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The primary purpose of instructional supervision is to support teachers as they improve their teaching and to aid them in developing as professionals. All of this is done, ideally, through a system built on trust and support (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). Over time, the practice of supervising teachers has evolved to embrace various models of supervision (Pajak, 1993), and has become an integral part of the daily work of schools (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002). Various supervisory approaches may be adopted to help teachers achieve their objectives, including mentoring, coaching, clinical supervision, developmental supervision, differentiated supervision, action research, and portfolio development. Each model has strengths and weaknesses, which makes it important for supervisors to carefully analyze and adopt...
Clinical Supervision

This research study was conducted to evaluate supervision practices in a private school in Lebanon. The school has an established reputation in the community for its supervision system and its endeavors for continuous improvement through professional development for teachers, middle managers, and principals. The school caters to orphaned children; its students are generally of low socioeconomic status and face academic challenges. It educates approximately 1,500 students (3–18 years old) and employs 125 academic staff, including teachers, supervisors of subject teachers (nine language, two social studies, seven science and math, one sport, and one religion; no supervisors for art, music, and theater), floor supervisors, heads of cycles (each school cycle includes three grade levels, beginning with Grade 1), and others. To improve teachers’ performance, the school carries out a supervision process with both novice and experienced teachers, taking into consideration variations in each teacher’s professional needs. The school claims to follow a developmental clinical supervision approach in which supervisors collaborate with teachers as they implement the process and follow up on all teachers’ performance and professional development needs. Motivated by accreditation, the school adopted clinical supervision to ensure that its teacher supervision processes are documented, reviewed by internal and external auditors twice yearly, and reported to the board.

The school’s supervision process consists of several phases. It begins with the establishment of a professional relationship between the supervisor and the teacher through a preliminary meeting, during which they examine the characteristics of good teachers as determined by the school, and discuss how the teacher can achieve these. Then, both supervisor and teacher determine the teacher’s professional development needs and decide on a timeframe for the ensuing steps. A preconference precedes each classroom visit, and a postconference identifies strengths and weaknesses and determines next steps. By the end of the school year, teachers are required to compile a portfolio that includes a reflection on their work. All phases of the supervision process are documented by supervisors using prescribed forms and observation tools. Supervisors are obliged to keep files for auditors in order to show teachers’ development from the time of induction until the end-of-year performance appraisal.

However, the process is not always smooth. One of the authors of this study, employed by the school as the head supervisor of the instructional supervision personnel, sensed a feeling of dissatisfaction among both teachers and supervisors about the supervision process. Many good teachers were leaving, and several supervisors requested release from their posts. Informal conversations with colleagues indicated a perception that the process required too much time and effort to document the various steps for auditing purposes, which came at the expense of quality conferencing time with teachers.

This research study was designed to examine the supervision process and how teachers and supervisors perceive it. Another goal on the part of the researchers was to propose suggestions for improvement at this particular site, with the long view that this study could provide insight for other schools seeking to improve the ways in
which they facilitate teachers’ growth. To the researchers’ knowledge, there are possibly two other schools in Lebanon that use such a systematic, well documented, and audited instructional supervision process, and no similar studies have previously been conducted. Our study also adds to the international literature on supervision as it is implemented in school contexts other than those in the West. We set out to answer the following research questions:

- How is instructional supervision conducted at the school?
- What are teachers’ and supervisors’ perceptions of the challenges and benefits of the supervision process?
- How does this process contribute to teachers’ professional development?
- How can the process be modified to meet the evolving needs of teachers and supervisors?

**Literature Review**

The researchers reviewed international literature related to supervision models and teachers’ reflections on their practices to create a framework for the current study, to compare findings from the investigation at this site to other sites that have been studied, and to suggest improvements in the site school.

Teacher supervision is an institutional function aimed at promoting teacher growth and improving teaching and learning (Nolan & Hoover, 2008). It is a policy-directed collaboration that assumes teachers are intelligent, professional, and committed to the enhancement of their instructional performance (Sharp, 2003). Some research on supervision, though, has indicated a certain level of dissatisfaction with traditional models of supervision and a need for new approaches that better enhance teachers’ professional growth. For example, Duffy (2000) found no evidence that instructional supervision improved instruction, and Aseltine, Faryniarz, and Rigazio-DiGilio (2006) commented that, in many instances, traditional instructional supervision focused primarily on the classroom environment, rather than on improving teaching and learning. They suggested the use of a model that transfers the emphasis of teacher evaluation to student learning outcomes.

Clinical supervision is one model that is traditionally seen as intensive and skill-focused, and also useful for beginning and experienced teachers who want to improve their performance and for teachers facing difficulties. It is rooted in the work of Cogan (1973) and can be simplified into five steps (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001):

1. Preconference between supervisor and teacher to determine the reason, purpose, focus, and time of the observation
2. The actual observation
3. Analysis and interpretation of the observation
4. Postobservation conference to plan instructional improvement
5. Critique of the previous steps

Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) described this model as formative evaluation useful for beginning teachers’ practices. It fosters collegiality, provides leadership for improving
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instruction, and prompts teachers to reflect on their practice, leading to improvement of teaching quality (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002) and student learning (Cogan, 1973; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2004). It may improve teacher retention because it supports teachers who are facing difficulties. However, Marshall (2005) identified several reasons why traditional clinical supervision systems are not effective: Lessons that principals observe are not typical lessons conducted by the teacher, observing a brief part of class time gives an incomplete picture of instruction, and most principals are too busy to do a good job at supervision.

Another model is developmental supervision, which emphasizes a number of tasks and skills useful in promoting instructional dialogue and professional growth (Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1998). This approach enhances teacher motivation (Barager, 2000; Donaldson, 2013) and requires supervisors to identify and become responsive to teachers’ developmental stages. It also helps teachers assume greater responsibility for improvement.

Marshall (2005) expressed a need for alternatives to traditional approaches to supervision, which rarely linked teachers’ supervision and professional growth with student learning outcomes. A possible model could be Aseltine et al.’s (2006) Performance-Based Supervision and Evaluation, whose strength lies in the collaboration between teachers and supervisors to enhance teachers’ instructional capacity to improve student learning. This approach honors teachers’ judgment, yet at the same time targets student learning in the different areas that need improvement.

Alternative approaches to supervision, such as mentoring, peer coaching, portfolios, and action research, stipulate democratic supervision based on collaboration, participatory decision making, and reflective practice. They require that visionary leaders promote certain beliefs and values needed to construct a supervisory program that improves teaching and learning (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). For example, in mentoring, an experienced educator works with a novice teacher nonjudgmentally and collaboratively (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). Peer coaching and action research can help teachers of diverse career stages and learning styles (Nolan & Hoover, 2008). In peer coaching, groups of teachers provide support and encouragement to each other, with supervisors as facilitators. Both are important supports for beginning teachers and decrease principals’ supervisory load (Ebmeier & Nicklaus, 1999). Action research encourages teachers to reflect on, improve, and refine teaching and consequently must be a component of any instructional supervision program (Glanz, 2005; Wanzare & Da Costa, 2000). Through this process, teachers may identify classroom issues they need to investigate, then collaborate with supervisors or academics from the university to collect and analyze relevant data, devise and implement interventions, and reflect on results and improvement.

Reflection is a key characteristic of good instructional supervision (Glanz & Sullivan, 2000). Teachers need the time and ability to reflect on their work with students (Garubo & Rothstein, 1998; Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1998) and to assume responsibility for self-evaluation and growth (Goldsberry, 1997; Husby, 2005; Kaagan, 2004). Creating portfolios can help teachers grow through self-reflection and analysis. In this process, teachers document the development of new and effective practices (Riggs & Sandlin, 2000). Although
portfolios are time-consuming to construct and not easy to review, they can ultimately support supervisors’ work (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000, 2005).

Research suggests a need for instructional supervision to move from a system that inspects teachers’ classes and expects similar standards and procedures of first-year teachers and experienced teachers (Danielson & McGreal, 2000; Donaldson, 2013) to a process that provides opportunities for teachers to identify and meet their unique needs. Supervision and staff professional development are linked, in that instructional supervision helps develop teachers who are capable of making suitable decisions and of providing students with quality services (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000; Glickman et al., 2001; Wanzare & Da Costa, 2000). The role of instructional supervisors is to facilitate rather than to act as the expert of instruction (Roberts & Pruitt, 2003); they should be guides (Glanz & Sullivan, 2000; Sullivan & Glanz, 2005) who engage teachers in reflective practice. The change in the supervisor’s role from judge to colleague is a key to improving the relevance of supervision (Starratt, 1997).

In conclusion, instructional supervision should be a collaborative effort between supervisors and teachers based on mutual trust and freedom to express ideas about how to improve teaching. The focus is on setting goals for professional development and, ultimately, student learning.

**Research Design**

Data were collected from all 20 subject supervisors and the 71 full-time teachers teaching in cycles 1, 2, and 3 in the school; Table 1 breaks down the distribution respondents by grade-level cycle. Data from the supervision process gathered prior to the final definition of the research questions were not used as an integral part of the study but guided decisions on methods to elicit participants’ perceptions, to conduct interviews and observations, and to examine documents (Yin, 2009). There was no prior hypothesis; data collection and analysis were considered for emerging themes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

The choice to adopt a mixed-methods approach was driven by pragmatism, as the researchers expected it to be the best way to answer the research questions (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Mixing quantitative and qualitative methods in one study overcomes the weaknesses of each (Creswell, 2003), and the addition of another method can “answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Cycle 1 Grades 1-3</th>
<th>Cycle 2 Grades 4-6</th>
<th>Cycle 3 Grades 7-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers (N = 71)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject supervisors (N = 20)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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a broader and more complete range of research questions, ... provide stronger evidence for
a conclusion through ... corroboration of findings, ... [and] increase the generalizability of
the results” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 21).

Questionnaires

Each group (teachers and supervisors) completed a group-specific questionnaire of 36
questions to rate their perceptions and understandings of the supervision process in their
school. The items were based on the literature about successful instructional supervision
models, including Glickman et al. (2001); Hurley, Greenblatt, and Cooper (2003); Ralph (2000);
and Sullivan and Glanz (2000, 2005). Some items addressed the various phases of supervision;
other items elicited perceptions of problems encountered during the process implementation;
other questions were directed at discovering how they thought the process could be improved.
Teachers’ and supervisors’ questionnaires included parallel items that addressed the process’s
implementation, its perceived benefits and challenges, its contribution to teachers’ professional
development, and suggestions for modifications to fit the evolving needs of the two groups.

The questionnaires used a four-point Likert-type scale to assess agreement attitude, with
answer values ranging from disagree to strongly agree. The option of a neutral category was
eliminated because respondents were familiar with the topic being studied, with the goal of
prompting them to take a clear stand. The questionnaires were piloted on one school teacher
and one university instructor in the field of teacher preparation, both of whom were not
connected to the school under study. This helped us to improve the wording of the items,
which increased the validity, or appropriateness, of the instrument (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006).

Interviews

Individual semistructured interviews were conducted in Arabic with a sample of seven
subject supervisors and 10 teachers who were selected in a manner to ensure even distribu-
tion among the three grade level cycles (preschool, elementary, and intermediate). Interview
questions aligned with questionnaire items to inquire about reasons and perceptions beyond
the questionnaire data. Teachers were asked about the process implementation, supervisors’
roles, forms, and the benefits and challenges of the process. Supervisors were asked similar
questions, with additional emphasis on the support they felt they might need for better
results and how they followed up on teachers’ professional development.

Each interview lasted approximately thirty minutes and provided an opportunity to ask
probing questions. The interviews were tape recorded, transcribed, translated from Arabic
to English, and back-translated to Arabic to ensure that the meaning was kept intact during
translations. Then transcripts in both languages were given to the participants to review
and make the needed corrections, additions, and deletions in the transcripts.

Observations

The researchers conducted nonparticipant observations of the supervision process over
a 2-month period. These observations took place during the supervisors’ and teachers’ needs
assessment and preobservation conferences, class observations, and postobservation confer-
ences. The research questions helped to focus the observations and guided the recording of
qualitative data in the form of observers’ descriptions of what was seen and heard. Quotes
from teachers’ and supervisors’ interactions were also recorded and used as evidence to address the research questions.

Document Review

The content of the following documents was reviewed and analyzed in light of the questionnaire and interview data: (a) the school’s professional development plan; (b) the school’s written procedure for instructional supervision; and (c) teachers’ files of supervision, which included the teacher’s progress record, the professional development plan set by the supervisor and teacher, other documents used in the supervision process, and the teacher’s needs assessment checklist, reflection papers, and career portfolios.

Ethical Considerations

The target population included all 20 subject matter supervisors and 71 teachers at the school. Participation was voluntary, and participants were given the choice to withdraw from the study at any time. To ensure anonymity, the questionnaires were not coded; they were administered in the absence of the head supervisor and in separate rooms for teachers and supervisors. Being known to the school community may have posed limitations to interview and observation data collection by the head supervisor, but teachers expressed willingness to share their views when they learned that senior management would not see names when findings were reported. The researchers tried to avoid leading participants during interviews and to record unbiased observation data.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Items were coded and entered on a data sheet. Blank spaces were treated as nonresponses, given the number zero, and ignored in the analysis. Simple frequency counts, means, standard deviations, and percentages were recorded. Analysis was based on the level of agreement for each item. A mean score of 3.0 and above represented a level of agreement, between 2.5 and 2.9 represented partial agreement, and less than 2.5 represented a level of disagreement.

Interview data were read thoroughly, and concepts relevant to each research question were highlighted, then organized in themes. These were arranged in categories such as procedures, perceived benefits and challenges, and recommended modifications. Similarities and differences in perceptions among teachers and between teachers and supervisors were highlighted and related to categories. Interviewee quotes were cited to describe certain points of view. In a similar manner, observation data were also read thoroughly, and patterns and themes were categorized by research questions. Data from all the instruments were compared, triangulated, and integrated in a coherent body.

Results and Discussion

The results are presented here as findings under each research question and compared to the reviewed literature to indicate similarities and differences.

How Is Instructional Supervision Conducted at the School?

The school documents included several forms for each phase of the supervision process. The interviewees said they were aware of these phases, but the observation results
showed that implementation did not always match the procedure described in the written documents. Preobservation conferences were skipped, as was filling out some forms that required lengthy responses. Questionnaire results showed that teachers disagreed that supervisors met with them to schedule and plan observations (mean = 2.3).

Most supervisors were able to describe the steps of the process as mentioned in the formal documents, whereas teachers were not. A possible reason for this might be that supervisors were the ones in charge of the forms and documentation of the process.

Teachers’ and supervisors’ perceptions differed concerning their overall impressions of the process. Most teachers said the aims of meeting supervisors at the beginning of the year were to establish a relationship of support and collaboration, to clarify how the supervision process would be conducted and what performance level would be expected of them, and to learn about the observation tools used during class observations. Supervisors said their aims were to follow up on professional development and improve teaching or pedagogical skills, to agree with teachers on a set of class observations to diagnose skills that needed improvement, and then to work with them to set professional development plans.

The school documents also stated that supervisors should adopt different styles of supervision to suit the conceptual and developmental level of teachers ranging from novice to experienced to help them reach the independent stage. However, most teachers did not perceive supervisors as taking their developmental levels into consideration while working with them. Another discrepancy was found in terms of whether teachers’ career portfolios were required in the supervision process. Few teachers submitted portfolios, and both teachers and supervisors commented that this practice was new; teachers needed more training on its implementation. However, all teachers presented self-reflections—a step required from teachers through the year and at the end of the year, and an important component and characteristic of instructional supervision (Glanz & Sullivan, 2000; Sullivan & Glanz, 2005).

What Are Teachers’ and Supervisors’ Perceptions of the Challenges and Benefits of the Supervision Process?

Data from questionnaires, observations, documents (mainly teachers’ reflection papers), and interviews showed that supervisors perceived this process as important and helpful (mean = 3.2, agreement) despite cumbersome procedures, while teachers did not feel the same way (mean = 2.5, partial agreement). Teachers and supervisors described their relationship as collaborative, with positive communication between the two parties. This relationship was built at the beginning of each year, and supervisors were trained on how to establish and maintain it. However, both teachers and supervisors complained about particular procedures of implementing the process (see Table 2). Supervisors admitted they did not implement many aspects of supervision described in school documents, such as mentoring, peer coaching, cognitive coaching, or action research. Instead, they focused on showing evidence to auditors.

Observation tools posed another challenge. Teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the way data were collected about their performance (mean = 2.2, disagreement). They considered some of the observation tools to be inaccurate. They also mentioned that although
supervisors gave them feedback on their class performance, the supervisors did not involve them in analyzing data derived from the class observations or give them enough opportunities to converse about the rationale behind their choices of some pedagogical practices. Teachers believed that some observation tools were neither good nor appropriately used by supervisors—for example, the Flanders interaction analysis system (an observation tool of students’ interactions with teachers and students’ involvement in the teaching-learning process). The Flanders system was created to observe verbal communication between teachers and students. It is a complicated system that requires two observers to encode the classroom observations. In the case of the school in the current study, only the supervisor observed the class. Both teachers and supervisors recommended revising class observation tools; supervisors requested more tools for observing the effectiveness of instruction in inclusive classes, for example.

Another complaint regarding postobservation conferences was that data from the specific observation tools were communicated to teachers in a rushed manner, as supervisors conceded. Teachers acknowledged that they did not have enough time for extended conferences in which to analyze, reflect upon, and discuss these data. The preobservation conferences, according to supervisors and teachers, also were not implemented as they should be due

Table 2. Respondents’ Comments on Challenges of the Supervision Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is no longer a confidential process.</td>
<td>There are no variations in supervision of teachers: the process is mechanical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is time consuming.</td>
<td>Frequency of class visits should be higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It puts both teachers and supervisors under stress and pressure.</td>
<td>The new and inexperienced teachers take the highest percentage of our time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many forms to be filled in; a lot of documentation is required for each step.</td>
<td>Many teachers are supervised, so this is exhausting to supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many observation tools need to be modified.</td>
<td>Supervisors’ personal and professional qualifications are not fit for the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time span between class observations is sometimes long, which reduces the effectiveness and benefit a teacher might receive.</td>
<td>Time needed to complete each clinical cycle is too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some supervisors need to be more knowledgeable about teaching practices.</td>
<td>Documenting the process for the sake of audit is stressful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervisor is physically with me, but emotionally she’s not with me at all, due to her many tasks.</td>
<td>There should be more classroom observation tools for inclusive classrooms, reading, writing, speaking, group work, emotional climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many forms to be filled out; some don’t really target the objective.</td>
<td>There are too many forms to be filled out; some don’t really target the objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some teachers are way behind the basic level of teaching skills.</td>
<td>Some teachers are way behind the basic level of teaching skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some supervisors’ personalities, communication skills, tolerance are not suitable for the task.</td>
<td>Some supervisors’ personalities, communication skills, tolerance are not suitable for the task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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to lack of time. Data results from questionnaires, interviews, observations, and documents showed that supervisors rarely held preobservation conferences with teachers to diagnose and plan teachers’ professional needs together. Teachers filled out these forms alone most of the time and complained about the time it took. Most of them taught 24 hours a week and had to attend many meetings. They felt that they were always working quickly, yet were unable to meet the school’s demands. Similarly, many supervisors explained that the multiple tasks given to them forced them to conduct the supervision process with teachers in a superficial way. They only cared about documenting what to show to auditors. Sometimes a supervisor would just fill in the forms and ask the teacher to sign for confirmation because they did not have enough time to sit together and discuss issues related to the teacher’s performance. The problem—a lack of time and an overload of teachers to supervise—appeared more crucial for supervisors, who were assigned considerable numbers of new recruits every year who needed training, support, and follow-up in a time frame that the supervisors could not accommodate.

Results also showed that most teachers disagreed that the objective of the supervision process was coaching and supporting teachers for improvement. They resented that supervisors submitted the class observation reports to the school principal weekly. Teachers wondered whether the purpose of such detailed documentation was to evaluate their performance rather than help them improve. Though Díaz-Maggioli (2004) insisted that most supervision activities include direct or indirect evaluation, Glanz (2005) noted that for clinical supervision to work, it must be separated from evaluation.

School documents recommended differentiation in teachers’ supervision, but results showed that this was not happening. Supervisors used the same supervision method for beginning, experienced, and expert teachers. This approach can be inadequate for teachers’ improvement and professional growth (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Glatthorn (1990) suggested that clinical supervision may not improve the performance of experienced teachers.

Another concern that teachers expressed was whether their supervisors were experienced and knowledgeable enough to provide them with different strategies to improve their teaching performance. Some teachers said that during postobservation conferences, the supervisor would tell them what was useful in their lesson, but they were unable to provide other ways for teachers to improve or enhance their lessons. Teachers commented that they could improve instruction if they were coached by knowledgeable supervisors in subject matter and teaching methods, new innovations in teaching, and other technical and professional skills needed for their tasks. Supervisors attributed their inability to do so to numerous other pressing duties and lack of time.

How Does This Process Contribute to Teachers’ Professional Development?

Findings indicated that supervisors and teachers were generally satisfied with the contribution of this process to the professional development of teachers. Data from teachers’ needs assessment checklists were found to be compatible with topics in the school’s professional development plans and teachers’ professional progress records. Data from the relevant questionnaire sections focused on whether the supervisory process helped promote professional growth and whether the objectives for improving instruction were
Nabhani, Bahous, and Sabra

Table 3. Respondents’ Comments on Supervision and Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This process made me very much aware about characteristics of effective teachers.</td>
<td>Active learning became a very important component in our professional development plans for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This process includes a step in which the supervisor is obliged to identify the teacher’s training needs and skills that need to be improved and work on them. Training needs should be filled in with the supervisor.</td>
<td>This process helps in guiding teachers to diagnose their own professional development needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a very accurate way of knowing teachers’ needs from the very beginning of the year. This is especially important for new or inexperienced teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

derived from supervision data. The results showed that teachers and supervisors perceived a connection between supervision and professional growth (mean = 2.7, partial agreement), and they agreed that supervision helped to improve instruction (mean = 3.3, agreement).

Interviewees also described how the supervision process contributed to professional development (see Table 3). Teachers and supervisors agreed that the teachers should help diagnose their own performance and list their individual professional development needs. Then the supervisor should set a plan for each teacher and send the teacher’s plan to the Human Resources department to incorporate in the whole-school plan for professional development.

The last phase of the school’s supervision model required supervisors to work with teachers to help them reach the self-guided stage of setting plans for their professional development, but findings showed that the supervision process neither provided continuous data about teachers’ progress and needs nor ensured that needs were being met.

Teachers and supervisors expressed satisfaction with the requirement that supervisors review teachers’ files regularly, but most answers showed that this review was not done as frequently as it should be per internal standards; it was often left until the end of the year because of time issues. Thus, implementation was not as described in the documentation.

How Can the Process Be Modified to Meet the Evolving Needs of Teachers and Supervisors?

Supervisors expressed their own need for professional development. They wished to be trained on the school supervision process practically, not theoretically. They requested training on various models of supervision other than clinical supervision, which is a main practice in their school. When asked about the different supervision models or approaches they implemented with teachers, none of the supervisors mentioned mentoring, peer observations, peer coaching, cognitive coaching, walkthroughs, action research, or portfolio development. Teachers expressed similar demands for other approaches.

Data results from questionnaires and interviews demonstrated strong agreement between teachers and supervisors for the need to modify this process (mean between 3.1 and 3.6). Both recommended keeping all documents related to their supervision process...
Clinical Supervision

Confidential to maintain a relationship of trust, as described in the formal documentation of the supervision process. Trust and positive communication are essential to supervision, and a climate that promotes collaboration and continuous growth can foster such relationships (Nolan & Hoover, 2008).

Again, teachers and supervisors agreed that the many forms used in this process were diverting supervisors’ attention from enhancing teachers’ instructional and professional practices. Members of both groups recommended reevaluating all forms and eliminating the unnecessary ones.

Conclusion, Recommendations, and Implications

The study findings were presented to the school administration. It was evident that the administration was unaware of the challenges that teachers and supervisors encountered as a consequence of the strict requirements of accomplishing all the described phases of supervision. The primary goal should be to benefit teachers, and not adhere to procedures. Constant evaluation of the process itself should be coupled with efforts to achieve teacher improvement based on feedback.

In general, the supervision process at the school was perceived by both teachers and supervisors as serving most of its purposes, but being cumbersome to the point of needing improvement. There was agreement that observation tools should be revised to meet the supervision objectives, and other tools should be revised to address subject matter–specific concerns. There was a general complaint about stress and lack of time due to the number of tasks and responsibilities both parties faced. Another issue that caused dissatisfaction was the lack of preplanning and preobservation conferencing in the supervisory process; both are needed for identifying and setting goals. Teachers need training in goal setting to foster efficacy, as found by Gibson (2001) and Ross and Gray (2006).

Based on the findings, the researchers recommended forming working committees of teachers and supervisors to review this process and suggested modifications according to the school context. Two suggestions were to add study groups and action research to the current professional development workshops and to increase support through mentoring of novices by experienced teachers granted a reduced workload for taking on that role. This is in line with Buchanan’s (2010) idea that observing more experienced peers can help reduce isolation. Other recommendations were to make professional development mandatory for supervisors and not only for teachers, and to evaluate the impact of supervision on student achievement.

The results of this study suggest that the clinical supervision at the school needed modifications to be more effective for both teachers and supervisors. Particular areas for improvement included reducing the amount of tedious paperwork; protecting the time available for preconferences, postconferences, and self-reflection; providing professional development for supervisors; and engaging in periodic evaluation of the process by committees of teachers and supervisors. Findings from this study may help other school systems to understand the advantages and pitfalls of clinical supervision of classroom teaching and to make decisions on whether to implement such a model or to modify it to fit their specific contexts.
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