

mal supervisory responsibilities for that teacher. They monitor attendance, make brief (5- to 10-minute) classroom visits, and record overall observations about the professional behavior of the teacher being mentored.

At every level of the program, the emphasis is upon sharing governance. District-level union officials and ad-

ministrators share in the supervision of mentors. Twice a year, mentors formally report the progress of their supervisees to the review board, which in turn carefully scrutinizes their efforts. Mentors may also recommend retention or termination of the teachers to the review board. After

novice teachers have successfully completed the first year, they are then placed in a traditional supervisory relationship with the building administrators, who make all subsequent retention and tenure recommendations.

Is it a perfect system without tension? Not always. For years administrators were reluctant to give up any traditional supervisory responsibilities; some remain skeptical. Because roles and responsibilities are at times ambiguous, those in participative governance situations need to be flexible. For example, because mentors are assigned to several schools, they do not directly associate with parents. Thus, if a novice is challenged by a parent, the administrator steps in as usual.

The benefits of shared governance, though, seem to compensate for these drawbacks. For the mentors, making meaningful contributions to the educational goals of the district provides powerful intrinsic rewards. For the novices, receiving more time, attention, and practical assistance than a building administrator can provide is a plus—a point with which administrators agree. Novices also feel their internship period prepares them in ways that their student teaching did not. While administrators share supervision with senior teachers during the novices' critical first year, they do retain many traditional supervisory responsibilities. The benefits of shared governance for administrators are twofold: gaining more competent teachers and having time to redirect their energies into other important responsibilities.

Suburban/Rural High School

"Suburban/Rural High" has 800 students, 65 faculty members. It is an East Coast traditional high school. For 15 years teachers there have been organized into departments without chairpersons in which they collectively make all instructional and managerial decisions. They select their courses and texts, schedule classes, determine budgetary allocations, order books and materials, and participate in hiring new staff and administrators. In addition, all members of the professional staff—administrators, librarians, counselors, and teachers—serve as personal and academic advisers to approximately

The More I See, The Better I Teach

Leo J. Gensante and Elizabeth M. Matgouranis

Today's staff development programs often focus on narrowly defined, technical models of teaching; supervision of instruction then falls within the limitations of these models. The result: teachers who function as technicians, as clones.

Reflective teaching, on the other hand, is "predicated on a broad and in-depth understanding of what is happening in the classroom" (Wildman and Niles 1987). It promotes dialogue about classroom events, dialogue requiring information, lots of information, sometimes in complex configurations (Barnett 1987). The result: teachers who are their own best critics.

We have developed our own staff development model to encourage reflective teaching. We believe that to reflect on their practice, teachers must first be able to describe what they are doing (Bracey 1987). When they learn the skills of observation typically reserved for supervisors and administrators, they become more analytical and insightful about their own teaching: They see themselves as others (their students) see them.

Information. We begin with the idea that information is the basis for all instructional decisions; then we provide an overview of effective teaching research. Teachers can draw this information from any number of models of teaching and use it conceptually. Conveying to teachers that this knowledge is a common language for decision making, not a formula for every lesson taught, is the key to proper integration of the information.

Data collection. In limited fashion, we've trained teachers to collect objective data as documentation for analysis of their teaching. Specifically, teachers learn to use anecdotal notetaking (not scripting), time-on-task coding, and seating chart flows. Teachers' initial fascination with these procedures leads to enthusiastic application and the development of keener observation powers. The real payoff is evident during the next stage, when teachers begin to analyze and reflect on their data.

Analysis. Focusing only on what they can document, teachers prepare nonjudgmental write-ups of how the lesson began, progressed, and concluded. Next the observer records important teaching skills and specific teacher and student behaviors seen during the lesson. These indicators become the basis for dialogue between observer and teacher. Finally, the observer lists behaviors that were less effective, such as "While you worked with reading group A from 9:00-9:15, groups B and C had no task." These behaviors are the basis for continued conversation between observer and teacher.

Anyone who has helped good teachers become better knows that supervisors have an ally in teachers who reflect on their own teaching; therefore, we expect authentic, sustained improvement from our efforts. This process improves the interaction between supervisor and teacher and, more important, develops independent habits of reflection. We have found that a promising way to so empower teachers is to train them to use the skills of instructional supervision so that the more they see, the better they teach.

References

- Barnett, B.C. (1987). "The Power of Reflection." In *Instructional Leadership: Concept Issues and Controversies*, edited by W. Greenfield. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
Bracey, G. (1987). "Reflective Teachers." *Phi Delta Kappan* 69: 233-234.
Wildman, T.M., and J.A. Niles. (1987). "Reflective Teachers: Tensions Between Abstractions and Realities." *Journal of Teacher Education* 38: 25-31.

Leo J. Gensante is Superintendent, Hollidaysburg Area School District, 201-15 Jackson St., Hollidaysburg, PA 16648. Elizabeth M. Matgouranis is Superintendent, Richland School District, 340 Theatre Dr., Johnstown, PA 15904.

Copyright © 1989 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.