A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISOR'S MAJOR TASKS IN AN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOL

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the College of Education

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by
Boyce Leon Wolters
May, 1973

To Joyce

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher is very appreciative of the support provided by many individuals during the course of this study. Appreciation is extended to each of the University of Houston faculty members who served on the advisory committee for this study. Special appreciation is expressed to the committee chairman, Dr. Stewart North, for his valuable guidance throughout the study.

Gratitude is expressed to those associated with the

Deer Park Independent School District, Deer Park, Texas, for

permission to conduct this study: the Board of Trustees;

Dr. Sebron B. Williams, Superintendent of Schools; and

Mr. Lee B. Caither, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction.

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISOR'S MAJOR TASKS IN AN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOL

An Abstract of

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the College of Education

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by
Boyce Leon Wolters
May, 1973

ABSTRACT

The research was undertaken to identify the major tasks of instructional supervisors in open concept schools and to compare them with the tasks of instructional supervisors in traditional schools. Data for the study were gathered by reviewing the literature, surveying instructional supervisors in selected geographic areas, and by conducting an intensive case study of the supervisory practices in one open concept school district.

Educational literature and research depict the supervisor as the instructional leader whose major responsibility is to coordinate the instructional program of the school. The instructional supervisor is often perceived as a change agent whose role is that of fostering curricular and instructional revision to provide students with meaningful learning experiences. The instructional supervisor is expected to provide leadership in the securing of and utilization of appropriate materials and equipment to meet the educational goals of the school.

The 1961 study conducted by the Texas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development influenced the nature of the research and the development of the survey instrument. Data for the 1961 study were gathered in a state wide survey of 206 instructional supervisors. Ten major tasks of

instructional supervision were identified. The findings of the 1961 study provided the structure for examining present day supervisory tasks.

The sample for the survey of supervisors in this research was selected from the 56 public school districts served by Region IV Educational Service Center in the Houston, Texas area. The superintendents of 27 districts agreed to participate in the survey. Nine of the 27 districts judged to be open concept districts were matched with nine districts judged to be traditional. Districts operating one or more open concept schools were considered open concept districts for the study, while districts without open concept schools were considered traditional. The guestionnaire used in the 1961 study was revised and mailed to the 303 instructional supervisors of the 18 districts participating in the study. The questionnaire responses from the 106 supervisors in open concept schools and the 101 supervisors in traditional schools were summarized and analyzed to identify major tasks of instructional supervisors.

One of the nine open concept districts was selected for the case study. Data derived from interviews with key personnel, examination of policies and school records were synthesized and analyzed for the case study. The case study revealed that the team leader as an instructional supervisor has become an integral part of the open concept school.

From the review of literature and analysis of data gathered in the study, the following major tasks of instructional supervisors in open concept schools were identified:

- 1. Curriculum Development: Curriculum development involves defining or redefining the content to be taught, the methods and procedures for teaching it, and the level at which it will be taught.
- 2. Organizing for Instruction: The organization of the curriculum content and the interpretation of the instructional program to the professional staff is a major responsibility of instructional supervisors. This task includes coordination and decisions concerning the organization of time, staff, and space.
- 3. Selection and Use of Textbooks and Materials: The identification, evaluation, and selection of textbooks and materials are essential to implement a planned instructional program.
- 4. In-service Education: The organization, planning, and supervision of the in-service education program of the school is a major task for instructional supervisors. This task includes selecting materials, obtaining consultative services, directing activities, and evaluating the program.
- 5. Counseling Teachers: Helping teachers with student behavioral and learning problems, methods of instruction, selection and use of instructional materials, and public relations is a routine task for supervisors.
- 6. Evaluation: Planning, organizing, and implementing activities for the evaluation and reporting of all facets of the instructional program is essential in supervision of the instructional program.
- 7. Communication: Administrators, teachers and parents must be kept informed about the instructional program to ensure cooperation and needed support.

Comparison of data gathered from traditional supervisors to data from open concept supervisors revealed that the major tasks are similar. The most significant differences noted between survey responses of supervisors in open concept schools and supervisors in traditional schools were that supervisors in traditional schools spend less time in the classroom than supervisors in open concept schools and perceive themselves as more directive in their relationships with teachers. A role of cooperation was assumed by most of the team leaders in the study.

Both groups of supervisors in this study related tasks different from the tasks reported in the 1961 study by the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Less emphasis was given to the following tasks by supervisors in this study than by supervisors in the 1961 study:

<u>Special Services</u>: Activities through which the special services, such as special education, student publications, and other student activities are planned and coordinated.

Staffing: Selecting and recruiting, assigning, rating, commending and rewarding, correcting and terminating teachers.

Designing Facilities: Activities for designing facilities and equipment appropriate to the curriculum and the organization for instruction.

The findings of this study indicate a changing role for instructional supervisors. The teacher supervisor is emerging as a key instructional leader. Communications between the

classroom and administration are enhanced through an instructional supervisor who shares in the responsibilities of the teaching team.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapte	er	Page
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	i
	ABSTRACT	ii
J. •	INTRODUCTION	1
	Introductory Material	1
	Statement of the Problem	9
	Need for the Study	10
	Limitation of the Study	11
	Procedure	11
II.	Definition of Terms	12
	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
	Introduction	15
	History and Background	15
	Goals of Supervision	18
	Role of Supervisors	22
	Role of Supervisor in Open Concept School	28
	Supervision in Open Concept British	2.1
	School	31
III.	Summary	33
	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	35
	Introduction	35
	Population	35
	Procedure for Gathering Data	42
	Procedure for Analyzing Data	44

TABLE OF CONTENTS CONTINUED

Chapter																			Page	
IV.	FINDIN	GS O	F I	HE	SI	ľUI	ΣY	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	46
	Result	s of	tŀ	ne S	Sur	:ve	ЭY	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	46
	Case S	tudy	•		•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	82
	Summar	Y •		•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		95
V.	SUMMAR	Y, C	ONC	LU	SIC	SNC	5,	ΑN	ΙD	RI	ECC	AM(IEN	IDA	\T]	101	IS		•	98
	Summar	у .		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠		•	•	•		98
	Conclu	sion	s.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	101
	Recomm	enda	tic	ons		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	106
Bibliography			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	109					
Appendices			_						_	_					118					

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Average Daily Attendance and Valuation of Responding Districts	3,8
II.	Districts Selected to Participate in the Study	4 J.
III.	Responses of Supervisors in Open Concept Schools	49
IV.	Summary of Related Tasks for Supervisors in Open Concept Schools	59
V.	Responses of Supervisors in Traditional Schools	62
VI.	Summary of Related Tasks for Supervisors in Traditional Schools	71
. VII.	Time Spent in Classrooms by Supervisors .	75
VIII.	Courses of Action for Supervisors in Disagreement with Classroom Teachers	76
IX.	Involvement Frequency from Questionnaire Responses	78
Х.	Nature of Responsibility from Question- naire Responses	79
XI.	Titles of Supervisors in Open Concept and Traditional Schools	81
XII.	Tasks of Case Study Supervisors from Questionnaire Responses	91

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Today education is facing new and distinct challenges brought about by recent social and technological changes. With increased emphasis being placed on education, the public is no longer satisfied with educational mediocrity. The failure of the school to afford the opportunity for each child to succeed in a normal setting is no longer acceptable. Lewis states:

Today, the American public school system has made great strides in making a quantity of schools available to its youth; however, there is a great need for improvement in the quality of American public school education programs. Many educators are faced with the realization that the methods being used are not accomplishing the task of providing equally effective educational opportunity to all children. Obviously, there must be an immediate and radical change.

Public schools must adjust their programs and schedules to give multiple opportunities for youth to develop their uniqueness. As a result of mass instruction, public schools must break away from the traditional ways of organizing and look for means of humanizing instruction. Programs and schedules should be adjusted to allow youth more effective ways to relate to life situations in order to develop this uniqueness.

James Lewis, Jr., A Contemporary Approach to Non-graded Education, (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 11-12.

Glasser contends that schools are responsible for the role of each child in society. He writes:

No one is more aware of the problems of failing children than those who work in the schools. Almost every teacher and administrator I have spoken to in the past several years has been disturbed, puzzled, and in many cases disheartened over the increasing numbers of children who seem to be totally recalcitrant to the school process. They are rebellious; they do not read; they are unmotivated; they are withdrawn; they are apathetic. They seem to be impossible to educate. Faced with these problem children, those who work in the schools have tried and continue to try many new approaches.²

Vernon Anderson reports that research findings in the area of creativity, human development, and individual differences which emphasize the uniqueness of the individual have resulted in the emergence of the open concept school in many areas of this country. 3

In discussing the need for more relevant educational programs in public schools, Kinbourie states, "The most promising educational development is the 'open classroom' concept." Open concept schools commonly offer an individualized curriculum for students, employ flexible grouping patterns,

William Glasser, Schools Without Failure, (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969), pp. 6-7.

Wernon E. Anderson, Curriculum Guideline in an Fra of Change, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1969), p. 70.

⁴M. Boland, article, Houston <u>Chronicle</u>, September 2, 1971.

make use of team teaching, are nongraded, and operate in large open areas.

These unique programs often require facilities which the traditional building does not provide.

Robert Anderson writes to this point:

Even though flexible grouping patterns, team teaching, and other related plans of organization have not yet gained full acceptance, it seems clear that such patterns will in the future dominate school practices which means that the traditional type building will soon become functionally obsolete. 5

According to Pesnick open schools and traditional schools have educational philosophies that contradict each other; therefore, the actual settings of the schools look entirely different. Generally, open classrooms are full of noise, motion, and at times even messiness. The children usually work independently, or in small groups at large tables. There is no "front" of the room, with all eyes focused on the teacher. The teacher often can be found sitting on the floor, working with a small group. Although many traditional educators describe open classrooms as chaotic, 6 in discussing the environment necessary for an effective individualized program, Althea Beery states:

⁵Robert H. Anderson, <u>Teaching in a World Change</u>, (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966), pp. 132-150.

Henry S. Pesnick, "Open Schools vs. Traditional: Which is Right for Your Child?" Red Book, (October, 1971), p. 60.

It is one thing to make provisions for a class to have a common experience or to indulge in identical practice. It is quite another to provide a setting in which individuals are encouraged to follow through with a variety of responses. The latter requires space for class planning meetings, for activity, and for protection of work-in-progress. Space is expensive, but if educators believe that pupils can reach their full potentialities only through personal organization of knowledge and experience as they interact with classmates and adults and explore materials and ideas, then high priority will be placed on space as a necessary prerequisite to such exploration and interaction. 7

The individualized approach to teaching found in most open concept schools fosters a new student-teacher relationship. This relationship involves a mutual respect and genuine concern for the welfare of the student, investing him with more responsibilities for becoming an active part of the teaching-learning team. The importance of accepting the student as an individual and a person is discussed by Madge Rudd.

No one can develop or express his greatest possibilities in a threatening situation. For idea to grow upon idea, an individual must be made to feel that his thinking is worthy and appreciated. There must be an air of acceptance in the group. At times, ideas may not seem to be related, but life itself is an experimental laboratory where one expresses according to his particular talents. Where ideas can be freely expressed, the way is open for help and guidance.

Althea Beery, "The Effect of Environment," <u>Individual-ized Instruction</u>, Ronald C. Doll, Editor, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1964), p. 107.

Madge Rudd, "Dare to Stretch," Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin 29, 1962, pp. 49-50.

Recent studies of open concept schools have examined change in teachers' roles as compared to more traditional schools. Killough associated teacher dedication and concern for the individual progress of each student with positive results in an open concept school. Carbonari considered teacher needs and perceived effectiveness as a part of his evaluation study of an open concept school. Warner compared teacher performance in an open facility with teacher performance in traditional surroundings.

The instructional supervisor has to be a part of the process from the planning through the evaluating stage. This is especially important in a situation in which a teacher is experimenting with new techniques, materials, or content.

The teacher as a team leader, involved in both supervisory and teaching responsibilities, may be the most effective supervisor. One of the most significant roles of the supervisor is that

Ocharles K. Killough, "An Analysis of the Longitudinal Effects that a Nongraded Elementary Program, Conducted in an Open-Space School, Had on Cognitive Achievement of Pupils," (Houston, Texas: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, 1971), p. 59.

¹⁰ Joseph P. Carbonari, "Report of an Evaluation Study of an Open Concept School" (Unpublished Report, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Houston, 1971), p. 2.

¹¹ Jack Bruce Warner, "A Comparison of Students and Teachers' Performance in an Open-Area Facility and in Self-Contained Classrooms" (Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston, 1971).

of helping teachers implement teaching for value clarification, intelligent inquiry, and development of meanings. Supervisors, therefore, would do well to concentrate on how to become an effective member of a team in a school where new competencies and new specialities are constantly needed. Denemark discusses supervisory implications of changing teacher roles:

A first and perhaps most obvious consequence is that some teachers will become supervisors in function if not in name. Many experienced and outstanding teachers will work with new teachers, with aides, with educational technicians, and with teams of other teachers, coordinating their efforts while retaining a relationship with teams of teacher colleagues and will work in a single school with a cluster of professionals and paraprofessionals. Such an arrangement will represent a departure from the common current conception of supervision, which tends to view the supervisor as a person who works with a cluster of schools rather than within one school and who has terminated all regular teaching responsibilities with children, except for an occasional demonstration lesson. 12

The role of instructional supervisors has been considered critical in coordinating and planning effective instructional programs and providing leadership for change. Supervisory activities are many and varied. The activities vary in terms of specific tasks and the purposes toward which they are directed. Before examining the supervisor's role in today's setting, it is necessary to establish a basis for that examination. In 1961 the executive committee of the

¹² George W. Denemark, "Coordinating the Team," The Supervisor: New Demands and New Dimensions, William H. Lucio, Editor, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 66-67.

Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (TASCD) appointed a commission to conduct a study of the status of the instructional supervisor in Texas. The members of TASCD, the supervisors, the curriculum directors, and the assistant superintendents of instruction throughout the state of Texas, were asked to respond to a questionnaire prepared by the committee; responses were received from 246 members. From this study ten major tasks of instructional supervision were defined as follows:

THE MAJOR TASKS OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

Instructional supervision as a major function of school management can be divided into ten fairly distinct tasks. Following is a list of these tasks with representative activities for each:

- Task 1. Curriculum Development: Those activities concerned with defining, or redefining, the content to be taught, the methods and procedures for teaching it, the level at which it will be taught, and the desired outcomes in terms of achievement, attitudes, skills, and values.
- Task 2. Organizing for Instruction: Activities for making arrangements to implement the curriculum design. This includes coordination, and the making of decisions concerning the organization of time, of personnel, and of space to achieve the objectives of the curriculum.
- · Task 3. Staffing: Selecting and recruiting, assigning, rating, commending and rewarding, correcting and terminating teachers.
- . Task 4. Designing Facilities: Activities for designing facilities and equipment appropriate to the curriculum and the organization for instruction.

- · Task 5. Selection and Use of Materials: The identification, evaluation, and selecting of materials to implement the learning process, and the securing of efficient utilization of these materials.
- Task 6. Communicating and Interpreting Instructional Programs: Communicating and explaining changes in the curriculum to teachers and other personnel who implement such changes. Providing teachers new to the school system with the necessary information and understanding to insure early success in the implementation of the curriculum.
- . Task 7. In-Service Education: Those supervisory activities which promote the personal and professional growth of instructional staff members to make them more efficient and more effective teachers and supervisors.
- Task 8. Special Services: Activities through which the special services, such as special education, student publications, and other student activities are planned and coordinated.
- Task 9. Public Relations: The activities which involve supervisory personnel and through which the school's public is kept informed about the instructional program in order to secure assistance and avoid undesirable influences in relation to instruction.
- · Task 10. Evaluation: Planning, organizing, and implementing activities for the evaluation and reporting of all facets of the educational enterprise which are directly related to instruction. 13

These ten tasks have been accepted by authorities in administration and supervision as indicated by accepted practice, school policies, and the literature. Further, Ben Harris

¹³Lorena Haynes (ch.), "Goals for Supervision in Texas," (Unpublished Report, Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Austin, Texas, 1961.)

discussed them as a part of the description of a typical supervisor in 1963. 14

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine the major tasks of the instructional supervisor in an open concept school by comparing them with major tasks of supervisors in traditional schools. The major consideration in terms of this study was the extent to which the open concept school affects the role of the instructional supervisor.

Specifically, the study will attempt to answer the following questions:

- What are the major tasks of an instructional supervisor in an open concept school as perceived by the supervisors?
- 2. What are the major tasks of an instructional supervisor in a traditional school as perceived by the instructional supervisor?
- 3. What differences exist between the tasks of the instructional supervisor in an open concept school and the tasks of an instructional supervisor in a traditional school?
- 4. What changes have been noted in the tasks of the instructional supervisor in open concept schools of 1972 and the tasks of the instructional supervisor in the year 1961?

Data for the study were obtained by administering a questionnaire used by the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in 1961 to each participant in

¹⁴ Ben Harris, Supervisory Behavior in Education, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), pp. 13-14.

the study. The questionnaire was revised under the supervision of the research committee to include questions relating to open concept schools. The tasks of instructional supervisors in 1961 were identified by the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Study and were referred to earlier in this chapter.

Need for the Study

New educational programs have caused changes in the roles, tasks, and evaluations of teachers and students.

Related changes in the tasks and assignments of instructional supervisors should be identified as they exist today.

Babcock states

The need for defining the role of the curriculum specialist, regardless of his title, in the functional organization of the school system is imperative. This task must be faced squarely if the schools are to meet their responsibility of providing the best possible educational opportunities for all children and youth. 15

Whittier recommends that

A continuing effort must be made to define and redefine what the supervisor does and who the supervisor is. Supervisor preparing institutions as well as school systems must be alerted constantly to the expectations held for those who

Director in a Climate of Change. Evelyn F. Carlson, Chairman, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965), pp. 50-51.

serve in supervisory and curriculum improvement positions. 16

Limitation of the Study

This study was limited to the fifty-six school districts within the geographical boundaries of the Region IV Educational Service Center. A minimum of two hundred supervisors from both traditional and open concept schools from these districts participated in the study. The findings of this study will apply only to the individuals participating in the study.

Procedure

- The public schools served by Region IV Educational Service Center were surveyed for the purpose of determining the number of districts that will participate in the study and the number of open concept schools operating in those districts.
- 2. The responding districts were divided into two groups, open and traditional. Districts with both open and traditional schools were considered open, and districts with all traditional schools were considered traditional. In order to group the districts in this manner, the two groups had to have the following similarities:
 - a. Student population
 - b. Community type
 - c. School wealth

Nine districts with one or more open concept schools and nine districts with all traditional schools were selected.

¹⁶ Taylor Whittier, The Supervisor: New Demands: New Dimensions. William Lucio, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), p. 13.

- 3. All supervisory personnel in the districts were asked to participate in the study by completing the revised questionnaire used by the TASCD in 1961.
- 4. The responses from the questionnaire were reported in tabular as well as in narrative form.
- 5. From the summarized data a description of the instructional supervisors' major tasks in an open concept school was presented.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as they were used in this study.

Open Concept Schools. This term is derived from many sources, several of which are reported in the introductory remarks of this paper. Open concept has been associated with a facility in which large open spaces are available for flexible scheduling, team teaching, and individualized instruction. This term has been used to describe an internal environment of a classroom in which the students and the teacher together plan and conduct their activities. In this study the meaning of open concept was limited to an open facility in which two or more classes worked in a common area using a program designed to meet the academic needs of each student with placement and assignments based on these needs.

Nongraded Program. An organizational structure in which pupils are permitted progression in school, based upon their individual achievement, was considered a nongraded program.

Traditional Schools. The term "traditional school" was used to indicate an educational program that is structured and organized so as to divide content into units equal to one year for each grade level. The program operates in a physical structure housing one teacher and one class of students in each classroom used.

Closed Area. A closed area facility provides individual classrooms, separated by walls, and housing one classroom of students controlled by one teacher.

Graded Program. In a graded program a student's placement is determined by age and previous grade assignment. The curriculum is designed to meet the needs of a majority of the students of the same age and grade placement.

Instructional Supervisor. This term also has many definitions in relation to assignment and function. In this study an instructional supervisor was the professional educator assigned to coordinate and supervise the activities of the classroom with no administrative assignments other than those directly related to instruction. In a school system employing more than one classification of supervisor, the person working most closely with the classroom teacher participated in the study. A team leader with scheduled time for supervising and coordinating the instructional duties of other teachers was considered a supervisor.

Instructional Supervision. Instructional supervision, as the term was used, includes professional activities which maintain and improve the goals, methods, procedures, and activities that have a direct or indirect influence on the quality of learning of pupils.

Major Tasks of Instructional Supervisors. Supervisory activities, grouped into categories and directly influencing supervision, were considered major tasks.

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of related goals of supervision. Attention will be focused on the history of supervision and the tasks involved therein in both traditional and open concept schools. The research studies completed in recent years as they relate to instructional supervision have been few in number and largely from doctoral dissertations. The need for further research is evidenced by examination of the massive and diverse problems in our high-achieving society, a society that has identified the educational system as a means of solving some of its complex problems. Studies regarding certification of instructional supervisors were not reviewed, since this study relates specifically to the tasks of supervisors and defines such supervisors in terms of function rather than certification.

History and Background

Although instructional supervision is among the oldest of the non-teaching positions in American education, historical studies reveal change in the concept and practice of supervision. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, supervision was largely concerned with inspection for the sake of control by civil leaders and clergy. This dominant role played by the laymen of the community in enforcing rules and

maintaining rigid standards continued throughout the nineteenth century but was implemented in larger school systems by professional educators rather than laymen.

Early in the nineteenth century the powers and duties of the lay committees or boards were placed in positions such as "acting visitor," "school clerk," or the "superintendent of schools;" upgrading the work of the teacher became a recognized function. Eventually, professional educators assumed this function. By 1870 there were superintendents in the 29 largest cities in the United States. New fields such as science, modern language, and music were being introduced into the curriculum by the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Special subject supervisors began to appear in city systems during this period.

During the first two decades of the twentieth century, the supervisor was primarily concerned with quality control in the teaching process. Teacher preparation was at a minimum, and supervisors were responsible for visiting classes, observing, and conferring with teachers.

By the 1920's concern was developing for the total educational program and attention was centered on overall

Harold Spears, Improving the Supervision of Instruction (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953), pp. 10-38.

²Fred C. Ayer and A. S. Barr, <u>The Organization of Supervision</u>, D. Appleton & Company, Inc., New York, 1928), pp. 7-37.

objectives. Course-of-study development as a means of reorganizing the curriculum was the usual approach. Supervisors often became course-of-study writers with the assistance of teacher committees. The general supervisor gradually became a recognized educational entity.³

The modern practice of supervision has evolved through three stages: the scientific concept, the democratic concept, and the creative concept. Early in the twentieth century, the scientific movement of supervision resulted in such practices as specified teacher qualifications and scientific methods of teaching; data were secured and statistically analyzed; and educational research and experimentation were instituted. Supervisory judgment depended more upon relevant data than upon sheer opinion. The 1930's brought an interest in a more democratic approach to supervision. This movement brought increased respect for the teacher's perception and involvement in the decision making processes. The most recent of these three concepts was that of finding ways to release the creative potential within the individual teacher.

³Gordon N. Mackenzie, "Role of the Supervisor," <u>Supervision</u>: <u>Emerging Profession</u>, Robert Leeper, Editor, (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 41-45.

⁴Robert C. McKean and H. H. Mills, <u>The Supervisor</u> (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), pp. 1-6.

Supervision has become more important over the years as a result of changing trends in education. Current educational demands and public opinion place supervision in an even more strategic position for meeting the individual needs of teachers and pupils.

Goals of Supervision

The identification of the goals for instructional supervision is significant in determining the role to be assumed by the supervisor. From the writings of educational authorities and researchers, many of the goals of supervision can be identified.

The goals most often mentioned by authorities and researchers relate to the improvement of teaching and learning, the provision of educational leadership, and the coordination of curriculum. McKean and Mills refer to the nature of educational leadership by instructional supervisors which will motivate teachers to strive for the fulfillment of their potentialities, thereby improving the quality of instruction. Lucio and McNeil consider the goal for supervision as "that of the school itself; furtherance of that knowledge or truth by which human beings can comprehend if not control their

Robert C. McKean and H. H. Mills, The Supervisor (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964), pp. 5-6.

world." 6 Carmen's study of general roles and responsibilities of supervisors from 99 studies conducted between 1955 and 1969 concluded that the chief purpose of instructional supervision as perceived by local school personnel was

to produce a coordinated effort for the improvement of instruction, with the three areas of curriculum development, in-service education and assistance to individual teachers being paramount concerns. 7

Hall's comparative analysis of the perceptions of teachers, principals, and general supervisors in the Mobile public schools determined that the principal purpose of supervision was leadership to improve teaching and learning. Two secondary purposes specified were, first, the improvement of individual teacher competence and, second, the coordination of efforts toward curriculum improvement. By Johnson, in an analysis of the opinions of 32 educational specialists, 348 teachers, and 64 administrators in Alton, Illinois, concluded

⁶William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, <u>Supervisor</u>: <u>A</u>
<u>Synthesis of Thought and Action</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill Book
<u>Cc.</u>, 1962), p. 12.

⁷Beatrice Davis Carman, Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction: A Synthesis of Research Findings. Florida State, 1970. Dissertation Order No. 71-6979 (126 pages). March 1971, Abstract, p. 4406-A.

Matthew Harvard Hall, "A Study of the Perception of Supervisors, Principals, and Teachers Regarding the Supervisory Program in Mobile (Alabama) Public Schools" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1962), pp. 79-102.

that all supervisory services have, as their ultimate goal, the creation of an instructional climate which will aid in the development of more productive citizens capable of functioning in a democratic society.

From the Florida Role Study in which questionnaires were submitted to supervisors only, more than 50 percent of the respondents felt that the primary purpose of supervision was that of providing the best conditions for learning and improving the quality of education. Two hundred and eightynine county supervisors were included in this study.

Puckett, in a survey of selected elementary and secondary schools in Arkansas, found that the principal goal of the supervisor was considered to be coordination of the instructional program. A similar study by Evans focused more attention on leadership roles of elementary school supervisors in 29 public school districts. According to these supervi-

⁹James Harris Johnson, "The Development of Criteria for an Evaluation of the Supervisory Program in the Schools of Alton, Illinois," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1955), Dissertation Abstracts, XIV-A, No. 6-9 (1955), 1526.

Regional Curriculum Projects (RCP), A Role Study: The County Level Supervisor in Florida (Atlanta, Georgia: RCP, Trinity Avenue, S.W., 1968), pp. 5-7.

ll Daniel Wayne Puckett, "The Status and Function of the General School Supervisor in Selected Arkansas Schools" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1962), 1.81.

sors, curriculum coordination and the development of and improvement in instruction were their major functions. 12

Guss reported the results of a perception study conducted in Indiana to determine how supervision is perceived by administrators, university faculty members, parents, supervisors, and teachers in that state. From the questionnaire responses the findings were grouped for study. Administrators, college faculty members, and supervisors indicated that improvement in instruction was of primary importance while teachers and parents viewed supervision as a supportive role for instructional processes. Other references to supervisory goals included community needs, evaluation, and communications. 13

The Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum

Development Study states that

The function of supervision in an organization is to maintain and to improve the quality of the product of the institution. No matter how well ideas are conceived or how well methods and procedures are developed, results cannot be satisfactory unless management makes sure that the work is done as it

Norman Dean Evans, "The Status and Function of the Public Elementary School Supervisor in the Third and Fourth Class Districts of the Pennsylvania Counties of Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1958), Dissertation Abstracts, XIX-A, No. 8-10 (1958), 1966.

¹³ Carolyn Guss, "How is Supervision Perceived?" Supervision: Emerging Profession, Robert R. Leeper, Editor (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 83-96.

should be done. Therefore, responsibility of management for quality, quantity, and cost must be largely met through supervision. 14

Role of Supervisors

Theory and practice are bridged in roles assumed by supervisors. In defining the role of supervisors many tasks are identified in educational research and literature.

The role of a supervisor is an all-encompassing one. The supervisor serves as a change agent providing guidance for teachers who must know how to individualize their instruction. Dissatisfaction with the status quo is seen as a characteristic of this role. This change agent concept is not new. This role was described in 1947 by Kurt Lewin and has been used extensively since then by many educators. Harris contends that instructional leaders should provide direction for finding better ways of influencing rationally planned and timed change. Analyses of the functions of the supervisor reflect his key responsibility as an inducer and coordinator of change. If the supervisor is to assume the role of a

¹⁴ Haynes, op. cit., p. 5.

¹⁵ Kurt Lewin, "Frontiers in Group Dynamics! Concept Methods and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibrium; and Social Change." Human Relations 1:5-41; June 1947.

¹⁶ Ben M. Harris, "New Leadership and New Responsibilities for Human Development," Educational Leadership 2:6(8): 739-742, May, 1969.

change agent, then it becomes a matter of great importance that he be able to help chart the direction of change and keep track of it. 17 Goodlad suggests a conceptional approach as a means of giving the supervisor a way of keeping track of what he is doing as he fosters change. 18 Ramseyer sees the instructional supervisor as a specialist who can program curricular and instructional changes and perform his specialized operation by analysis, diagnosis, and hypothesis formulation. 19 Lucio and McNeil designated the supervisor as a leader who has possession of two properties: one, a clear perspective of the goals of the school and awareness of its resources and qualities, and two, the ability to help others contribute to this vision and to act in accordance with it. 20

¹⁷ Paul R. Klohr, "Looking Ahead in a Climate of Change," Fole of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. Ronald R. Leeper, Editor. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036, 1965, pp. 150-151.

¹⁹ John Goodlad, "The School Scene in Review," The School Review. December, 1958; p. 391.

¹⁹ John A. Ramseyer, "Supervisory Personnel," <u>Preparation Programs for School Administration: Common and Specialized Learning</u>, Donald J. Lew and Herbert Tudman. Seventh UCEA Career Development Seminar. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1963, pp. 155-168.

Lucio and McNeil, <u>Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action</u>, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962, p. 46.

In his study of supervisory behavior, Harris cites the need for the supervisor to engage in all activities designed to maintain and support the present level of instruction while working as a change agent for instructional improvement. 21

Lewis maintains that the instructional leader must assume the major responsibility for adopting effective educational goals in which the individual child is at all times the focal point of the instructional program. He stresses the need for an instructional leader who is versatile in training and approach so that he can assume the following roles:

- The role of a coordinator who is able to get the teaching staff to function together as a team so that each member may make his maximum contribution to the nongraded program.
- The role of an instigator who can provide the necessary impetus to get the staff involved completely in the nongraded program.
- 3. The role of an educational engineer who is able to organize and structure the nongraded program in order to provide maximum opportunities for individualized instruction.

Ben M. Harris, <u>Supervisory Behavior in Education</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, <u>Prentice-Hall</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, 1963, pp. 18-19.

- 4. The role of a research virtuoso who can bring together materials, resource persons, teachers, and students in a positive relationship so as to effectuate intellectual development and social growth in a nongraded program.
- 5. The role of an overseer who can develop and maintain the nongraded program which is written within the framework established by the Board of Education and the chief school administrator.
- 6. The role of an intellectual leader who makes contributions to the education of all students through the leadership which he provides to teachers attempting to develop special programs for particular needs and to implement those program facets into curriculum.
- 7. The role of a diplomat who is able to relate effectively to the community so that he may keep them informed and continually abreast of the nongraded programs' developments.
- 8. The role of the psychologist who is able to gain the necessary insights for making the most effective use of creative minds on his staff in order to bring additional advantages to the program.²²

A measure of disagreement among supervisors concerning certain desirable and expected supervisory roles was determined in Bannister's Iowa study. He found considerable consensus on the desirability of such roles as educational leader,

James Lewis, Jr., A Contemporary Approach to Non-graded Education, (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1969), p. 29.

curriculum builder, counselor, and helping teacher. ²³ Researchers have attempted to identify tasks of practicing supervisors. Livesay, in defining eight critical tasks for the supervisor, determined that the major function of supervision is to produce a coordinated effort in the direction of the improvement of instruction. ²⁴

Carman cited the ten supervisory tasks of most significance as

- A. Coordinating in-service education programs and workshops.
- B. Fostering improvement in human relations.
- C. Providing consultative services and instructional help.
- D. Engaging in community, student, and organizational contacts.
- E. Providing resource materials.
- F. Coordinating instructional programs.
- G. Visiting classrooms.
- H. Demonstrating methods and materials.

²³

Richard Eugene Bannister, "The Role of the Elementary Consultant in Iowa," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1962), pp. 75-83.

Herbert Y. Livesay, "A Competency Pattern for the General Supervisor as Expressed in Theory," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1955), p. 112.

- I. Assisting in evaluation of system-wide programs.
- J. Holding follow-up conferences after classroom visits.²⁵

Moll determined the four most important tasks of the curriculum director in the supervisory role to be the following:

- 1. To plan for improvement of the curriculum and development of the pilot program.
- 2. To evaluate continually both the appropriateness and quality of curriculum.
- 3. To implement changes in the curriculum when conditions warrant a change.
- 4. To serve the personnel as a consultant and advisor regarding curriculum problems.²⁶

Activities rated most beneficial, according to a New Jersey Classroom Teachers' Association survey, included grade level meetings, individual conferences, workshops, demonstration lessons, exhibits of books, materials, and information bulletins. 27

²⁵Carman, op. cit., p. 41.

Loren Allen Moll, "An Analysis of the Role of the Curriculum Director," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965), pp. 81-82.

Jane Franseth, <u>Supervision</u> as <u>Leadership</u> (Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson and Company, 1961), pp. 307-310.

Role of Supervisor in Open Concept Schools

Instructional supervisory behavior encompasses various definitive roles and trends in modern education, implementing such programs as team teaching, flexible scheduling, non-graded learning activities, and various other innovations. As the traditional school evolved into a more student-centered open concept school, the need for teachers to work together as a team in order to effect better means of meeting individual needs of students became popular. The team leader as the key person of the instructional staff can be an asset in helping formulate significant operational procedures. The team leader assignment is emerging as a vital part of staffing for open concept school supervision.

Anderson contends that supervisors in innovative or open schools who create conditions in which it is easier for teachers to implement curriculum improvements cooperatively must concentrate on becoming effective members of a team. He is of the opinion that one of the supervisor's most significant roles is that of helping teachers implement such concepts in their teaching as teaching for value clarification, intelligent inquiry, and development of meanings. He suggests principles which can help supervisors determine how they should function in their relations with other human beings:

- The assumption of mutual growth of all concerned is a significant factor in the improvement of instruction.
- As supervisors, we cannot change people; we can only provide situations in which it is easier for them to change.
- 3. Supervision should focus on the strengths of the teacher and his development as a unique individual.
- 4. The supervisor functions as a charge agent, who helps people evaluate themselves.
- 5. Leadership is a service role.
- 6. Supervision stresses good human relationships.
- 7. In leadership, the authority of competence is superior to the authority of status.
- 8. Supervision creates an atmosphere in which there is freedom to disagree.
- 9. The supervisor is a most significant factor in encouraging experimentation.²⁸

McCarthy, in discussing interdisciplinary teaming in the middle school, lists five duties and responsibilities that are incumbent on team leaders in an interdisciplinary arrangement:

- 1. To lead the entire team in a continual, thorough analysis and evaluation of each student's progress.
- 2. To plan and coordinate the constantly shifting schedules of all students and teachers composing the team.

²⁸Vernon E. Anderson, <u>Curriculum Guidelines in an Era</u> of Change. New York: Ronald <u>Press Company</u>, 1969, pp. 42-49.

- 3. To meet on a formal basis once each month with the leadership team of the building to discuss the team's operation.
- 4. To assume responsibility for the development and implementation of differentiated reading programs and diagnostic testing programs.
- 5. To strive continually to maintain a constant dialogue among all members of the team that focuses on each individual student as well as on logical attempts to coordinate material from the four disciplines. 29

The need for an Instructional Consultant with supervisory training and skills as a vital member of the building leader-ship team is subsequently recommended by McCarthy. This person, he suggests, should

assist teachers in the examination of the values they hold, and assist them in modifying those beliefs and values in light of the changing needs of children and society and the findings of research in child growth, development, motivation, and learning. 30

Sybouts cites a few illustrations of how the supervisory relationship can be more productive between administration and teacher in a team teaching setting as follows: (a) promoting cooperative planning; (b) reducing teacher isolation; (c) providing new teachers with more constant assistance

Robert J. McCarthy, The Ungraded Middle School, New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1962, 11, pp. 96-98.

³⁰ Ibid.

and guidance; (d) promoting peer evaluation of teaching; (e) relating supervision to staff-identified needs and interests. 31

Supervision in Open Concept British Schools

The development of the open classroom in the British primary school has had a profound influence on the thinking and practices of American educators and their approach to education and instructional supervision. In many of the British open schools the head teacher assumes the role of instructional leadership. In discussing the role of the head teacher in the British primary school, Hertzberg and Stone emphasize that the head teacher's concept of supervision is a broad one where he works with the teacher in a collegial fashion, and where the focus is on the child and the program rather than on the performance of the teacher. The head teacher spends a great deal of time helping his teachers in the following ways:

- 1. Individual discussions.
- 2. Group discussions.
- 3. Faculty meetings.

Ward Sybouts, "Supervision of Team Teaching," Educational Leadership, 25 (2): 159, November, 1967.

Alvin Hertzberg and Edward F. Stone, <u>Schools Are For Children</u>. (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 196.

- 4. Knowing materials.
- 5. Arranging for teachers to visit other classes in their school, as well as in other schools.
- 6. In-service.
- 7. Working with children.
- 8. Supervision. 33

Along similar lines Hapgood states that the English headmistress is not an "administrator" in the American sense. She is the head teacher, a master teacher. She is given remarkable autonomy in determining educational policy and practice in her school. The most successful heads are anything but autocrats. They work closely with their staffs, often teaching alongside a teacher in a classroom. The need for this role is supported by Margaret Mead as she states:

School administrators might pattern their need to keep up-to-date on the Air Force, where the highest ranking officers continue to fly. Unless he has an opportunity to teach--not to go in and take one class once, but to put up with the same class over quite a period and find out what students know and don't know--he can't help his teachers much. 35

^{33&}lt;sub>Ibid</sub>.

³⁴ Marilyn Hapgood, "The Open Classroom: Protect It From Its Friends," Saturday Review, p. 68; September, 1971.

³⁵ Margaret Mead, "Are Any School Administrators Listening?" Nations Schools 87 (6):42, June, 1971.

Summary

In summary the literature reflects a similarity of roles for instructional supervisors in terms of their importance to the total educational program. More references were made to the supervisor as a change agent for instruction than any other role. A supervisor is viewed as the logical educator to implement new programs of instruction by virtue of his relationship to the administration and teaching staff and his skills in instructional leadership. The supervisor is viewed by many as a consultant in all curriculum matters. The references to coordination of educational services reflected a need for better communication between educators as well as more group planning.

Educational leadership looms as another major role expected of instructional supervisors. Supervisory training and staff assignments should equip them to provide such leadership. Evaluation of the total instructional leadership is a natural follow-up.

Numerous and common activities or tasks for supervisors in fulfilling these various roles as mentioned in the literature are

- Planning and conducting teacher workshops as a part of the in-service training program.
- Conferring individually with teachers as needed to insure proper communication and quality instruction.

- 3. Demonstrating new teaching methods, equipment, and the use of new materials.
- 4. Publishing educational bulletins and curriculum quides.
- 5. Scheduling the activities of teachers and students in team teaching programs.
- 6. Conducting research as a means of evaluating existing programs and finding new and more meaningful ways of conducting an educational program.

References to supervision in open concept schools tended to emphasize general roles and philosophy rather than specific tasks or activities. Greater concern with human relations in dealing with teachers, students, and patrons seems to be the major thrust of these new programs. Openness tends to relate more to human relations than to space or curriculum content. The role of change agent through group processes is stressed for the instructional supervisor in the open concept school as well as an evaluation of change. Continual evaluation will help insure and maintain direction in planning new programs and changing old ones.

Supervision in open concept British schools has served as a guide for many American educators. The instructional leader in the British schools works closely with teachers and students. Leadership activities are common tasks for these supervisors. This role is seen by many as a necessity for acquiring first-hand knowledge of the classroom environment.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study attempted to determine the major tasks of instructional supervisors in open concept schools. Data have been gathered by surveying supervisors in a selected geographical area and by an intensive study of one school district in the area. The purpose of this chapter is to present a description of the procedure used to acquire the basic information for the study. The procedures have been reported in the following categories:

- 1. Population to be investigated
- 2. Procedure for gathering data
- 3. Procedure for analyzing data

Population

Region IV Educational Service Center was selected as the source for schools to survey for data. The service center serves 56 public school districts from seven counties in the metropolitan area, thus providing geographic boundaries for the sample.

The service center was asked to provide the names and mailing addresses of the 56 superintendents in Region IV.

With this information, the superintendents of each district were mailed a questionnaire which provided the following information:

- 1. Purpose of the study
- 2. Need for the study
- 3. Definition of open concept and traditional schools as used in this study
- 4. Proposed means of gathering data from school personnel

The following information was asked of the superintendents:

- The number of open concept schools operating in the district
- 2. Their willingness to participate in the study
- 3. The name of a contact person from the participating districts

A copy of the letter may be seen in Appendix A. From the 56 districts, there were 41 responses, and 27 agreed to participate in the study. Of the 27 districts agreeing to participate, nine indicated that they operated at least one open concept school as defined in the study. All of the responding districts indicated that they operated one or more traditional schools. In order to select a population from which to survey supervisors in open concept school districts, it was determined that a district operating one or more open concept schools should be considered an open concept district for the study. Districts operating all traditional schools as defined in this study were considered traditional districts. The assumption for this classification was that the total supervisory staff of districts moving in the direction of openness should be affected by this change,

regardless of their specific assignment in the district.

In addition to the information gained from the population survey, the following information was compiled for each of the 27 districts agreeing to participate in the study:

- 1. Average daily attendance (ADA) for the 1971-1972 school year
- 2. Assessed valuation for 1971-1972
- 3. Assessed valuation per ADA

Average daily attendance, assessed valuation, and type of district are reported in Table I.

In order to more accurately describe the tasks of instructional supervisors in open concept school districts as being unique to open concept districts, an examination of the tasks of supervisors in traditional districts was included in the study.

Of the 27 districts listed in Table I, nine traditional districts were selected to be surveyed along with the nine open concept districts. The nine traditional districts were selected to participate in the study on the basis of their being similar to the nine open concept districts in terms of average daily attendance and assessed valuation in the geographical confines of Region IV Educational Service Center. Table II reflects the population to be sampled.

lexas Education Agency, Public School Directory, Austin, Texas: 1972, 281 pp.

TABLE I

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND VALUATION OF RESPONDING DISTRICTS

District	ADA	Valuation	Assessed Val.	Concept Open/Traditional
DISCILCE	HDA	varuacion	per ADA	Open/iradicionar
Alief	2,893	209,247	72.33	Open
Barbers Hill	623	60,000	96.31	Traditional
Brazosport	9,881	437,021	44.23	Traditional
Cypress- Fairbanks	6,500	310,000	47.	Open
Dayton	1,637	37,100	22.66	Traditional
Deer Park	6,054	454,055	75.00	Open
Dickinson	3,813	188,884	49.54	Traditional
Fort Bend	4,705	219,000	46.55	Open
Galena Park	10,725	286,751	26.74	Open
Galveston	11,681	345,174	29.55	Open

TABLE I CONTINUED

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND VALUATION OF RESPONDING DISTRICTS

District	ADA	Valuation	Assessed Val. per ADA	Concept Open/Traditional
Goose Creek	12,399	517,000	41.70	Open
Hitchcock	1,829	31,200	17.06	Traditional
Katy	1.,538	127,512	82.91	Traditional
Kendleton	265	6,250	23.58	Traditional
Lamar	6,950	243,550	35.04	Traditional
LaMarque	6,303	233,790	37.09	Traditional
LaPorte	4,100	266,000	64.88	Traditional
Liberty	2,285	56,750	24.84	Traditional
North Forest	14,166	150,118	10.60	Traditional
Pasadena	33,069	633,353	19.15	Traditional
Pearland	3,515	84,335	23.99	Traditional

TABLE I CONTINUED

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND VALUATION OF RESPONDING DISTRICTS

District	ADA	Valuation	Assessed Val. per ADA	Concept Open/Traditional
Santa Fe	2,139	39,000	18.23	Traditional
Sheldon	2,517	97,106	38.58	Traditional
Spring	2,238	153,828	68.73	Open
Spring Branch	36,531	860,000	23,54	Open
Texas City	6,635	252,983	38.13	Traditional
Tomball	1,479	40,200	27.18	Traditional

TABLE II

DISTRICTS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

Open Concept	Traditional Concept
Alief Independent School Dis-	Brazosport Independent School
trict	District
Cypress-Fairbanks Independent	Dickinson Independent School
School District	District
Deer Park Independent School	Katy Independent School Dis-
District	trict
Fort Bend Independent School	Lamar Consolidated Indepen-
District	dent School District
Galena Park Independent School	LaMarque Independent School
District	District
Galveston Independent School	LaPorte Independent School
District	District
Goose Creek Consolidated Inde-	North Forest Independent
pendent School District	School District
Spring Independent School	Pasadena Independent School
District	District
Spring Branch Independent	Sheldon Independent School
School District	District

Procedure for Gathering Data

Survey of Supervisors

Data were gathered for the study by surveying the supervisors of the 18 districts participating in the study and by conducting an intense study of one district. The Quéstionnaire to Determine Status of Supervision in Texas was used as the means of gathering data for the study. This questionnaire, developed in 1961 by a committee appointed from members of the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, contained 53 multiple choice items relating to frequency of involvement and nature of responsibility in tasks performed by supervisors. General information relating to the assignment of each supervisor was requested on eight items with blanks provided for responses.

The questionnaire was modified by the researcher to include four multiple choice items and requests for more information relative to the nature of assignment in the general information section. The questionnaire is found in Appendix B.

The contact person designated by the superintendent of each participating district in the study was questioned to determine how many supervisors were employed in each district.

A plan for communicating with each supervisor was initiated.

A total of 154 questionnaires were mailed to supervisors in the nine open concept schools and 149 were mailed to supervisors in the nine traditional school districts. A total of

106 were returned from the open concept districts and 101 from the traditional schools.

Case Study

Deer Park Independent School District was selected as the case study. Deer Park was found, through examination of records and interviews with key personnel, to be moving in the direction of openness in staffing as well as building construction and curriculum development. The Superintendent of Schools, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, Director of Elementary Education, and ten instructional supervisors from the Deer Park Independent School District were interviewed as a means of gathering data to determine the supervisory needs and supervisory tasks in that district. General information requested of central office administrators included the following:

- 1. When did the district begin staffing with supervisory personnel?
- 2. How did this staffing trend develop and why?
- 3. From a district-wide view, how effective is this pattern?
- 4. What improvements in instructional supervisors are needed?

The interviews with instructional supervisors assigned to specific schools were composed of the following:

1. How would you describe your major tasks as they relate to instructional supervision?

- 2. What advantages do you feel are gained by an instructional supervisor who has some teaching responsibilities?
- 3. What limitations do you note in your role as supervisor?
- 4. What administrative changes in your assignment would result in a more effective instructional program?

Additional data were obtained from examination of written policy, directives, guides, and district records.

Procedure for Analyzing Data

Responses to the questionnaire were tabulated by total responses for each group of supervisors, open concept and traditional. Each percentage of total responses and a percentage of responses by item were made of the 57 multiple choice items. The responses of the Deer Park Independent School District supervisors were included in the open concept group and also handled as a third group. This procedure allowed more detailed analysis of the case study district.

The summarized questionnaire responses were grouped as they related to tasks described in the 1961 study. These grouped responses were also examined as to degree of involvement to determine the tasks most frequently performed by supervisors. Examination of the grouped responses as to nature of responsibility was made to determine how the supervisors perceived themselves in terms of authority for each task. The tasks with the highest percentage of responses and

those with the lowest percentage of responses were identified for each group. Differences between the two groups of supervisors were noted from the summarized data. The tasks most often performed according to the questionnaire responses were considered major tasks for this study.

The results of the 1961 study by the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development were reviewed to note any changes in general supervision between 1961 and 1972. These changes provided more comparative data concerning the tasks of supervisors in open concept schools that are peculiar to open concept schools.

The results of the interviews and examination of records were treated in narrative form unless major differences were noted in interview responses, in which case tables were constructed and tabulations were made to illustrate these differences. Data from the questionnaire responses were analyzed for the case study supervisors to strengthen the results of interviews and record examinations.

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of the study are reported in this chapter. Data for the study were collected by surveying instructional supervisors from selected districts served by Region IV Educational Service Center and by conducting a case study of the Deer Park Independent School District. The chapter is organized into three major sections: results of the survey, the case study, and a summary.

In the first section, data from the survey of instructional supervisors from the 18 districts participating in the study will be reported and analyzed. The two groups of districts classified as open concept and traditional will be treated separately in order to detect tasks unique to open concept supervisors. The second major portion of this chapter will present an analysis of the data collected in the case study and trace the development of supervisory staffing patterns as changes in the instructional program occurred.

Results of the Survey

The questionnaire used in the survey was developed by the Texas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development and modified by the researcher to include questions relating specifically to open concept schools. The instrument contains questions relating to the frequency of involvement and the nature of responsibility for 55 specific tasks as

well as a section dealing with the specific job assignment of each responding supervisor. The questionnaire instructions classify involvement frequency into four categories and nature of responsibility into five categories as follows:

Involvement Frequency

- 1. Always--When this objective is undertaken, I am involved in some way.
- Ordinarily--When this objective is undertaken, I am ordinarily, but not always, involved.
- 3. Seldom--When this objective is undertaken, I am sometimes, but not often, involved.
- 4. Never--When this objective is undertaken, I do not get involved.

Nature of Responsibility

- 1. Director--Achieving this objective is my responsibility. The school policy within which I operate gives me ample authority to make administrative decisions necessary to expedite my work.
- 2. Coordinator--Achieving this objective is my responsibility. Agreements regarding goals and procedures are derived by group process techniques, by group consensus, or by mutual consent. Any change in administrative procedure is subject to administrative approval.
- 3. Consultant--I am responsible for giving advice, supplying pertinent data, or otherwise making suggestions to aid in achieving this objective.
- 4. Incidental Contributor -- I have responsibility for achieving this objective when, and only when, I am invited to help.
- 5. Participant -- I work under the leadership of

another, alone or in association with a group of peers, to achieve this objective.

Questions relating to specific assignments in the questionnaire include grade level assignment, number of buildings in the assignment, number of teachers to supervise, location of work station, and time spent in classrooms.

Questionnaires were mailed to 154 supervisors in the participating open concept districts and to 149 supervisors in the participating traditional districts. One hundred six questionnaires were returned from the open concept districts and 101 from the traditional districts.

Supervisors in Open Concept Schools

From the general questionnaire responses relating to the assignment of each supervisor, information describing their general responsibility was gathered. Fifty percent of the responding supervisors in open concept districts were assigned to the elementary level, 37 percent at the secondary level, and 13 percent had responsibilities involving both elementary and secondary schools. The average number of school buildings assigned to each supervisor was eight with an average of 50 teachers to supervise. Forty-one percent of these supervisors were on central office staffs while 59 percent were assigned to specific buildings.

The responses to each of the 55 items on the questionnaire are reported in Table III. Percentages were computed

TABLE III
RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	.veme	ent		Natu spon			•
T	ASKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	н Always	N Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	y Director	ы Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	H Participant
1.	Adding new emphases to instructional programs	46	40	11	3	13	50	15	9	13
2.	Designing new instructional programs (New programs in math and foreign languages are examples)	43	31	18	9	22	42	20	6	8
3.	Discontinuing the use of courses, segments of courses, or instructional emphases which you do not approve	26	36	21	17	18	42	24	10	5
<u>4</u> .	Experimenting with, trying out, new emphases in teaching	43	44	11	2	23	44	25	6	2
5.	Planning the sequence of content and instructional emphases	42	37	19	3	27	17	28	14	14
6.	Considering effective methods of instruction	45	4.1	9	2	18	39	25	10	8

TABLE III CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	.veme	nt			re c sibi	f lity	
		Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
T	ASKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	1	2	3	4	A	В	С	D	E
7.	Developing a school philosophy pertaining to instruction	23	41	21	15	14	29	22	20	14
8.	Selecting textbooks	51	27	14	8	15	35	21	15	13
9.	Accounting for and distributing textbooks for the district	19	11	22	48	26	23	15	17	20
10.	Selecting text-type materials	32	47	10	11	14	44	20	11	10
11.	Producing curriculum guides and resource bulletins	43	21	17	19	18	44	20	9	9
12.	Interpreting the "school's" program to new teachers	51	34	12	4	23	36	25	7	9
13.	Interpreting the school's program to the professional staff	33	36	25	6	23	32	22	12	1.1

TABLE III CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon		f lity	
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	нAlways	~ 0 rdinari 1 y	w Seldom	P Never	> Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	^H Participant
14.	Interpreting the school's program to the community	19	37	40	4	18	30	16	22	15
15.	Evaluating the educational status of our children and youth	32	36	24	8	14	48	18	10	10
16.	Determining whether, and how well, our program is functioning	42	42	12	4	10	44	16	16	1.1
17.	Determining the areas in which tests will be used	1.7	35	20	27	20	38	10	20	12
18.	Selecting tests (standardized)	14	22	19	45	21	34	15	18	13
19.	Instructing the staff regarding how to administer the tests	18	16	31	35	16	29	22	20	13
20.	Interpreting the test data	1.4	32	25	29	23	25	21	13	17

TABLE III CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		Ι	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon			
		. Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	1	2	3	4	A	В	С	D	E
21.	Helping teachers with children who have behavioral problems	13	40	32	15	9	30	34	13	10
22.	Helping teachers with problems pertaining to methods of instruction	13	51	15	3	19	24	40	12	4
23.	Helping teachers with problems regarding the selection of instructional materials	21	56	18	5	14	29	34	14	10
24.	Helping teachers with problems related to the use of instructional materials	31	48	16	4	20	29	39	9	6
25.	Helping teachers who have relationship problems with school staff or community	9	25	34	31	15	21	32	24	7
26.	Helping teachers with children who have learning problems	13	47	33	7	11	23	36	23	7

TABLE III CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt			re o sibi	f lity	
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	r Always	o Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	⊅ Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	ы Participant
27.	Helping teachers to learn to use materials and equipment (projectors, globes, tape recorders)	22	45	19	14	13	32	32	13	10
28.	Appraising teachers of instructional supplies and materials	35	43	14	8	22	30	35	7	6
29.	Advising teachers regarding effective ways to use instructional supplies, materials, equipment	28	52	15	5	16	43	28	9	5
30.	Recommending the purchase of instructional supplies, materials, and equipment	42	39	16	3	21	29	25	9	16
31.	Discontinuing the use of supplies, materials, and equipment which you cannot recommend	35	38	21	6	22	34	27	9	7

TABLE III CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	f lity					
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	н Always	n Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	v Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	⊟ Participant
32.	Recommending design for remodeling instructional space	22	24	27	27	20	32	28	14	7
33.	Designing instructional space for new construction	21	20	21.	38	17	35	25	13	10
34.	Selecting furniture for classrooms	17	18	30	35	17	15	42	12	14
35.	Designing built-in features to accommodate teaching-learning experiences	19	21	21	38	14	21	30	24	11
36,	Determining the need for professional staff	19	21	21	38	20	28	31	13	8
37.	Selecting professional staff	12	31	14	43	16	30	28	16	10
38.	Placing professional staff in specific positions	14	20	24	43	17	32	22	15	14

TABLE III CONTINUED
RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon		f lity	
		Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	1	2	3	4	A	В	C	D	E
39.	Making extra-curricular assignments to staff	8	17	23	52	15	33	31	13	8
40.	Evaluating staff performance	16	19	37	28	18	17	32	22	11
41.	Continuingdiscontinuing contract with professional staff	10	6	10	73	30	18	27	12	12
42.	Making decisions regarding which library services will be provided	9	17	26	49	21	29	21	18	11
43.	Selecting library materials	16	9	48	27	9	24	29	19	19
44.	Planning ways for children to use the library	19	27	25	28	12	12	52	15	10
45.	Determining which special education in- structional units should be provided	8	23	13	55	15	21	36	13	15

TABLE III CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt			re o sibi	f lity	,
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	н Always	∾ Ordinarily	w Seldom	फ Never	⊅ Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	ы Participant
46.	Making evaluations of children to determine eligibility for a specific program	18	25	29	28	19	25	15	19	23
47.	Deciding which, if any, organized programs will be provided for the in-service professional development of the staff	34	33	16	17	15	33	25	12	14
48.	Developing an organizational plan of work for the in-service programs	36	27	19	18	23	38	23	8	9
49.	Guiding personally the work activities of the in-service program	38	29	19	14	20	40	24	7	9
50.	Obtaining consultative service for the in-service programs	30	21	20	29	21	40	23	9	7
51.	Obtaining resource materials for the in-service programs	30	25	21	24	25	36	19	9	11

TABLE III
RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon		_	•
ΤΆ	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	- Always	∾ Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	∀ Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	J Contributor	H Participant
	one of bothwiston and only by Thackard		#4		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>					
52.	Editing whatever written materials are produced by the in-service program	31	23	14	33	24	34	20	11	11
53.	Managing the publication of materials produced by the in-service program	27	16	16	41	25	38	20	11	6
54.	Work with teachers in the classroom in a teaching role	38	27	22	13	15	28	30	9	18
55.	Function as a member of a teaching team working directly with students	42	14	17	27	9	22	13	16	29

for each item. Questionnaire responses reported by groups of related supervisory tasks are found in Table IV. This method of combining related tasks was used in the TASCD study as a means of identifying major supervisory tasks and examining them in terms of a classification of general and related responsibilities.

Examination of the responses to the questionnaire items revealed 77 percent of the open concept supervisors reported involvement of always and ordinarily in the area of instructional improvement. Only 7 percent of the respondents indicated no involvement in this area. Supervisors in open concept schools were active in carrying out tasks relating to instructional improvement as 56 percent of them assumed a role of director or coordinator and 19 percent as contributor or participant.

Supervisors in open concept schools played a major role in the selection of textbooks, since 77 percent of them reported involvement of always and ordinarily for the task of selection of textbooks. Less time was spent in accounting for and distributing textbooks by this group of supervisors as evidenced by involvement of always or ordinarily from only 30 percent of the respondents.

Program planning ranked high in involvement and responsibility by these supervisors. Sixty-seven percent

TABLE IV
SUMMARY OF RELATED TASKS FOR SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT SCHOOLS

			P	erce	ntage	of R	espo	nses		
Item No.	Tasks	Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
1- 7	Improvement	38	39	15	7	18	38	22	10	9
8-10	Sel. & Acct. of Texts	34	28	15	22	17	35	19	14	13
L1-14	Program Planning	36	31	23	8	20	34	20	12	10
L5-20	Evaluating Program	23	30	21	24	16	37	17	15	12
21-26	Counseling Teachers	19	43	26	12	15	26	36	16	7
27-31	Sel. & Use of Inst. Supplies	31	40	19	10	19	34	29	10	8
32-35	Facility Planning	19	20	23	37	17	25	32	16	11
36-41	Personnel	11	18	22	48	19	26	27	17	11
12-44	Library Services	14	21	28	37	11	20	38	16	15
45-46	Special Education	13	24	21	41	16	29	20	12	24
47-53	In-Service	34	24	27	15	23	38	22	9	9
54-55	Classroom Teaching	40	20	20	20	13	30	23	12	23

indicated involvement of <u>always</u> and <u>ordinarily</u>, and 54 percent assumed the role of director or coordinator in activities relating to program planning. This area of responsibility includes producing curriculum guides and interpreting the instructional program to new teachers, the total professional staff, and the community.

Evaluation of the educational programs was a major responsibility of open concept supervisors. Responses to the individual questionnaire items in this area revealed that these supervisors devoted more time and assumed more responsibility relating test data to the effectiveness of the instructional program than they do in selecting, administering, and interpreting standardized tests.

Supervisors in open concept schools spent a considerable amount of time counseling with teachers as indicated by frequency of involvement responses of always and ordinarily from 62 percent of the participants. Examination of the individual tasks in this broad area reveals limited counseling with teachers in problems of discipline and staff relationships.

Tasks in which open concept supervisors spent the least amount of time according to the survey are facility planning, personnel matters, library services, and special education.

These supervisors were active in planning and directing in-service education programs. Such activities as planning the programs, obtaining consultative services, providing resource materials, editing materials produced from inservice programs and evaluating the effectiveness of in-service activities are assumed by or delegated to open concept supervisors. A more directive role is assumed by supervisors in in-service activities than any other major task. According to the responses, 61 percent of the open concept supervisors indicated a role of director or coordinator in this area.

An examination of the nature of responsibility for the total sample reveals their perception of themselves in terms of their relationships with teachers. More than 50 percent of the respondents perceived their nature of responsibility as coordinator or consultant on all of the tasks with the exception of special education.

Supervisors in Traditional Schools

The responses to each of the 55 questionnaire items are reported in Table V. Questionnaire responses reported by groups of related supervisory activities are summarized in Table VI for supervisors in traditional schools.

The supervisors in schools classified as traditional indicated the highest percentage of involvement in the major

TABLE V
RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon		f lity	
		Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
T	ASKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	1	2	3	4	A	В	С	D	E
1.	Adding new emphases to instructional program	40	42	14	4	22.	33	15	14	17
2.	Designing new instructional programs (New programs in math and foreign languages are examples)	38	37	15	11	24	37		10	17
3.	Discontinuing the use of courses, segments of courses, or instructional emphases which you do not approve	28	38	23	17	23	26	23	12	15
1.	Experimenting with, trying out, new emphases in teaching	38	47	11	3	26	28	22	7	7
5.	Planning the sequence of content and instructional emphases	38	46	11	4	23	42	20	6	12
5.	Considering effective methods of instruction	39	45	12	4	26	28	24	6	12

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

	I	nvol	veme	nt			re c sibi		,
TASKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	н Alwa <u>y</u> s	N Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	≽ Director	w Coordinator	o Consultant	U Contributor	H Participant
7. Developing a school philosophy pertaining to instruction	29	39	19	13	22	23	23	14	18
3. Selecting textbooks	48	36	13	3	22	25	26	9	18
 Accounting for and distributing textbooks for the district 	12	4	13	72	21	21	7	17	34
10. Selecting text-type materials	24	51	17	7	22	27	31	4	17
ll. Producing curriculum guides and resource bulletins	46	26	15	14	31.	25	20	8	14
12. Interpreting the "school's" program to new teachers	46	32	18	4	32	26	18	10	14
13. Interpreting the school's program to the professional staff	38	31	17	15	39	29	18	12	10

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme.	nt		Natu spon			
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	r Always	N Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	₽ Director	W Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	H Participant
14.	Interpreting the school's program to the community	22	23	36	18	27	14	19	19	21
15.	Evaluating the educational status of our children and youth	24	35	27	14	21	20	18	21	20
16.	Determining whether, and how well, our program is functioning	38	37	18	7	23	26	23	9	20
17.	Determining the areas in which tests will be used	22	28	22	27	20	26	23	9	22
18.	Selecting tests (standardized)	20	18	17	45	30	16	16	16	22
19.	Instructing staff regarding how to administer the tests	10	14	15	62	31	17	11	17	23
20.	Interpreting the test data	15	29	18	38	23	21	21	16	18

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt			re o sibi	_	,
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	r Always	N Ordinarily	ω Seldom	A Never	≽ Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	H Participant
21.	Helping teachers with children who have behavioral problems	12	24	33	32	19	20	22	22	17
22.	Helping teachers with problems pertaining to methods of instruction	26	49	20	4	20	27	30	14	9
23.	Helping teachers with problems regarding the selection of instructional materials	22	50	21	7	22	24	32	12	10
24.	Helping teachers with problems related to the use of instructional materials	24	55	12	9	24	24	28	13	10
25.	Helping teachers who have relationship problems with school staff or community	17	21	35	27	24	17	24	15	20
26.	Helping teachers with children who have learning problems	15	38	29	18	21	21	32	14	14

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt			re o sibi	f lity	
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	⊢ Always	N Ordinarily	ω Seldom	rever 4	∀ Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	ы Participant
27.	Helping teachers to learn to use materials and equipment (projectors, globes, tape recorders)	16	36	35	12	20	21	24	23	12
28.	Appraising teachers of instructional supplies and materials	37	33	25	5	41	30	33	1.8	11
29.	Advising teachers regarding effective ways to use instructional supplies, materials, equipment	28	45	24	3	24	27	22	18	9
30.	Recommending the purchase of instructional supplies, materials, and equipment	47	42	9	2	27	34	27	9	9
31.	Discontinuing the use of supplies, materials, and equipment which you cannot recommend	39	40	15	6	33	32	15	10	9

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon			
		Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	1	2	3	4	A	В	С	D	E
32.	Recommending design for remodeling instructional space	19	20	26	35	24	25	24	17	10
33.	Designing instructional space for new construction	14	23	14	48	27	20	31	10	12
34.	Selecting furniture for classrooms	10	23	20	47	20	36	27	14	14
35.	Designing built-in features to accommedate teaching-learning experiences	11	21	23	49	20	30	22	14	14
36.	Determining the need for professional staff	22	23	13	42	27	27	23	13	11
37.	Selecting professional staff	30	15	10	45	28	15	36	8	13
38.	Placing professional staff in specific positions	16	22	22	40	30	11	37	18	5

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt		Natu spon		f lity	
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	н Always	N Ordinarily	w Seldom	A Never	₽ Director	W Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	H Participant
39.	Making extra-curricular assignments to staff	9	15	23	53	28	19	30	14	9
40.	Evaluating staff performance	19	26	19	35	30	22	32	8	8
41.	Continuingdiscontinuing contract with professional staff	13	10	13	63	29	20	23	20	9
42.	Making decisions regarding which library services will be provided	8	25	20	47	16	29	29	16	11
43.	Selecting library materials	8	42	29	20	7	12	34	27	20
44.	Planning ways for children to use the library	4	26	31.	39	6	16	36	24	18
45.	Determining which special education instructional units should be provided	13	14	22	52	26	32	23	5	14

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	.veme	nt			re o sibi	f lity	
		Always	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	1	2	3	4	A	B 	С	D	E
46.	Making evaluations of children to determine eligibility for a specific program	19	22	29	29	17	19	33	13	19
47.	Deciding which, if any, organized programs will be provided for the inservice professional development of the staff	34	23	20	22	32	25	25	9	9
48.	Developing an organizational plan of work for the in-service programs	33	32	24	12	37	17	14	21	11
49.	Guiding personally the work activities of the in-service program	33	27	27	1.3	35	22	20	13	10
50.	Obtaining consultative service for the in-service programs	33	18	20	29	40	22	18	13	7

TABLE V CONTINUED

RESPONSES OF SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

		I	nvol	veme	nt			re o sibi		
TA	SKS OF SUPERVISION REPORTED BY PERCENTAGES	н Always	o Ordinarily	ω Seldom	4 Never	∀ Director	w Coordinator	O Consultant	U Contributor	ы Participant
51.	Obtaining resource materials for the in- service programs	27	23	30	20	36	26	19	9	1
52.	Editing whatever written materials are produced by the in-service program	28	20	16	35	37	35	15	6	2
53.	Managing the publication of materials produced by the in-service program	26	12	15	48	40	28	18	6	8
54.	Work with teachers in the classroom in a teaching role	20	26	32	23	28	17	23	13	19
55.	Function as a member of a teaching team working directly with students	15	11	27	40	22	15	19	19	26

TABLE VI
SUMMARY OF RELATED TASKS FOR SUPERVISORS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

			F	erce	ntage	of R	espo	nses		
Item No.	Tasks	$\Lambda 1$ wa Y s	Ordinarily	Seldom	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant
1- 7	Improvement	36	42	15	7	24	31	20	10	16
8-10	Sel. & Acct. of Texts	28	31	14	27	22	25	25	8	20
11-14	Program Planning	38	28	21	13	31	24	19	12	15
15-20	Evaluating Program	22	27	19	32	15	14	13	9	16
21-26	Counseling Teachers	19	39	25	16	24	21	29	14	12
27-31	Sel. & Use of Inst. Supplies	33	38	17	12	28	18	29	16	10
32-35	Facility Planning	14	22	17	47	23	27	25	12	12
36-41	Personnel	17	19	18	46	27	19	32	13	9
42-44	Library Services	8	27	27	37	13	20	31	19	18
45-46	Special Education	16	18	25	41	25	22	29	11	14
47-53	In-Service	30	22	22	26	37	24	17	12	9
54-55	Classroom Teaching	17	18	29	34	24	15	20	15	22

task of instructional improvement among the task groupings.

Seventy-eight percent of this group reported involvement of

always and ordinarily for tasks relating to improving instruc
tion. Other tasks directly relating to instruction with

reports of high percentages of involvement were program

planning with 66 percent and selectional of instructional

supplies with 71 percent.

Forty-nine percent or more of the supervisors reported involvement of always and ordinarily in the areas of selecting textbooks, evaluating the program, and in-service education. As in the case of supervisors in open concept schools, supervisors in traditional schools spent little of their time accounting for and distributing textbooks.

Eighty-five percent of the respondents reported seldom to never for textbook accounting.

The highest single response for nature of responsibility from supervisors in traditional schools was in the area of in-service education; 37 percent of the respondents indicated a role of director in carrying out this task.

As in the case of supervisors in open concept schools, least involvement was reported for tasks relating to personnel matters, library services, and special education. A response of <u>never</u> was reported as frequency of involvement by 46 percent for personnel, 37 percent for library services, and 41 percent for special education.

Fifty percent or more of the responding supervisors in traditional schools perceived themselves in roles of director and coordinator for tasks relating to improvement of instruction, program planning, facility planning, and in-service education. More than 40 percent of the respondents indicated the role director and coordinator for selection of text-books, counseling teachers, selection and use of instructional supplies, personnel, and special education. The dominant response for responsibility associated with the remaining tasks ranged between that of coordinator and consultant.

Similarities and Differences Between Open Concept and Traditional Supervisors

The responses to the questionnaire revealed more similarities than differences between the tasks of open concept and traditional supervisors. These similarities and differences were noted by analyzing the individual responses and summaries of questionnaire items.

Forty percent of the supervisors in open concept schools reported assignments on the central office administrative staff while 59 percent were assigned to specific buildings. Supervisor responses from traditional schools indicated that 44 percent were assigned to the central office and 56 percent to the building staffs. The average number of buildings served by open concept district supervisors was seven and the average for traditional district

supervisors was six.

TableVII indicates a similarity in the number of hours per week spent in classrooms by both groups of supervisors. This information was obtained from the general information section of the questionnaire.

Supervisors with district responsibilities such as assistant superintendents and directors reported less time in the classroom than department chairmen and team leaders. The central office based supervisors and the building based supervisors seem to be divided at the 11 to 15 hour bracket of Table VII.

Table VIII indicates a similarity between the two groups in regard to authority assumed by supervisors.

These data were obtained from the general information section of the questionnaire to determine the level of authority delegated to instructional supervisors.

The frequency of involvement reported by the two groups of supervisors indicated similar emphases. Both groups of supervisors reported always to ordinarily most frequently for tasks relating to improvement of instruction, program planning, selection of instructional materials, selection of textbooks, program evaluation, and in-service education. Supervisors placed least emphasis on personnel matters, library services, and special education. The most dominant response for each of the 55 questionnaire items as

TABLE VII

TIME SPENT IN CLASSROOMS BY SUPERVISORS

	Percentage of Responses						
Hours per Week	Open Concept	Traditional					
0	32	31					
1-5	13	10					
6-10	12	15					
11-15	1	6					
16-20	10	9					
21-30	17	24					
31÷	14	13					

TABLE VIII

COURSES OF ACTION FOR SUPERVISORS IN DISAGREEMENT

WITH CLASSROOM TEACHERS

	Percentage of Response						
Course of Action	Open Concept	Traditional					
Accept the teacher's preference	17	15					
Appeal to someone with higher rank	46	52					
Require the teacher to accede	9	12					
Other	27	21					

to frequency of involvement is reported in Table IX. The data were gathered by identifying the largest number of responses for involvement in each of the 55 items. The total responses reflect similar involvement.

The most obvious difference noted between the two groups from survey responses was their involvement in class-room teaching, although differences in regard to assignment and nature of responsibility were also noted. Sixty percent of the supervisors in open concept schools indicated an involvement of always to ordinarily in classroom teaching while 35 percent of the supervisors in traditional schools responded in a like manner. Supervisors in open concept schools reported a frequency of involvement of 60 percent or greater as always to ordinarily for five major tasks while supervisors in traditional schools reported 60 percent or greater for three major tasks. The nature of responsibility assumed in carrying out these tasks differ somewhat between the two groups.

Table X summarizes the nature of responsibility for the sample. The nature of responsibility indicated by the greatest number of respondents for each of the 55 questionnaire items is reported in the Table. The definition for each classification of responsibility was provided in the questionnaire instructions.

TABLE IX

INVOLVEMENT FREQUENCY FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Involvement Frequency	Number of items with the most Responses for Involvement					
	Open Concept	Traditiona				
Always	16	12				
Ordinarily ,	18	17				
Seldom	5	3				
Never	14	20				

TABLE X

NATURE OF RESPONSIBILITY FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

	Number of Items With Most Responses					
Nature of Responsibility	Open Concept	Traditional				
Director	2	18				
Coordinator	36	16				
Consultant	15	16				
Contributor	0	0				
Participant	0	1				
Participant	0	1				

The role of director is assumed by supervisors in traditional schools in more tasks than by supervisors in open concept schools. Coordinator responsibilities are assumed more often by supervisors in open concept schools. These differences reflect the way supervisors perceive their roles in working with teachers by virtue of the definitions of director and coordinator.

The supervisors were asked for their title in the questionnaire. Table XI summarizes the responses to this section of the study.

The major differences noted in Table XI were in the titles of coordinator, supervisor, chairman, and team leader. Twenty-four percent of the responding open concept supervisors reported titles of coordinator while four percent of the traditional supervisors responded in a like manner. Thirty-six percent of the open concept supervisors were titled team leader compared to one percent of the traditional supervisors. Traditional supervisors indicated 25 percent as supervisors and 48 percent as chairmen while open concept supervisors reported six percent as supervisors and 15 percent as chairmen.

Similarities and Differences Between Supervisory Tasks in 1961 and 1972

Examination of the findings of the Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development study in 1961

TABLE XI

TITLES OF SUPERVISORS IN OPEN CONCEPT

AND TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

	Percentage	f Responses			
Title)pen Concept	Traditional			
Assistant Superintendent	6	5			
Director	13	13			
Coordinator	24	4			
Supervisor	6	25			
Chairman	15	48			
Team Leader	36	1			

revealed ten major tasks of instructional supervision. The ten major tasks are given in Chapter I of this study.

Considering the 18 districts participating in this study as one group, major differences in supervisory tasks of 1961 and 1972 are noted. Four of the ten major tasks identified in the 1961 study were given limited emphasis according to the frequency of involvement responses in this study. Between 37 percent and 48 percent of the supervisors in open concept and traditional schools reported never as frequency of involvement for personnel, library service facility planning, and special education. Supervisors in this study indicated involvement in the remaining major task areas. Between 49 percent and 77 percent of the supervisors in this study reported always and ordinarily as involvement for instructional improvement, selection of textbooks, program planning, program evaluation, counseling teachers, selection and use of instructional supplies, and in-service.

Case Study

The Deer Park Independent School District was selected as a case study district because of the recent open concept building program, staffing changes in instructional supervision, and creation of a non-graded continuous progress program for all of the elementary schools in the district.

Data were collected concerning this district through inter-

views with staff members, examination of questionnaire responses from the survey portion of the study, and examination of pertinent school records. The case study was an attempt to trace the development of supervision in a growing district as the school population increased and as instructional programs were changed.

History and Background of Supervision

The Deer Park Independent School District initiated instructional supervision as a specific administrative assignment in 1959 with the employment of a director of instruction. The job description for this assignment called for general supervision of the instructional program of the district and specific tasks as assigned by the superintendent of schools. The qualifications required by the board of trustees are to have a master's degree, a minimum of ten years' experience as a teacher and/or administrator, and possess both a valid Texas administrator's and/or supervisor's certificate. Second 2012 and 2012 and 2013 and

Examination of the instructional and supervisory programs revealed a need for additional supervision. During

Assistant Superintendent for Instruction Lee B. Gaither, of Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, August 1972.

Policies of the Board of Trustees, Deer Park Independent School District, 1972, p. 111-2, unpublished policies extracted from board minutes.

the 1959-60 school year a supervisor of special services was employed. This assignment called for the following general responsibilities:

Work cooperatively with directors, principals, consultants, and other supervisors to inspire the quality of special services and to encourage effective use of these services through planning, organizing, supervising and evaluating the programs for exceptional children, the school health services, guidance and counseling activities and the testing program to secure compliance with pertinent objectives, standards, policies, regulations and directives.³

The need for additional supervision at the elementary level was recognized in the early sixties with the creation of a position of director of elementary education. The assignment was created in 1961 with the following minimum qualifications for the director:

To hold the position of Director of Elementary Education, the employee must have a master's degree in elementary education or in elementary school administration, have had a minimum of five years of experience as a teacher and principal or supervisor in elementary schools and hold a valid Texas elementary supervisor's certificate. 4

The duties for this assignment included the following general tasks:

1. Plan, organize, direct, supervise, and evaluate the total instructional program in the elementary schools.

³Ibid., p. 11-9.

⁴Ibid., p. 111-1.

- 2. Plan, organize and direct the elementary in-service program.
- 3. Secure compliance with accreditation standards.
- 4. Work cooperatively with principals and supervisors in improving the quality of instruction.

In 1964 the division of instruction had grown to include supervisors for physical education and music. The general responsibilities of these instructional supervisors included planning, coordinating, supervising, and evaluating district-wide programs in the areas of their respective assignments. Consultive assistance to principals and other administrators was to be provided by the supervisors.

The position of Reading Consultant was created in 1964 for the purpose of strengthening the district reading program through the following tasks:

- 1. Coordinate the reading program.
- 2. Serve as a resource person for teachers and administrators.
- 3. Evaluate the program and recommend needed changes.

The qualifications for a consultant are as follows:

To hold the position of consultant, the employee must have a master's degree, possess a college major in the subject area of special assignment, have a minimum of five years of experience as a teacher in the subject area of special assignment and have a valid Texas teacher's

certificate and an appropriate supervisor's certificate. 5

Open Concept Schools and Supervision

The first open concept school building in the district was Deer Park Elementary School which was opened in 1969 to house grades K-5. The instructional program for the new building included a non-graded individualized approach to education. Pupils were to be allowed to progress at their own learning rate. Their performance was to be evaluated in terms of their individual abilities and efforts rather than by comparison to peer achievement.

Team teaching was to be employed in the Deer Park
Elementary School, which was also a new venture for the
district. In order to provide for coordination of team
planning and team teaching, a different staffing pattern
was needed. The solution was the employment of three team
leaders with the following grade level assignments:

Team Leader A--Kindergarten and 1st Grade

Team Leader B--Grades 2 and 3

Team Leader C--Grades 4 and 5

For the same year, 1969, it was recognized that additional supervision was needed at the senior high school to coordinate the efforts of a growing faculty caused by

⁵Ibid., p. 11-13.

increased enrollment. Department chairmen were employed to supervise the English, mathematics, social studies, and science programs.

The qualifications established by the board of trustees for team leaders and department chairmen were

- 1. Three or more years of successful teaching experience in the subject or field and level of assignment.
- 2. Possess at least a master's degree with a major closely related to the subject area(s) or level(s) of assignment.
- Be able to work successfully with co-workers and to provide effective professional leadership.

The duties of and responsibilities of the six team leaders and department chairmen were

- Provide professional leadership in planning, organizing, implementing, evaluating, and improving the instructional program in the subject area(s) or level(s) of assignments for the purpose of achieving approved educational objectives and serve as a model for other teachers and demonstrate new techniques and media.
- 2. Serve as chairman of the staff members who are assigned to the department or team and be the chief liaison person between the principal and the assigned staff members in all matters directly related to teaching, learning, curriculum development and inservice education. At the elementary level assist the principal in placement of new students and work with teachers in the grouping of students for instruction.
- 3. Orient new teachers concerning the curriculum in the area or level of assignment, Board

policies and administrative regulations pertaining to their work and any matter that may assist them in becoming aware of their responsibilities as teachers in this school district.

- 4. Observe instruction, offer assistance when asked or needed, and seek to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching and keep abreast of the latest teaching material and strategies.
- 5. With the help of co-workers, initiate requisitions for needed teaching supplies and equipment, see that teaching supplies and equipment are used effectively and economically, and take appropriate measures to minimize damage, loss, or theft of schoolowned property that is used by the department or team.
- 6. Keep up-to-date professionally and encourage other certified members of the staff to do so.
- Supervise and coordinate the services of teacher aide(s), student teachers, interns, etc., who may be assigned to the department or team.
- 8. Perform any other related duties as may be assigned by the principal.

The team leaders and department chairmen were compensated by a contract of 200 days compared to a 190 day contract for classroom teachers.

By 1970 it was evident to the administration and board of trustees that additional coordination and supervision were needed for the growing district. Consideration

⁶ Ibid., p. 111-32.

was given to central office based supervisors with districtwide authority and to building based supervisors such as
those in the open concept elementary and senior high school.
After extensive discussion, conferences, and evaluation by
the administration, team leaders, and classroom teachers, it
was decided that several advantages existed with building
based supervisors. Some of those advantages were

- 1. More supervisors could be employed for the same cost by employing supervisors with teaching responsibility.
- 2. Better teacher-supervisor relations could exist with a member of the teaching team as the supervisor.
- 3. A committee of team leaders and department chairmen with common assignments could provide a collective approach to district-wide coordination of instruction.
- 4. A supervisor with teaching responsibilities would be more familiar with student and teacher needs.

Disadvantages of this staffing arrangement were

- 1. Lack of curriculum coordination between schools and between levels (elementary, junior high, senior high).
- 2. No compensation for the additional responsibility.

The decision was reached in 1970 to provide the needed supervision through the building based team leader and department chairmen. Changes were made in the schedule and the salary scale for these supervisors in the following ways:

- 1. A schedule of 195 work days.
- 2. A salary increment of approximately \$400 annually.
- 3. Released time from teaching to allow time for supervisory activities.

Department chairmen for language arts, social studies, mathematics, and science were added to the junior high school staffs and team leaders for each grade level were assigned to each elementary school in the district.

Survey Data from Case Study

The responses of the total supervisory staff of the Deer Park Independent School District were analyzed along with the responses from other open concept districts participating in the study. Considering the Deer Park supervisors as a separate group was judged to be important to the case study. Responses for the Deer Park supervisors are listed in Table XII.

The responses to the questionnaire indicated highest involvement in the following areas: classroom teaching, selection and use of instructional supplies, program planning, instructional improvement, and selection and accounting of textbooks. These were the same tasks given high priority by the total group of open concept supervisors. But more important to understanding the Deer Park concept was the fact that these tasks were described as expectations for team

TABLE XII

TASKS OF CASE STUDY SUPERVISORS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

	Percentage of Responses									
Item No. Tasks	Always	Ordinarily	Seldcm	Never	Director	Coordinator	Consultant	Contributor	Participant	
1- 7	Improvement	28	34	20	17	4	33	25	20	18
8-10	Sel. & Acct. of Texts	26	28	28	19	8	27	23	23	20
11-14	Program Planning	32	23	30	15	12	27	21	20	20
15-20	Evaluating Program	14	25	35	27	5	18	17	31	29
21-26	Counseling Teachers	18	51	29	2	10	12	38	30	10
27-32	Selection & Use of Inst. Supplies	30	38	23	9	11	31	30	19	8
32-35	Facility Planning	19	18	19	45	2	37	16	21	24
36-41	Personnel	6	17	25	53	4	15	33	24	24
42-44	Library Services	10	33	25	32		20	30	21	29
45-46	Special Education	13	35	9	43	4	12	8	9	13
47-53	In-Service	17	19	22	43	14	28	24	21	13
54-55	Classroom Teaching	52	23	18	7	2	30	28	9	32

leaders and department chairmen. Involvement was least dominant in the areas of program evaluation, facility planning, and personnel. These functions were carried out by assistant superintendents and directors rather than by team leaders and department chairmen.

Responsibility assumed by the case study supervisors was less directive than either of the large groups in the study. A high concentration of coordinator and consultative responses was noted in the area of responsibility by these supervisors. These responses indicate a perception on the part of instructional supervisors in the case study district as being a colleague and a part of a teaching team rather than a supervisor in terms of administration in relationships with teachers.

Status of and Plans for Supervision

Interviews with case study supervisors were held to determine the status of supervision and are summarized in the following statements:

- Major tasks include coordinating the instruction, planning units of instruction and evaluation of the program.
- 2. Advantages gained by having teaching responsibilities in an open concept environment include the following:
 - a. More student contact helps to be aware of student needs and provides a source of feedback for program evaluation.

- b. Rapport is good with other classroom teachers as team members. Teachers are more open with communication about the program because of this relationship.
- c. As a member of the teaching team, the supervisor has first hand knowledge of needs and possible solutions.
- 3. Limitations noted by most of these supervisors included limited planning time, limited time for supervision, and a need for more working days prior to the beginning of school.
- 4. The two most desired changes in the supervisory program according to the teaching supervisors were for additional time scheduled for supervision during the teaching day and for more work days scheduled during the summer months.

Future plans for the district include additional staffing of the division of instruction as the 7,000 student district grows. Consideration has been given to creating additional subject area supervisors to coordinate the efforts of department chairmen and team leaders.

The need for more department chairmen at the senior high school level such as business education and industrial arts has been considered for the immediate future. These two departments have increased in staff and enrollment during the past three year period, thus needing more coordinated planning.

Staffing and scheduling to accommodate additional release time from teaching duties for team leaders and

department chairmen is expected in the future. Scheduling to gain additional planning for the total teaching staff is recognized as a desirable change. Many schools have employed modular scheduling techniques which provide large blocks of planning time for the teaching staffs.

The supervisory assignments of team leaders and department chairmen have proven to be an integral part of the open concept school in Deer Park. This assignment enhances more openness in teacher-administrative communications, teacher participation in curriculum planning, and team teaching. Future plans for the case study district include the extension of the building based instructional supervisor with additional time scheduled for supervisory tasks by expanding the use of paraprofessional employees in the instructional program, thereby gaining time for additional supervisors without undue additional costs.

The present supervisor staffing pattern in Deer Park has evolved as population growth and changing instructional program have occurred. The team leader as a teaching instructional supervisor emerged to meet the needs of the open concept program of the district. As the open concept program of continuous progress non-graded education expanded into the total elementary program, the team leader concept grew. Department chairmen were added to the secondary staff to provide instructional coordination and leader-

ship for the secondary program as the student population grew.

Summary

The results of the survey and case study were reported in this chapter. Data were obtained and charted for supervisors in open concept and in traditional schools. Data for the case study were obtained through research of district publications, minutes of the board of trustees, interviews with school administrators and supervisors, and examination of questionnaire responses.

Supervisors in open concept schools who participated in the survey indicated that more of their time was spent in the following tasks than others listed in the questionnaire:

- 1. Tasks directly relating to the improvement of instruction.
- 2. Planning the instructional program
- 3. Selection of and use of instructional supplies
- 4. Counseling with teachers in regard to the instructional program
- 5. Working with students in a classroom situation
- 6. Selection of textbooks
- 7. In-service education

Least amount of time was spent with tasks relating to personnel matters, library services, and special education.

The responses on the questionnaire indicated that supervisors in open concept schools assumed a cooperative role with teachers in carrying out their tasks. The dominant responses in the area of nature of responsibility were those of coordinator and consultant.

Questionnaire responses from supervisors in traditional schools indicated the following tasks as those involving most of their time:

- 1. Tasks relating to instructional improvement
- 2. Planning the instructional program
- 3. Selection of and use of instructional supplies
- 4. Selection of textbooks
- 5. Evaluating the instructional program
- 6. In-service education

As in the case of supervisors in open concept schools, supervisors in traditional schools indicated least involvement in personnel matters, library services, and special education.

Two areas of decided differences were noted in the data analysis. The most obvious difference between the two groups of supervisors' tasks was in the area of classroom teaching. Supervisors in open concept schools reported more time spent teaching students than other supervisors. A major difference was noted between the two groups in their

perception of their nature of responsibility. Supervisors in open concept schools view themselves as consultants and coordinators in most areas while supervisors in traditional schools perceive themselves as more directive in their relationships with teachers.

The case study revealed changes in staffing for and roles of instructional supervisors as curriculum and student population changes occurred. The opening of a nongraded open concept school brought about staffing and role changes for the district with the creation of the position of team leader who performed as a classroom teacher and an instructional supervisor. The case study supervisors perceived themselves as more cooperative in their relationships with teachers than either of the two groups of supervisors participating in the study. The success of the open concept school and team leader assignment was evidenced by the expansion of both programs throughout the district.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the conclusions of the study. The chapter is organized into three major sections: summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The summary section will present a recapitulation of the study, with references to pertinent literature. The conclusions will be drawn from data collected in the study and implications of that data will be presented. Recommendations will be presented in the last section.

Summary

Educational literature and research depict the effective instructional supervisor as a change agent. In their roles as change agents, supervisors are expected to lead the instructional staff in new directions by providing current information to the staff as well as by planning and implementing meaningful in-service education. In addition they are to demonstrate various teaching techniques and cooperatively plan with the teaching staff. One specific change often mentioned in the literature is the emphasis on human relations in working with colleagues, students, and parents as curricular options are explored.

Research studies have pointed to educational leadership and coordination of instructional programs as major tasks for instructional supervisors. Administrators and teachers look

to instructional leaders to provide this leadership and coordination in evaluating instructional programs and developing new educational experiences for students.

A relatively new and popular innovation which has influenced the role of the instructional supervisor is the open concept non-graded school. Many references are made in the literature to the new and different roles of students and teachers in open concept schools. Teachers work as members of teaching teams rather than as independent units. Students participate in planning their educational experiences with teachers and parents. A relationship of cooperation and support is assumed by teachers in open concept schools as they work with fellow teachers, students, and parents in planning and carrying out learning activities.

According to advocates of the open concept schools, the roles and tasks of instructional supervisors are affected by the open concept school. Instructional supervisors are seen as members of teaching teams, providing leadership and direction through example as they participate in teaching and learning activities. Supervisor-teacher relationships are improved with the supervisor functioning as a member of the teaching team.

The purpose of this study was to determine the major tasks of instructional supervisors in open concept schools.

Data for the study were gathered by conducting a survey of

instructional supervisors from the 56 public school districts served by Region IV Educational Service Center and by an intensive study of one district in the sample. A similar survey was conducted in 1961 by the Texas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development involving 206 instructional supervisors of the state of Texas. From the 1961 study, the major tasks of instructional supervisors were identified.

Twenty-seven of the 56 districts served by Region IV Educational Service Center agreed to participate in the study. Nine of the 27 districts were judged to be open concept districts as each operated one or more open concept school. Nine of the 27 responding districts operating all traditional schools with similar school populations and assessed valuation were selected to participate in the study as traditional districts.

The questionnaire used in the 1961 study was revised to include questions relative to open concept schools and mailed to the 303 instructional supervisors of the 18 districts participating in the study. The questionnaire responses from the 106 open concept supervisors and 101 traditional concept supervisors served as the primary source of data for the survey. Questionnaire responses, interviews with key personnel, and school records constituted the sources of data for the case study.

101

Conclusions

From the review of the literature and analysis of the data gathered in this study, the following conclusions are presented.

The major tasks of instructional supervisors in open concept schools are as follows:

- Curriculum Development. Curriculum development involves defining the content to be taught, the methods and procedures for teaching it, the level at which it will be taught, and the desired outcomes of the learning experiences. This task is most often accomplished by supervisors through group processes. The school philosophy, academic and social needs of students, available instructional support and physical means of support are taken into account in carrying out the tasks of curriculum development. Supervisors in open concept schools often solicit the support and recommendations of students and parents as well as other teachers. Team planning on the part of the total instructional staff is vital in developing effective instructional programs. Many instructional supervisors employ the method of setting performance goals as a means of curriculum development. An effective performance based curriculum requires cooperation and support from the total instruc-The instructional supervisor can tional staff. become an effective change agent in quiding curriculum toward new and meaningful goals.
- 2. Organizing for Instruction. Arrangements must be made to facilitate the curriculum and to reach the instructional goals. Coordination of staff, facilities, and materials is essential in planning for instruction. The instructional supervisor assumes a leadership role in coordinating activities and facilities for implementing the instructional program. Supervisors perform their leadership tasks in this area through the utilization of human relations and group processes. Teachers become a part of the decision making process for meeting instructional goals.

- Selection and Use of Textbooks and Materials. The instructional supervisor must see that appropriate teaching materials are available for teachers and students. The supervisor often serves as a resource person in providing information to teachers concerning textbooks and instructional materials. Care must be taken to insure that the selected materials are appropriate for meeting the instructional goals of the school. Current innovations must be explored to insure that teachers are kept abreast of changing instructional programs and teaching strategies. The final selection of materials for instruction may be made by the open concept supervisor, but only after recommendations have been obtained from the teaching staff.
- 4. In-Service Education. Promoting the professional growth of the instructional staff is a major task of instructional supervisors. Meaningful inservice activities must be planned by taking into account the curriculum goals, professional status of the staff, available programs, and interests of the staff. Cooperative planning with the teaching staff is essential in identifying the needs and interests of the participants. Planning professional growth activities is often the vehicle with which the supervisor guides the instructional staff into new learning experiences. Keeping abreast of current research and literature is essential for the instructional supervisor to plan for meaningful in-service programs.
- day problems is a routine task for many instructional supervisors. Student behavioral and learning problems are often effectively handled by the teacher with proper guidance and support from the supervisor. Problems dealing with methods of instruction, selection and use of instructional materials and public relations are dealt with by the instructional supervisor as needed or requested. Supervisors serving as a member of the teaching team have numerous opportunities to counsel with teachers.
- 6. Evaluation. All facets of the instructional program must be evaluated. The instructional supervisor in open concept schools assumes a role of

leadership in directing and coordinating activities necessary to evaluate the instructional program. Standardized tests, pupil performance, teacher opinion, and public reaction are some of the tools used by the instructional supervisor in evaluation. As in other supervisory tasks the instructional supervisor strives to involve the total teaching staff in evaluation activities so that the data gained from evaluation can be used in making necessary changes in the instructional program.

7. Communication. Open and direct communicative processes are essential in today's education. Administrators, teachers, parents, and the general public should be kept informed about the instructional program. An informed administrator will be more supportive in meeting the instructional goals of the school. Teachers should be aware of the total curriculum and instructional plans in order to better understand the significance of their role in meeting educational goals. Parents are interested in the education of their children and should be kept current as to the instructional progress and plans of the school. The supervisor in an open concept school utilizes several strategies in maintaining adequate communications. Administrators are brought into the planning phase of new programs and kept informed as to their pro-Teachers are kept informed through published gress. materials and cooperative planning. Public relations is handled through public meetings and published material about the instructional programs.

Although the major tasks are similar, the major differences noted between the two groups of supervisors were in the areas of classroom teaching and role perception. Supervisors in open concept schools spend more time carrying out the teaching act than supervisors in traditional schools. As many of the supervisors in open concept schools in this study were team leaders and departmental chairmen, their assignments required teaching activities. The noteworthy difference

between the two groups of supervisors was in the perception of their relationships with teachers. Supervisors in open concept schools perceive themselves as members of teaching teams, working with teachers in coordinative and consultative roles. Group processes are used more often in decision making by these supervisors than by supervisors in traditional schools. Supervisors in traditional schools perceive themselves as more directive and autocratic in their relationships with teachers. They tend to perceive themselves as administrators more than as members of teaching teams as they relate to teachers. This finding is supported by literature relating to open concept schools. As supervisors share in the responsibilities of teaching students, they gain a better understanding of the classroom environment. Classroom teachers working with the supervisor who participates in the daily teaching activities tend to relate more openly to them. A mutual understanding and respect are gained in this arrangement as both teacher and supervisor work together. This supervisor-teacher relationship of cooperation and support is enhanced by the open concept atmosphere.

Three major tasks were identified in the 1961 study by the Texas Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development that are not carried out by most instructional supervisors today. These tasks are as follows:

- 1. Special Services. Instructional supervisors in 1961 were responsible for special services such as special education, student publications, and many student activities. Today, these tasks are assumed by other staff members or by supervisors assigned to only one of the related tasks.
- 2. Staffing. Duties relating to selecting, recruiting, assigning, and terminating employees are assumed by personnel specialists in many of our schools today. Instructional supervisors assist in the evaluation and assignment of the teaching staff, but only as they relate to the instructional program.
- Designing Facilities. Decisions affecting the design and equipment of educational facilities are made by specialists and higher level administrators in today's schools. The instructional supervisor communicates the physical requirements necessary for meeting instructional goals to those who make the decisions.

The findings of this study indicate a changing role for instructional supervisors. Supervisors in open concept schools were found in this study to be more open in their relationships with classroom teachers and more involved in the task of teaching students than supervisors in traditional schools or supervisors in 1961. Although indication of the empirical changes were limited in this study, the trend toward openness in education is having its impact on supervision.

The similarities between the two groups of supervisors may be due to the fact that the open concept school is a relatively new innovation in public education. Changes in teaching strategies and teacher-student relations have been

noted in open concept schools, but changes in other relationships caused by the open concept school may be realized later in the progress of openness in education. Many of the districts participating in the study which were classified as open concept districts operated many more traditional schools than open schools, demonstrating that open concept education in districts dedicated to its value were in the formative stages of total implementation. The autocratic supervisor who functions in an administrative capacity making decisions and directing the activities of teachers is gradually becoming outmoded. The teacher supervisor is emerging as the effective change agent. Teachers view their teaching supervisor as a colleague with common problems, needs, and goals. Professional educators working together to achieve common goals are more effective than the former employeeemployer method of decision making. Instructional supervisors should be concerned about how to become active members of instructional teams in an environment where new competencies and new insights are constantly needed.

Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest the need for changes in supervisory training programs and staffing patterns for public schools. The need for more extensive training in human relations and group processes for future instruc-

tional supervisors is evidenced by the role of the open concept supervisor and the emergence of openness in today's schools. The effective change agent must have the appropriate training to secure the support of teachers, patrons, administrators in order to implement needed change.

Public schools administrators should consider the teaching supervisor as an assignment for future staffing. The creation of this new assignment should have the support of teachers and patrons as well as administrators. tional compensation for the teacher supervisor is needed as the supervisor will be expected to assume additional responsibility in carrying out supervisory tasks. Sufficient release time from teaching duties must be scheduled for the teaching supervisor in order to allow for the accomplishment of these needed supervisory tasks. This recommendation does not imply that the present supervisory assignment should be abolished, rather that they be augmented with the additional position. The task of coordinating the total instructional effort must be carried out by an educator with district-wide responsibility. Needless to say, the addition of staffing positions will result in added costs for school districts. Differentiated staffing and the use of paraprofessionals in the classroom can be implemented in order to accomplish more economically this needed change.

Based on the findings in this study and conclusions drawn, the recommendations below are made for further study:

- In order to have a more realistic picture of specific roles and the resulting supervisory tasks, it is recommended that a study of this nature be made of instructional supervisors in similar assignments from open concept and traditional schools. An in-depth study of various types of supervisors—such as team leaders, department chairmen, consultants, and general supervisors—would provide more specific data.
- 2. In order to test and improve the findings of this study, it is recommended that a broader sample be selected for a study. There may be geographical or economic differences which affect the status of supervision.
- 3. Teacher opinion, organizational climate of the school, and instructional programs should be included as independent variables in future studies of supervisor role definition.
- 4. A replication of this study should be made within the next five years, to determine the extent that open concept schools affect tasks and responsibilities of instructional supervisors.
- 5. A statistical comparative study of supervisory tasks in open concept and traditional schools using a Likert-type scale is recommended. A study of supervisor role perceptions supported by empirical data would be of value in assessing the status of supervision in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Periodicals

- American Association of School Administrators. <u>Impetus in</u> Education. Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1966.
- American Association of School Administrators. Open Space Schools. Washington, D.C., 1971.
- Anastasi, A., <u>Individual Differences</u>. New York: John Wiley, Inc., 1966.
- Anderson, Robert H., <u>Teaching in a World of Change</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1966.
- Anderson, Vernon E., Curriculum Guideline in an Era of Change. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1969.
- Ayer, Fred C. and Barr, A. S., The Organization of Supervision.
 D. Appleton & Company, Inc., 1928.
- Babcock, Chester D., Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change, Evelyn F. Carlson, Chairman. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.
- Berry, Althea, <u>Individualized Instruction</u>, Ronald C. Doll, Editor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Developments, 1964.
- Beggs, David W. and Edward G. Buffie, Nongraded Schools in Action. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.
- Berman, Louise M. and M. L. Usery, <u>Personalized Supervision</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Education Association, 1966.
- Bremer, Anne and John, Open Classroom, A Beginning. New York:
 Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Burnham, Reba M., and King, Martha L., <u>Supervision in Action</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1961.

- Cay, Donald, Curriculum: Design for Learning. New York: Bobbs Merrill, 1965.
- Cutts, Norma E. and Nicholas Moseley, <u>Providing for Individual Differences in the Elementary School</u>. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
- Denemark, George W., The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, William H. Lucio, Editor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.
- Dufay, Frank R., <u>Upgrading the Elementary School</u>. West Nyack: Parker Publishing Company, 1966.
- Franseth, Jane, <u>Supervision as Leadership</u>. Evanston, Ill.: Row Peterson and Company, 1961.
- Garver, Robert J., Nongraded School in Action. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967.
- Gitter, Lena, The Montessori Way. Seattle: Washington Special Child Publications, Inc., 1970.
- Glasser, William, Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.
- Goodlad, J. I. and Robert Anderson. The Nongraded Elementary
 School. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 19591963.
- Gross, Ronald and Judith Murphy, The Revolution in the Schools.

 New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.
- Gwynn, J. Minor, Theory and Practice of Supervision. New York: Mead and Company, 1961.
- Harris, Ben M., Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Hertzberg, Alvin and Stone, Edward F., Schools are For Children. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Hillson, Maurie, Change and Innovation in Elementary School Organization: Selected Readings. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Howard, Eugene and Rogert Bardwell, How to Organize a Nongraded School. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

111

- Kazamias, Andreas M. and Massialass, Byron G., <u>Tradition and Change in Education</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Krezewich, Stephen J., Administration of Public Education.
 New York: Harper & Row, 1962, 1969.
- Lewin, Kurt, "Frontiers in Group Dynamics! Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibrium; and Social Change." Human Relations, 1:5-41; June, 1947.
- Lewis, James Jr., A Contemporary Approach to Nongraded Education. New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.
- Lucio, William H. and McNeil, John D., <u>Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1962.
- MacKenzie, Gordon N., Supervision: Emerging Profession, Robert Leeper, Editor. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.
- McCarthy, Robert J. The <u>Ungraded Middle School</u>. New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1972.
- McGahan, F. E. and Carolyn McGahan, <u>Toward Accountability</u>, Eureka Springs, Arkansas: Learning Designs, Inc., 1973.
- McKean, Robert C. and Mills, H. H. The Supervisor. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
- Murray, Evelyn M. and Williams, Jane R. The Flexible Elementary School. West Nyack, New York, 1971.
- Perlstein, Marcia, <u>Teaching Strategies and Classroom Realities</u>, ed. by <u>Mildred G. McClosky</u>. <u>Englewood Cliffs</u>: <u>Prentice-Hall Publishing Co.</u>, Inc., 1971.
- Ramseyer, John A., <u>Preparation Programs for School Administration: Common and Specialized Learning</u>, Donald J. Lew and Herbert Tudman. Seventh UCEA Career Development Seminar. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1963.
- Regional Curriculum Project (RCP). A Role Study: The County Level Supervisor in Florida. Atlanta, Georgia: RCP, Trinity Avenue, S.W., 1968.

- Schaefer, Robert J., The School as a Center of Inquiry.

 New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967.
- Silberman, Charles E., Crisis In the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Smith, Lew L. <u>Teaching</u> <u>In A Nongraded School</u>. West Nyack, New York, 1970.
- Tewksbury, John L., <u>Nongrading in the Elementary School</u>.
 Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1967.
- United States Office of Education. Supervision in Retrospect and Prospect. Prepared by Freeman R. Irvine, Jr., Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Whittier, Taylor. The Supervisor: New Demands: New Dimensions.
 William Lucio. Washington, D.C.: Association for
 Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

Periodicals

- Aigner, Boyd. "A Statistical Analysis of Achievement: Differences of Children in a Nongraded Primary Program and Traditional Classrooms," Journal of Research Service, 1: 43-46, May 1962.
- Black, Hillel, "A School Where Children Teach Themselves,"

 <u>Saturday Evening Post</u>, CCXXXVIII (June 19, 1965).
- Coleman, Richard. "The Promise of the Open Classroom,"

 <u>Today's Education</u>, Vol. 62 (February, 1973), pp. 53-54.
- Dobbins, Allen L. "Introduction at Adams," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (May, 1971), 516-519.
- Dunn, Kaye and Robert Blomstedt. "A Philosophical Approach In the Integrated Day," <u>Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Journal</u>, Vol. III (November 1972), 12-15.
- Editorial in the Houston Chronicle, September 2, 1971.
- Fletcher, Jerry L. "Research and Evaluation at Adams," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (May, 1971), 523-526.

- Glasser, William. "Robs Goals and Failure," <u>Today's Education</u>, Vol. 60 (October 1971).
- Goodland, John. "The School Scene in Review," The School Review. December 1958, 20-21, 62.
- Griffiths, Daniel E. "Making Schools Liveable for Students: London After the Blitz," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (September 1972), 47-52.
- Gross, Ronald. "From Innovation to Alternatives: A Decade of Change in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (September, 1971), 22-24.
- Hansen, William and Catherine Hopper. "A Changing School" in National Association of Secondary School Principals, ed. by Thomas F. Koerner and Martha A. Crawford, Vol. 56, No. 371, 1971.
- Indiana Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Research Committee. Chairman, Carolyn Guss.

 "How is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership, XIX, (November, 1961).
- Killough, Charles K. "An Analysis of the Longitudinal Effects that a Nongraded Elementary Program, Conducted in an Open-Space School, Had on Cognitive Achievement of Pupils," Bureau of Educational Research and Services (Houston, Texas: University of Houston, 1971), p. 59.
- Kohl, Herbert R. "The Open Classroom," The New York (1969), 111-116.
- Lewin, Kurt. "Frontiers in Group Dynamics! Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibrium; and Social Change," Human Relations, 1:5-41; June, 1947.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Education in New Cities," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (March, 1972), 407-411.
- Long, Barbara Ellis. "A Climate for Learning." Today's Education, Vol. 61 (September 1972), 5 -52.
- Mead, Margaret. "Are Any School Administrators Listening? Nation's Schools, 87, 41-45, June, 1971.
- Parker, John L. "Teacher Training at Adams," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, (May, 1971), 520-522.

- Parnell, Dale. "A State Superintendent Teaches First Grade," Today's Education, Vol. 60 (October 1971), 29-30.
- Pesnick, Henry S. "Open Schools vs. Traditional: Which is Right for Your Child?" Red Book (October, 1971), 60.
- Resnick, Lauren B. "Open Education: Some Tasks for Technology," Educational Technology, XII (January 1972), 70-76.
- Rodgers, Vincent R. "Primary Education in England: An Interview with John Coe," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (May 1971), 534-538.
- Rudd, Madge. "Dare to Stretch," <u>Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin</u>, 29, (1962), 49-50.
- Shane, Harold G., "Looking to the Future: Reassessment of Educational Issues of the 1970s," Phi Delta Kappan, LIV (January, 1973), 326-336.
- Schwartz, Robert B., "Profile of a High School: An Introduction," Phi Delta Kappan, LII (May, 1971), 515.
- Schreiner, Kathy. "Capitalizing on the Differences of Your Teaching Staff," School Management, 16 (June, 1972), 30-32.
- Til, William Van. "One Way of Looking At It--The Second Coming of the One-Room Schoolhouse," Phi Delta Kappan, LIII (September 1971), 16-17.
- Toulson, Shirley, ed. "The Case for Early Learning," Child Education, January 1972, 49: 14-15.
- Virgilio, James D. "Our Middle Schools Give the Kids a Break," Today's Education, Vol. 60 (January 1971), 1-32.
- Wertheimer, Patricia A. "School Climate and Student Learning,"

 <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, LII (May, 1971), 520-527.
- Ziegenfuss, W. Beatrice. "Special Feature on Reading: Recipe for Reading," Today's Education, Vol. 60 (October 1971), 44-45.

Unpublished Material

Interviews

- Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Lee B. Gaither, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, August 1972.
- Department Chairman, N. Catheryn Mabry, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, October 1972.
- Department Chairman Susan A. Brittain, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, October 1972.
- Director of Elementary Education, Neal M. Adams, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, September 1972.
- Principal Dan R. Lamb, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, October 1972.
- Superintendent Sebron B. Williams, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, September, 1972.
- Reading Consultant Dorothy E. Masterson, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, September, 1972.
- Supervisor of Special Services, Margaret W. Bigham, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, October 1972.
- Supervisor of Athletics, Weldon B. Kethan, in a personal interview, October 1972.
- Team Leader Evelyn M. Clements, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, October 1972.
- Team Leader Louis Guisti, Deer Park Independent School District, in a personal interview, October 1972.

Dissertations

- Bannister, Richard Eugene, "The Role of the Elementary Consultant in Iowa" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1962), pp. 75-83.
- Carbonari, Joseph P. "Report of an Evaluation Study of an Open Concept School," (Unpublished report, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Houston, 1971), p. 2.
- Carman, Beatrice Davis, "Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction: A Synthesis of Research Findings," Florida State, 1970 (unpublished dissertation, order No. 71-6979 (126 pages). March 1971, Abstracts, p. 4406A.
- Evans, Norman Dean, "The Status and Function of the Public Elementary School Supervisor in The Third and Fourth Class Districts of the Pennsylvania Counties of Chester, Delaware, and Montgomery" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1958),

 Dissertation Abstracts, XIX-A, No. 8-10 (1958),
 1966.
- Hall, Matthew Harvard. "A Study of the Perceptions of Supervisors, Principals, and Teachers Regarding the Supervisory Program in the Mobile (Alabama) Public Schools," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Auburn University, 1962).
- Haynes, Lorena (ch.), Goals for Supervision in Texas (Unpublished report, Texas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Austin, Texas, 1961).
- Johnson, James Burris, "The Development of Criteria for an Evaluation of the Supervisory Program in the Schools of Alton, Illinois," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1955).
- Killough, Charles K., 'An Analysis of the Longitudinal Effects that a Nongraded Elementary Program, Conducted in Open-Space School, Had on Cognitive Achievement of Pupils," (Houston, Texas: Bureau of Educational Research and Services, 1971), p. 59.
- Lwiesay, Herbert Y., "A Competency Pattern for the General Supervision as Expressed in Theory," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1955).

- Moll, Loren Allen, "An Analysis of the Role of the Curriculum Director," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965), pp. 81-82.
- Puckett, Daniel Wayne, "The Status and Function of the General School Supervisor in Selected Arkansas Schools" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1962).
- Policies of the Board of Trustees, Deer Park Independent School District, 1972 (unpublished policies extracted from board minutes).
- Regional Curriculum Project. A Role Study: The County
 Level Supervisor in Florida. Atlanta: RCP, Trinity
 Avenue, S.W., 1968.
- Warner, Jack Bruce, "A Comparison of Students and Teachers'
 Performance in an Open-Area Facility and in SelfContained Classrooms" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston,
 1971).



APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS
SERVED BY REGION IV EDUCATIONAL SERVICE CENTER

DEER PARK INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 203 IVY

Deer Park, Texas

April 7, 1972

Dear

As a part of my doctoral program at the University of Houston, I am conducting a study of the role of instructional supervisors in todays schools, both open-concept and traditional.

Much of the literature indicates that the teacher-student relationship is changed by the open-concept school.

My study will investigate the teacher-supervisor relationship in both traditional and open-concept schools. Team leaders, under certain conditions, will participate in the study also.

Supervisors and teachers from districts selected to participate in the study will be asked to complete a questionnaire similar to the one used by a TASCD state wide survey in 1961.

Your cooperation in answering the following questions will be greatly appreciated.

- 1. Will you give permission to selected supervisors and teachers from your district to participate in the proposed study?
- 2. How many schools in your district operate as open-concept (non-graded program in an open-space facility)?
- 3. How many schools in your district operate a graded program in a traditional facility (classrooms separated by walls)?
- 4. Who should be contacted to supply the names of personnel to participate in the study?

Very truly yours,

Leon Wolters Administrative Assistant

LW:er

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE TO DETERMINE STATUS OF SUPERVISION

Dear Fellow Educator:

The enclosed questionnaire is designed for the purpose of helping to describe what supervisors are now doing in open-concept schools and in traditional schools. I would appreciate your giving this questionnaire your careful consideration and returning it in the self-addressed envelope by June 1, 1972.

Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely yours,

Leon Wolters Administrative Assistant Deer Park Independent School District 120

QUESTIONNAIRE TO DETERMINE STATUS OF SUPERVISION

The items in this instrument may be thought of as jobs or objectives in which supervisors may, or may not, be involved. You are invited to react to each item, if you are involved, in two ways. First, indicate the frequency of your involvement by checking (1) always, (2) ordinarily, (3) seldom, or (4) never. Next, you are asked to define the nature of your responsibility by marking items on a five-point scale, (a) director, (b) coordinator, (c) consultant, (d) contributor, and (e) participant. An explanation of each item in the two scales is given below:

I. Involvement frequency

- Always--When this objective is undertaken, I am involved in some way.
- 2. Ordinarily--When this objective is undertaken, I am ordinarily, but not always, involved.
- 3. Seldom--When this objective is undertaken, I am sometimes, but not often, involved.
- 4. Never--When this objective is undertaken, I do not get involved.

II. Nature of responsibility

- a. Director--Achieving this objective is my responsibility. The school policy within which I operate gives me ample authority to make administrative decisions necessary to expedite my work.
- b. Coordinator -- Achieving this objective is my responsibility. Agreements regarding goals and procedures are derived by group process techniques, by group consensus, or by mutual consent. Any change in administrative procedure is subject to administrative approval.
- c. Consultant--I am responsible for giving advice, supplying pertinent data, or otherwise making suggestions to aid in achieving this objective.

- d. Incidental Contributor -- I have responsibility for achieving this objective when, and only when, I am invited to help.
- e. Participant--I work under the leadership of another, alone or in association with a group of peers to achieve this objective.

As you respond to the items you will need to think of your involvement as the job or objective pertains to your supervisory assignment. For example: a supervisor of mathematics would add the phrase, "as it involves the mathematics program" after each item. The primary supervisor would add "as it involves the primary program," etc.

When you have finished checking this questionnaire, please mail it to:

Leon Wolters Administrative Assistant Deer Park Independent School District 203 Ivy Deer Park, Texas I. Indicate the frequency of your involvement I by placing a check mark (ν) in column 1, 2, 3, or 4. Involvement

II. Indicate the nature of your responsibility when you are involved by placing a check mark (/) in column A, B, C, D, or E to indicate the nature of our most likely involvement.

II

Involvement Frequency				Re	Nature of Responsibility				
HAlways	NOrdinarily	w Seldom	-Never	∀Director	₩ Coordinator	OConsultant	U Contributor	H Participant	

Jobs or Objectives of Supervision

- 1. Adding new emphases to instructional programs
- 2. Designing new instructional programs (New programs in math and foreign languages are examples.)
- 3. Discontinuing the use of courses, segments of courses, or instructional emphases which you do not approve
- 4. Experimenting with, trying out, new emphases in teaching
- 5. Planning the sequence of content and instructional emphases
- 6. Considering effective methods of instruction
- 7. Developing a school philosopny pertaining to instruction

Ι

- 8. Selecting textbooks
- 9. Accounting for and distributing textbooks for the district
- 10. Selecting text-type materials
- ll. Producing curriculum guides and resource bulletins
- 12. Interpreting the "school's" program to new teachers
 - 13. Interpreting the school's program to the professional staff
 - 14. Interpreting the school's program to the community
 - 15. Evaluating the educational status of our children and youth
 - 16. Determining whether, and how well, our program is functioning

I

- 17. Determining the areas in which tests will be used
- 18. Selecting tests (standardized)
- 19. Instructing the staff regarding how to administer the tests
- 20. Interpreting the test data
- 21. Helping teachers with children who have behavioral problems
- 22. Helping teachers with problems pertaining to methods of instruction
- 23. Helping teachers with problems regarding the selection of instructional materials
- 24. Helping teachers with problems related to the use of instructional materials

I

- 25. Helping teachers who have relationship problems with school staff or community
- 26. Helping teachers with children who have learning problems
- 27. Helping teachers to learn to use materials and equipment (projectors, globes, tape recorders)
- 28. Appraising teachers of instructional supplies and materials
- 29. Advising teachers regarding effective ways to use instructional supplies, materials, equipment
- 30. Recommending the purchase of instructional supplies, materials, and equipment
- 31. Discontinuing the use of supplies, materials, and equipment which you cannot recommend

Ι

II

В

- 32. Recommending design for remodeling instructional space
- 33. Designing instructional space for new construction
- 34. Selecting furniture for classrooms
- Designing built-in features to accommodate 35. teaching-learning experiences
- 36. Determining the need for professional staff
- 37. Selecting professional staff
- 38. Placing professional staff in specific positions
- 39. Making extra-curricular assignments to staff

 \mathbf{E}

D

I

- 40. Evaluating staff performance
- 41. Continuing--discontinuing contract with professional staff
- 42. Making decisions regarding which library services will be provided
- 43. Selecting library materials
- 44. Planning ways for children to use the library
- 45. Determining which special education instructional units should be provided
- 46. Making evaluations of children to determine eligibility for a specific program
- 47. Deciding which, if any, organized programs will be provided for the in-service professional development of the staff

Ι

- 48. Developing an organizational plan of work for the in-service programs
- 49. Guiding personally the work activities of the in-service program
- 50. Obtaining consultative service for the in-service programs
- 51. Obtaining resource materials for the in-service programs
- 52. Editing whatever written materials are produced by the in-service program
- 53. Managing the publication of materials produced by the in-service program
- 54. Work with teachers in the classroom in a teaching role
- 55. Function as a member of a teaching team working directly with students

Ι

ΙI

Involvement Frequency

Nature of Responsibility

Jobs or Objectives of Supervision

1 2 3

A B C D E

- 56. Other
- 57. Other____

The information requested below will be useful in treating the data obtained from the remainder of the guestionnaire.

- 1. Your name Name of your district
- 2. Number of students in district_____
- 3. Number of school buildings your supervisory assignment includes______
- 4. Number of teachers your supervisory assignment includes_____
- 5. Your title (Check one or more of the following or fill in the blank for Other).

	Assistant Superintendent	Elementary					
	Director	Secondary					
	Coordinator	Math					
	Supervisor	Science					
	Chairman	Language Arts					
	Team Leader	Special Education					
	Other	Other					
6.	Are you a member of the Central Office Staff_	School Building Staff					
7.	Type of school in your assignment area (Check	one or more than one of the following)					
	aOpen area (more than two classes meeting in the same area) bClosed (classes separated by walls) cGraded program (students assigned by ages and previous placement) dNon-graded program (student progress and assignment is determined by his individual achievement)						
8.	Time spent (Check one or more)						
	Open area 0-25% , 25%-50% , 50%-75 Closed area - 25% , 25%-50% , 50%-75	%, 75%-100% %, 75%-100%					
9.	Number of hours per week spend teaching in the classroom or working directly with students						
10.	When you observe channels or responsibility, to whom do you go for immediate advice						
11.	In the event you and a teacher cannot agree o your supervisory assignment, which courses of						
	a. Accept the teacher's preference						
	b. Appeal to someone with higher rank						
	c. Require the teacher to accede	_					
	d. Other	<u></u>					

12.	Please add any comments that will provide more information about your than has been asked for in this questionnaire.	

.

.

.

•