to instructional strategies that she had used

when she was in the classroom, without insisting that there was any one best way to

attack a problem. At the same time, Michelle could overlook Vivian's evaluative role

and be open with her consulting teacher about the problems she faced with certain classes because she was clearly meeting the district's performance standards and had nothing to fear in terms of her summative evaluations. Thus, in my analysis I could only document this isolated case in which the first-year teacher developed a relationship with her consulting teacher that resulted in a true professional dialogue. The professional approach to supervision that the consulting teacher drew upon certainly influenced the development of this relationship. However, the undeniable competence of the first-year teacher emerged as the factor that seemed to push the consulting teacher's evaluative role in the background so that an open, trusting dialogue, initiated at times by both the CT and the first-year teacher, could flourish and thrive.

Sources of Supervisory Authority for First-Year Teachers' Assistance and Growth

When the cases of Chris Parker and Alexis Burton are placed beside the case of Michelle Newman I am struck by both the disparities and similarities in their experiences. Chris and Alexis experienced a first year of teaching plagued particularly in the first semester by challenges with classroom management, instructional organization and curriculum content. On the other hand, Michelle's knowledge and practices in these areas were firmly in place from the start of the year. She struggled with issues that many veteran teachers face in terms of differentiating instruction for students of widely varying abilities. Yet, all three expressed the most positive sentiments about working with their consulting teachers when their consulting teachers drew from professional sources of authority. Whether the consulting teacher was tasked with providing intensive assistance or professionally enriching experiences to the first-year teachers, taking a stance that privileged teacher knowledge over scientific knowledge, and teachers' values over

prescriptive directives more positively influenced the relationship between the CT and his or her client. The finding that struggling teachers respond best to a supervisor's reliance on professional sources of authority seems congruent with Goldhammer's (1993) argument that supervisors should take a more supportive, non-authoritative role in working with less effective teachers. Rather than bombard these teachers with advice, Goldhammer (1993) argues for supervisors to adopt a non-directive stance in their conferences with these teachers.

Beyond understanding how the sources of authority on which the CTs' relied influenced the first-year teachers' responses to assistance, I began to understand how the CT's reliance on a particular source of authority influenced the *content* of that assistance. Stroot et al. (1999) argue that first-year teachers move more quickly through stages of new teacher development when they work with consulting teachers. Specifically, they claim that first-year teachers move more expeditiously from concerns about classroom management to concerns about instruction when working with a consulting teacher. I would argue that we need to look more closely at what might influence a change of this nature in the focus of first-year teachers. Based on the cases in this study, the first-year teacher's facility with basic classroom management and effective instructional practices at the outset of the school year loomed largely as a predictor of whether he or she would reflect on the meaning of instructional approaches rather than simply grasp at ideas for technical changes in his or her classroom. Furthermore, it was not simply working with a consulting teacher that helped the first-year teachers focus more on instruction, but working with a consulting teacher who drew upon professional sources of authority. When the consulting teacher took a more technical-rational approach as in the case of

Chris Parker, the first-year teacher had little latitude to think. Advice came from his

consulting teacher in a very directive way. On the other hand, when the consulting

teachers asked their client's questions about classroom observations, and referenced what

they had learned in their own teaching experiences as a guide rather than a prescription

for changes their clients could consider, the first-year teachers began the practice of

looking at multiple pieces of data to draw their own conclusions about the best

instructional approaches. Thus, I found that it was both the proficiency with which the

first-year teacher began the year *and* the source of authority that the consulting teacher

used that most significantly influenced how quickly the first-year teachers began to

generate their own ideas about instruction.

How the CTs Defined Their Evaluative Roles

    I will now turn to a fourth aspect of the CTs' approaches that had a considerable

influence on the relationships they developed with their first-year teacher clients: the way

the CTs defined their evaluative roles. A longstanding debate exists between researchers

who insist that teacher supervision (formative assessment) and teacher evaluation

(summative assessment) need to be kept completely distinct (Blau & Scott, 1962; Hoy &

Forsyth, 1986) and those who argue that the two can be combined (Blumberg, 1980;

McQuarrie & Wood, 1991; Holland, 2004). The participants in this study developed

more trusting relationships with their CTs when the consulting teacher's evaluative role

was overshadowed by his or her role as an advocate and helper. I will discuss three

aspects of the way the consulting teachers defined their evaluative roles that seemed to

influence their relationships with their clients. In the fourth section, I discuss how Alexis

Burton became particularly overcome by her consulting teacher's role as an evaluator due

primarily to the fact that her CT had the power to recommend dismissal. I will attribute Alexis's reactions less to the supervisory approach taken by her CT and more to her own perception of the positional power her CT possessed.

Communicating the Evaluative Role in the Beginning

Earlier in this chapter I discussed the approach the district took to introducing the first-year teachers to Peer Assistance and Review. Although I was critical of the manner in which this was done, one could argue that the district's introduction is merely a first step in helping teachers understand the program. The logical next step is that the consulting teachers themselves clarify their roles in assisting the first-year teachers throughout the year. I found that even after some of the consulting teachers had met with their clients at least once, the first-year teachers still clung to murky notions of how they would work with their CTs.

Understanding Begets Appreciation. Both Michelle and Nym felt somewhat threatened by their initial understandings of the purposes of PAR. By the middle of the school year, both expressed a dramatic change in their comfort level with the program, and that change was due to the CT's de-emphasis of her evaluative role. Michelle said,

> I think the first time we [Michelle and I] talked I was a little skeptical about the whole purpose and structure of the program in that I understood [Vivian] to be the person who really recommends whether my position here is continued or not….I wish it had been communicated a little more clearly to me. [Vivian] is an advocate for me. She's not against me. She's not waiting for me to mess up. One of the first things she said after we met for the first time was 'you know, if I come in for one of your formal observations and I see that it's just going horribly, I'll do it again. I'll do it over.' And right then and there I realized that she wants me to succeed.

Nym expressed a very similar change in his first thoughts about the program. He said,

> Initially I think as a new teacher this program is kind of intimidating because you're told that you're observed once a week and it's usually unannounced. As a

matter of fact, most of them have been unannounced! And then you're told that these observations determine whether your contract is renewed. So when you're first told about the consulting teacher, you don't see her as a friend so much as an adversary, another obstacle, another, you know, hoop that you must go through, right? [laughs]. So I think the initial presentation of this program is vital…I think after the new teacher truly understands what this program is, I think they'll see it in a very positive light from day one.

As both Michelle and Nym conveyed, the first-year teachers tended to feel ill-at-ease at the thought of an authority figure coming to their classes weekly, from the very first week of school, to make a judgment about whether they were fit to continue in their jobs. Learning the curriculum (including reading all of the literature they must teach) and figuring out how best to teach that curriculum to their set of students was already so potentially overwhelming for the first-year teachers that the thought of being under scrutiny from an outside evaluator threatened to push their nerves over the edge. Once they viewed the consulting teacher as someone whose first priority was to help, their minds were put at ease.

Confusion Begets Mistrust. At the end of November Chris Parker still had a fuzzy concept of the PAR process. When I asked him about his understanding of it, he looked to me for guidance. Our conversation proceeded as follows:

CP: All I know is that if I pass this little thing…he writes up four formal reports on me, two of which he's already done…and if I pass, whatever the passing is, I'm not sure what the criteria is, you don't have to come under the assistance program or something like that…people will help you out your second year. I guess you go before a panel, and you lose your job, or get a year [of additional help]. I think that's how it works.

DRJ: Um-hum [nodding affirmatively].

CP: Are you nodding because you understand or because you know that's what happens?

DRJ: That is the process. The CT makes a recommendation, and then they either recommend that you go into a regular professional growth cycle, that you have a consulting teacher next year, or that…he could recommend dismissal.

CP: Oh, so I don't have to go [before the PAR Panel] unless…

DRJ: You wouldn't have to go…other than that [a recommendation for dismissal]…because the panel looks at all the evidence and makes the decision…So, you pretty much have it.

CP: So, if everything goes well, I'm done with it this year?

DRJ: Right.

CP: I wasn't sure.

While it is unclear if Paul, Chris's consulting teacher, had already explained the PAR process to him, or had only explained pieces of it to him to prevent Chris from feeling overwhelmed, it was clear that Chris desired clarity about the process. He particularly wanted to be clearer about the standards against which he was being measured, and what he needed to do to meet those standards. This was especially important for Chris since the two formal evaluations he had been given at that time indicated that he needed to exhibit higher expectations for his students and improve his classroom management skills. The exchange between me and Chris that day showed me that Chris desperately craved more specific information about the district's performance standards and the PAR process. After all, teaching was his livelihood. If he was facing the prospect of losing that livelihood, he needed to be crystal clear about the decision-making process. I would submit that this lack of clarity sat as a dark cloud over the relationship between Chris and his CT, Paul. Chris's uncertainty about the PAR process as well as his uncertainty about his fate placed Paul's role as an evaluator more in the foreground of their relationship, making Chris increasingly more distrustful of his CT.

Disentangling bureaucracy's web. Sergiovanni (1992) argues that one assumption of bureaucratic sources of authority is that "teachers are subordinates in a hierarchically arranged system" (p. 206). Furthermore, he says that when supervisors draw primarily from bureaucratic sources of authority "teachers are expected to comply or face consequences" (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 206). In this study, when the consulting teachers did not ensure that their clients had an accurate picture of the Peer Assistance and Review process, the first-year teachers were intimidated by the idea of working with them, and assumed that the CT's purpose was to scrutinize their shortcomings rather than enhance their skills. Overlooking the importance of giving a succinct explanation of PAR to first year teachers at the beginning of the year cast PAR as a bureaucratic construct over which first-year teachers had little influence. As a result of not possessing ample knowledge about the program, first-year teachers had a more intense perception that the consulting teachers were part of the district's hierarchy. In the beginning of the school year instead of viewing themselves as partners in a relationship centered around assisting them, the first-year teachers saw themselves as subordinates under inspection by the district.

Underscoring the Evaluative Role Through Mandates

Although consulting teachers as well as other district representatives would emphasize how much Peer Assistance and Review was about supporting teachers, it was undeniable from what I observed, that it was also in part about indoctrinating teachers. The district had adopted John Sapphire's *The Skillful Teacher* as the guide for effective instructional practice. As they had been instructed in the Observation and Analysis of Teaching (OAT) class, the CTs relied faithfully and consistently on the skillful teaching strategies when

working with their clients. They used the terminology of skillful teaching in planning with the first-year teachers, as well as in post observation conferences and final observation reports. I found that the first-year teachers seemed most resistant to the consulting teachers' intervention when the CTs insisted that the teachers follow a lesson plan structure for their classes that is prescribed in *The Skillful Teacher*. Specifically, the district expects all teachers to communicate a mastery objective to students, open class with a "warm-up" or "activator," and end class with a "summarizer." Michelle followed this structure most consistently throughout the year, whether the consulting teacher was present or not. Alexis displayed an objective on the board every day that I observed her class. The other teachers, however, seemed to find the planning structure constraining, cumbersome or unnecessary.

In fact, although Michelle consistently followed the lesson plan structure, she remembered being somewhat frustrated by the inconsistent messages she received from the county regarding what comprises a mastery objective. When I asked her to talk about ways that Vivian Conley assisted her with planning, she said,

> She [Vivian] did provide a sheet on how to write a lesson plan…that's more day-to-day as opposed to broad spectrum planning. Actually, we had, certainly not a disagreement, but just a discrepancy between what an objective should include. I went to a new teacher training that was hosted by the county, and they were in discrepancy with what [Vivian] had said [Michelle laughs] and so I was more confused than I was in the beginning. I don't think writing an objective is detrimental to my overall teaching, but I wish I was getting a consistent message from everyone.

Three important points emerge from Michelle's recollection. First, that the mastery objective was indeed perceived by teachers as a district mandate. Teachers believed that a formula existed to which they were expected to adhere in writing their objectives. Secondly, teacher trainers, in disseminating the "correct" formula for writing mastery

objectives, provided inconsistent messages. The fact that these messages were inconsistent seemed to mock the gravity with which the district communicated the purposes of written objectives. This leads to my final point. Teachers did not perceive that written objectives were critical to student achievement. Thus, insisting upon a particular way of writing a mastery objective, although it did nothing to impair the relationship between Michelle and Vivian, still posited the consulting teachers as agents of the district whose mission was to inculcate new teachers as much as it was to assist them.

To fulfill his requirements for writing mastery objectives, Nym Oh decided to post general learning goals that would be applicable to his lessons for several days in a row. According to Nym, "this [posting the learning goals] is something that is recommended for first year teachers because they grade you on writing these learning objectives. So, what I've done is I've written down essentially the four things that will almost always go on in my class. I just write them for each week. Now, the objective will change every day. But, those learning goals will not change unless they're doing something really out of the ordinary." When I asked him who required him to post his objectives, he said, "it's required by the person that observes me, the consulting teacher." Interestingly, Nym noted that it was sometimes a stretch to make his learning goals, which were based on the learning indicators (or objectives) in the district's curriculum, fit with what he was doing in class. He said, "It's not always a perfect fit. So, what I wind up doing is that on the days that it's not a perfect fit, I have to direct the students' attention to that particular number [district curriculum indicator], and then I have to make a connection between the goal and the agenda. But, most of the time they do fit." In saying that it was sometimes a

stretch to fit together the objectives and the lesson's agenda, Nym seems to suggest that the mandate to post the objectives forced him to make artificial, or at least unnatural connections between the district's goals and his lesson activities. This highlights how the first-year teachers perceived the mandate to post objectives, particularly those directly from the curriculum, as a constraint rather than a vehicle for enhancing student learning. Later in the school year, as I observed Nym, I noticed that no objectives would be posted. Thus, once the consulting teacher's role had ended, he did not feel compelled to continue the practice of posting objectives, a practice that he most likely believed added little to students' abilities to master the curriculum.

   With confidence in his approaches to instruction and strong convictions about the curriculum in and management of a high school English classroom, Nym admitted that he and the consulting teacher did not always see eye to eye on the changes he should make. He said,

> Based on her [Vivian Conley's] emphasis, there are two areas which I need to improve. One is discipline, so that the class is quieter and there are no students standing up or speaking without their hands raised. I'm not really into that, though. I mean, it's my personality. When I was a student, I didn't want to raise my hand to speak. I felt like we were adults…The second one is the objectives…how to write them more clearly. And, to always give a closing summary at the end, which I'm not very good at doing, especially because I tend to want to do a lot of things. I can't summarize everything that goes on at the end [laughter]. So, I'm pretty bad with that. I've also been told to lay off grammar…and every time I read their essays, I say to myself, 'I've got to teach them grammar!' [laughter].

In essence Nym seemed to find the classroom structure that the CT expected him to adopt somewhat inhibiting. Having students raise their hands, for example, brushed against his notion of what it meant to participate as a young adult in a high school classroom. Yet, although he expressed that concern about the CT's suggestion, he *did* make changes in

his classroom throughout the year that reflected a more structured approach to discipline.
His final summative report, dated March 12, 2002, indicated that "[Mr. Oh] has expanded
his repertoire of attention and discipline strategies." In addition, Nym said that, "[the
CT] liked the fact that [his] discipline measures are more regimented." At first, however,
he did not attribute the new strategies to be the result of his work with his consulting
teacher. He said, "I came up with them [the discipline strategies] myself." Then, after
thinking a moment, he said,

> Well, she [the CT] suggested indirectly by giving me an article to read…and in
> this article it says the classroom rules should be no more than five, and they
> should be clearly stated on the board. And every time, the first two weeks when
> the class starts, be very consistent. On top of that what I did was I had the
> students fill out a questionnaire that asks what they did to be disruptive in class.
> They sign a statement that says the next time this arises, they'll have a parent-
> teacher conference with me. And, then they write a brief essay as to how they're
> going to change their behavior in my class. It takes them about thirty minutes to
> fill this out.

By seeing the CT's documentation of her suggestions regarding his classroom
management in the summative write-ups, and by discussing these issues with his CT at
the post-observation conferences, Nym understood the need to make the changes that the
CT wanted to see, even if he was not convinced that he wanted to manage his class in the
ways she suggested. In this sense, I believe he was quite aware of Vivian Conley's
evaluative role, and that he understood the suggestion she made about increasing the
structure in his classroom to be more directive. Nonetheless, by providing him with an
article to read, the CT drew from more professional sources of authority with Nym.
Although she was insisting upon more structure in his classroom, she was leaving the
"how" to him. She provided him with the resources to make discoveries for himself, and

as a result he not only implemented some of the article's suggestions, but he also used the article as a springboard to develop his own ideas about changing student behavior.

As far as including a summarizer at the end of each lesson, Nym said, "She [the CT, Vivian Conley] suggested things like how to fill in the five minutes of closing time with these short activities like one neighbor tells the other neighbor what they learned on a sheet of paper." When I asked why he had decided against trying this approach, he replied, "because, I just…I think it's silly. And I'm afraid the students will think it's silly. And unless I'm going to read every one of them [the sheets of paper] and make a comment, I don't want them to do that. It trivializes the act of writing, so I don't want them to do that." Although Nym felt that some of the summarizing activities the CT suggested would not be appropriate for his eleventh graders, he did make a point of using summarizers when his CT came to observe. In an observation report dated October 3, 2001, the CT noted that, "[Mr. Oh] and I have been discussing the importance of a summarizing activity. In this observation, he ended the first segment of class by asking students to restate new material in their own words. Thus, [Mr. Oh] reflects on feedback and makes appropriate modifications to lessons." In this case, Nym's use of summarizers seemed to be limited to the times when the CT was present. Thus, it was the CT's strong recommendation that he include summarizers rather than his own conceptions of their value which drove his decision to employ them when Vivian Conley observed.

On the one hand, Nym's case illustrates the value of the consulting teacher's evaluative role. It is possible that Nym would not have made the changes in his approach to classroom management as early in his teaching career had it not been for the fact that the CT provided the expectations and resources that gave him the impetus to do so. Once

he had added more structure to his classes, Nym said that student behavior was "much better." On the other hand, his case begs the question of why the structures suggested in *The Skillful Teacher* are compulsory for new teachers from the district's perspective. If the first-year teachers adopt the practices of posting objectives and using summarizers only for the benefit of the person who evaluates them, how useful are teachers finding these structures in working with their students? Furthermore, if teachers believe they are being pressured by the CTs to use these structures, how much do those perceptions have the potential to interfere with the trusting, collegial relationship that the CT works to build with his or her clients?

Subverting the Evaluative Role Through Negotiation

If Vivian Conley, like the other CTs, drew attention to her role as evaluator by pressing her clients to follow the principles of *The Skillful Teacher,* she bolstered her role as an advocate in the way she worked with Chad Wolf. I have already recounted the unconventional ways (in light of district standards) that Chad taught. He rarely varied his instructional approach, wrote an objective on the board, started with a warm-up, or summarized the major points of his lesson. His approach was to teach his "patterns" system by engaging students daily in a quest to find instances where the author repeats him- or herself in the text, and to discover what meaning that repetition could have. He only followed the district's curriculum loosely, choosing instead to teach short stories that he found to be more compelling than those in the English department's book room. With my first visit to Chad's ninth grade class on Veteran's Day, I was terribly impressed by the students' enthusiasm and high levels of participation, yet my informal chat in the parking lot with his consulting teacher revealed that she had some concerns. She did not

question whether many students in the class were learning. In fact, she believed that they were. She had high praise for a lot of what she observed Chad doing. She said,

> He has a lot of strengths. He's got fabulous classroom management. He's got very good organization. He's very competent in terms of keeping grades and recording grades and getting things done on time, so I think that's a real strength. I think he's got a real strength in terms of delving into literature with kids. He really gets them to do a lot of abstract thinking. He really makes literature accessible to on-level kids. So he's got lots of strength in that direction. He's got lots of strength in terms of clarity. He's very explicit. He's very clear. He's been giving them graphic organizers to kind of even give them more organization…and he's quite thoughtful. He's quite thoughtful about what he's doing. I think he really has an objective firmly in his mind and is able to move them toward that objective in a pretty efficient way. So, I think he has a lot of strengths.

What concerned her was the possibility that not all students in his classes would succeed with his singular approach. She noted that, "he doesn't use a complete repertoire of strategies. He tends to depend on the same strategies over and over and over again." Furthermore, she wondered what foundational skills the students might be missing as they pick out these "patterns" without emphasizing literary terms or any of the elements of writing that are prevalent in the ninth grade curriculum. She said, "many things that I think are essential for good practice, he's not doing. He's not giving the kids written assignments, he's not giving the kids rubrics." Additionally, she perceived her role as someone who should ensure that Chad's methodology would work in any school in the district, not just in the upscale community in which Jefferson High School was nested.

She could find no support for her position. According to Chad, his Resource Teacher had assured him that since the school's test scores were high "with a few exceptions [he could] pretty much do whatever." When Vivian talked to the principal about her concerns, the principal said that as long as the parents and students were pleased with Chad's performance, she saw no basis for intervening. Thus, with everyone from the

principal to the parents having nothing but praise for Chad's teaching, Vivian Conley

struck a deal with him.

Although she was fully aware that on the days she was not present Chad would teach

his patterns system the way he had always taught it, she outlined the proficiencies that he

needed to demonstrate when she was there to at least show her that he had the *capability*

to include these strategies in his instruction. She described the conversation she had with

Chad in this way:

> Well, the most useful thing that worked with him was just to show him the standards. And what I did was I took…I had done two observations then…I took the two observations, and I put a little check on the standards next to everything I had documented. And when we looked at it, we just looked at the first four standards because those are the ones that deal with instruction. When we looked at it, it was really obvious that we had only documented maybe a third of what was there. And I said, 'now we have two more observations, Chad. If I keep seeing the same thing over and over again, I will be just documenting more of these things. And, I can't go in front of the PAR Panel and say this teacher is competent if I've only seen you doing a third of the things on the standards.' And he was stricken. He really was. He looked at it. He read it through, and then he looked up at me and said, 'can I ask you some questions about these?' That is the first question he ever asked me! The first question. Now, you know I'd been working with him for two months by then. I said, 'sure.' He said 'what would it look like if I did this and how could I do that, and what do you think about this?' And we had, I thought, a very good discussion about what he needed to do. And then, when I started going in, I saw him…doing some different things… Like having the kids come up with an objective…Like giving them the big picture…why are we doing this…things like that. I saw him do a couple of group activities…the first time I'd ever seen him doing that. So, you know, baby steps, but at least there was some awareness there that he's got to do some of these other things.

From Vivian Conley's perspective Chad had some awareness of the importance of using

different instructional strategies, but from Chad's perspective he was jumping through

another district hoop. He never said to me that he saw value in other instructional

approaches. In fact, he frequently disparaged the approaches that his colleagues took,

believing that those approaches did little to prepare students for studying literature in

college classes. He had the following take on his conversation with Vivian:

> She [the CT] literally gave me a list of things that like 'well, you're not doing
> these things and you have to because that's what the PAR committee is going to
> look for. And not because you need them and not because you have…some big
> gaping hole in your style, but this is what they look for. And basically I need these
> things.' She's basically saying that she needs these things in order to write the
> review that's going to end the process. So, you know, I understand the
> practicality of the matter. On the days that she comes in, I will work them in. I'm
> essentially changing some of the aspects of the way I teach a normal class, but I
> understand the practicality of what she's saying. She's saying this is the list they
> gave me to give to you, and this is what you have to do if you don't want to see
> me again next year.

Chad viewed his conversation with Vivian, not as an epiphany in which he started to

appreciate the value of placing students in groups or summarizing his lesson at the end of

class, but rather as a superficial demonstration that he could perform a given list of

teacher behaviors. Nevertheless, Chad had nothing but positive comments about his

consulting teacher. He said, "we have a really good rapport, I think…You know, she's

very helpful. I feel like the suggestions that she makes to a certain extent they're

motivated by this sort of checklist. I still think she genuinely wants me to improve and to

be a good teacher." By the end of the year, when Chad was discussing the value of the

Peer Assistance and Review program with me, he emphasized the importance of having

consulting teachers who can be open to teachers who take unconventional approaches to

instruction. He said,

> …It's the fact that she looked at the ends, and she saw what they were doing, and
> …even though I got there in a different way, she was very flexible and patient
> with me, and she was able to see something from a different perspective. I would
> just worry about, you know, that if somebody gets some [consulting] teacher
> that's not that way. That sees it (PAR) as sort of a way in which to impose policy
> on somebody, and I never felt that way from her. She was very…even when we
> needed to do something that was along the lines of the policy, she really brought it
> to me in a way that it wasn't like 'you have to do it this way', but that we have to

figure out a way to integrate the two for the time being, for this moment. So, she was really fantastic about that.

Clearly, Chad never believed that Vivian was trying to force him to change his beliefs about the importance of the patterns system he taught to prepare his students for college. He actually appreciated the fact that Vivian gave him suggestions that fit within his system, rather than trying to convince him to abandon his system. He said,

> She gave suggestions to make the system better instead of being really critical of the fact that I teach completely…you know the way I teach is…on the surface it seems like exactly the opposite of what everybody says is the right way to do it, you know? And so instead of coming in and saying 'oh, but this is what it says on this piece of paper right here you're supposed to do.' She came and said, 'You know, I really like a lot of the stuff you're doing here, but let me give you some suggestions that will help you in the way that you're teaching.' She really made a lot of good, professional decisions that made our relationship better because she made them based on me, and not based on policy necessarily.

Instead of demanding that Chad change his instructional methodology, Vivian praised him for the positive aspects of his methods, and made suggestions that he could fit within his current practices. And although I believed she sometimes felt uncomfortable with the fact that Chad did not regularly differentiate instruction or use structures that she considered to be best practices, Chad was far more open to her suggestions because she recognized the value in a system that he held very dear. Although student work was not a part of the data sources I requested to collect, I often thought it would have been interesting to examine the quality of the papers that Chad's students produced. He had always stated that the quality his students' writing was far beyond that of ninth graders in other English classes. Would my assessment of their writing have been the same as Chad's assessment of it? Could his unwavering commitment to his self-created system have made him biased in assessing his students' work? What new learning could have emerged had he and Vivian sat down to examine his students' writing?

Chad's skepticism about the benefits of the strategies in *The Skillful Teacher* for his students was based in part on the fact that he did not believe those strategies fit with his patterns system. For example, he told me that "my goal is to teach them how to structure their argument, and read for abstract meaning, and so for me to do warm-ups and things like that…it's irrelevant to my system." At the same time, he found great value in Vivian's suggestion about clarifying the "big picture" with students. He said,

> she kept telling me to try to get an objective in…and, of course, the concept of the objective itself, like I said, is kind of irrelevant to the way I teach. But one of the things that really did help is that she got me to really express more clearly to the kids really where we were, where we've been and where we're going. So, even if I didn't do it in the conventional objective way, again, this is one of the professional things she did that was really very personalized to me… So, [that's] one of the ways in which the guide sheet evolved… so that was actually a hugely beneficial thing because sometimes… kids can lose sight of the big picture, so she really showed me it was valuable to really make sure they know…what it feels like to go through the process on their own, and they need to know how to locate themselves… It happened a lot that way, that she would give a suggestion, and… it finds its way into the way I do things.

Thus, although Chad did not seem particularly impressed by the structured lesson planning advocated in *The Skillful Teacher*, he was open to his consulting teacher's suggestions about how he could improve his way of teaching patterns. The suggestions, interestingly enough, were a part of the skillful teaching strategies, but Chad's CT was able to relate those suggestions to the way of teaching that Chad strongly valued. The respect she showed for his way of approaching instruction prompted Chad to take seriously her suggestions about improving the system, and to reflect on what he could change to make the system more transparent for his students.

When I asked Chad about any changes that he had planned to make from one semester to the next in his teaching and how he determined what changes he would make, he replied,

the basic framework, the pattern system that I use…the system of writing, reading has been in place…so that's certainly going to stay 'cause that's been a great success, but it's been revised consistently over the course of the year…A lot of times I'll revise things from one period to the next…so I've even…because having gone through the argument several times, I've revised the argument and revised how I present it and some of the examples that I use and things like that…I think one gets a general sense of what, you know, what works and what doesn't. I mean, you see how the kids react you know, do they look like they understand, or do they look like they're cross-eyed or something?

So, Chad certainly reflected regularly on how well his students understood his lessons, and what he could do to clarify the process of developing an argument around the meaning of patterns in literature. However, he was still wed to his process, and in that sense limited in his instructional practices. In our last interview Chad said that he was unsure about whether or not working with Vivian Conley influenced what he did instructionally or whether she influenced the way he thought about the changes he would make in his instruction. He said,

A lot of times…I just sort of I work things out, and don't necessarily always know that I even have, so it's possible that she has affected my style. But as of this point, really what I see is a refinement of what I started at the beginning of the year. But, I can never say for certain because sometimes I turn around four years later and look at something and say, 'Oh yeah, now I can see exactly how she said something and it worked it's way in,' so there's always that possibility, absolutely.

Chad's case is an interesting one because he clearly responded to Vivian Conley's call for restructuring his lessons in a way that Sergiovanni (1992) describes as a teacher's response to bureaucratic approaches to supervision. According to Sergiovanni (2002), supervisors who rely largely on bureaucratic sources of authority have to carefully inspect teachers' practices, and "without proper monitoring, teachers wind up being loosely connected to bureaucratic systems, complying only when they have to" (p. 29). This statement is true of Chad's response to Vivian in that he only changed his behavior

when she was present, and he did not come to see differentiated instruction, rubrics, or written objectives as valuable in his particular classroom context. At the same time, he still perceived Vivian as another professional who wanted to help him improve his teaching. From Chad's perspective, Vivian's willingness to acknowledge the value in his approach to instruction, as well as her acceptance of the perfunctory behavior modifications he made to meet the district's performance standards, made her an advocate for teachers who generated thoughts and approaches that were independent of the instructional framework adopted by the district. Vivian's feedback did prompt Chad to reflect on changes that he could make in the ways he helped students understand his "patterns" system. Given the foundation of mutual understanding that supported Chad and Vivian's relationship, I often wondered if Vivian could have also convinced Chad of the value of multiple approaches to instruction if she had been given more time to work with him, along with more school-based support to validate (for Chad) her claims about the importance of differentiated instruction.

Asserting Bureaucratic Authority to Hasten Change

In terms of formally documenting Chad's progress in the PAR program, Vivian's Conley's focus became getting Chad to show that he *had the ability* to perform in a way that met district standards. She was never honestly concerned about whether he *could* do what she was asking, only that he would not do it. Chris Parker's CT, Paul, had a different concern entirely. By the beginning of January Paul was not only fearful that Chris had not developed the skills to meet the district performance standards, but he was also afraid that Chris failed to understand that not meeting standards meant he was compelled to recommend against renewing Chris's contract.

A Question of Clarity. Paul blamed himself, in part, for not seeing more changes in

Chris's approaches to instruction, because he did not push Chris to be more reflective.

When Paul and I discussed whether Chris agreed that he needed improvement in the areas

that Paul had identified, Paul said

> Yeah, I think he would [agree], but again that's part of the problem where he doesn't reflect very often. He's not really come out and blamed the students, but he's kind of close to that…where he says 'I don't really know what to do anymore, because you send them out in the hall, they don't do anything. They come back and they're worse.' But, I've tried to point out to him that he's just very inconsistent with his rules. You know, at times he'll say 'no.' Then, five minutes later, he'll say 'yes.' And, so the kids just know that he's sort of a pushover. And he doesn't seem to…I don't know if it's a willingness to recognize it, or an unwillingness to recognize it…an inability to recognize it…I haven't really addressed that issue with him. I think this semester we're going to, though. I'm going to really start making him be more reflective. And start thinking about what he could have done to improve the lesson.

Paul's struggle with Chris Parker's case was evident. Paul did not know if Chris lacked

confidence in his capacity to change the behavior in his classroom (regardless of the

instructional strategies he tried), or if Chris simply did not see what changes he could

make. Paul had also indicated that he had difficulty talking to Chris about the necessity

for him to make changes because Chris was such a friendly, likeable guy. Certainly, Paul

had used post-observation conferences and reports in precisely outlining the changes

Chris should make as they worked with one another throughout the year, however, Chris

did not seem to view those changes as non-negotiable. Paul did.

   For example, Paul had been very explicit about the district expectations for writing

objectives during an October pre-observation/planning conference. Paul said,

> Mastery objectives must be on the board. It's required by the county. They can be in two forms…essential questions or 'students will be able to'…For example, students will be able to explain Troy's role in Act I of *Fences*…[it should be] something measurable. The county is offering modules for lesson planning templates for all teachers. When we [CTs] come into the classroom, some kind of

> objective needs to be on the board. If you think just about the mastery objective, the rest [of the lesson] just falls from that, but if you don't, then the lesson tends to fall apart.

Chris did not have a verbal response to these instructions. Overlooking the silence, Paul moved on to asking about how Chris had organized his unit on *Fences.* As it turned out, Chris's silence was most likely an indication that he either did not know what Paul expected to see in terms of a mastery objective, or that he had tuned out when Paul said, "it's required." Chris's failure to write a mastery objective on the board subsequently became a criticism on his next three formal observation reports. The comments in the reports were as follows:

> *Observation Report #1* (10/11/01): The mastery objective was not written on the board, although students knew that they were going to continue reading the play.

> *Observation Report #2* (11/05/01): There was no mastery objective written on the board, just a list of activities.

> *Observation Report #3* (1/09/02): There was no objective for the class written on the board. There was a list of items on the board that read: 'Landscape questions, movie, and film questions.' Mr. Parker did say that the class was going to continue to watch a film called *Cross Creek.*

The steady mention of the objective's absence reflects several dynamics. First, that during the post-observation conferences the absence of the objective was not discussed. The focus in these conferences was typically on student behavior. Thus, Paul and Chris did not walk through possible connections between improved student behavior and having students focus on the learning objective at the beginning of class. Secondly, it seems unlikely that Chris read the observation reports thoroughly, with an eye for what he needed to improve. What Chris shared with me regarding the improvements his CT wanted to see always reflected the conversations I had observed between him and Paul, not necessarily all of the elements included in the observation reports. If Chris indeed

had not thoroughly read the reports, it supports the claim that at least through January 9, 2002, Chris did not fully understand the PAR process, particularly how the formal observation reports served as documentation for the basis of the CT's recommendation regarding whether or not Chris could continue in his job. In this case, then, the CT's mandates went unheeded, at least until the post-observation conference that I observed on January 9, 2002.

Forcing Compliance. By this time Paul knew that he was obligated to have what the district termed as a "courageous conversation" with Chris.   On January 9th, in the only observation that year that made me feel as though I was intruding upon a very private, very personal meeting, Paul told Chris that his job was in jeopardy. As Chris sorrowfully looked on, his CT nervously said,

> I have to tell you that quite honestly I've lost sleep over you because I like you a lot…like you a real lot, but I do have some concerns that I think my likeness for you has stopped me from saying things as bluntly as I need to say them. Uh, I'm thinking that sometimes my message is getting lost. So, what I'm saying is that next semester I need to see some changes. And they're the things that we've talked about. One is classroom management. We can't have the same problems that we saw in the first semester…I think classroom management is something that we can work on together…The big concern I have is in terms of the assignments you create and the expectations you have for the students…especially with your eleventh grade on-level next semester because they have the research paper…and that's going to require a lot of preparation, and I'm here to help you with that.

Paul admitted that he believed that he could have been even more open with Chris first semester. He said, "Some of [my concerns] are coming from the fact that I think that I've…it's my fault, because I don't think I've been as clear with you as I could have been. It's really hard to be honest sometimes, especially with somebody that I really like."

Paul went on to explain that he would have liked to recommend that Chris receive a second year of PAR support, but that the district's budget constraints would possibly eliminate a second year of PAR as an option. Paul discussed how he would argue his case in front of the PAR Panel. He said,

> I am going to fight tooth and nail to have you go into the program for a second year because I think you're coming from outside the county and you're dealing with students that you didn't have to deal with in your student teaching. So basically you're experiencing the mistakes that you should have experienced in student teaching, but you didn't because you had first off, high-level classes, and you had a smaller type of population than you do at Stonegate. So, I think you're being exposed to something that you were not prepared for either through your program or through your student teaching.

However, if Chris could not meet standards by the end of the program and the district deemed that a second year of PAR would not be fiscally feasible, Paul told Chris that

> unfortunately it means that you won't be recommended for rehiring. That's the worse case scenario. I don't think it's going to come to that. I don't want to like ruin your weekend…this why I'm being as blunt as I possibly can now because it's not hopeless yet. What's going to really determine this is the semester...and what's going to happen. I can work more with you…My coming here more often doesn't necessarily mean that I'm watching you more. It means that I really want to get you through this process successfully.

As Paul said this, Chris just silently looked at him, only gesturing once when he removed his glasses and sat them on his desk.

In the next few moments Paul began to explain how he would help Chris meet the district's performance standards. He talked about possibly team teaching with Chris, bringing him to visit English teachers at other schools who taught similar student populations, and planning intensively with him throughout the entire second semester, well past the official ending date of PAR in late March. In addition, Paul planned to attend a department meeting with Chris to ensure that he was scheduled to receive class sets of books that were on a reading level accessible to his students.

After delineating the interventions he had planned, Paul talked more about which standards Chris needed to focus on meeting. He said, "The last thing that I want to see happen is that you don't successfully meet all the standards…Of the four standards that I've seen, the one that I'm the most concerned about is classroom management, and that's Standard Three, [CT reads from the teacher evaluation manual] 'teachers must establish and maintain student learning in a positive learning environment.'" Next, Paul went on to say that he was also concerned that Chris did not have high enough expectations for his students. He said, "you really need to challenge these kids more. I know Stonegate is a tough population, but the fact that they went through a whole semester without having a novel is a problem. Most of the homework I see you giving is really just studying for quizzes. Now, I know it's easy for teachers, especially burnt out teachers to get into the pattern where they don't give homework because kids don't do it, but that's not a reason not to give homework." Chris's only reply was that he had been under the impression that he should not have been giving his ninth grade literacy classes homework because the course was an elective. Paul vowed to set up a meeting with the literacy coordinator to gain some clarity about the structures of the program, which he believed were unclear.

Finally, in the first exchange of words during the meeting, Chris talked briefly about some of his frustrations, while Paul attempted to soften his message and reiterate his commitment to supporting Chris. Paul opened the exchange as follows:

> CT: I didn't mean to dump all this on you, but I really felt like I've been beating myself up for the past six weeks…that I haven't said what I needed to say the way I wanted to say it because I didn't want to hurt your feelings. You know, that's the hard part about this job. That's the part that sucks about this job, but I don't want to make it all gloom and doom. I really think we're going to get through this successfully…Do you have anything that you want to say? I feel like I've let you down.

CP: Oh, no…whatever. Like I said before, I know you gotta do what you gotta do, you know? I'm at the point where I love it (teaching). I want to do it and stuff, but I'm not good.

CT: It's not that…it's just that you're having problems. Serious problems that need to change. And, part of the thing is that Elizabeth County might not be the right match for you…I don't think you need to be out of the classroom. That was never my impression. I do think, though, that there are things that just need to be worked on.

CP: I think my hardest part is just getting…stuff to do. Like everyone tells me things that I can read in a philosophy of education book…proximity…do this, do that, raise your voice, don't do [that], you know? I can read that out of a book, you know? ...But until I got all that stuff from you on *Fences*, I had no idea….without having all that (instructional materials) I feel uncomfortable...Unless I feel confident with what I'm doing, and I'm happy with what I'm doing, I'm not going to do well, you know?

CT: I know it's tough not having read the books, not having a lot of materials…I have all my files for next semester, so I'll be your resource for that. But, you know, a lot of the effort needs to come from your part also in that you have to be consistent with the way you are with the kids. You can't banter with them as much as you do even though you think that builds personal relationships, which in some ways it does…And, you're right, reading stuff in a book, reading things in *The Skillful Teacher* is not what you need right now. What you need right now is the confidence to know that you are in charge of the classroom…Nobody feels good when they come out of the classroom knowing the kids have just beaten the heck out of them. You can go home and feel like crap, or you can become a little bit more self-reflective. And that's part of my job…to help you become more self-reflective, 'what did I do wrong to make the class act that way?' And part of it is establishing the first week of class. I can't tell you how important the first week of class is…I think within the next two or three reports, if I start seeing things I hadn't seen before, I can report that there was growth, that he's really made a turnaround, and then you can probably go on successfully. My concern is if that doesn't happen, what's going to be the next stage…my job is to make sure that (dismissal) doesn't happen…That's where things are at the moment. Is there anything I can do to make you feel better?

CP: I don't know.

Nothing that the CT discussed in this conversation was new information. The only new piece was the threat that if Chris did not comply with what his CT asked him to do, he faced being fired. Although I knew that the CT resorted to this approach partly because

neither the post-observation conferences nor write-ups during the first semester had

resulted in any change in Chris, I still questioned if this tactic was necessary. Chris was

never belligerent, nor openly opposed to change. In my observations of him, it seemed

that he was simply overwhelmed by the large amounts of content he had to cover—much

of which he had never read, and by the incredible amounts of time it took to plan and

grade. During my first year as an English teacher, I was similarly overcome with the

enormity of the job.

Yet, in Chris, Paul saw someone who was not particularly enthralled with the study of

English literature. He saw, instead, a teacher who was more captivated by coaching

students in various sports. Thus, Paul continued to push Chris to separate himself from

his students and to delineate his role as teacher from his role as coach. Guided by his

own deep fascination with literature, Paul could not relate well to Chris. And, as I will

discuss in more detail in the fifth section of this chapter, it was most likely Paul's

inability to identify with Chris *combined with* the fact that Chris had not made

modifications to his practice that pushed Paul to initiate the conversation on January 9th.

However, given that Chris did not display a reluctance to change as much as he seemed

to question what changes to make and to question his own capacity to make changes that

would improve student behavior, I believe that more could have been accomplished in the

meeting if Paul had taken a different approach. What if, for example, Paul had asked

Chris whether he believed his students were capable of learning? And, then, what if he

had prompted Chris to think about what it would take for students to become learners in

his classroom? From the many conversations I had with Chris, I would surmise that he

believed that motivating students to learn was all about teaching them subject matter that

they found interesting, and engaging them in activities that they thought were fun. If that is an accurate assessment of how Chris was thinking, then January 9th could have launched an important discussion between Chris and his CT about whether students can be engaged without necessarily being entertained. They could have begun to unravel ways to take the prescribed curriculum and make it both accessible and engaging for students.

Instead, January 9th marked a turning point for Chris, not in terms of his beliefs, but in terms of his actions. It also marked a turning point in what he started saying to me about his consulting teacher. If Chris had not gotten the message before, he was now clear that he had to get his classes under control or risk termination. In the high school calendar January 9th was just prior to first semester exams. Students took exams for about one week, and then the second semester began. In this district, teachers received a new mixture of students for second semester, with approximately half of their students coming from other English teachers. Thus, while Chris knew some of the students assigned to him for second semester, many of them were new to him, and he was able to make a fresh start. I observed Chris's literacy classes the first three days of the second semester, and the differences in what he did were striking.

Changed Behaviors, Unaltered Beliefs. On January 31, 2002, the first day of the second semester, Chris opened his ninth grade literacy class by putting them in a seating chart. Already, a female student began to protest, saying "See, why you gon' do that?" Written on the board was not a mastery objective, but a clearly defined agenda for class that day, along with the eight reading strategies that he would teach throughout the semester. The agenda on the board read: (1) seating chart, (2) student information, (3)

course expectations/overview, (4) folders, (5) personal letter. Also on the board was a word of the day—"impugn—to challenge the accuracy or honesty of something." Chris handed out folders to each student, and distributed his list of classroom expectations. He said, "This class is a college preparatory class…basically to try to advance your skills—your studying skills. We're expecting everyone in here to go to college. You've been selected to improve your skills and to get into a better college." As he reviewed his expectations, a female student who was not a part of the class walked in. Chris told the class to continue reading over the attendance policy, while he tended to the student. After a brief exchange with the student, she complained loudly, "No, you said I had a 'B!' This is fucked up!" Then, she stormed out of the classroom.

Maintaining his composure, Chris continued reviewing his expectations. He discussed the reading strategies, and how students would be practicing those strategies using texts from their social studies classes. He also explained how the folders would be used, saying that students were required to keep all of their work in the folders, and that the folders would stay in a bin in the classroom. Each week students would be required to list their grades and assignments on the folder, so that they could monitor their progress in the class. Finally, he said that starting Friday a stack of warm-ups would be sitting on the corner of the table near the door, and they were to pick up the warm-ups and complete them each day as they entered the classroom. For the last fifteen minutes of the class, he asked students to write a letter introducing themselves to him, with information about their school and community activities, along with any other interesting facts about themselves. Students worked quietly on the assignment until the end of class.

Chris held fast to his structures throughout the rest of the semester. Indeed, students always had a warm-up waiting for them as they entered class. An agenda for the day was posted on the board. Students utilized the folders to organize their work and record their grades. The seating chart policy was enforced, and students typically worked quietly throughout the class. Chris's impression of the changes he had made for second semester were as follows:

> The first couple of days I was real strict and mean and no fun and lots of work…just to set the tone. I have a good rapport with all the kids, but I kind of wanted to separate myself a little bit more…I do attendance thoroughly now….I don't know. I made a ton of changes, I guess, like organization, I guess, was huge. I planned out for my classes a calendar from the start of semester two, right to Spring Break. So, I kind of had a daily plan as to what I was doing…I had a warm-up everyday for all my classes, which got myself [sic] organized in the classroom, to take attendance and do this and that. I try to vary the activities in the class. So, you know I'd come in, [students] knew they had the warm-up, and they knew we'd jump into something else and then we'd jump into something else, and they all had calendars and everything ahead of time, so they knew where we'd be, what we were supposed to do.

When I asked him about ways that Paul had influenced these changes, he said,

> Paul gave me a lot of suggestions second semester as to what to do. I made all the changes and stuff that he wanted to see, and he was all happy and 'oooh la-la!' He thought the warm-up was real good. He just wanted classroom management was his big thing. He wanted me to separate myself [from the] students [as] an authoritative figure. He liked the fact that I got warm-ups in all my classes now. They know what they're doing, they have expectations. And, you know, he sat down with me to do a calendar for the research paper, and I already had it done, so he was all happy.

In the tone of what Chris said, it is evident that his attitude toward his consulting teacher had started to change. He expressed a cynicism that he had not shown to me before. Nonetheless, he admitted that his classes were running much more smoothly second semester, describing the semester by saying it was "awesome! A lot better than first semester, for sure. I think kids know what to expect now. Everyday they come in, they do

this, do that, which is great to know, you know? Things have gone a lot better." Yet, there was still some sense in which he believed that the different mixture of students had just as much to do with the better behavior than the changes he made. He said,

> Last semester, it's probably my fault, too…there were basically those five kids that I remember, right off the top of my head…just behavior and no attention span or anything…always up and moving. So this time, you know, a lot of them want to learn. You know, they're doing all the work for the most part, and I think they're learning. They're taking notes in class and stuff, which I didn't see at all last semester. And, you know, they want to learn. They're asking questions and stuff.

Chris could have benefited from an analysis of his instructional practices. If he could have reflected upon ways that providing his students with structures resulted in more time on task in the classroom, he could have had a springboard for examining his beliefs about student engagement. Furthermore, he could have looked more deeply at whether the students were indeed learning, or just behaving. However, because his CT had drawn from bureaucratic sources of authority, threatening the twenty-two-year-old teacher with the loss of his job, Chris had no impetus to reflect on how the changes were occurring in his classroom. When he saw the students on task, he simply exhaled, relieved to be out from under the threat of termination. In addition, he had found no middle ground between being "real strict and mean and no fun and lots of work" and building a rapport with his students while engaging them in the district's curriculum. The threat of termination had changed his behaviors, but it had not really altered his beliefs.

Perceptions of the CT's Power Kindle Distress

Until now this discussion has centered around how the CTs' reliance on particular sources of authority defined their roles as evaluators, and thus influenced how their first-year teacher clients responded to them. While the case of Alexis Burton seems to fit in

the category of "the CTs' evaluative role," it was not necessarily how her CT defined the

role that seemed most influential in the way Alexis responded, but rather the way the

district defined the CT's role. Regardless of how positive Karen Carter had been with

Alexis, how much Karen had reassured Alexis, and relied on professional sources of

authority in working with her, Alexis still viewed Karen as an evaluator. As a result, she

never confided in Karen about how miserable she really had been during her first year of

teaching. Unarguably the year had been tough, but Karen was shocked when just one

week after she and Alexis had successfully team taught a lesson preparing students to

read *Antigone*, Alexis suffered somewhat of a breakdown.

An Emotional Eruption. The emotional collapse occurred on the day of Alexis's third

formal observation, an observation that happened to be unannounced. Her CT had

thought that it would be a perfect time to observe her ninth grade honors class. She had

believed Alexis would be smoothly moving forward in the *Antigone* unit, propelled by

the momentum of a very successful team teaching experience the week before. Karen

said, "when I walked in, I had absolutely no sense that she was upset that I was there. I

had no feeling about my presence being part of this." However, Alexis felt that this

moment had been building for some time. In a special interview that I requested after

Alexis told me about this incident, she explained what happened that day. In reporting

this conversation, I have broken up the monologue to lend greater clarity to this retelling.

However, in actuality, I asked very few questions and said very few words. She exposed

her thoughts and emotions with little prompting from me. According to Alexis,

> everything was really getting very, very overwhelming. It was like, what am I
> doing? Why am I doing this? O.k., I need to improve this, need to improve
> that…everything was really blurry…like, I didn't know what I was doing. I didn't
> know if it was correct…it just didn't feel like teaching, not that I knew what

teaching felt like. …Things would get so overwhelming, like the paperwork, coming up with lessons, and trying to get the curriculum down…I couldn't sort everything out…And I know like Karen tried to help me. We team taught, and that was a good experience…She modeled for me like [the] mastery objectives…telling me what they're learning and why they're learning it…but I needed to practice a little more of that just to get a feeling of how I'm supposed to get a mastery objective out of the indicators…it's confusing.

The sense of being overwhelmed, the nervousness and the agitation were all present in her words and in her demeanor as she told me her story.

Next, Alexis talked about why she had not talked to Karen about what she was experiencing. She said, "I don't know…it's like I see her as the evaluator, and that's how I saw her even though she helps me out…it's still an evaluation. You know?" In addition to believing that it would be inappropriate to confide in Karen, Alexis had not been pleased with the amount of attention that the school-based mentor who was originally assigned to her could give. Alexis said,

My mentor really wasn't…well, it didn't meet my expectations…you know, maybe it's asking too much, but just meet once a week to go over lesson plans, what went well, why did it go well, maybe where to improve for next week. You know, I'm sitting here trying to get through my grading, get through my clutter, and everything keeps piling up. I really didn't have an opportunity to stop and pause, like 'o.k. I really see what I did wrong,' [or] you know, 'this is how I could improve classroom management.'

In addition to having a mentor who fell short of her expectations, Alexis did not find her resource teacher to be much more useful. He would peer into her classroom, but rarely gave her feedback about how to improve. She said of him, "He says he's like he's observed outside [the classroom door] or listened, but when you do that, and you don't talk to me about it, then how will I know what I'm doing wrong…" Without the sense that she could confide in anyone, and with all of her responsibilities as a teacher seeming to converge at once, without giving her a moment to catch her breath, Alexis was ready to

burst. Karen could not have been caught more off guard. Karen said, "Her response to the way she's seeing her job did not really meet my sense of how things were going… I thought things weren't perfect. And, I also thought when we team taught that she was really excited about continuing, and I thought it was a very productive day."

In fact, the teaming had been productive, and had provided Alexis with more than the usual preparation to conduct her unit. Alexis said "everything was going pretty well that week because I was able to get my lessons together, and I was a little bit more prepared. I had my whole *Antigone* unit together." Then, she saw Karen walk into the back of the classroom. It was also the day that yearbook pictures had been distributed, and many students were buzzing about how they looked or exchanging pictures with one another. Alexis said, "…And me, wanting things to go perfect because this is evaluation now. So I'm like, we have students coming in late, and I'm like 'where's your pass?' And I remember [the student] getting an attitude with me, and that kind of ticked me off a bit." Then, there was an issue with the worksheet that Alexis was giving to students. She had borrowed it from another teacher, and she was a bit confused about the correct answers to a section in which students had to place events from the play in chronological order. Alexis explained, "So, when I was attacked with the question [about the correct answer] in fourth period, I was like, 'hold on, I can't remember.' So, it was just like, 'oh no, I should have written it down'…that was it for me, I guess." Alexis could not recall much more of what happened after that, other than the fact that she burst into tears, and eventually left the classroom.

Karen helped me to fill in the details. She said,

> They were going over a worksheet based upon, I forget what act or scene. I didn't even have a copy of that, and I was scripting at my laptop. And, my perception

was that all of a sudden I heard her voice kind of change, and then a couple of
kids were questioning--this was in her honors class, 4th period—a couple of kids
were questioning something and my perception was…that the real problem was
that she didn't know the answer as well as she might have…All of a sudden as I
am scripting, I was like shocked. Alexis started to cry. Now, she said 'there are
things going on in my life that have nothing to do with this.' This is what she said
to the class…'that are upsetting to me.' I have no idea that that is true, or what
they were. And, then she just lost it. She didn't like run out of the room. What
was fortunate was that the students were getting ready to do a scene from the play,
which she had organized…they had togas…nice touches. I told her to go take
care of herself. I got up, and I said 'just understand that your teacher is a human
being and something is upsetting her. I have no idea what it is, but I think that we
can all pull together and make this thing work. And, I really expect you to do
that.' And my first thought very honestly was I needed to take care of these kids
because they were probably very upset. And, there was nothing overt that I could
see that caused this reaction. My sense was, and I've been in moments too in the
classroom where all of a sudden if a kid's asking a question, especially as a new
teacher, you feel challenged…And I don't know what was boiling inside her.

After a while, Alexis returned to the class to wrap it up. Changing her original plans,

Karen stayed during fifth period to make sure that Alexis was o.k., and then met with her

during her sixth period planning hour.   According to Karen,

> That's when she told me that she was going to resign. I didn't know it was at that
> level.   The first thing she said was 'my family is my most important thing,' and
> she told me that her aunt and her grandmother are very supportive and they really
> wanted her to stick it out, but she really does not want to spend the next…even if
> she gets better, she doesn't want to spend her life not being happy. And she was
> honestly very strong about not wanting to continue then.

All that Alexis can remember about her meeting with Karen was the feeling that "[she]

just wanted to go home." Alexis said, "I don't remember exactly all that we talked about.

I guess we talked about me quitting…That evening I went to talk to my resource teacher

and asked who I would talk to about resigning, and he was shocked, too." I asked Alexis

why everyone was caught off guard when she expressed how much trouble she was

having in her job. She said, "I didn't really vocalize it to anybody that I was really having

a *really* difficult time, you know? That's stuff I keep to myself. I don't know if it's a

pride thing or what, but I just like to work out my problems on my own."

After discussing her plans with her principal later that week, Alexis decided to stick it

out at least until the end of the year. Alexis said the principal told her that, "it was easier

for them if I stayed 'til the end of the year, and if there was anything that she could do to

help me, maybe another setting or more support…like a junior high school, she would be

able to help me." Alexis said that she was also motivated to stay until the end of the year

by her resource teacher, who seemed to be encouraging her mid-year resignation. Alexis

said, "it felt like he was pushing me to leave in a way. So I was like 'how dare you?'

[Alexis laughs.] I signed up, and so I'm staying…I decided that I was going to try this

new semester as if it was a brand new [year], [a] new start."

Perceiving Bureaucratic Authority. What strikes me about the breakdown that Alexis

experienced is that her consulting teacher had been extremely positive first semester,

given the types of challenges Alexis faced with classroom management, assessment, and

knowledge of the curriculum. The two formal observation reports prior to this third

formal observation were dripping (almost surprisingly so) with positive comments about

the fact that mastery objectives were displayed on the board, the fact that she made use of

rubrics during peer editing, and that she knew the subject matter she was teaching. Karen

had also identified areas where improvement was necessary. For example, she suggested

that Alexis improve her transitions from topic to topic, make better use of wait time, and

call on a wider variety of students. Yet, both reports ended by reiterating Alexis's

commitment to continuous improvement. Thus, even though her consulting teacher had

been as positive as she possibly could have been, and even though Alexis respected her

consulting teacher as someone who was committed to her professional growth, the evaluative position of the CT still overshadowed all of the assistance when it came down to Alexis sharing her honest feelings of disappointment and despair about her first year of teaching.

Alexis was not the only participant in my study who was constantly mindful of the consulting teacher's power to evaluate. I asked all of my participants how the consulting teacher's presence changed the dynamics of what happened in their classrooms, or more specifically how the CT's presence changed what they said or did. Chris Parker responded that "I might do something differently if [the CT] is here. I might not try something new. I remember the last time [the CT] came, I was going to try something new, and I wasn't sure if it was going to be good or bad, so I held off until the next day…I won't do as much joking with [students] if he's around because he told me to work on it." Changes did not only occur with teachers who were struggling in their practice. Even Michelle Newman, who was quite proficient, possessed a constant awareness of her CT's evaluative power. According to Michelle, "sometimes I'm more aware of my word choice. For instance, yesterday we were doing the opening scene of *Romeo and Juliet*, and there are a couple of very sexual lines. In my earlier classes we had laughed about it and we did in the period she was in as well, but I was much more conscious of choosing my words, and how I was going to say it, and where I was going to laugh, so I felt that was more contrived." Chad Wolf also discussed the ever-present sense that the CT represented the district's eyes and ears. He said, "[Vivian] does a great job of being constructive and stuff like that, but we all know that's just sort of the Trojan horse in the sheep's clothing for the county's program, and I get that….I get it that that's

just sort of the mask for the fact that what it really is, is a review program to see who they should keep and who they shouldn't."

These sentiments led me back to the longstanding tension between the formative and summative purposes of supervision. Can supervisors take on the role of both developer and evaluator without threatening the trusting relationship that should exist for teachers to be honest with them? Again, it seemed to be the primary source of authority used by the consulting teacher that partially determined how well the CT's roles of helper and evaluator meshed. Chris Parker's CT relied primarily on bureaucratic and technical-rational sources of authority, thus Chris's instructional practices were narrowed (Sergiovanni, 1992). He would not try a new approach if his consulting teacher walked through the door for fear that a misstep would add to the CT's tally of reasons his contract should not be renewed. None of the other participants expressed a reluctance to try something new in the presence of the consulting teacher because they perceived their CTs as their advocates. The fact that Michelle did not want to have the appearance of encouraging sexual humor, or the fact that Chad "may cuss a little less" when the CT is present is not the same as Chris's disinclination to try new strategies in front of his CT. On the one hand, you have teachers who want to put their best foot forward when another adult is in the room, and on the other hand, you have a teacher who is so distrustful of his CT that he will not use the CT to help him refine his instructional strategies.

Yet, even beyond the source of authority used primarily by the CT, it seemed that the first-year teacher's proficiency from the outset of the year also had a part in determining the extent to which the first-year teacher could perceive assistance as the CT's chief intent. Michelle, Nym and Chad did not have to fear a recommendation to the PAR Panel

for non-renewal of their contracts. The struggles that Chris and Alexis faced in their first year of teaching gave them something to fear. For Chris, the threat of termination was explicitly communicated by his CT. For Alexis, the threat of termination was perceived because of her CT's power to recommend it. Because Chris's CT relied primarily on bureaucratic and technical-rational sources of authority, the threat meant that Chris narrowed his instructional practices. Because Alexis's CT relied primarily on professional sources of authority, Alexis never felt a press to narrow her practices. However, her perception of her CT's bureaucratic authority meant that she was not comfortable enough to admit her mistakes (e.g., failing to make adequate preparations to address students' questions about their assignment), and she did not trust her CT enough to acknowledge her feelings of defeat.

Sources of Authority in the CTs' Evaluative Roles

In defining their evaluative roles, all of the CTs revealed multiple faces of supervision to their first-year teacher clients. As their relationships with their clients began, the CTs seemed to draw from more bureaucratic sources of authority by introducing their functions with the first-year teachers in a way that lacked depth. The imbalance between what the CTs knew and what the first-year teachers knew about PAR set up an unspoken hierarchy and an imbalance of power between the CTs and the first-year teachers. It is important for me to note that the abbreviated way in which the consulting teachers seemed to explain their roles did not reflect any desire on their parts to keep PAR in a shroud of mystique. They meant no harm. On the contrary, they were trying to avoid overwhelming their first-year teacher clients with the details of PAR. As one CT noted, "I keep the first meeting very brief…I am really cognizant of not hitting them with too

much." However, I assert that the lack of detailed information did more to add anxiety for the first-year teachers than reduce it. It is also true that a couple of the first-year teachers seemed oblivious to the consulting teachers' role in the beginning. In that sense, ignorance was bliss. However, several months into the school year, when these teachers realized that they were not meeting all of the district's performance standards, their lack of clarity about the PAR process stirred up deep anxieties, and intensified their perceptions of the CT as primarily an evaluator.

The CTs continued to underscore their evaluative roles by a strict insistence that their teachers plan lessons in the format prescribed by John Sapphire's *The Skillful Teacher*. In so doing, the CTs drew primarily from technical-rational sources of authority. The result was that several of the first-year teachers wrote objectives, and conducted warm-ups and summarizers solely for the benefit of their CT. Such a response fits with Sergiovanni's (1992) claim that when supervisors draw mainly from technical-rational sources of authority, "with proper monitoring, teachers respond as technicians executing predetermined steps. Performance is narrowed" (p. 207). With an undue amount of attention to structuring lessons in prescribed ways, the first-year teachers on the whole[9] did not spend ample time with their CTs expanding their use of various strategies or using student work to analyze the effectiveness of the strategies they used. Their evaluations were based primarily on observable behaviors during formal observations, and thus their main goal in working with the consulting teachers was learning to demonstrate those behaviors.

---

[9] The one exception seems to be Michelle Newman who was able to work with her CT on expanding her instructional strategies because she clearly met all six of the district's performance standards, virtually from the outset of the school year.

In discussing this aspect of the first-year teachers' responses to supervision, I do not mean to demonize the principles in Sapphire's book. In fact, I believe *The Skillful Teacher* offers a nice synthesis of research on best practices for teachers, and the district's reliance on the text did in some sense achieve the goal of prompting teachers throughout the district to use the same language when talking about instruction. The book's shortfall, however, is its emphasis on teacher behaviors, particularly at a time when research is turning more to a focus on student achievement. The district compounded the problem by using the text as a prescription for improved teacher practice, rather than as a resource to improve teacher practice. The CTs' mandates to structure lessons in the prescriptive way yielded only superficial and momentary changes in the behaviors of the teachers.

The CT's reliance on bureaucratic sources of authority was most profound in the case of Chris Parker. Not only did Chris respond to the threat of termination by narrowing his instructional practices, but he also began to distrust his CT. Thus, the CT's use of bureaucratic authority did more to diminish his capacity to be viewed by Chris as a source for help than it did to change Chris's beliefs about his capacity to increase student engagement and learning.

If there was any place in the way the CTs defined their evaluative roles where I documented a CT drawing somewhat on professional sources of authority, it was in the case of Chad Wolf. Vivian Conley understood that trying to force Chad into teaching according to the district's prescriptive lesson plan structure would have built a wall between them that would have prevented her from helping him at all. Instead, she showed him how the underlying purposes of the strategies in *The Skillful Teacher* could

be achieved in his patterns system if he made some modifications. In a strategy used by supervisors who draw from professional sources of authority, she gave Chad the discretion to choose how he would achieve skillful teaching goals using his approach to instruction (Sergiovanni, 1992). The result was that he did reflect on his system, and he did make lasting changes within that system so that it could be clearer for his students.

Chad's CT also insisted that he show her that he could differentiate instruction, and that he could use structures suggested in *The Skillful Teacher*. However, Chad did not perceive her insistence as a threat. From his perspective, Vivian came to him openly and honestly, as a colleague, with the standards that she had to document. He trusted her enough to be frank with her about the ephemeral nature of the behaviors she would witness during his formal observations, and he deeply respected her capacity to see the value he placed in his approach. I believe that Vivian could have pushed Chad farther by engaging him in the analysis of his students' work as a way of gathering data about the effectiveness of the patterns system. However, she was the single critical voice in the vast sea of Chad's supporters. The fact that the administrators at the school site were satisfied with Chad's teaching combined with the fact that she had a limited amount of time to work with Chad seemed to dissuade her from pressing him to stretch his thinking about using a wider repertoire of instructional strategies. Vivian's approach with Chad did not so much narrow his instructional practice (in the way that Sergiovanni claims bureaucratic approaches to supervision typically affect teachers) as much as it just did not significantly expand his practice.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not admit that how the CTs used various sources of authority did not tell the complete story of the way their clients responded to them. In

fact, the first-year teachers' own perceptions of the CTs' power (by virtue of the CT's position) also came to bear on the way the teachers responded. This was particularly the case for the two teachers who believed that they faced the real prospect of dismissal. Thus, the first-year teachers to whom PAR was aimed at providing the most assistance stood to be the most inhibited in their work or dialogue with the consulting teachers out of the fear that they could lose their jobs.

<u>The CTs' Abilities to Identify with the First-Year Teachers</u>

So far, I have argued that the source of supervisory authority the CTs drew upon as demonstrated in the frequency of their visits, the nature of their feedback, and the ways they defined their supportive and evaluative roles all contributed to the way in which the working relationship developed between them and their first-year teacher clients. I will now continue this line of argument, adding a fifth element that seemed to influence the development of that relationship. That element is the extent to which the CTs identified with their clients. I talked with the first-year teachers about the similarities and differences between how they perceived their consulting teachers' as teachers and how they viewed themselves as teachers. I found that in the case in which the first-year teacher had difficulty describing what kind of teacher his consulting teacher must have been, it signaled that the teacher had difficulty connecting with his CT who was supposed to be his "peer."

CTs Helping First-Year Teachers See Them As Teachers

The working relationship between the CTs and their clients seemed to be the strongest when the CTs communicated that they were fellow colleagues who were not far removed from the classroom. Vivian Conley, the veteran CT who was assigned Michelle, Nym

and Chad said that she emphasized the fact that she was a teacher as soon as she met her

clients. She said,

> my first word that I say to them is, you know, my name and 'I'm a teacher.' And,
> then I explain to them that this is a three-year job, that I came right from the
> classroom, I will go back to the classroom when the job is over… and the reason
> this is important is because teachers learn from teachers. So, what I see and what I
> talk to them about and the suggestions I give them and the opinions I offer them
> come from my experience as a classroom teacher.

Sergiovanni (1992) argues that one source of professional authority is "informed craft

knowledge and personal expertness." When Vivian Conley told her clients that she was a

teacher and that she drew upon her own experiences in giving them guidance, she was

setting herself up as more of a peer than an evaluator. She was someone who had just

been where they are, and she was relying on her experience in schools like theirs as

opposed to de-contextualized scientific knowledge to guide them.

Both Michelle and Nym could express ways in which Vivian was a teacher much like

themselves. For instance, Michelle said,

> For the most part, she holds her students very accountable for absolutely
> everything, and I would say that I'm the same way because I don't want to lose
> people along the way. For instance, I know that a lot of people don't like the idea
> of giving daily quizzes, and she fully supported that because she knew if I lost
> people at Chapter 4, there was no way that I could expect them to be with me at
> Chapter 12. So, that was very helpful. Also, I wouldn't say I over plan, but I plan
> things very specifically, and I would say that she does as well. I've seen some of
> her rubrics, and they're very specific. I find that I get better results from students
> if I have more specific rubrics, and I think she does as well.

For Michelle, when Vivian shared her instructional materials and gave her advice about

how to motivate students to keep pace with the reading of novels, she saw in Vivian a

teacher who had faced the same challenges that she faced. She also saw someone who

valued clarity in instruction the way that she did, and who could thus really appreciate her

approach to instruction. Nym on the other hand, could not think of any particular lesson

plans from her teaching that Vivian had given him, but he still believed that she

approached teaching similar to the way that he did. He said,

> She hasn't given me any lesson plans. She hasn't told me what she did with her
> classes, but basically, judging from her comments with what I do, I think she does
> pretty much what I do. Or, at least she attempts to do so, but she says she's never
> done that with regular students…when I get students to talk about things like
> Marxism or psychoanalysis…things like that. As a matter of fact, I think that
> that's what impresses her—the fact that I don't change the curriculum simply
> because the students are regular…I give them the same thing."

Nym discussed how impressed he believed Vivian was during one of his unannounced

formal evaluations when he had engaged students in an activity to understand some

aspects of Marxism. He created an internet company, and the students were his workers.

Half of the students were given a piece of paper—some containing words, others having

punctuation marks, and some were blank—and the other half of the students were

observers. The students with the papers had the task of working together to arrange the

papers from left to write in a way that made poetic and grammatical sense. Of the

experience, Nym noted that,

> obviously, since they didn't know the end result, there was mass confusion and
> rebellion. [The observers] wrote down whether there was a ringleader, whether
> there was a revolt, whether there was unhappiness, whether there was alienation.
> With this, I started to discuss Marx notion of the proletariat versus the bourgeois,
> and this notion of the alienation of the worker…and that lesson went extremely
> well…it was very complex, and yet the exercise was so engaging that the students
> bought into it. Initially when I told [Vivian] I wanted to do stuff like this with
> regulars, she was a little hesitant, worrying that I may discourage my students and
> turn them off by demanding too much. And, I didn't take her advice! [laughter].
> So, when she saw that it succeeded, I think that ever since then she kind of trusts
> me…I think ever since then, she's looked favorably on my lessons.

In this sense, while Nym believed that in many ways Vivian was similar to him as a

teacher, he also found that in the one major way that they could have been different, *he*

contributed something to *her* understanding about teaching and learning. This is

important because it shows the consulting teacher and first-year teacher in a relationship

in which they learn from one another as professionals, rather than the consulting teacher

as someone who is the sole source of knowledge.

Chad Marks, who also worked with Vivian Conley, stands somewhat as an outlier. Of

the possible similarities between his teaching and Vivian's, Chad said, "it's probably not

similar. I mean, but only because I really don't know anybody's whose is. We have a

good rapport, I think. She's very helpful…but the biggest problem with the way I teach is

that no one gets it. [In one sense] it's very traditional—modeled after the university

system, [in another sense] it's experimental…based solely on what I know about

writing." Thus, even though Chad did not draw similarities between his teaching and

Vivian's, he still saw her as another teacher who could be helpful to him.

Alexis Burton could identify a lot with her CT. Alexis said,

> I think our expectations are pretty much the same…I think that she would set high
> expectations, and so do I…following through with those expectations may be my
> weakness…making sure that students can meet my expectations….She's really
> thorough. So I can imagine that she made sure that she understood what they [the
> students] were learning…She seems to be a teacher who used a variety of
> instructive tools to get her lesson across…that's a very positive thing that I've
> seen. She's always offering ideas of different ways I can present notes or do a
> group project…she's just full of wonderful ideas for doing things a variety of
> ways.

Alexis saw her CT as a role model in many ways. She believed that in some ways she

was working to become the type of teacher that Karen Carter had been. This served to

add an endearing quality to their relationship. Clearly, Alexis respected Karen as an

effective educator.

When the First-Year Teacher Does Not View the CT as a Fellow Teacher

Chris Parker, on the other hand, was not sure about the kind of teacher his consulting

teacher, Paul Simms, had been. He seemed to think about it for the first time when I put

the question to him. Chris said,

> I don't really know. I haven't thought about it. I guess he told me he saw a lot of
> the same stuff in me that happened to him when he first started teaching. So, in
> one sense that kind of relieves me because other people went through it, and here
> he is evaluating me. It seems like he has more of a love for English. I mean, I
> enjoy English and all, but I'm more into the philosophy and analysis and critical
> thinking and stuff. He comes up with all these great ideas, he's read all this stuff,
> you know, and analyzed it, which is awesome. I wish I was like that. Maybe
> after teaching it, I'll get that excited.

At first, Chris seemed to express comfort in the fact that Paul had told him that he had

experienced challenges similar to those that Chris was experiencing in his first year of

teaching. However, when Chris said, "and here he is evaluating me," the tone of the

remark did not strike me like that tone that a person would take if he believed that his CT

had surmounted the obstacles of his early years of teaching. It sounded instead as if

Chris questioned how a person who had also endured the problems he faced could now

sit in judgment of him. Next, Chris talked about Paul's love for English. Although he

spoke of it in positive terms, I still had the sense that the enthusiasm Chris perceived Paul

to have about English was somehow a mismatch for the way that Chris viewed the

subject—most likely due to the fact that Paul expressed such excitement over literary

works to which Chris had not been exposed.

Next, Chris talked to me about Paul as a classroom teacher. He said,

> I have no idea what he'd do in the classroom. He's more, again, he's coming after
> teaching for so long, so it looks like he's a lot more organized than I am. I'm sure
> I'll be more organized next year. The other thing is he seems kind of shy, which
> can be the total opposite of how he is in the classroom, you know? Like, there's a
> teacher in this department, he's real shy when you talk to him, [but] you go into

the classroom and there's complete order…control. They're not loud, they're not talking.

It is noteworthy that overall, Chris did not know what kind of teacher Paul was. Not knowing meant that Chris could have been unable to see the connections between the advice Paul gave him and the applicability of that advice in a real classroom. At the very least it meant that Chris did not know if the advice could work with the students *he* taught. Chris once mentioned the fact that Paul "taught AP (Advanced Placement) at a high profile school" might prompt him to expect too much from Chris who had "all of the lower levels." Thus, Chris did not see Paul as someone who had necessarily had teaching experiences, specifically with the challenging population of students, similar to what Chris faced at Stonegate High School.

The second striking comment was Chris's perception that Paul was shy. The way Chris perceived this personality trait is significant because one of Paul's criticisms of Chris throughout the year had focused on Chris's "laid back" style. Paul believed that Chris was too friendly with his students. Chris's perception that Paul was shy meant that he could have easily dismissed Paul's claims as those of a person who was unable or disinterested in building a rapport with students. Although Chris spun it in a positive way (by saying that a shy teacher can still have good control of his classes), I still believe that he questioned the validity of Paul's advice based on the fact that they were such different people. Additionally, as I will discuss in greater detail in the next section of this chapter, Paul found little support from school-based supervisors in many of the recommendations he made to Chris. The fact that Chris saw Paul as the sole person who told him to be (for example) less friendly with his students, combined with the mismatch between what Chris and Paul valued made the advice Paul gave lose significance in Chris's eyes,

especially as that advice became more and more removed from the way that Chris wanted to teach.

Connections Between Sources of Supervisory Authority and Identifying with Supervisees

As a participant in the American Educational Research Association's Division K Graduate Student Seminar in April 2002, I had the opportunity to review a portion of my findings with other doctoral students for their analysis. One of the students, whose name I cannot recall, said to me "This program is called *Peer* Assistance and Review. Did any one of your teachers view their consulting teacher as a peer?" The answer to her inquiry was "no." Clearly, in all the meetings that I attended between the consulting teachers and the first-year teachers there was never a sense in which the first-year teachers were completely free to let their guards down. After all, the person sitting across the table was not only there to help, but to evaluate.

However, there was a strikingly higher comfort level between Vivian Conley and her clients as well as between Karen Carter and Alexis, than there was between Paul Simms and Chris Parker. I would argue that part of the comfort level that four of the five first-year teacher participants achieved with their consulting teachers was due to the fact that they perceived their CTs as colleagues who had recently experienced what they were now experiencing, who were for the most part the kind of teachers that they were, and who had a realistic and valid perspective about strategies that could work best within their school contexts. In other words, four of the teachers in this study could identify with their CTs, and their CTs could likewise identify with them. The common values, the common experiences and the common perspectives the CTs and first-year teachers shared served as the basis for a working relationship in which ideas could be exchanged in an

environment that was not completely free of apprehension, but that was at the very least replete with mutual respect. While the match of personalities and values between these CTs and their clients in some ways occurred due to the luck of the draw, I would argue that the CTs themselves, by showing their clients what kind of teachers they were, inspired a relationship with their clients based on a sense of professionalism. In so doing, the two CTs drew upon professional sources of supervisory authority, approaching their clients not so much as subordinates, but as partners in a quest to improve teaching and learning.

Sharing the Supervisory Function with School-Based Supervisors

The final element that influenced the relationship between the consulting teachers and their clients is the way that the consulting teacher compared to and collaborated (or did not collaborate) with those at the school site who also supervised the first-year teachers. When I use the term collaboration, I'm referring not only to having regular meetings with assistant principals, resource teachers (department chairs), or others involved in supervision. I'm also referring to coming to some kind of consensus with these other stakeholders about how to best help the first-year teacher.   I will begin with a description of the way many of the first-year teachers compared their CTs to others who supervised or assisted them. Next, I will discuss an example of the way that too many sources of assistance served to overwhelm rather than support one of the first-year teachers. Finally, I will move to an analysis of what occurred when the CTs and the school-based supervisors gave the first-year teachers mixed messages.

The CTs' Provision of More Instructional Assistance than School-Based Supervisors

Clearly, as compared to anyone at the school site, the CTs provided the first-year teachers with more instructional assistance. I frequently asked the first-year teachers to delineate the roles of the resource teachers (department chairs), the CTs, the mentors and staff development teachers in working with them. For Michelle, a difference between her CT and her resource teacher was the amount of time the CT had to spend. Michelle said, "The thing I find about [my resource teacher] is that she's so busy that, not that I don't feel that she's welcoming and open to questions, but I feel like she has her own things to do, and if I can figure it out on my own, I should." Michelle also commented that her resource teacher had been supportive of her in matters pertaining to student and parent complaints. For instance, she had to work with her resource teacher when a student wanted to appeal a failing grade in her class that was based on a high number of absences. Thus, the resource teacher seemed to help Michelle with administrative concerns, but not necessarily instructional ones.

Nym Oh seemed to have a similar experience, with the exception of getting his resource teacher's help with curriculum matters. He said,

> My resource teacher] helps me keep on track with the curriculum…and she makes sure that all the 12th grade teachers are finishing up the curriculum in a timely manner. And, if we're not, she always has suggestions as to how to make the projects maybe a one-day project…maybe an in-class write as opposed to a full-blown essay. She makes suggestions like that. I haven't gotten any materials from her, but materials are readily available. She tells me where they are.

For Nym, the resource teacher served as someone who enforced the district's policy on coverage of the curriculum. The suggestions he can remember receiving from his resource teacher surrounded increasing the speed of covering the curriculum rather than increasing student understanding or achievement. This stands in stark contrast to the

conversations with his consulting teacher when he analyzed the scripts from his class to detect ways that he could better structure his classes for students.

In addition to having resource teachers, the first-year teachers had mentors to whom they could go for support. According to Chad, his mentor teacher was "just there if you need him." He further noted that mentors were there "if you need stuff. For instance, I had a question one time about how to log in to the interim system, so he could answer that question for me…[and] you can talk to them confidentially." Nym also consulted his mentor about the printing and distribution of interim grade reports, as well as other district policies regarding students' loss of credit for exceeding the number of allowable class absences. Nym said his mentor helped him with, "practical things...like when to give interims, how to fill out the interims…what books can be taught at the regular level as opposed to an honors level…what the timeline for the research paper should be…how many days you need in the computer lab to complete a four-page assignment, [and] what to do when a student LCs [loses credit in a class]." Chris Parker said that he and his mentor "worked [together] a lot at the beginning. Now we just kinda check up on each other. But, it's not a whole lot of mentoring in the sense that it's a lot of being friendly, making sure that everything's o.k., and then giving me help with materials…She's made the transition a lot easier." Thus, mentors seemed to be friendly faces who assisted the first-year teachers with implementing policies specific to the building or district. Chris Parker's mentor did provide him with instructional materials, but he did not discuss whether his mentor observed his classes, allowed him to observe her classes, or helped him with lesson planning.

The other building-level supervisor the first-year teachers had were their on-site staff development teachers. Rather than providing the first-year teachers with individual classroom assistance, the staff development teachers seemed to spend more time coordinating school, department, or committee meetings. Of his staff development teacher, Chad said, "she coordinates any department wide or school wide staff development events…I'm getting started on another degree, so I needed information on that, and so I went to her for that. So anything that relates to getting signed up for classes, she's kind of like a liaison." In a similar vein, Michelle noted that, "I've never used her. However, on April 15th the ninth grade, we're all getting staff development subs and spending the day doing something…I don't know what that something is." She also said that the staff development teachers at her school coordinated monthly meetings for new teachers in which they would read and discuss a book. Michelle said that

> the intention [of reading the book] was to discuss an issue. On the whole I think it's been a positive experience…it's where I get a lot of information that maybe I don't get from [my resource teacher]. The things that haven't been so helpful…I'm tired of being taught. I'm tired of going to committee meetings where they're teaching how they want me to teach. I like discussing things you would do in the classroom, but I could probably use that hour more effectively."

Thus, although the staff development teachers at Michelle's school attempted to develop somewhat of a study group for the new teachers, in Michelle's estimate the discussions did not provide the content or level of depth that she deemed to be useful in her instruction. There was also a sense in which these sessions tried to indoctrinate teachers (much in the way the district used *The Skillful Teacher*) rather than engage teachers in the type of critical thought that would expand their practices. Overall, none of the school-based supervisors seemed to provide the first-year teachers with the same level of individual assistance as did the consulting teachers.

The CTs' Provision of More Frequent, Accurate Feedback than School-Based Supervisors

As I discussed earlier in the chapter, the frequency of the CTs' visits seemed to have a

very positive influence on the relationship that developed between the CTs and their

clients. The first-year teachers particularly appreciated having CTs when they compared

the quality and quantity of feedback they received from the CTs with the lack thereof

from school-based supervisors. For example, Michelle recounted the differences between

her consulting teacher and her supervising assistant principal in terms of the timeliness

and value of the feedback. Michelle said,

> I appreciate [Vivian] the most because as I mentioned before she sees me the most
> frequently and knows my routines, how I do things, what the big picture is,
> whereas [the assistant principal] has only seen me once. It was only for half an
> hour, and she chose a period where we were watching part of a court scene from
> *To Kill a Mockingbird*. I felt like, 'Oh, great. She just thinks I'm just showing a
> movie.' We were actually doing a whole jury deliberation during the entire thing,
> but she left before that started. And, actually we haven't even had our follow-up
> conference, so I don't even know what she thinks about it. So, the longer we wait,
> the less powerful her words become because we both lose perspective on what
> was going on.

Michelle noted that the assistant principal's observation had occurred 2 ½ weeks earlier,

a period of time that made the classroom visit increasingly foggy in both Michelle's mind

and that of her assistant principal. It also bothered Michelle that the one time her

assistant principal observed, she did not get a full picture of what was happening in

Michelle's classroom. Without holding a pre-observation conference in which Michelle

could have explained what she was doing with the movie, and without providing an

opportunity for immediate follow-up with Michelle, the assistant principal had only seen

students watching a movie, without a clear understanding of how the activity tied in with

Michelle's larger goals for the class.

Nym Oh agreed that his consulting teacher and his school-based supervisors provide a very different form of feedback. Nym said, "Oh, they're drastically different. The assistant principal has observed me, and has yet to do a post-observation meeting. And, my resource teacher has observed me, and she made a narrative of the observation, which I signed. She made some recommendations. And that was the end of that." Like Michelle, Nym looked neither to his assistant principal, nor to his resource teacher for the kind of regular feedback he received from Vivian Conley. Nym also believed, like Michelle, that the one time his assistant principal had observed him, she saw him engaged in an activity that out of context could have appeared quite strange. Laughing as he told me the story, he said,

> [Vivian] is the only person that has an accurate picture of what really goes on, on a weekly basis…I think this program is very valuable in the sense that there is one teacher who comes on a regular basis who sees your work for the full length of the lesson…without [Vivian] I would have to rely on just the administrators walking in and walking out…it is so disruptive…And I don't get any evaluation of that. They just come in and walk out. I don't know what they're looking at…And sometimes they walk in, and we're doing something rather rowdy…like one time they walked in, and I was lying on top of that table acting like a bug [laughter], when we were doing *The Stranger* I was enacting the opening scene of "The Metamorphosis," how the character wakes up from the bed…I wish they would have stayed the whole time so they knew what was happening…they just come in, they see it, and they walk out! It's odd, you know? [laughter]. So, I'm very happy that we have this consulting teacher, and they see the whole thing.

Nym raised an key point about the significance of the consulting teachers' roles vis à- vis building-level supervisors. Since the CTs entire jobs centered around observing teachers and giving them feedback, they had far more time to provide regular, timely and accurate feedback than anyone in the first-year teachers' schools. Without a consulting teacher, the first-year teachers stood to have no one who came close to having an accurate picture of them as teachers.

Chris Parker and Chad Marks had very little feedback from their supervising administrators as well. On November 29, 2001, when speaking of his supervising administrator, Chris said that "he hasn't been in to see me. I talk to him all the time, but he hasn't been in to see a class." Shortly thereafter, on December 6, 2001, when I asked Chad about who in the building had observed his classes thus far, he replied, "[My RT] observed me once. But other than that…I think that's been it." By December 5, 2001, Alexis Burton said that her resource teacher had been in only twice. She said, "Once he did a five-minute observation, and the other one was a formal observation…he wrote up a little formal observation [report]." Neither Chad nor Chris gave me any sense that they had received instructional feedback from their administrators. The only feedback Alexis described receiving from her resource teacher spoke to what she did outside of classroom instruction. According to Alexis, "he's given me suggestions for little things here and there, [like] standing out in the halls, greeting the students on the way in…kind of like that…relationships with students...I had a question about the ADHD kid and how I would handle that situation...he said contact the counselor, probably also involve the other teachers…" Alexis's comments show once again, that she did not get a significant amount of instructional feedback from her school-based supervisors. This would not be true of her fellow departmental members.

The CTs Supervision as Another Voice To Overwhelm the First-Year Teacher

Earlier in this chapter, I discussed Nym Oh's fears at the outset of the year about PAR forcing him to serve too many masters. While it turned out that this was not a problem for Nym, it became a huge problem for Alexis, who felt that she had so many sources of advice about how to improve her instruction, that she could not nearly absorb it all. She

said, "I get so much advice from different teachers…so many different observations, it's like one tells me one thing, the other tells me another. When you get so much from so many different places, it starts to become like mush. I don't know. Some things work for some classes, and some things don't work for others." In a separate conversation I had with Alexis's resource teacher, he agreed that she had too many sources of assistance. He said, "I think the problem is that there were just too many directions to go. She was overwhelmed, you know? And, I still have the question of too many cooks…she was getting too many pieces of input." In fact, her resource teacher even named the teachers' union as a source giving Alexis information that did more to hurt her classroom performance than to help it. He said, "What bugged me too, the union has a lot of stuff that they do with first-year teachers. And, it screwed her up big time. She had gone to one of those (a teachers' union sponsored workshop). They said she should be doing this, this and this. And, it was stuff she should have done the first week, so she backtracked and did it the sixth week, and oh it was a nightmare!"

The resource teacher also openly admitted that the coordination of assistance between him, the consulting teacher, and the principal could have been better. When I asked him to comment about Peer Assistance and Review overall, he said,

> I think one of the negatives of it are that the communication lines have got to be constant, clear and open between all the parties…mainly me I think is the most direct person who has observation of that person (the beginning teacher)…So that as a team maybe we can provide that support. That eroded over time and was non-existent, I think, at the end of second semester entirely. Although at a certain point in the year she had made a decision that she wasn't going to be here, and why spend the extra time? So, I don't know how much that was a factor.

Although it was likely that the teachers in Alexis's department had good intentions, the result of her getting so many pieces of advice was that she felt overwhelmed. Having

other teachers constantly give her tips also masked the complexity of teaching for Alexis,

convincing her that if she adopted the right bag of tricks, it would make the difference in

all of her classes.

Her resource teacher also raised an important point when he discussed the

coordination of support for Alexis. Having three supervisors (the consulting teacher,

resource teacher and supervising administrator) providing assistance in isolation

contributed to Alexis feeling absolutely inundated in that she did not have two or three

consistent areas to focus her improvement. It seems that at the beginning of the year

attempts were made by the resource teacher and consulting teacher to stay in contact, but

these attempts still did not lead to a structured plan for the ways that the many school-

based supervisors could assist Alexis. Her resource teacher said,

> I tried as much as possible to talk to the consulting teacher, where we could. She came in a number of times, and I didn't know she was coming in, and that's probably an area that needs to be worked on. At the very beginning I think we had a lot of contact on email. I would pass on a concern that I have for her to come in and look for. She would pass on what she observed or a concern that she may have had. And then, probably the weakest link was with the principal because she would get in whatever her standard number of [required] observations were, and that was it.

The resource teacher never described sitting down with the consulting teacher and the

principal simultaneously to develop a strategy to help Alexis. In fact, at the end of the

year when I spoke to him, he was unaware of what Alexis's final summative report

contained. He said,

> I have not seen Alexis's final write-up. I haven't seen any of the consulting teacher's stuff from since the first semester, and that has waned as the year has gone on…my contact with the consulting teacher. But, then again [Alexis] would tell me occasionally, like once when she told me the consulting teacher had come in and they had co-taught a lesson. O.k. good now things are going in the right direction. So I think things are going smoothly. And [then] I'd hear a parent complaint and I'd say, 'Oh, things aren't going smoothly.'

It seemed that the resource teacher was forced to rely on sources of information outside of his own infrequent observations and conferences with Alexis to understand what was happening in her classroom. However, in his defense, the 2001-02 school year was only the second year of Peer Assistance and Review in the district, and many school-based supervisors were unsure about their supervisory roles when it came to teachers who had been assigned to CTs. He could have thought he was overstepping if he had observed and talked with Alexis more frequently, or he simply could have been too consumed with other aspects of his job to provide Alexis with the attention she needed. Whatever the reason, it appeared that Alexis's RT was content to leave the CT with the bulk of the task of helping Alexis, while allowing other members of his department to perform "random acts of assistance" for her, based on secondhand information about the challenges she faced. Furthermore, the RT seemed to see the principal as the one responsible for coordinating support for Alexis. Regardless of who was indeed responsible for coordinating the support for Alexis, clearly this coordination had to be done (not just for Alexis, but for any teacher who struggled in the classroom), and its absence stood as a gaping whole in the way Peer Assistance and Review in the district was conceived.

Falling Short of Forming A Consensus with School-Based Supervisors

Two cases in this study involved some disparities between how the consulting teacher perceived the first-year teacher's instruction and how it was perceived by the school-based supervisors. I believe in both cases that the school-based supervisors tended to draw more upon what Sergiovanni (1992) describes as "psychological" sources of authority, whereas the consulting teachers drew from bureaucratic, technical and/or professional sources of authority. According to Sergiovanni (1992), when supervisors

use psychological sources of authority, they assume that "congenial relationships and harmonious interpersonal climates make teachers content, easier to work with and more cooperative," hence their strategy is to "develop a school climate characterized by high congeniality among teachers and between teachers and supervisors" (p. 207). In both cases it was primarily the resource teacher who disagreed with either the consulting teacher's approach, his or her findings, or both. The result of the differences in the ways that the CTs and RTs supervised and perceived the first-year teacher was that the teacher clung to the perspective of the supervisor who told him what he wanted to hear. In both cases, that supervisor was the school-based resource teacher.

The first instance of a discrepancy between the CT and the RT occurred with Chad Marks. While Vivian Conley, Chad's consulting teacher, had been impressed with a number of aspects of Chad's classroom from the beginning, she also expressed great concern that he did not use a full repertoire of instructional strategies. Chad's resource teacher, on the other hand, did not view Chad's reliance on a singular instructional strategy to be cause for any concern. Vivian recounted her conversation with Chad's resource teacher in this way, "[The] first thing she said was his classes are really interesting, the kids enjoy it. The kids like him. The parents like him. I've had no complaints. The second thing she said was 'as long as the kids are reading and writing, I don't really care what strategies he uses.' And the third thing she said to me was, 'he's young. He'll learn. He'll learn how to do these different things.'" What Vivian wondered was "how will he learn?" She believed strongly that it was incumbent upon Chad's resource teacher to "sit down and say, you know, you have got to do this, this and this. You've got to fall in line here." However, according to Vivian the resource teacher was

"not going to do that because she doesn't see the need to. As far as she's concerned, he's doing fine." Vivian lamented that in regards to the significance of using multiple instructional strategies, "He's hearing it from me over and over and over and over again, and he's not hearing it from anybody else." From Chad's perspective, the freedom that his resource teacher gave him was what made his teaching possible. He said,

> she lets me do whatever I want…she trusts me to do the right thing. I mean, not that she doesn't watch over, but she gives me full freedom to really do whatever I want because she believes in what I'm doing…And, she's so positive, and I can't emphasize enough that like I do things really, really differently and sometimes I push the envelope. And, she's just really always very positive, and she gives me a lot of reassurance, which is really nice because you know to a certain extent, because of what I do and how I do it, I'm somewhat isolated. Teachers tend to be pretty threatened by what I do. That was my experience last year especially with my mentor, and this year as well. They're really threatened by an aggressive presence in the school. So, it's nice to have your boss saying 'I'm behind you.'

Vivian, on the other hand, was concerned about how Chad's students would perform on the district's final English 9 exam (which was based upon the state mandated high-stakes tests). Worried about Chad's decision to skip having students complete a research paper, she said, "there were questions on the final exam about the research process. How are his kids going to answer that question? And, he didn't do a research paper because his resource teacher told him he didn't have to." Vivian, who had taught at Chad's school before becoming a consulting teacher one year ago, still took considerable pride in her former department's accomplishments in preparing students for district finals and state tests. Furthermore, she valued differentiated instruction, and she feared that not *every* student in Chad's class was learning the important elements of literature and writing from his patterns system.

Vivian not only brought her concerns to Chad's resource teacher, but also brought them to his principal with the identical result. Without being able to garner any support

for her desire to push Chad to use different instructional approaches regularly, she backed down somewhat from her quest, and simply asked Chad to show her that he was capable of using a variety of strategies. Simultaneously, she suggested strategies to improve what Chad was doing within his self-created patterns system. However, her original fervor about convincing Chad of the value of various strategies certainly lost its steam once she failed to gather support from his school-based supervisors. Content that his patterns system was an effective one in light of the support he received from his resource teacher and supervising administrator, Chad never seemed to question whether he should continue to implement the system or not.

   With Chris Parker, the consulting teacher and resource teacher did not disagree so much about instructional strategies as much as about the decisions Chris should make about his coaching career at the school as well as the way he interacted with his students. Chris got along famously with his resource teacher, who at Stonegate, also served as the staff development teacher. In commenting about how his resource teacher had helped him, Chris said,

> My resource teacher is awesome. She helps me out so much…classroom management, schedules…when to do things, when not to do things…to avoid things right before Christmas break…Personal things, like I can talk to her, and I know it's confidential. She's there to help me, and she's not judgmental at all, and she gives you a truthful answer. She's just outstanding, very personable.

In addition to finding her quite personable, Chris could name specific ways in which her classroom observations had helped him pick up on aspects of what was happening in his classroom of which he was unaware. For example, he said

> She's come into the classroom a few times, so she has a good idea of what I'm doing. When she came in, she noticed that I would ask a question, and then whoever's hand went up first, pick on them just because I got excited that someone knew the answer…which I didn't realize I was doing….I have to have

more wait time. Also, to have like a little beginning five-minute warm-up, which has helped me a little bit.

In comparing his relationship with his resource teacher to that of his consulting teacher,

Chris said,

> I think she knows me a lot more than he does, so a lot of the advice is more concrete advice. So, he might talk about these great ideas and stuff, but I can't use them at all because either the English department doesn't have the materials for them, or I don't know enough about it. I think she wants me to be personable with the kids. She likes that I'm personable with the kids, although she knows I need order. And, I think he's trying to get me away from being personable with the kids…And, she's, you know, with coaching, I'm coaching again, and he really suggested to me not to do it, and she kind of just said, 'it's your decision.'

In comparison to the advice that his resource teacher provided, Chris found that the

consulting teacher's advice was somewhat out of context. From Chris's perspective what

his consulting teacher suggested was pie in the sky. Stonegate either did not have the

resources for Chris to accomplish it, or Chris himself did not feel comfortable enough

with the material to accomplish it. On the other hand, his resource teacher knew what

was available in the book room, so her suggestions were a closer match to what was

actually feasible.

Yet, even more than Chris believing that his CT's suggestions were not feasible ones,

it was the fact that the CT was against Chris coaching and the fact that he wanted to see

Chris relate to his students differently that seemed to really be upsetting for Chris. As I

have discussed earlier, coaching and relating to students were the two aspects of teaching

that Chris seemed to value the most. By taking aim at those values, Paul Simms alienated

Chris, making Chris skeptical and distrustful of what he said. For Chris, this, combined

with the fact that Chris's resource teacher (from his perspective) seemed to take a

different stance on the issue of building a rapport with students, quickly eroded the validity that Chris attached to his CT's advice.

An interesting aspect of this case is that Chris's CT, Paul, believed that the resource teacher was very much on the same page as he was in terms of how Chris interacted with his students. Paul had met with Chris's resource teacher and his mentor, and he believed that he and the resource teacher in particular were in accord. Paul said,

> I've met with his resource teacher. We've come up with a strategy for better helping him. I've met with his mentor to sort of ask her to provide him with the necessary materials…The resource teacher and I are definitely along the same lines of thinking with Chris. She's very worried about his informalness [sic] with students, his casual attitude with them. She's very concerned about his work ethic in terms of staff meetings because he's always goofing around, doesn't take things very seriously…doesn't really contribute too much. So, she's been in there. And, we're almost page for page in terms of the knowledge base triangle of what we're seeing in Mike. The assistant principal only went in the week before the semester was out. I met with him afterwards, and he said 'you know, I see some things that need improvement.' But I don't think he thought it was as serious as the resource teacher and I felt it was. He was mostly concerned about the fact that he didn't see him take attendance that period.

If anyone was not on the same page as Paul from his perspective it was Chris's assistant principal. In fact, it was Paul's perception that the administration was not ready to dismiss Chris that seemed to sway Paul's decision to recommend that Chris's contract be renewed. Paul said, "it's awkward when the CT recommends for dismissal and the administration doesn't. And, it hasn't come to that yet, but it has sort of made me think. Because Chris is so close to the edge…at this point, I think I can go either way. But, if the administration is comfortable with retaining him, and they can assure me that he'll get the support that he needs, then I'll be happy to lean in that direction." Thus, in this case, differences in the perceptions of the CT and the school-based supervisors not only served

to undermine a lot of the advice given by the CT (as in Chad's case) but also served as a powerful influence on the consulting teacher's final recommendation.

In this district, it is common to hear staff developers make the distinction between a group of professionals who have *congeniality* and a professional learning community in which there is *collegiality* On some level what happened in the cases of Chad and Chris is that resource teachers who inhabited the school's hallways and offices with these first-year teachers on a daily basis wanted to be friendly. They wanted to keep the peace. As long as Chad and Chris were not generating phone calls from parents or committing any egregious acts, the resource teachers were satisfied to overlook what they could have considered typical experiences or dispositions of first-year teachers. The consulting teachers, on the other hand, were pushing their clients. Chad was being pushed more to think, while Chris was being pushed to act. The tension between the ways the resource teachers approached supervision, and the ways that the consulting teachers approached supervision gave the first-year teachers an opening to reject the more difficult advice that their CTs gave them in lieu of embracing what they found to be comfortable, and that which gave them peace of mind.

Sources of Authority as Related to Shared Supervision

Large, comprehensive high schools following both traditional models of supervision (in which a principal, assistant principal and/or department chair possesses the responsibility for supervising teachers) as well as those that have adopted models such as Peer Assistance and Review, are likely to have more than one person charged with the supervision of a teacher. In the district I examined, the consulting teachers, resource teachers and supervising administrators all had a role in evaluating the first-year teacher,

and all had roles in supervising the first-year teacher. Yet, in the second year of Peer Assistance and Review in this district, no structure existed that defined how the shared supervision of first-year teachers would be coordinated.

I would argue that not only was the lack of coordination problematic for at least three of the teachers in this study, but it was also problematic that when meetings did occur among the supervisors, there was no agreed upon way to approach supervision of the first-year teacher. That is to say, more could have been accomplished with the first-year teachers if all of their supervisors had discussed their own beliefs about their roles and come to a consensus about how best to support the teachers. Sergiovanni (1992) argues that supervisors who draw primarily on professional sources of authority, "promote a dialogue among teachers that makes professional values and accepted tenets of practice explicit" (p. 208). What if that dialogue was not limited to the teachers under supervision, but expanded to include all persons charged with supervising the teacher? In the many instances where the supervisory role is shared, how can supervisors coordinate their efforts to improve teachers' professional growth?

<u>Summary of Findings</u>

Six elements emerged from my data that seemed to influence the relationship between first-year teachers and the consulting teachers: (1) the frequency of the CTs' visits, (2) the nature of the CTs' feedback, (3) the CT's assistance with instructional planning and materials, (4) how the CTs defined their evaluative roles, (5) the CTs' abilities to identify with the first-year teachers, and (6) how the CTs shared the supervisory function with school-based supervisors. I examined these six elements in terms of the sources of authority that CTs primarily drew upon in working with their clients. I used

Sergiovanni's (1992) model for sources of supervisory authority, and I made claims that the CTs drew mostly from bureaucratic, technical-rational and professional sources of authority. This is not to say that there was no evidence of the CTs drawing from personal or moral sources of authority. However, I saw significantly more reliance on bureaucratic, technical-rational and professional sources. I argued that, as Sergiovanni's model indicates, when CTs (as supervisors) drew more on bureaucratic and technical-rational sources of authority, the first-year teachers' practices were narrowed. In addition, the first-year teachers tended to express negative sentiments about PAR or about their interactions with their consulting teacher when the CT relied heavily on bureaucratic and technical-rational sources.

However, when CTs drew more from professional sources of authority, they established a relationship with their clients that lent itself to promoting teacher growth. In at least one case, the first-year teacher's practices were expanded when the CT relied on professional sources of authority. In other cases, even when the CT drew upon professional sources of authority, other elements such as how the CT defined his or her evaluative role or the inconsistency of the messages first-year teachers received from their CTs and their school-based supervisors, seemed to inhibit the expansion of the first-year teachers' practices.

CHAPTER SIX

Bringing First-Year Teacher Assistance and Evaluation Up to PAR:
Lessons about the supervision of first-year teachers from the assumptions, policies and
practices of Peer Assistance and Review

In this final chapter, I turn to the implications of my findings for research, policy and

practice in the supervision of first-year teachers. I begin by examining a possible gap in

Sergiovanni's (1992) model of supervisory authority that is linked to the context for

supervision. Using my own findings, I propose that the lack of coordinated supervision

could explain why the instructional practices of my participants were not expanded or

narrowed in the ways that Sergiovanni's model predicts. I discuss my vision for

coordinated supervision, as well as the challenges that exist for implementing coordinated

supervision with the Peer Assistance and Review model. Next, I examine the district's

Peer Assistance and Review policy, focusing on the purposes of the policy as well as the

policy outcomes as documented in my research.   From these outcomes, I suggest

implications for Peer Assistance and Review policy. Finally, I explore my study's

implications for Peer Assistance and Review as it is practiced in the district. Using my

findings, I offer suggestions for what leaders in districts with similar characteristics might

consider as they plan and adjust Peer Assistance and Review programs.

<u>Sources of Supervisory Authority and the Context for Supervision</u>

Current theories underlying the supervision of teachers seem to focus on the roles of

supervisors or on models of supervision. Some theorists in discussing the purposes of

supervision, argue that the supervisor should not be charged with both the assistance and

evaluation of teachers (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986). Others look at supervision in terms of the

different approaches or models (Pajak, 1993; Tracy,1998), ranging from those in which

the supervisor takes a more directive approach (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004) to those in which the teacher being supervised has more autonomy over the content and direction that supervision takes (Costa & Garmston, 2002; Sergiovanni, 2002). Some discuss models of collaborative supervision in which the teacher and the supervisor work in a collegial way to identify and implement instructional improvements (Joyce and Showers, 1982). Supporting a more collaborative model of supervision, Sergiovanni (1992) argues that when supervisors rely more on professional and moral sources of authority, teachers' practices will be expanded rather than narrowed.

The data I analyzed for this study support the idea that supervisors who enter into more collaborative relationships with their clients, and who draw more from professional sources of authority than bureaucratic, personal, or technical rational sources, are more likely to develop relationships with teachers that promote teacher growth. However, I was unable to make the claim that all of the first-year teachers who worked with CTs drawing mainly from professional sources of authority expanded their practices. For example, the CTs of both Alexis Burton and Chad Wolf relied mostly on professional sources of authority, but neither Alexis nor Chad expanded their instructional practices. Those outcomes, I believe, stem partly from factors within the variousschool contexts for supervision. That is, the specific supports, expectations and resources at the school sites seemed to exert as much influence over how much the first-year teachers' practices were narrowed or expanded as did the source of authority that the consulting teacher drew upon. Sergiovanni's (1992) model for sources of supervisory authority, while useful in understanding the dynamics of the relationship between a supervisor and his or her

supervisee, does not give ample attention to the contexts for supervision and how supervisors might negotiate these contexts to help teachers improve.

In my study the chief contextual factors that seemed to influence the practices of the first-year teachers were the messages they were given by supervisors who worked with them daily at their school sites. While current theories of collaborative supervision or even of supervisors' reliance on professional sources of authority focus solely on what happens between a supervisor and his or her teacher client, I would argue that it is equally important to examine how a supervisor works within a given context. In this case, I believe that the consulting teachers could have had more influence on the practice of teachers if they had worked in a more coordinated way with supervisors at the school site.

Coordinated Supervision of First-Year Teachers

Consulting teachers likely overlooked the importance of the school contexts in which their supervision occurred because they worked at the district level. Although they were trained to make contacts with school-based supervisors, they were never trained to work with them in a coordinated way. Supervisors working together to coordinate supervision is very different from supervisors merely working together. In this study, for instance, consulting teachers met with resource teachers, principals, assistant principals, and mentors to discuss their clients. These meetings provided a vehicle for exchanging thoughts on the first-year teachers' progress, but the meetings did not necessarily result in a well-coordinated plan for supporting the teachers. In the case of Alexis Burton, for example, although the consulting teacher met with others in supervisory roles at the school, Alexis still became bombarded with a wide variety of suggestions, on a broad

array of topics, from seemingly countless supervisors and colleagues. In addition, as the cases of Chad Wolf and Chris Parker demonstrate, consulting teachers could meet with school-based supervisors and still not come to a consensus with them about the content and approach to supervision. The disparity between the school-based supervisors and the consulting teachers resulted in weakening the legitimacy of the consulting teachers from the perspective of their first-year teacher clients. Thus, I would argue that consulting teachers as well as school-based supervisors being *involved* in the decisions about the supervision of first-year teachers falls short of what is needed. Instead, consulting teachers and school-based supervisors should organize their support and assistance to first-year teachers to provide them with coordinated supervision.

That said, everyone might not agree with my call for coordinated supervision. Goldstein (2003) who studied Peer Assistance and Review as it relates to distributing leadership for teacher evaluation, argues that "task sharing" or collaboration among consulting teachers and principals might do more to weaken than strengthen the professionalism and professionalization[10] of teaching. She argues that when principals and consulting teachers work together to make decisions about the evaluation of teachers, it could move the authority for teacher evaluation back into the traditional purview of principals, thereby diluting the concept of PAR as challenging "education's hierarchical norms" (Goldstein, 2003a, p. 178). She does admit that perhaps "task sharing" serves as an interim step to changing those norms, however, her study cannot pinpoint conclusively what effects task sharing has on professionalism, professionalization, or teacher evaluation. Because Goldstein focused on the consulting teachers and principals sharing

---

[10] Goldstein (2003) defines professionalism of teaching as "introducing capable people to a new role," while defining professionalization as "introducing a new role to an institution."

tasks as they related to teacher evaluation, I can only speculate about her stance on CTs and other school-based supervisors coordinating supervision. Perhaps, she would argue that teacher supervision is also best left in the hands of teachers.

Such a notion would be congruent with Sergiovanni's (1992) vision of supervision that is ideal. He argues that when schools get to the point of focusing on the moral dimensions of the profession, there will be little need for accountability or in-servicing as they have been known traditionally. Instead, "teachers [would] respond to community values for moral reasons. Their practice becomes collective, and their performance is expansive and sustained" (p. 209). Even if this is the ideal, I find merit in Goldstein's notion that there is perhaps an interim step to be considered before we reach this goal. While it would be desirable for teachers to respond to community values based on their morals, we know, of course, that teachers in schools possess values that not only conflict with those of other teachers, but that also conflict with those in the communities in which they teach. Thus, getting to the point where teachers' practices are collective and based on shared values means that teachers would have to come to a consensus about what those values should be, and that, it seems to me, could take some time.

In the interim, it is important to attend to supporting and assisting first-year teachers given the structures that currently exist in schools. I would argue that in many comprehensive high schools, those structures involve more than one person with the responsibility of supervising the first-year teacher. Thus, to achieve an outcome in which the first-year teacher is neither confused about nor dismissive of the assistance he or she receives from any one supervisor, it is critical to coordinate supervision.

<u>The Challenge of Coordinated Supervision in PAR</u>

In Peer Assistance and Review I see two primary challenges to my notion of coordinated supervision. The first challenge relates to the context for supervision. Holland (1998) identifies two major contexts for supervision—school-level supervision and classroom-level supervision. She delineates three facets of school-level supervision: teacher evaluation, professional development, and curriculum development, while identifying two processes that distinguish classroom-level supervision: the observation of teachers and conferences with teachers. With coordinated supervision, consulting teachers and school-based supervisors would likely have a concern for different contexts of supervision. Thus, working in a coordinated way to integrate those concerns could be difficult. The second challenge to my notion of coordinated supervision in Peer Assistance and Review relates to different contexts for supervision in a similar way. If supervision occurs at the school-level and at the classroom-level, conflicts could arise between consulting teachers and school-based supervisors over the fact that consulting teachers locate themselves neither in the school, nor in the classroom. Their supervision is at the classroom level, but they *work* at the district level. I will now explore these two challenges in more depth.

The Differing Concerns of School-Based Supervisors and Consulting Teachers

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) argue that the roles of school-based administrators and teacher supervisors should be kept distinct partly because administrators and supervisors seek different outcomes—administrators strive for harmony, supervisors strive for change. This distinction fits well with what I documented in the cases of Chad Wolf and

Chris Parker. School-based supervisors were concerned with maintaining amicable relationships with the first-year teachers, while the consulting teachers were concerned with pushing the teachers to refine their instructional practices. Harmony and change, as Hoy and Forsyth (1986) note, are not always compatible. Thus, it occurs to me that those at the school will have supervisory concerns that differ from the consulting teachers. For example, the principal or assistant principal might be concerned with holding teachers accountable for their duties as professionals, including arriving to work on time, completing administrative duties consistently and accurately, and responding to parents in a timely fashion. This is exemplified in the concern of Chris Parker's assistant principal that Chris did not record attendance regularly. These concerns differ from those of the resource teachers, who likely want to ensure that the first-year teacher is covering the curriculum, or even the mentor teacher who wants to ensure that the first-year teacher is comfortable and has all of the materials he or she needs. Finally, the concern of the consulting teacher is that the district's standards for classroom instruction are met. The different concerns that each supervisor brings to the table makes coordinated supervision difficult because each supervisor's perception of how the first-year teacher can be best assisted is filtered through his or her primary supervisory concern. However, I would argue that because the district's performance standards include elements that address instruction, curriculum and professionalism, it is possible for school-based supervisors and consulting teachers to coordinate their support for teachers if they commit themselves to developing a plan to support the teacher that incorporates elements from any of the six standards that the teacher does not meet. Instead of isolating themselves because of their

different concerns, they can meet to discover how those concerns overlap to have an impact on the first-year teacher's overall performance.

Locating Consulting Teachers in the Context of Supervision

Consulting teachers are in a very peculiar role indeed. Charged with the classroom-level supervision of first-year teachers, consulting teachers locate themselves neither in the classroom, nor in the school. They work at the district level, and are supervised themselves by district officials in the Office of Staff Development. Thus, the priorities that the consulting teachers must focus upon are district-level priorities (e.g., teaching the concepts in *The Skillful Teacher*). Conflicts arise when the priorities of the district are not the same as the priorities for the school, when principals or resource teachers are not emphasizing (or enforcing) the same standards for curriculum and instruction as the consulting teachers are emphasizing. This showed up most prominently in the case of Chad Wolf. The consulting teacher wanted to see differentiated instruction and a better match between what Chad taught and the district curriculum, while his resource teacher had given him the complete discretion to teach what and how he wanted. Such a tension between district and school expectations would provide a challenge for coordinated supervision because coordinated supervision requires that consulting teachers and school-based supervisors come to a consensus about how best to assist the first-year teacher. To address this challenge, I believe both school-based supervisors and consulting teachers need to look at altering some of their practices. On the one hand, consulting teachers must examine the contexts of teaching and learning in which their clients work. Coming to those contexts with prescriptive guidelines for the way teaching and learning must occur serves to de-contextualize supervision, as if the interactions that occur during the

supervisory process are not rooted in and influenced by values and dispositions that spring from individuals and their contexts (Waite & Fernandes, 2000). Consulting teachers cannot ignore district expectations, but the way that they communicate those expectations should not narrow the first-year teachers' practices. At the same time, school-based supervisors must commit themselves to inspiring change, not just harmony. Continuous improvement should be embedded in the culture of the school such that the ways that teaching and learning occur are always up for discussion and critique. As these changes are made, I believe that the path will be laid for a movement toward the coordinated supervision of first-year teachers.

The Policy Implications of First-Year Teachers' Responses to Supervision in PAR

In this section I begin by discussing the purposes and desired outcomes of the district's Peer Assistance and Review policy. Next, I discuss how the participants in my study experienced the policy in light of the district's intended outcomes, and what those experiences imply for the policy of Peer Assistance and Review.

Purposes and Desired Outcomes of the Peer Assistance and Review Policy

Peer Assistance and Review as policy in this district can be viewed through rational, political and symbolic lenses. Malen and Knapp (1997) identify multiple perspectives of the phases of policy development. Rational perspectives see policy as means to an end. From a rational perspective, Peer Assistance and Review was aimed at solving the real problems of teacher supervision in the district. One of those problems was that administrators, who had traditionally been in charge of the evaluation of teachers, lacked the time and (particularly at the secondary level) the expertise to assist or evaluate teachers in any way that was meaningful. Prior to the initiation of the new professional

growth system in the district, administrators used a checklist of behaviors to evaluate every teacher in the school every year. Once Peer Assistance and Review was initiated, administrators evaluated tenured teachers who were not assigned to consulting teachers on a cycle that rotated every three, four or five years, depending on the number of years of experience the teacher possessed. Thus, the number of teachers administrators were required to evaluate in a given year decreased substantially, and the teachers who were most "at-risk," those who were untenured or in remediation, were handled primarily by the consulting teachers.

The second problem of teacher supervision in the district surrounded the quality of the feedback given to teachers, as well as the value of the standards to which teachers were held. In the system of checklists, mediocre as well as high performing teachers received high marks on their evaluations, and poor teachers were often viewed as "good enough" (to maintain their jobs). The vast documentation and complexity of dismissing a teacher for poor performance in a heavily unionized district proved to be a task so daunting and time-consuming that few administrators would pursue it.

Yet, beyond solving the problems of teacher supervision, Peer Assistance and Review as policy could be viewed as an attempt to regulate conflicts between the district and the teachers' union about who controls the quality of teaching in the district. According to Malen and Knapp (1997) the purpose of policy from political perspectives is "to regulate social conflict and retain institutional legitimacy" (p. 428). The policies surrounding Peer Assistance and Review were constantly negotiated and re-negotiated by work groups with representatives who were school-based administrators, district administrators, union officials and teachers. Even now, four years after the initial implementation of PAR,

some school-based administrators believe that the consulting teachers subvert their authority about teacher performance for which the principals will ultimately be held accountable. Thus, the policy continues to be fiercely debated in the district, and its survival is a topic of discussion every year as budgets are made.

The political lens of policy also helps to elucidate Peer Assistance and Review as an attempt by the teachers' union to professionalize teaching by having teachers in charge of the evaluation of their colleagues. This purpose of the policy is a problematic one if the evaluative function of consulting teachers proves to hinder their supportive roles. The union, unrelenting in its quest to balance the power between teachers and administrators, might be unwilling to relinquish the evaluative role of the consulting teachers even in light of data that the assistance and evaluation of teachers are functions that are best left separate.

Finally, from symbolic perspectives, the purpose of policy is to make meaning. Malen and Knapp (1997) argue that "policy viewed from symbolic perspectives is intended to shape conceptions of institutions, the problems they face, and the work they carry out" (p. 430). From this perspective, the purpose of Peer Assistance and Review was to demonstrate to relevant publics that the district was committed to improving teaching quality by supporting its neediest teachers, dismissing its incompetent teachers, and providing leadership opportunities for its best teachers. The district frequently uses PAR in a symbolic way to recruit new teachers by touting the considerable support provided to teachers in their induction year.

Policy Outcomes of PAR Based Upon This Case Study

In light of my discussion about the impetus for initiating PAR at the district level, I would like to turn to the ways that policy influenced the supervision experiences of teachers in this study. Clearly, the Peer Assistance and Review program provided teachers with regular, detailed feedback on their instruction. The quality and quantity of this feedback was unmatched by that given by any school-based supervisor. To that extent, PAR went a long way to addressing the problem of making teacher supervision more meaningful. As Goldstein (2003a) also found in her study of distributed leadership in PAR, consulting teachers had far more time to spend in classrooms than did supervisors at the school site, and the teacher clients greatly appreciated both the quantity and detail of the feedback they received.

The idea that PAR served as a way to professionalize teaching by placing teachers in the position of quality control never surfaced in my conversations with the first-year teachers. None of the teachers even mentioned any involvement in the union, with the exception of those who attended a union-sponsored workshop for first-year teachers at the suggestion of their consulting teachers.

I did, however, talk to the participants about whether they believed that their relationships with their consulting teachers would have been different if the CT did not have an evaluative role. Interestingly enough, most of the participants in my study expressed little sense in which his or her relationship with the CT would have been different if the CT had not been an evaluator. By and large it was the source of authority that the CT relied upon in developing a relationship with the teacher that seemed to make the most difference for my participants, not the sheer fact that the CT was an evaluator.

For example, when I asked Chad Wolf if there would be any difference in the way he would relate to his CT if she had not been evaluating him, he said

> I guess it might be for some people. Like, for me, I never worried about evaluations because when I was in the Hopkins program last year, I was evaluated like 30 or 40 times. And, you know, I'm confident in what I do. I know that what I do is right. And, once I met her [the CT] and got to know her. Especially, once I met her and got to know her, and saw how she was going to react to the things that I did, we were very comfortable right away.

When Michelle Newman met and got to know, Vivian Conley, she developed a comfort with her similar to what Chad describes. However, Michelle noted that before getting to know her CT, based on what she understood about PAR, there would have been a difference in how she related to her CT. Michelle said,

> If I had kept the original impression of her role that I had in the beginning of the year, yes [there would have been a difference in how she related to her CT]…because I think I told you before how it was kind of communicated to us that she alone had the power to renew our contract. And that was extremely intimidating, and I was intimidated by her. But, luckily, she changed the tone of that in the beginning, and so, no, it hasn't changed my teaching.

For Chris Parker, working with a CT who drew primarily from bureaucratic sources of authority meant that he would perceive that he was under scrutiny, even if his CT did not have a formal role as an evaluator. He said, "I think when you have someone watching you, you always want to perform better…[do] something you're comfortable with…you don't want to change things up as much. I think I'd still, if he just came in to watch, you still feel like you're being evaluated." Even Alexis Burton, who clearly saw her CT as an evaluator even though the CT drew mostly from professional sources of authority, merely said, "I think for anyone it [not having the CT be an evaluator] would take off the pressure…I think when anyone is being evaluated, you want to be on your best. I don't think my performance would have changed, because I wanted feedback." I did not

consider this the strong statement that I had expected from her. For example, she did not

say that she would have been more open with her CT about her unhappiness that year,

she only said that she would have felt less pressure during classroom observations.

   I believe that the implications of these statements are that, for first-year teachers,

having the consulting teacher as an evaluator does not impede the formation of a

relationship that can lead to professional growth for the teacher *if* the consulting teacher

draws primarily upon professional sources of authority. These findings fit with the way

Pajak (1993) describes Arthur Blumberg's interpersonal intervention model of

supervision.   According to Pajak (1993), Blumberg identifies five factors that can quell

the tension between a supervisor's helping and evaluative role. Those factors are: (a) a

recognition by the supervisor that his or her role as evaluator and helper can be wrought

with conflicts, (b) an open discussion between the supervisor and the teacher about the

inherent conflicts in the supervisor's role and a clarification of how the teacher's personal

goals fit within the school and district goals, (c) a decision by the supervisor and teacher

about how data will be collected and used throughout the observation process,

(d) collaboration between the supervisor and teacher to determine whether the

performance standards have been met, and (e) co-planning by the supervisor and teacher

of appropriate follow-up activities. Thus, to the extent that the supervisor is open with

the teacher in the beginning, and treats the teacher as a partner rather than a subordinate

in the process of assistance and evaluation, the feelings of fear and distrust that have the

potential to occur in the first-year teacher can be avoided. That is to say, when

supervisors consistently draw upon professional sources of authority when working with

first-year teachers, the evaluative role of the consulting teacher will not necessarily

undermine his or her supportive role, even for teachers like Alexis Burton and Chris Parker who struggled in their practice. Perhaps, this phenomenon is particular to first-year teachers because (if they have come through a teacher preparation program) they are used to being observed regularly (as mentioned by Chad Wolf), and therefore find it easier to adjust to someone who serves in a supportive and evaluative role, similar to the dual role of a cooperating teacher.

Finally, the symbolic purpose of the Peer Assistance and Review policy did not seem to have a major influence on any of my participants. One participant mentioned that he had heard about PAR as a part of the recruitment presentation the district gave at his college, but this did not seem to figure prominently in his decision to pursue a job with the district. Also, three years ago when these data were collected, the district did not promote Peer Assistance and Review to new recruits as much as it does at this time.

<u>Implications for the Practice of Peer Assistance and Review</u>

In this final section, I will discuss the implications of my findings for the way Peer Assistance and Review is practiced.   My findings revealed six elements that most influenced the relationship between the consulting teacher and the first-year teacher. Those elements were: (1) the frequency of the CT visits, (2) the nature of the CT's feedback, (3) the CT's provision of assistance and materials, (4) how the CT defined his or her evaluative role, (5) the extent to which the CT could identify with his or her client, and (6) how the CT compared to and worked with people at the school site who supervised his or her client. Within these categories, I argued that when the CTs drew primarily from professional sources of authority, they were more likely to build the types of relationships with their clients that had the potential to lead to the first-year teachers'

professional growth. Specifically, the first-year teachers were more likely to have a positive sentiment about their CTs as well as the PAR program itself, expressed more ways in which their CTs had helped them, and viewed the CTs as more valid sources of guidance.

Based on this argument, I have developed a set of considerations for the district to contemplate in training their consulting teachers and designing their PAR programs. First, I suggest that the district considers training consulting teachers not only in cognitive coaching (as they do currently), but also in ways that supervisors can draw upon more professional or moral sources of authority to build relationships with teachers that lend themselves to teacher growth. My analysis shows a connection between the source of authority primarily used by the CT and the kind of relationship the consulting teachers were able to build with their clients. Yet, although I analyzed the data in terms of the sources of supervisory authority that the consulting teachers drew upon, the consulting teachers themselves did not necessarily recognize that they were using their authority in the ways that I describe. Sources of authority and their possible influence on teachers could be discussed explicitly with consulting teachers so that they can reflect on their own practices and determine if altering those practices in any way could result in different outcomes with their first-year teacher clients.

In addition to understanding the importance of drawing from particular sources of authority, consulting teachers could also benefit from understanding the importance of the contexts in which they supervise their clients. Earlier in this chapter, I discussed the fact that the contextual factors in this study that seemed to most influence the narrowing or expansion of first-year teachers' practices were the messages they received from

school-based supervisors. I suggested the need for coordinated supervision at the school site. From that discussion, the question emerges, who will do the coordinating? I propose that staff development teachers, who are school-based, take on the role of coordinating supervision for the first-year teachers. Currently, staff development teachers work with teachers and administrators at the school to coordinate schoolwide training, as well as training for departments and individual teachers. Consulting teachers already meet with staff development teachers to request staff development leave for first-year teachers, assistance in lesson planning or modeling lessons for the teachers, or assistance in coordinating peer visits for the teachers. Staff development teachers are typically among the first people in the building to meet new teachers at the two-day, building-level orientation that they plan and facilitate. In many schools, staff development teachers also conduct ongoing meetings with first-year teachers throughout the year. With the rapport that is established between SDTs and first-year teachers at the beginning of the year, combined with the SDTs unique knowledge of both district and school-based priorities, I recommend that the SDTs hold quarterly meetings with the CTs, supervising administrator, RT and mentor teacher (if one has been assigned) to develop and amend a coordinated plan for assisting the first-year teacher. In these meetings, priorities can be set and reset to accommodate the changing needs for support of the teacher, and to ensure that the first-year teacher is not overwhelmed by competing demands placed on him or her by various supervisors.

Beyond ensuring that the supervision of teachers is coordinated, I believe that consulting teachers and district officials should make certain that first-year teachers possess a thorough knowledge of the PAR process from the outset of the school year.

Lack of clarity about the PAR process set the wrong tone for PAR in the eyes of the first-year teachers. For first-year teachers with consulting teachers who helped them see PAR more as assistance than scrutiny, the tone of PAR changed and teachers were able to rest assured that the primary purpose of PAR was to help them. However, for the first-year teachers whose contract renewal seemed questionable towards the end of the first semester, the lack of clarity about the process from the beginning of the year added to their anxiety about what the district expected of them. Giving first-year teachers a clear picture of the PAR process, including its purposes for first-year teachers, is likely to promote a smooth beginning to the relationship between the consulting teachers and their clients.

Nonetheless, having clarity about the process is unlikely to help first-year teachers completely overcome the fear that a misstep on their parts could lead to the termination of their contracts. In this sense I believe that while it is helpful for consulting teachers both to assist and evaluate first-year teachers, it is not necessary that they have the ability to recommend non-renewal of the first-year teacher's contract to the PAR Panel.   For the average twenty-two-year-old first-year teacher, the fear of being fired for not measuring up to the district's performance standards is a proposition that can be so overwhelming and intimidating that it can prevent the first-year teacher from entering into the type of trusting relationship that lends itself to the teachers' professional growth. If a first-year teacher's performance is a cause for such concern that termination is warranted, I believe that the decision to pursue that option should be left to the school-based administrator. Consulting teachers can continue to assess how well the first-year teachers are meeting performance standards, and those assessments could be included in the permanent files of

the teachers. Furthermore, it is appropriate that CTs have the ability to recommend a second year of PAR support for the first-year teacher.

Outside of making a recommendation for a teacher's contract renewal, consulting teachers are in the best positions to provide both summative and formative feedback to first-year teachers. As schools are currently structured, school-based administrators simply do not have the time, or in some cases the expertise, to give regular, meaningful feedback to teachers. Currently, summative evaluations by school-based administrators are completed at the very end of the year, much too late to assist the teacher in making adjustments in his or her practice during the school year. In addition, when consulting teachers are matched with first-year teachers who teach the subject area in which they are certified, the depth and relevance of the assistance provided seems greater from the first-year teacher's perspective.

The issue of the depth and relevance of the assistance the consulting teachers provide has the potential to extend beyond curriculum support. The content of the assistance that consulting teachers provide could focus more on exploring the way that first-year teachers are thinking about their students, the curriculum and how students learn, and less on the adoption of prescribed behaviors. In focusing too much on prescribed behaviors suggested in *The Skillful Teacher*, the consulting teachers inadvertently narrowed the practices of teachers. The first-year teachers focused so much on satisfying the criteria of having written objectives, warm-ups and summarizers, that the larger issues of how they were thinking about teaching and learning as well as how their students were performing, were minimized. In addition, too much reliance on *The Skillful Teacher* perpetuated a misleading notion that good teaching is about adopting the right bag of tricks. In so

doing, the consulting teachers diminished the complexity of teaching in the eyes of the first-year teachers and overlooked the importance of contexts and moment-to-moment decisions that teachers must make within those contexts. Furthermore, as the consulting teachers pressed their clients to demonstrate prescribed behaviors, they gave first-year teachers a sense thatPAR was more about professional compliance than professional growth. Perhaps, the district sees PAR as a means of encouraging teachers to adopt research-based practices that will lead to improved teaching and learning. However, encouraging the blind adoption of particular practices without providing a forum for teachers to think about and discuss these approaches is unlikely to lead to sustainable changes in the teachers' instruction.

Overall, I found Peer Assistance and Review to be a promising program for supporting first-year teachers within their schools. The personalized attention and feedback the consulting teachers provided was unmatched by school-based supervisors. Yet, improving teaching quality by changing the deeply-held beliefs and practices of teachers is a complex task that the consulting teacher cannot bear alone. A coordinated approach to supervision that recognizes teachers' values and predispositions while providing opportunities for teachers to think critically about their instruction will move the district closer toward expanding and sustaining sound teaching practices. As the district attends more to the context of supervision and to encouraging more critical conversations among teachers about instruction, I believe Peer Assistance and Review can become one of the most powerful programs available to supervise first-year teachers and to lay the foundation for them to be committed to ongoing and continuous professional growth.

APPENDIX A

Teacher Evaluation Performance Standards, Performance Criteria, and Descriptive Examples

The six performance standards are defined and further supported by performance criteria. Descriptive examples of what a teacher might be doing in order to meet a specific standard are provided. The purpose of the examples is to create a sample picture of what teaching looks like when it meets and when it does not meet the ECPS performance standards. These examples are not provided to suggest that every teacher is expected to be doing all or everything that is described in either column. These examples can serve as a template against which to compare a teacher's overall performance on the six performance standards. They are not intended to isolate teaching strategies or behaviors in a checklist for assigning a numerical rating to teaching. They define a range of behaviors and provide examples and indicators. The examples that are provided are intentionally designed to reflect a high standard of performance.

Standard I: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

Performance Criteria

A The teacher acts on the belief that every student can learn and that all can master a challenging curriculum with appropriate accommodations.
B. The teacher sets quantifiable learning outcomes for students and holds the students and themselves accountable for meeting those objectives.
C. The teacher produces measurable growth in student achievement toward goals he/she has set on system-wide accountability measures.
D. The teacher recognizes individual differences in his/her students and adjusts his/her practices accordingly.
E. The teacher understands how students develop and learn.
F. The teacher extends his/her mission beyond the academic growth of students.

Examples of evidence of beliefs, commitment, and tenacity:

Meets standard	Below standard
holds all students to high standards and expectations, regardless of differences such as racial/ethnic group membership, gender, disabilities, socioeconomic background, or prior educational background and achievement	does not hold all students to high standards and expectations
plans and delivers lessons that challenge students without overwhelming them	delivers lessons that bore or frustrate students
sends these key messages to students through instructional practices and interactive behavior: a) This is important. b) You can do it. c) I won't give up on you. d) Effective effort leads to achievement	gives students the message that they are not all capable of learning a challenging curriculum

Standard I: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.

teaches students strategies for exerting effective effort, e.g. time management, study skills, knowledge, and use of resources including teacher, family , and peers	assumes that students know strategies for exerting effective effort and does not discuss or directly instruct students in these strategies
motivates and inspires in all students the willingness to learn, self-confidence, and/or perseverance	shows little or no concern for and/or discourages students' willingness to learn, self-confidence, or perseverance
encourages students to challenge themselves for personal growth in academic, vocational, arts, and extracurricular areas	does not encourage students to challenge themselves for personal growth in academic, vocational, arts, and other extracurricular areas
promotes students' social and emotional development	ignores students' social and emotional skill development
encourages students to set their own academic, social, and extracurricular goals	does not involve students in academic, social, and extracurricular goal-setting
teaches students to reflect on and to apply standards and criteria to their work	does not give students the information they need to evaluate their own work
provides prompt and specific feedback to students on their work and progress toward goals	does not provide prompt and/or specific feedback to students on their work and progress toward goals
provides opportunities for students to receive individual support as needed; perseveres in outreach to students	does not provide opportunities for individual support to students
uses differentiated activities and assignments that reflect high standards for all students	uses assignments and activities that do not reflect high standards for all students **OR** does not differentiate assignments and activities
shows students how differentiated assignments and learning activities are to assist them in meeting high standards	communicates to students that a differentiated assignment means a lack of the teacher's confidence in student ability to meet high standards
demonstrates/models sensitivity to all students; treats all students respectfully and equitably	does not demonstrate/model sensitivity to all students; does not treat all students respectfully and equitably
uses research and other information on students' developmental stages and how students think and learn in planning instruction	uses instructional practices that do not reflect research and other information on students' developmental stages and how students think and learn in planning instruction

Standard II: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

Performance Criteria

A. The teacher understands the content of his/her subject area(s) and how knowledge in his/her subject field is created, organized, and linked to other disciplines.
B. The teacher demonstrates subject area knowledge and conveys his/her knowledge clearly to students.
C. The teacher generates multiple paths to knowledge.
D. The teacher uses comprehensive planning skills to design effective instruction focused on student mastery of curriculum goals.

Examples of evidence of knowledge, planning skills, and successful instruction

The teacher ....

Meets standard	Below standard
displays deep and broad content knowledge in his/her field(s)	gives incorrect or insufficient information; does not correct student content errors; omits critical content from instruction
teaches the curriculum for his/her grade level(s) and subject(s) as defined by state and ECPS curriculum standards	does not teach the curriculum for his/her grade level(s) and subject(s) as defined by state and district curriculum standards
plans for the year, semester, marking period, unit, and day; includes all curricular goals with appropriate sequencing and time allocation	plans lessons that do not include; sequence, and balance all curricular goals
plans instruction in specific thinking skills and learning experiences that require student use of those skills	does not plan direct instruction in specific thinking skills; plans instruction that does not require students to use thinking skills beyond factual recall and basic co comprehension
provides clear explanations	provides explanations that are limited, vague, or lack coherence
asks questions appropriate to the mastery objective	asks questions that are not appropriate to the mastery objective
requires students to support their responses with evidence	accepts minimal student responses; does not probe for support or justification of responses
anticipates student misconceptions, difficulties, and confusion and adjusts instruction accordingly	delivers lessons without consideration of possible student misconceptions, difficulties, and confusion
identifies and uses a variety of sources of information within his/her subject(s)	uses a limited variety of sources of information within his/her subjects

Standard II: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.

models and teaches students a variety of ways to share their learning	does not give students an opportunity to share their learning
uses research and other information on students' developmental stages and how students think and learn in planning instruction	uses instructional practices that do not reflect research on students' developmental stages and how students think and learn
assigns homework, papers, projects, and other out-of-class activities that are extensions of classroom instruction	assigns homework, papers, projects, and other out-of-class activities that are not useful or relevant
plans lessons that focus on mastery objectives and communicates those objectives to students	plans lessons that focus only on coverage or activities
pre-assesses (formally and/or informally) student knowledge and skills in order to plan instruction	does not pre-assess student knowledge and skills
plans activities that create links between students' prior understanding and new knowledge	fails to link instruction to students' prior knowledge
consults with colleagues (in or outside the building) to develop lessons or units	plans only in isolation; never collaborates with colleagues in planning
provides appropriate opportunities for divergent thinking	does not allow disagreement or different views
identifies the appropriate criteria for students' demonstration of understanding of curricular objectives and communicates them explicitly	does not identify criteria for successful completion of the objective and/or does not clearly communicate the criteria to students
uses strategies that apply to a variety of learning styles	uses one type of strategy that applies to one learning style
checks for understanding in a variety of ways and modifies instruction to meet student needs	rarely or never checks for understanding
provides opportunities for students to summarize/reflect on what they have learned, articulate why it is important, and extend their thinking	provides few or no opportunities for students to summarize/reflect on what they have learned, articulate why it is important, and extend their thinking
plans for flexible student grouping to maximize student learning	students in same inflexible groups for instruction

Standard III: Teachers are responsible for establishing and managing student learning in a positive learning environment.
Performance Criteria

A. The teacher creates a classroom climate that promotes openness, mutual respect, support and inquiry.
B. The teacher creates an organized classroom that maximizes engaged student learning time.
C. The teacher establishes and maintains respectful, productive partnerships with families in support of student learning and well-being.
D. The teacher orchestrates learning in a variety of settings.
E. The teacher involves all students in meaningful learning activities.

Examples of evidence of positive climate, management, and family partnerships.

The teacher ....

Meets standard	Below standard
creates a classroom atmosphere that fosters students using each other as sources of knowledge, listening to, and showing respect for others' contributions	discourages students from using each other as sources of knowledge; does not model or promote listening to and showing respect for others' contributions
communicates the following messages: You can do it Effective effort leads to achievement	gives students the message that they are not all capable of learning a challenging curriculum
promotes positive interpersonal relationships among students	does not promote positive interpersonal relationships among students
builds positive interpersonal relationships with students	does not build positive interpersonal relationships with students
designs a classroom rich in multicultural resources; creates lessons that incorporate these resources; works with media specialist and other resources and experts to obtain multicultural resources	uses few multicultural resources; makes no effort to obtain multicultural resources
uses a repertoire of strategies matched to student needs to avoid and/or address behavior problems	fails to anticipate and/or appropriately address behavior problems
maximizes engaged student learning time by appropriately pacing lessons, making seamless transitions, having materials ready and organized, etc.	wastes learning time by not appropriately pacing lessons, failing to make smooth transitions or not having materials ready

creates a classroom atmosphere for students and families in which all are welcomed and valued	creates a classroom atmosphere for students and families in which all do not feel welcomed valued
solicits/uses information from families about their children's learning style, strengths, and needs	does not solicit or use information from families about their children's learning style, strengths and needs
communicates academic and/or behavioral concerns to families in order to develop collaborative solutions	does not communicate academic and/or behavioral concerns to families in order to develop collaborative solutions
communicates positive and/or negative feedback to families in a timely manner	limits feedback to the negative; does not provide feedback in a timely manner
communicates (telephone calls, interim reports, notes, conferences with family members, etc.) with families and responds to concerns	fails to communicate with families
provides opportunities for students to work positively and productively with others in a variety of groupings	provides limited or no opportunities for students to work positively and productively with others consistently designs lessons that are centered the teacher
uses a variety of instructional groupings appropriate to learning goals	uses little variety of instructional groupings or instructional groupings inappropriate to learning goals
arranges space, equipment, and materials to support instruction	does not arrange space, equipment, and/or materials to support instruction
arranges space, equipment, and materials to accommodate the needs of all students	allows the use of equipment, materials and/or the arrangement of furniture to inhibit engagement in learning
extends the learning environment beyond the classroom to include the media center, computer lab, community, etc.	does not use resources beyond the textbook
uses activities that are based on meaningful content	uses activities that are not meaningful to students

Standard IV: Teachers continually assess student progress, analyze the results, and adapt. instruction to improve student achievement.

Performance Criteria

A. The teacher uses a variety of formal and informal assessment techniques.
B. The teacher analyzes student information and results and plans instruction accordingly.

Examples of evidence of assessment, analysis, and adaptation of instruction

The teacher…

Meets standard	Below standard
gathers data about student performance and other relevant information from a variety of sources: previous teachers, guidance counselor, other staff: records, etc.; shares data with students' subsequent teachers and other staff	gathers little or no data about student's previous performance; does not share data with students' subsequent teachers and other staff
makes adjustments to assessment to meet the needs of students with differing learning styles or special needs	makes few or no adjustments to assessment to meet the needs of students with differing learning styles or special needs; assesses all students in the same way
develops and communicates clear criteria for success for student work; uses models, rubrics, exemplars, anchor papers, etc.	does not communicate clear criteria for success for student work; does not use models, rubrics, exemplars/anchor papers, etc.
develops and uses a clearly defined grading system that is consistent with the ECPS Grading and Reporting Policy and Regulations informs students and families	does not use a clearly defined grading system or uses a grading system that is inconsistent with the ECPS Grading and Reporting Policy and Regulations
assesses student progress before instruction *(pre-assessment),* during instruction *(formative assessment),* and after instruction *(summative assessment*	assesses student progress infrequently or only at the end of instruction
Maintains clear and accurate records of student performance	maintains no records of student performance; maintains records of student performance that are inaccurate, illegible, out of date, incomplete, etc.
Analyzes data about student performance and other relevant information and plans instruction accordingly	does not analyze and use data about student performance and other relevant information to plan instruction

Standard V: Teachers are committed to continuous improvement and professional development.

Performance Criteria

A. The teacher continually reflects upon his/her practice in promoting student learning and adjusts instruction accordingly.
B. The teacher draws upon educational research and research-based strategies in planning instructional content and delivery.
C. The teacher is an active member of professional learning communities.

Examples of evidence of reflection and collaboration for personal growth
  The teacher ....

Meets standard	Below standard
reflects on own strengths and weaknesses and modifies instruction accord in	does not reflect on the effectiveness of their instructional practice
develops a professional development plan (PDP); implements strategies that support PDP outcomes	does not develop a professional development plan (PDP); does not implement strategies that support PDP outcomes
develops and maintains a portfolio or other means of assembling evidence of meeting evaluation standards	assembles little or no evidence of meeting evaluation standards
analyzes the success of efforts undertaken during the professional growth years of the cycle; initiates reflective conversations with PDP support team, other _ staff development teacher (SDT), or supervisory staff	does not use the evaluation year to analyze the success of efforts undertaken during the professional growth years of the cycle; does not initiate reflective conversations with PDP support team, other peers, staff development teacher SDT , or supervisory staff
participates in workshops, conferences, activities sponsored by professional organizations, etc.; brings ideas back to the school and tries them in own instructional practice	never participates in workshops, conferences, activities sponsored by professional organizations, etc.
reviews current research; uses current research as a foundation for planning instructional content and delivery	does not review or use current research as a foundation for planning instructional content and delivery

Standard V: Teachers are committed to continuous improvement and professional development.

Meets standard	Below standard
Appropriately modifies instruction based on solicited and unsolicited feedback from students and parents/guardians	Does not solicit feedback from students and parents/guardians; does not act on any feedback, whether solicited or unsolicited
Supports vertical teaming efforts	does not support vertical teaming efforts even when time is provided
shares materials and experiences with colleagues; plans. evaluates, and reflects with colleagues on lessons	does not share materials and experiences with colleagues; does not plan, evaluate, or reflect with colleagues on lessons
actively participates in own informal and formal feedback conversations by analyzing teacher and student behaviors and making appropriate comments, questions and suggestions for improvement	participates passively, defensively, or reluctantly in own informal and formal feedback conversations; makes few or no comments or suggestions related to improving instruction
seeks the support of colleagues and is open to applying advice or suggestions	does not accept the support of colleagues
examines student work with colleagues to analyze and adjust instruction	does not work with colleagues to analyze student work

Standard VI: Teachers exhibit a high degree of professionalism.

Performance Criteria

A. The teacher understands and supports the vision of the school system.
B. The teacher views him/herself as a leader in the educational community.
C. The teacher contributes to the smooth functioning of the school environment.

Examples of evidence of leadership, professionalism, and routines

The teacher ....

Meets standard	Below standard
uses practices and procedures that align with ECPS vision, goals, policies and regulations	uses practices and procedures that are inconsistent with ECPS vision, goals, policies, and regulations
works with colleagues to analyze school needs and identify and implement strategies for school improvement and to support the mission of the school system	does not participate in school improvement planning and implementation
participates in and/or takes a leadership role in professional development activities, committees, or school-level decision making (i.e., Faculty Administration Collaboration Committees)	does not participate in required professional development or leadership activities within the school
participates in system-based representative structures (Council on Teaching and Learning, Council on Instruction or district wide work groups) and professional organizations	does not use appropriate avenues for expressing professional concerns
engages in dialogue, problem solving, planning or curricular improvement with other teachers in the same grade level or subject discipline within the school or across the district	does not respond to opportunities for dialogue or collaborative work with teachers in the same subject or grade level
serves as a formal or informal mentor to others	seldom dialogues with colleagues about teaching
represents the school well when dealing with students, parents, and other members of the community	does not represent the school well when dealing with students, parents, and other members of the community .

Standard VI: Teachers exhibit a high degree of professionalism.

Meets standard	Below standard
interacts in a respectful manner with all members of the school community	shows a lack of respect or professional courtesy to some members of the school community
participates in development and implementation of local school improvement goals	does not participate in development and implementation of local school improvement goals
develops and teaches objectives that reflect local school improvement goals	does not teach objectives consistent with local school improvement goals
establishes classroom standards and policies that are consistent with school-wide policies	establishes classroom standards and policies that are inconsistent with school-wide policies
sponsors, actively participates in, and/or supports student extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities such as clubs, teams, cultural productions, etc.	does not participate in or support any student extracurricular activities
meets professional obligations in a timely fashion (e.g., submits paperwork, reports, and responds to requests for information on time	does not meet professional obligations in a timely fashion; does not submit paperwork
attends work regularly, arrives at work on time, and does not leave before the end of the defined work day	is frequently absent, arrives at work late, and/or leaves before the end of the defined work day
starts and ends class on time	does not start and/or end class on time
leaves well-planned lessons when absent	leaves poor or no lesson plans when absent
provides data and feedback about student progress for course placement, parent conferences, Educational Management Team (EMT), meetings, annual reviews, etc., as requested and in a timely manner	provides little or no data and feedback about student progress *for* course placement, parent conferences, Educational Management Team (EMT), meetings, or annual reviews, does not provide data and feedback in a timely manner

APPENDIX B

Notes 10/14/00 Leadership Briefing

-Peer review has been around in some places for 15 years.
-ECEA brought it to the districts attention
-In the past there was a more traditional approach to teacher evaluation—a supervisor makes the evaluation.

-Efforts begin in 1985; ECEA was frustrated in trying to get the school system interested.

-TURN—works for education reform and union reform
-The leadership of NEA and the state teachers' association is also supporting this effort

>   -you must differentiate between 2 teachers → new/veteran
>   -find a way to help incompetent teachers leave

-people observing who have a common language about teaching; a lot of training and development of those who would be observing

Speaker: ECEA president: → 1997 proposed to board of ed. that we enter a problem-solving process of negotiating; interest-based bargaining;
--bargaining that year contained language that put staff development front & center
--language in student results; accountability (no student has the right to fail)
--14 joint work groups produced as a result of this contract
--we took the hard road to getting to PAR—the union went to principals; 1st negotiated the language with them on PAR—spent the last year doing this

Associate Superintendent of HR
--we are operationalizing a good idea
-34 schools → new standards based on NBPTS
-what does it look like to meet standards and not meet standards
-professional growth cycle—once teachers enter tenure (after 2 years) phase they must review their own development; time/focus a peer observation and peer review—
--PAR—20 consulting teachers
         81 teachers identified by principals as in need of support
         67 teachers currently in program
         --unprecedented for ECPS to have 11 teachers resign because of quality
         requirements
--PAR Panel—6 teachers/6 principals…a collaboration between the two to look at quality
--Research for Better Teaching originally provided training

--every Thurs, morning…teachers union president meet w/ county reps.

--if you're designated as below standards, you go into the PAR program

Speaker: Julia Koppich

What has teacher quality meant across the country?

History—How have we gotten to the point of focusing on teacher quality?

1983—A Nation At Risk

1987—Intensification—if we did everything we've always done, but harder/faster and under state scrutiny, we'd improve...this didn't happen

1987-1997—2nd wave of reform—development of standards and assessments; provided teachers with modest decision making authority (SBM); school achievement didn't go up

Currently—in all states except Iowa we have student achievement standards
--we're moving to a standards-based form of education.
--parents/community/etc. are saying that 'teaching matters.'
--there's a range of ways people can think we can improve teaching quality

Five components of improving teaching quality

 (1) much better teacher preparation programs
 (2) well supported induction programs for new teachers; 30% of new teachers leave within the first 3 years of teaching; in urban systems it's 50%
 (3) high quality and sustained professional development
 (4) evaluation systems based on standards of good teaching…including evidence of student learning
 (5) constructing a new compensation system

--Koppich has been asked by the National Alliance of Business to write a teacher quality report; scheduled to be released shortly after the November election.

Speaker: Fran Prolman, Research for Better Teaching

Her discussion today will be about: their five propositions on teaching, research on collegiality, and the importance of a labor-management connection

Propositions about Teaching

 (1) nothing is as important as a teacher and what goes on between a teacher and children, minute-to-minute, lesson to lesson, day to day.
 (2) It is hard to imagine anything more demanding or conceptually complex as teaching. (1300 decisions a day—Jacob Kounin)
 (3) The study of teaching is inherently interesting.
 (4) There is a real knowledge base about teaching.

(5) One of the most satisfying and productive things that we could do for each other is to talk about teaching together.

Collegiality

-Collegiality is most confused with congeniality. In a highly congenial school, there's food… "we're happy, we're having a great time, we're doing everything right"; there's no correlation between congeniality and student achievement.

-Judith Warren Little notes that there are five things that happen in highly effective schools:
  (1) high frequency of teachers talking concretely and precisely about teaching
  (2) high frequency of teachers planning and making materials together
  (3) high frequency of teachers observing one another.
  (4) Teacher are teaching each other about the practice of teaching

--Rosenholz…teachers are asking for and providing each other with assistance.

Speakers: Panel from ECEA's PAR program—both co-chairs of the PAR panel; two consulting teachers; one Observation and Analysis of Teaching (OAT) trainer

In Observation and Analysis of Teaching (OAT), we teach students how to communicate the following messages to students: this is important; you can do this; we can do this together…I won't give up on you.

--the staff development teacher facilitates the five aspects of collegiality; they assist teachers in talking about teaching
--What is in place right now to measure the new program?
  The Associate Superintendent for Human Resources—GWU…a team of five sets the model for the evaluation; data will be assessed quarterly; we are capturing the work of the staff development teacher

--High quality, sustained professional development…what would this look like in the view of teachers?
  PD is job-embedded; course in Understanding Teaching; technology…as we look at PD long-term

--consulting teachers are introduced to their clients by the principal; CTs develop a rapport with teachers; build trust before the formal observation; human resource skills

--Parents/PTA—wants to include parents in this initiative; Is there a component to helping teachers learn to work with parents

--staff development teachers job is focused on PD and if there is a classroom crisis; it may not be appropriate for the staff development teacher to come in.

--feedback sharing//follow-up from observations is time-consuming

Discussion Specifically About PAR

--Is it being accepted by teachers?
- A consulting teacher responds that not only is he expected, but teachers have lots of questions for him.
- From a principal…teachers usually get defensive when the principal suggests something.
- Teachers are emailing questions to CTs

PD Process Joint Work Group…union and school system will look at rewarding excellence.

--Evaluation of PAR—formative way…thru GWU…professional growth cycle; summative way…building in record keeping

Dept. of Staff Development/Community Superintendents/ECEA/administrator/union support staff are a part of the Evaluation Implementation Team, which meets weekly…making instantaneous mid-year corrections to the program.

--There are four trainings (modules 1, 2, 3, 4) for Phase I schools; rubrics, expectations, etc.

--will hire an additional 20 CTs next year

--We chose to implement PAR when there was money; what happens where there is no money? ECPS was spending less than 1% on teacher evaluation; it's now spending $11 million, which represents 2% of its budget, on teacher evaluation.; New York spends 6% of its budget on professional development.

--The reason for the 3-year phase in is that the cost of doing this is significant.

ECPS School Board Member:
--If we are going to raise the bar and close the gap…everybody's tried everything else…we have to do this; In the county 1300 teachers were hired; 2000 teachers were produced from Maryland schools last year, but 11,000 teachers will be needed statewide next year; we have an aging workforce.

APPENDIX C

Interview Protocol--First Year Teachers
Initial Interview

Teacher's Name _____   Consulting Teacher _____
School _____   Principal _____
Subject/Grades Assigned _____   Resource Teacher_____
Mentor Teacher _____
Certification Area_____   Highest Degree _____
Universities Attended _____   Age _____

  I. Personal Background/Interests
     1) Why did you decide to become a teacher? (probe for interest in subject area; specific reasons for "love of children"; specific prior experiences with children and teens)
     2) What did your family think of your decision to become a teacher then? How does your family feel about the career you are about to embark upon now? (probe for who the beginning teacher lives with; what his or her family obligations are; the level of support his or her family provides)
     3) What aspects of your personal experiences do you feel will be most beneficial to you in working with students?
     4) What was school like for you?
     5) How would you like your students to experience school? What do you believe is your role in helping students have that kind of experience?

II. Professional Preparation
     1) Where did you receive your preparation for teaching?
     2) What were the most heavily emphasized aspects of that preparation? (probe…when you think about what the program really tried to get you to know or do…what sticks out in your mind the most?)
     3) Did you student teach? If so, what grades/subject areas were you assigned to teach? And, what were the most important things you got out of that experience?
     4) How would you describe your relationship with your cooperating teacher (or teachers)?

III. Expectations
     1) Now that you know which school you're teaching at and what your class schedule is, what do you think your students will be like?
     2) What do you believe your students may struggle with the most in your subject area?
     3) What do you expect students to like the best about your subject area?
     4) What do you see as the greatest strength(s) you bring to teaching? (probe for specific strengths he or she brings to teaching this particular subject area)

5) What do you believe will be your greatest challenge(s) as you begin to teach?

IV. Attitudes and Beliefs About Assistance
1) When you encounter challenges on the job, what type of assistance is available to you at the school? (probe for who the beginning teacher would go to if he or she needs some help; follow-up from the specific possible challenges the teacher named in III. #5)
2) What type of training does the county offer?
3) What, if anything, do you know about PAR? How did you obtain this information?
4) Do you have any other sources of assistance? If so, what? (probe for family members or close friends who teach; alliances with university professors; other organizational affiliations)
5) In your opinion, should beginning teachers seek assistance for any/all types of challenges they encounter? If not, what are the types of problems that they should seek assistance for and what are the types of problems that they should handle themselves?

Interview Protocol–First Year Teachers
Second Interview

Expectations
1) What types of experiences have you had as a teacher thus far that have been similar to what you expected to occur? What experiences have taken you by surprise?
2) Give an example of how you handled a situation or experience that caught you by surprise.

Instruction
Planning Instruction
1) Give me an idea of what units and major concepts you've covered with the class I've been observing this year.
2) Talk to me about your planning process…walk me through the typical steps you take in planning a unit and in planning individual lessons. How do you decide on what your objectives will be?
3) What specific assistance in instructional planning has your consulting teacher provided to you? (List examples).

Implementing Instruction
4) What instructional approaches seem to work best for your students? What instructional approaches have been less successful in your work with students?
5) What signals do you look for to decide whether or not an instructional approach is working well for students?
6) What concepts (or aspects of the subject matter) do students have the most difficulty grasping? What approaches are you using to help students grasp the material? What signals do you look for to decide whether or not students have "gotten it."

Motivating Students
7) What challenges do you face in terms of students coming to class ready to learn?
8) How have you attempted to overcome these challenges?

Experiences in PAR
8) At this point in the school year, what is your understanding of what Peer Assistance and Review is?
9) Tell me about your CT. What kind of teacher is he or she? How are his or her approaches to and
thinking about teaching the same or different from your own? How qualified is he or she to serve in the role of CT?
10) How often do you have contact with your consulting teacher? Who initiates the contact? How long do the encounters last? (Give an example of the typical CT visit)

11) What have you discussed with your consulting teacher thus far?

12) How comfortable do you feel (and what opportunities have you had) discussing classroom challenges with your CT? What has contributed to your level of comfort?

13) How comfortable do you feel with the frequency of classroom observations your CT makes? Does the CT's presence in any way change the dynamics of your classroom? If so, how?

14) What about your teaching does the CT look upon favorably? What aspects of your teaching would your CT like to see change?

15) What does your CT say or do to persuade you? How does he or she attempt to get you to think about something differently? (Provide an example if applicable).

16) Is there anything so far about your teaching or the way that you think about teaching that has changed as a direct result of your work with your CT?

17) What do you consider the most and least useful advice your CT has offered to you?

18) What do you believe your CT has learned or come to see differently as a result of working with you?

19) How has the CT's role been similar to or different from the role of your RT and your supervising AP?

Assistance

20) Beyond what we've already discussed, what are examples of things that you had questions about or needed help with during the past couple of months? (Probe for help finding instructional materials, understanding school policies, instructional planning, classroom management)

21) What did you do when you needed help with those things?

22) Which people at your school do you rely on for assistance? Why are those people most helpful to you?

Professional Growth

23) How have you changed as a teacher since the very beginning of the year? What do you know now that you didn't know before? What would you tell future new teachers about what they need to know to be successful?

24) Talk about the professional development opportunities that you have had this year? Which were required and which were voluntary? Who provided you with these opportunities? (district, school, etc.)

25) How would you rate the usefulness of these professional development opportunities? What were the strengths and weaknesses of the professional development activities in which you engaged?

26) What aspects of teaching do you feel you need to work on to improve your overall teaching quality?

27) What would help you accomplish your professional goals?

Interview Protocol–First Year Teachers
Third Interview

Changes Beginning Second Semester

1) Do you get a chance to reflect on your work as a first year teacher? How do you go about this process?
2) When second semester began, give me the top three things about your teaching/instructional approaches that you said you definitely wanted to continue and the top three things that you definitely want to change. Explain why.
3) How have you gone about implementing changes? What have been the results?

Curriculum/Planning for Second Semester

1) For the class that I've been observing, what units/literary works have you covered so far?
2) How do you assess students progress in this class?
3) What approaches to instruction seem to work best for students in this class?
4) What do you identify as the main things students struggle with in this class? What have you done to improve student performance/understanding in those areas?
5) How do you communicate with the parents of students in this class?
6) Have you ever conducted student evaluations in your classes?

Changes that the CT Tried to Elicit

1) The county seems to promote this kind of daily lesson: a warm-up at the beginning, an objective on the board, and agenda on the board, and a summarizing activity. I don't see these things necessarily in your classroom…you do your own thing…explain why?
2) How has your CT worked with you during the second semester? Did the way he/she work with you second semester change from the way he/she had been working with you first semester?
3) What sorts of suggestions has the CT made to you for this semester?
4) Does the CTs presence change the dynamics of what happens in your class? Does the CTs presence change what you do in your class?
5) If the CT was **not** submitting an evaluation for you, do you think that would change the way you worked with him/her this year? If so, how? If not, why not?
6) Now that your final summative report has been completed, what would you say that you got out of participating in the PAR program?
7) What suggestions do you have for how the county can improve the program as it relates to the growth/assistance of new teachers?

Assistance from Multiple Sources

28) Explain the role of your Resource Teacher in assisting you with your job.
29) Explain any interactions you have had this year with the Staff Development Teacher.
30) Explain what you've done with your mentor this year.
31) What is your relationship like with the other English teachers in the department? Is there anyone in the department that you seek assistance from or who has offered you help?
32) Is there anyone who we have not discussed (inside or outside of school) who you've sought for assistance? Who? And, what kind of assistance/advice did he or she provide you with?

Professional Growth

33) What do you know at this point in the year that you didn't know before? What would you tell future new teachers about what they need to know to be successful?
34) Talk about the professional development opportunities that you have had this year? Which were required and which were voluntary? Who provided you with these opportunities? (district, school, etc.)
35) How would you rate the usefulness of these professional development opportunities? What were the strengths and weaknesses of the professional development activities in which you engaged?
36) What do you believe are your strengths as an instructor and what are things you continue to struggle with and wish to improve about your teaching? How could the district assist your efforts to improve?

Job Satisfaction

1) Do you enjoy teaching? Why or why not?
2) How long do you plan to stay in teaching? What are your career goals?

Observation Protocol
Classroom Observations of First-Year Teachers

Teachers Name _____ Certification Area _____
Subject/Grade _____ Date/Time of Observation _____
Male Students _____ # Female Students _____

Physical setting:
      1) What is on the board? [clarity of objectives and itinerary]
      2) What is on the walls? [learning environment]

Standard I: Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
   1) Is the teacher clear about what the students are expected to accomplish during the class period?
     Does the teacher communicate that the curriculum is important?
   2) How does the teacher establish rapport with <u>all</u> students and motivate them to learn?
   3) Does the teacher pose challenging questions and problems to <u>all</u> students?
   4) Does the teacher frequently check for student understanding, and adjust his or her instruction based on those checks?
   5) Does the teacher communicate high expectations for <u>all</u> students? Does he or she stick with students who are struggling?

Standard II: Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
   1) Does the teacher find out what students already know about the topic?
   2) Does the teacher use what students already know as a bridge to learning new information?
   3) Has the teacher anticipated what students will misunderstand? How does the teacher react to students' misunderstandings?
   4) Are the teacher's explanations clear?
   5) Does the teacher explain the material in multiple ways, and engage students by using multiple approaches to instruction?

Standard III: Teachers are responsible for establishing and managing student learning in a positive learning environment.

   1) How has the teacher established classroom routines?
   2) How much class time is taken up for administrative items (i.e. attendance, plan books, etc.)?
   3) Does the teacher encourage <u>all</u> students to ask questions and participate actively in discussions?
   4) Does the teacher show an interest in what students are interested in?

5) Are instructional activities meaningful? Does the teacher make explicit how the instructional activities are tied to the curriculum?

Standard IV: Teachers continually assess student progress, analyze results and adapt instruction to improve achievement.

1) Is it evident that the teacher uses different forms of assessment with students?
2) Is the teacher using rubrics with students?
3) Is the form of assessment the teacher is using a valid way of measuring student understanding of the topic?

Standard V: Teachers exhibit a high degree of professionalism.

1) How does the teacher distinguish him- or herself from students? (in tone, in dress, in interactions)
2) How prepared is the teacher to implement instruction?

APPENDIX D

Interview Protocol--Consulting Teachers (CTs)
Initial Interview

Consulting Teacher's Name _____ Date _____
Certification Area   _____
Teaching Experience: Years exp. teaching? _____   Years in this district? ____
Years as a CT? _____
Description of Caseload: How many clients new to teaching? _____
How many clients in remediation?_____
Are you working with any clients who you worked with last year? _____
If so, how many?_____   How many schools do you have clients in? _____

   I.   Personal Background/Interests in Mentoring/Coaching Teachers

              1) Why did you decide to enter the teaching profession?
              2) What led to your decision to apply for a position as a CT? What personal
                 attributes do you possess that are particularly useful to you as a CT?
              3) Is working with adults different than working with students? If so, how? If
                 not, what are the strong similarities?

   II.   Professional Preparation
              1) What training did you receive in order to be a CT?
              2) Looking back, what were the most and least useful aspects of that training?
              3) What aspects of your other professional experiences (i.e. teaching) do you
                 feel are the most beneficial to you in the role of CT?

   III.   Attitude Towards Daily Tasks
              4) What is a typical week like for you as a CT? (Applicable only if this is a CT
                 in his or her 2nd year)
              5) What aspects of your job do you enjoy the most? What aspects of your job
                 do you like the least?
              6) How is working with beginning teachers different from working with
                 teachers in remediation?

   IV.   Specifics about Beginning Teacher in Study
              1) What will your role be during the new teacher training week?
              2) How will you set up your initial meeting with the new teacher(s)? Where
                 will it be? Who will introduce you to the teacher(s)?
              3) What about yourself do you plan to share with the beginning teacher? Why?
              4) What do you hope to accomplish in the initial meeting?
              5) How will you accomplish those things?
              6) How will you decide when your next visit will be?

Interview Protocol—Consulting Teachers (CT)
Second Interview

Relationship with the Beginning Teacher

1) How often have you had the chance to work with this beginning teacher?
2) Who initiates the communication between the two of you?
3) What do you typically talk about with the beginning teacher?
4) Have you found it easy or difficult to work with this beginning teacher? Explain.

Assistance given to Beginning Teacher by CT

1) How did you identify the type of help this beginning teacher would need? And, what did you identify as the specific areas in which the beginning teacher needed assistance?
2) Did the beginning teacher agree with you that he or she needed assistance in the areas you identified?
3) In what specific ways have you attempted to help this beginning teacher?
4) Has the beginning teacher accepted your assistance?

CT Collaboration with Other Sources of Beginning Teacher Assistance at School Site

1) Have you ever had the opportunity to talk with the beginning teacher's resource teacher or supervising administrator? Why or why not?
2) What particular topics did you discuss with the resource teachers or supervising administrators?
3) Have you, the resource teacher, and the supervising administrator always been on one accord when it comes to identifying the needs of the beginning teacher? If not, describe what conflicts existed and how did you handle these conflicts?
4) What types of professional development activities as the beginning teacher participated in this year? How much do you believe those activities have enhanced the teacher's practice?

Instructional Influences

1) What changes have you seen in the beginning teacher's performance throughout the year?
2) To what do you attribute these changes?

CT Self-Evaluation

1) What personal strengths assisted you in working with this beginning teacher?
2) What, if anything, would you do differently in working with this beginning teacher?
3) What types of professional development would be most useful to you as a consulting teacher?

Interview Protocol—Resource Teachers
Initial Interview

Personal Background
   1) How long have you taught English?
   2) How long have you been teaching at this school? How long have you been an RT? What led to your decision to become an RT? What's it like to work at this school? How would you describe student backgrounds, etc. at this school?
   3) What is your role as RT? How many classes do you teach? How frequently does the department meet? Are you involved in the accreditation process?
   4) Are you also the staff development teacher for your department? If so, what do you do in that role? If not, how do you work with the designated staff development teacher? [probe for the RTs role in the professional development of teachers in his or her department].

Work with New Teachers
   1) In your experience what have been the primary needs that new teachers have? What are the areas in which new teachers struggle the most?
   2) What is your personal approach to assisting new teachers?
   3) What do you focus on when evaluating new teachers?
   4) What sort of feedback is important for new teachers to receive?
   5) What are example of the range of things that you've interacted with the new teachers in my study about?
   6) Where do you identify as the strengths and areas of need of the new teachers in this study?
   7) Are there any special programs or regular meetings for new teachers that the school sponsors?

Work with Additional New Teacher Supports
   1) How do you see the role of the consulting teacher? How is his or her role different from and similar to your own?
   2) Do you ever have an opportunity to speak with the CT? If so, what is the nature of the conversations you've had thus far this year?
   3) How long has this school been participating in PAR? What do you see thus far as the benefits and drawbacks of PAR? What do you think needs to be done to refine the program?
   4) Who are the new teachers' mentors? What are their roles in working with the new teacher?
   5) What is the supervising AP's role in working with new teachers? What characterizes the types of interactions you have with the AP regarding the new teachers in your department?

References

Acheson, K. A. & Gall, M. D. (1992). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers*, 3rd edition. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Adler, P.A., & Adler, P. (1998). Observational techniques. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials.* (pp. 79-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

American Federation of Teachers, & National Education Association. (1998). *Peer assistance and review: An AFT/NEA handbook*. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association.

Anderson, L., & Pellicer, L. (2001). *Teacher peer assistance and review*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Ayers, W. (1993). *To teach: The journey of a teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bartell, C. (1995). Shaping teacher induction policy in California. *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 22(4), 27-43.

Bascia, N. (2000). The other side of the equation: Professional development and the organizational capacity of teacher unions. *Educational Policy,* 14(3), 385-404.

Bascia, N. (1994). *Unions in teachers' professional lives*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Benzley, J. (1985). Peer evaluation: An interview study of teachers evaluating teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Chicago, IL.

Black, S. (2000). Evaluation for growth. *American School Board Journal,* 58-61.

Blau, P. & Scott, W. (1962). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Pub. Co.

Bloom, G., & Goldstein, J. (2000). *The peer assistance and review reader*. Santa Cruz, California: New Teacher Center.

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

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1998). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (1999). *How People Learn.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Chase, B. (1999). The new NEA: Reinventing teacher unions. In B. Peterson & M. Charney (Eds.), *Transforming teacher unions: Fighting for better schools and social justice.* Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools, Ltd.

Chase, R. (1997). *The new NEA: Reinventing teacher unions for a new era.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Chase, R. (1996, November). Sleeping with the enemy. *The Washington Post.*

Chase, R. (2001, April 22). To hire and to hold. *The Washington Post.*

Cohen, D.K.; McLaughlin, M. and Talbert, J.E (1993). *Teaching for understanding: Challenges for policy and practice.* Jossey Bass.

Colbert, J., & Wolff, D. (1992). Surviving in urban schools: A collaborative model for a beginning teacher support system. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 43 (3), 193-99.

Costa, A. & Garmston, R. (2002). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools.* Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.

Creswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice.* (ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1986). A proposal for evaluation in the teaching profession. *The Elementary School Journal,* 86(4), 530-551.

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

Duke, D. (1993). Removing barriers to professional growth. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 74(9), 702-4, 710-12.

Education Week. (2000, January 13). Who should teach? The states decide. *Education Week Quality Counts 2000,* 19, 8-9.

Evertson, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1985). Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 36(3), 2-12.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). Helping novices learn to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 52(1), 17-31.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (1998). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials.* (pp. 47-78). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S., Ross-Gordon, J. (2004). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

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

Goldstein, J. (2003). *Teachers at the professional threshold: Distributing leadership responsibility for teacher evaluation.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Goldstein, J. (2003a, Winter). Making sense of distributed leadership: The case of peer assistance and review. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 25(4), pp. 397-421.

Gordon (1997). Has the field of supervision evolved to a point that it should be called something else? *Yes.* In J. Glanz and R. F. Neville (Eds.), *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies*, pp. 114-123. Norwood: MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Gratch, A. (1998). Beginning teacher and mentor relationships. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 49(3), 220-228.

Hodder, I. (1998). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials.* (pp. 110-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Holland (1998). Processes and techniques in supervision. In Firth, G. and Pajak, E. *Handbook of research on school supervision*. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Holland (2004, June). Principals as supervisors: A balancing act. In *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*. 88 (639), 3-14.

Hoy, W. & Forsyth, P. (1986). *Effective supervision : Theory into practice*. New York : Random House.

Huling-Austin, L. (1992). Research on learning to teach: Implications for teacher induction and mentoring programs. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 43(3), 173-180.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 37(1), 2-5.

Jerald, C., & Boser, U. (2000, January 13). Setting policies for new teachers. *Education Week Quality Counts 2000,* 19, 44-47.

Johnson, S. (1984). *Teacher unions in schools*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

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

Kelly, P. (1998). *Teacher unionism and professionalism: An institutional analysis of peer review programs and the competing criteria for legitimacy.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, St. Lansing.

Kerchner, C., Koppich, J., & Weeres, J. (1997). *United mind workers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kerchner, C., & Mitchell, D. (1988). *The changing idea of a teachers' union*. New York: The Falmer Press.

Kerchner, C.T., & Koppich, J.E. (2000). Organizing around quality: The frontiers of teacher unionism. In T. Loveless (Ed.), *Conflicting missions? Teachers unions and educational reform.* (pp. 281-315). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Knight, P. (1990). *Teachers as leaders: A descriptive study of the peer assistance and review consltant teacher leaders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Koppich, J.E., & Kerchner, C.T. (1999). Organizing the other half of teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: handbook of policy and practice.* (pp. 315-340). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Little, J. (1990). The mentor phenomenon and the social organization of teaching. *Review of Research in Education,* 16, 297-351.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher, A Sociological Study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Malen and Knapp (1997). Rethinking the multiple perspectives approach to education policy analysis: Implications for policy-practice connections. *Journal of Education Policy*, 12 (5), 419-445.

McColskey, W., & Egelson, P. (1997). *Designing teacher evaluation systems that support professional growth*. Greensboro, NC: SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education.

McQuarrie, F. & Wood (1991, Spring). Supervision, staff development, and evaluation connections. *Theory into Practice,* <u>30</u> (2), p. 91-96.

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis, An expanded sourcebook*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miner, B. (1999). Networking for union reform: The story of TURN. In Anonymous, *Transforming teacher unions.* (pp. 22-24). Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Rethinking Schools.

Moo, G. (1999). *Power grab*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc.

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

Murphy, J. (1980). *Getting the facts*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Murray, C. (2000). Exploring the 'new' unionism: Perceptions of recently tenured teachers.

National Center for Education Statistics (2001). Retrieved May 2001, from http://nces.ed.gov//programs/projections/ch_5.asp.

National Commission for Teaching & America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. (ed.). New York: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk*.(ed.). Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

National Education Association. (1999). Peer assistance programs and peer assistance and review programs. Available http://www.nea.org/resolutions/99/99d-11.html.

Nolan, J. and Hoover, L. (2003). Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice. San Francisco, CA: Wiley and Sons.

Odell, S. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. *Journal of Teacher Education,* <u>37</u>(1), 26-29.

Odell, S., Huling, L., Resta, V., Feiman-Nemser, S., Schwille, S., Bartell, C., Day, B., DeBolt, G., Dynak, J., Head, F., Nagel, A., Reiman, A., Sweeny, B., & Wolfe, M. (2000). Framework for quality mentoring. In S. Odell & L. Huling (Eds.), *Quality mentoring for novice teachers.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators.

Odell, S., Huling, L., & Sweeny, B. (2000). Conceptualizing quality mentoring--Background information. In S. Odell & L. Huling (Eds.), *Quality Mentoring for Novice Teachers.* (pp. 3-14). Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators.

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

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitativer esearch ande valuation methods*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Peterson, K.D. (1990). Assistance and assessment for beginning teachers. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation.* (pp. 104-115). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Recruiting New Teachers (1999). *Learning the ropes: Urban teacher induction programs and practices in the United States*. Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers.

Richards, T., & Richards, L. (1998). Using computers in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rogers, R., & Threatt, D. (2000). Peer assistance and review: Lessons from Mt. Diablo. *Thrust for Educational Leadership,* 29(3), 14-16.

Schaffer, E., Stringfield, S., & Wolfe, D. (1992). An innovative beginning teacher induction program: A two-year analysis of classroom interactions. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 43(3), 181-192.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. United States of America: Basic Books, Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). Moral authority and the regeneration of supervision. In Glickman (Ed.), *Supervision in transition* (pp. 203-214). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T. and Starratt, R. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition*. (7th Ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Stallings, J. (1980). Allocated academic learning time revisited, or beyond time on task. *Educational Researcher,* 9(11), 11-16.

Stedman, P., & Stroot, S. (1998). Teachers helping teachers. *Educational*

Leadership, 55, 37-38.

Stiggins, R., & Duke, D. (1988). *The case for commitment to teacher growth: Research on teacher evaluation.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stodolksy, S. (1990). Classroom observation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers.* (pp. 175-190). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Stroble, E., & Cooper, J. (1998). Mentor teachers: Coaches or referees? *Theory into Practice,* 27(3), 231-36.

Stronge, J. (1997). Improving schools through teacher evaluation. In J. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching.* Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Stroot, S., Fowlkes, J., Langholz, J., Paxton, P., Stedman, P., Steffes, L., & Valtman, A. (1999). Impact of a collaborative peer assistance and review model on entry-year teachers in a large urban school setting. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 50(1), 27-41.

Sullivan, S. & Glanz, J. (1999) *Supervision that improves teaching : Strategies and techniques*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1987). *Supervision in education :   Problems and practices* New York : Macmillan.

Tracy, S. (1998). Models and approaches. In Firth, G. and Pajak, E. *Handbook of research on school supervision.* New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Tellez, K. (1992). Mentors by choice, not design: Help-seeking by beginning teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education,* 43(3), 214-221.

Tyack & Cuban (1997). *Tinkering toward Utopia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research,* 54(2), 143-78.

Waite, D. and Fernandes, M. (2000). Complicity in supervision: Another postmodern moment. In Glanz, J. and Behar-Horenstein, L. (Eds.) *Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision,* Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Wolcott, H. (1990). On seeking--and rejecting--validity in qualitative research. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate.*(pp. 121 -152). New York: Teachers College Press.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Zeichner, K., & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective teaching*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.