

2020

## Shaping the Supervision Narrative: Innovating Teaching and Leading to Improve STEM Instruction

Bill Sterrett

*University of North Carolina, Wilmington, sterrettw@uncw.edu*

Ginger Rhodes

*University of North Carolina Wilmington, rhodesg@uncw.edu*

Dennis Kubasko

*University of North Carolina Wilmington, kubaskod@uncw.edu*

Angelia Reid-Griffin

*UNC Wilmington, reidgriffina@uncw.edu*

Kerry Kathleen Robinson

*University of North Carolina Wilmington, robinsonkk@uncw.edu*

*See next page for additional authors*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/jes>



Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Sterrett, B., Rhodes, G., Kubasko, D., Reid-Griffin, A., Robinson, K. K., Hooker, S. D., & Ryder, A. J. (2020). Shaping the Supervision Narrative: Innovating Teaching and Leading to Improve STEM Instruction. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 3 (3). <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.3.3.5>

This Connecting Theory to Practice is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Educational Supervision by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact [um.library.technical.services@maine.edu](mailto:um.library.technical.services@maine.edu).

---

## Shaping the Supervision Narrative: Innovating Teaching and Leading to Improve STEM Instruction

### Authors

Bill Sterrett, Ginger Rhodes, Dennis Kubasko, Angelia Reid-Griffin, Kerry Kathleen Robinson, Steven D. Hooker, and Andrew J. Ryder

# Shaping the Supervision Narrative: Innovating Teaching and Leading to Improve STEM Instruction

Journal of Educational Supervision

59 – 74

Volume 3, Issue 3, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.3.3.5>  
<https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/jes/>

**William L. Sterrett<sup>1</sup>, Ginger Rhodes<sup>1</sup>, Dennis Kubasko<sup>1</sup>, Angelia Reid-Griffin<sup>1</sup>, Kerry K. Robinson<sup>1</sup>, Steven D. Hooker<sup>1</sup>, and Andrew J. Ryder<sup>1</sup>**

## **Abstract**

This paper offers a model of supervisory collaboration that brings teacher and administrator programs together through a lens of formative evaluation. The roles of teacher and principal must be collaborative to sustain student success, yet the preparation models for those respective positions are often isolated from each other, as varying university departments and focus areas exist in silos. Preparation programs must maximize the clinical experiences of teacher education and administrator preparation programs, with a focus on practical teaching strategies and authentic feedback to pre-service educators and their instructors for reflection and change. This paper overviews a collaborative supervision model and incorporates case study vignettes focused on reflective supervisory practices in a STEM instructional environment.

## **Keywords**

supervision; clinical components of teacher education; instructional leadership; principal preparation; teacher preparation; classroom observations

---

<sup>1</sup> University of North Carolina – Wilmington, North Carolina, USA

### **Corresponding Author:**

William L. Sterrett (Department of Educational Leadership, University of North Carolina – Wilmington, 601 South College Road, Wilmington, NC 28403, USA)  
Email: [sterrettw@uncw.edu](mailto:sterrettw@uncw.edu)

## Introduction

The roles of teacher and principal must be collaborative to sustain student success, yet the preparation models for those respective positions are isolated from each other as varying university departments and focus areas exist in silos. The notion of instructional supervision can be daunting for the aspiring teacher as well as the aspiring principal. When the novice teacher, in the throes of the “survival year,” is observed by the principal in the classroom setting, this can be accompanied by a sense of uncertainty and trepidation, rather than seen as an opportunity to reflect and grow. Supervision is seen as an *event* that is mandated, scheduled, sometimes hurried, and often nominally descriptive or simply administrative, rather than as a *process* that is formative and mutually reflective. Glanz and Hazi (2019) note that instructional supervision has “travelled incognito” (p. 13) and has been “overshadowed by educational administration” (p. 13). Today, the improvement of teaching and learning is often disconnected from the practice of supervision, and observations are seen as merely an administrative “to do” item. In this model, supervision does little to move the needle on the gauge of student success. Those that prepare teachers and principals must maximize the clinical experiences of teacher and administrator preparation programs with a focus on practical teaching strategies and authentic feedback to both the candidates and the programs (Darling-Hammond, 2014).

Infusing collaboration and reflection into the supervisory process is a bidirectional, shared approach where teacher and principal candidates learn the value of working together in the supervisory context. This paper offers an exploratory model currently being developed as a result of a university grant that is shifting the teacher education and principal preparation landscape into a shared model of collaborative leadership. In order for educators to advocate for collaboration in the professional context of a school learning community, it is vital that those who prepare teachers and principals better understand how both principals and teachers develop their knowledge, leadership perspective, skills, and practices.

The notion of shared supervision must extend beyond the P-12 context and include a shift in the clinical context in teacher and principal preparation programs. Institutes of higher education must be engaged in this shift and explore how key players in the university setting, such as professors of educational leadership and their counterparts in teacher education, engage in their own shared learning community through teaching, research, and service in a way that promotes and supports this needed shift.

## Current Context

There are over 120,000 schools in the United States that serve over 58 million K-12 students and in which 3.5 million teachers serve alongside over 90,000 principals (Hussar, et al, 2020). In the context of the current accountability era of high-stakes testing and ever-changing mandates, the nature of the teaching profession is projected to change as well. Teacher shortages, particularly in the areas of science and math, loom in the coming years. Overall, there is projected demand of 300,000 teachers annually between 2020 and 2025, far exceeding the projected estimated supply of less than 200,000 teachers in those same years (Sutcher et al., 2016). The next decade of education preparation is key to shaping the profession of both teaching and leadership.

Preparation programs today largely operate in a “silo” approach. Educational leadership departments and teacher preparation departments teach different students and have different courses of study. Principal preparation programs largely enroll current teachers who are at least several years removed from their teacher credentialing coursework.

The University of North Carolina Wilmington is a regional university with over 17,000 students “dedicated to the integration of teaching, mentoring, research and service” (UNCW, n.d., para. 1). The university sponsors awards for Experiencing Transformative Education through Applied Learning (or ETEAL) learning experiences such as the Applied Research Strategic Initiative Awards<sup>2</sup> designed to optimize applied learning experience in a manner that aligns to the university strategic plan values of student focus, diversity, excellence, integrity, innovation, and community engagement.

The ETEAL Strategic Initiative Awards consider projects in terms of scope and scaling, quality, program impact, program design & management, and access & equity (UNCW ETEAL, n.d.). Faculty from three departments—Educational Leadership (EL); Instructional Technology, Foundations, and Secondary Education (ITFSE); and Math and Statistics—received an ETEAL Strategic Initiative Award for a proposal called “innovating Teaching and Learning Leadership” (or iTALL) that brought seven faculty members together in areas that included principal preparation, evaluation, STEM education, and teacher preparation. This work built on an existing line of research that examined the way that principals evaluate STEM instruction and provide feedback to STEM teachers (Sterrett et al., 2018; Kubasko et al., 2019). The goal of this project is to develop and implement a model of shared preparation and supervisory practices that informs both the faculty and the students in regards to teaching, learning, and leadership.

## **Literature Review**

Teachers play an important role in terms of their presence and their actions. Research indicates that teaching strategies can have positive effects on student achievement (Marzano et al., 2001). Reform efforts in classrooms require teachers to teach in ways that may be different than how they learned when they were in school, yet teachers tend to teach in ways similar to how they were taught (Lortie, 1975). To meet the national and state standards for student learning, teachers are asked to teach using inquiry-based strategies (Bybee, 2006; Czerniak & Johnson, 2014) and engage in what has been called “ambitious teaching” (Boston et al., 2017). In addition, teachers themselves are not finished products; it is important that they be given the opportunity to learn, reflect, and grow as professionals and as learners. They must also be empowered to lead within their learning communities (Sterrett, 2016). Given that teachers are busy and stressed (Sterrett, Parker, & Mitzner, 2018), they must be actively supported by their administration. They need to be provided opportunities and supports that intentionally foster such ongoing growth.

According to the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (2018), the skills teacher leaders need can be broken into six different categories. The main categories include: (a) working with adult learners, (b) communication, (c) collaboration, (d) knowledge of content and

---

<sup>2</sup> The authors would like to acknowledge the UNCW ETEAL Applied Research Strategic Initiative Awards that made this effort possible.

pedagogy, (e) systems thinking and (f) equity lens. It is critical that emerging pre-service teachers learn to be open to constructive criticism and honest feedback from supervisors. It is equally important that pre-service principals can converse with pre-service teachers in a way that establishes the practice of observational practices as collaborative and formative, where both parties learn, contribute, reflect and grow, rather than a “top-down” evaluative approach. Therefore, establishing trusting relationships in a collaborative context and communicating information about content and pedagogy objectively is key to success.

### **The Role of the Principal**

The new Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) formerly known as the ISLLC Standards, call for effective educational leaders to develop and support rigorous and coherent systems of assessment to promote each student’s academic success and well-being (NPBEA, 2015). One of the challenges is for administrators to “employ valid assessments that are consistent with knowledge of child learning and development and technical standards of measurement” (NPBEA, 2015, p. 12). While principals often observe classroom management, classroom environments, and student engagement, they rarely focus on specific strategies that will improve teaching of the discipline.

Kachur et al. (2013) believe that principals must develop a culture of mutual respect and trust in the school. Trust is critical for learning and performance (City et al., 2018), and while building trust takes time, administrators can support this work by using “protocols to provide safe spaces for people to learn” (City, et al., 2018, p. 146). They can encourage meaningful conversations that follow walkthrough observations (Kachur, et al., 2013). These conversations can foster a greater collective understanding of perspectives, roles, and insights regarding teaching and learning.

### **The Purpose of Evaluation**

Marzano (2012) notes that teacher evaluation serves two purposes: *measuring* teachers and *developing* teachers. Given the nature of the iTALL model, we will focus on the developmental nature of this reflective process. Gordon and McGhee (2019) explain that the purpose of formative evaluation is to “promote the teacher’s professional growth leading to the improvement of teaching and learning” (p. 17). The focus of the iTALL model is reflecting on and improving teaching. This observation and feedback model will thus, as Gordon and McGhee (2019) propose, “foster the collegiality, trust, honesty, safe space, and teacher risk taking associated with successful formative practice” (p. 19). Providing clarity on the purpose of the supervisory process—in this case, to better understand and improve instructional practices—is key.

Walkthrough observations are utilized in this model, as they are brief (a specific portion of the lesson rather than the full scheduled class), informal, focused observations used for the purpose of providing formative feedback (Kachur et al., 2013; Zepeda, 2009). The purpose of walkthroughs is not only to observe what teachers are doing, but to better understand what students are doing and how they are learning (Antonetti & Garver, 2015). The observer, who might be a principal or a teacher colleague, could enter the learning setting at any point in the

lesson, engage in observing the setting, the teacher, and the students, and may even interact with the students (Antonetti & Garver, 2015). It is helpful to use a consistent form that is understood and in which teachers can have input (Antonetti & Garver, 2015; Zepeda, 2009). This conceptual perspective supports intentional planning, sharing, and reflection through shorter, focused walkthrough format that provides specific feedback to the teacher (Antonetti & Garver, 2015; Kachur et al., 2013; Zepeda, 2009). These short observations provide a means to focus on specific portions of teaching and provide a context or follow-up reflective discussions.

### **Focus on STEM Instruction**

At the school level, principal leadership plays an invaluable role in the development of effective pedagogy and student learning. However, not all principals have served as STEM teachers, or even have experienced STEM instructional professional development. Principals' limited background in STEM areas can influence what they notice when they observe STEM classrooms and the feedback they provide to STEM teachers (Sterrett et al., 2018). For example, Rigby, et al. (2017) found that most principals' feedback to mathematics teachers was focused on content-neutral instruction or classroom management rather than on mathematics instructional practices that would likely lead to actual instructional changes in the classroom.

Along with reflective formative evaluation practices, professional development can foster greater understanding and exploration of STEM instruction. Loucks-Horsley et al. (2010) identified five tips for considering leadership in professional development design for STEM- infused teachers with the most relevant being to "help principals develop the 'eyes' to recognize good mathematics and science teaching" (p. 101). The authors argue that principals are integral in the development, support, and success of new teaching methodologies in science and mathematics. Both pre-service teachers and pre-service principals need a greater awareness of curricular practices across the STEM fields. Recent research shows that different principals see STEM instruction differently in the classroom and may offer varying feedback as a result (Kubasko et al., 2019; Sterrett et al., 2018).

STEM education "is an organizing principle upon which to build the interconnectedness of subjects" and includes a focus on student engagement and motivation (Myers & Berkowicz, 2015, p. 8). STEM-infused teachers are expected to facilitate meaningful learning for students through challenging tasks or ill-structured problems allowing students to engage in creative solutions and critical thinking. Meaningful instruction can be strengthened by focusing collaborative conversations between teachers and principals.

### **Preparation Model**

The role of STEM-related university teacher preparation models is to prepare candidates to teach high quality STEM in secondary schools that leads to improvements in student learning. Such models seek to provide teacher candidates with knowledge and understanding of their purposes in the classroom and school environment as they develop their teacher professional identity (Luehmann, 2007). Pre-service teacher education programs at universities and colleges must be prepared to contribute to STEM reform for future teachers (Bybee, 2013). University faculty need to review their programs and determine if there are potential synergies that can be created

across principal and teacher pre-service development. For instance, to be seen as instructional leaders, principals and emerging teacher leaders must take an interest in the instructional strategies of their STEM-focused teachers.

Buckner and Boyd (2015) explain that administrators serving as STEM leaders should carefully examine STEM teaching and learning experiences to ensure they are meaningful for students. Beyond learning about teacher evaluations and observations, pre-service principals can learn how to establish a culture of trust and collaboration by (a) engaging in short meetings with pre-service teachers a couple times a semester to review methodology and practice, (b) allowing pre-service teachers to talk about their teaching and learning and (c) providing feedback to pre-service teachers for growth and development.

As university preparation models for educational leaders must cover a wide array of both the instructional and managerial components of the position, instructional supervision is one area that cannot be overlooked. The idea of preparing leaders who can critically supervise, coach, develop, and evaluate teachers is especially relevant as schools look to support and retain quality teachers. Many aspiring principals' comfort levels with supervision and evaluation is dependent on their past experiences as a classroom teacher and their comfort level with evaluating and providing feedback to STEM teachers (Lochmiller, 2016). While learning the theories behind the practice of supervision is important, having an opportunity to put it into practice in a field experience provides a more meaningful learning setting than simply through coursework alone (Davis & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Dodson, 2014; Kearney & Valadez, 2015).


## **Conceptual Framework**

Even though principals and teachers work together, they are largely prepared separately from each other. When their respective preparation programs neither collaborate nor intersect, clinical opportunities for pre-service teachers to work with aspiring principals simply do not exist. Building on a case study involving principal perceptions of teaching, a model was proposed by researchers to bring teachers and principals together on the "preparation side" of the profession (Kubasko et al., 2019). This model has been further developed to foster an ongoing, shared conversation about innovating teaching and learning leadership, as illustrated in Figure 1.

As the model indicates, both pre-service teacher and pre-service principal programs engage students in coursework and field experiences, albeit in isolation from each other. The iTALL model provides an intersection of professional practice, teaching, observation, and reflection through a shared, collaborative field experience. Pre-service principals and pre-service teachers go through a cycle of planning for an observation, implementation, and reflecting on the observation, similar to the clinical supervision model (Glickman et al., 2010). During the planning stage the pre-service principals and pre-service teachers will prepare for the experience and outline their intended learning goals. These learning goals are specific to the pre-service educator and will set the stage for the lesson implementation and observation.

*Figure 1: The innovating Teaching and Learning Leadership (iTALL) model*





Then, during the implementation stage the pre-service teacher teaches a lesson and the pre-service principals will use their walkthrough observation protocols to notice important features of the lesson. The role of the university faculty member, as facilitator, is important in the observation, particularly in relation to the teacher's thinking (van Es & Sherin, 2008). Carefully listening and reflecting on the feedback will require engaged participation from both the pre-service teacher's and pre-service principal's university faculty members. Both verbal discussion and the written components can be instructive. Hill and Grossman (2013) emphasize the importance of the written protocols being specific to the subject matter, in this case STEM, to zero in on aspects such as explaining "key mathematical ideas like equivalence" (p. 374) and even providing a "feedback bundle" (p. 381) that includes advice on resources such as curriculum materials or names of content-area teachers who might be helpful.

Finally, during the reflection stage the pre-service principals will offer evidence and feedback to the pre-service teachers and the pre-service teachers will respond to the evidence and feedback in an active manner. At the end of the experience, the pre-service principals and pre-service teachers will reflect on the entire experience and document what they have learned about themselves as future teachers and leaders.

This formative support will allow more meaningful reflection, planning, and change in classroom practice. The iTALL model includes what pre-service principals see in the pre-service teachers' classroom, how they will provide feedback, how the pre-service teachers will respond, and how both pre-service principals and teachers will reflect on the experience.

An evaluation component can then provide a view of supervision experiences through the lens of the participants (Thanh & Thanh, 2015). The evaluation component of our work will consist of

qualitative materials gathered during a research study on the implementation of the iTALL model. Research data from observations, surveys, and interviews will be gathered to determine if the experience influences the goals of participants. Evaluation of the success of the iTALL model will be based on outcomes including positive feedback from participants.

### **iTALL case study vignettes**

The iTALL model can be further illustrated by a case study vignette. Case studies can include useful elements such as context, relevance, ambiguity, and complexity (Fossey & Crow, 2011). The following three scenarios show how the iTALL model is infused in teacher and leadership preparation programs as a collaborative means to shape the supervision narrative. The scenarios include case studies<sup>3</sup> of a STEM education student, Master of School Administration student, and the iTALL faculty team.

***Scenario 1: The STEM education student.*** Elena, an MAT secondary science education major with a BS in Marine Biology, was excited and nervous about her final spring semester in student teaching. She had successfully completed an immersive fall semester field experience and was looking forward to returning to the same class with the same host partnership teacher. The local region was experiencing a teacher shortage in nearly every STEM-related area and after attending a recent job fair on campus, Elena had gotten offers from a local high school and two middle schools in need of a highly-qualified STEM educator. She had excelled in both her academic content and pedagogy courses, and she had enjoyed her fall field experience. Even as an emerging pre-service teacher, her field experience supervisor spoke in glowing terms of her ability to engage students in advanced STEM concepts regardless of their achievement level. However, when finally tasked with classroom instructional responsibilities, Elena was uncertain about how her host teacher and school principal would view and support her work, which was anchored in hands-on, inquiry-based methodologies rather than strictly adhering to textbook instruction. She knew how important the high stakes end-of-course test scores were in the district, yet she was confident in her ability to help students succeed by engaging them in meaningful ways.

Based upon Elena's very recent fall semester field experience in schools, she observed principals as distant, stressed-out managers who sometimes would appear in the classroom with a clipboard for a perfunctory observation of her partnership teacher. Yet, in her secondary MAT program, she had realized that evaluation could be formative and that she had a voice in the process rather than merely receiving written feedback that was simply filed away in a personnel folder. Elena was learning how short walkthrough conversations could actually help transform her instruction, and provide her with a means to share challenges and successes with her colleagues as well.

In the same fall semester as Elena's field experience, she had learned in her methods course what an example administrative walkthrough observation looked like and how it was deployed as a classroom assessment tool. Under the guidance of her methods and field experience instructors, Elena's class was assigned a 20-minute National Board approved science teaching video to

---

<sup>3</sup> The characters within the teacher and principal case study vignettes are fictional, designed to illustrate the work being done within the collaborative work of the iTALL effort.

watch. While viewing the sample teaching video, her class was asked to complete the same walkthrough observation form as a practicing principal would. Upon conclusion of the video and completion of the form, her class would engage in group discussion about what was observed. This explicit process was completed over the course of the semester on two different occasions using two different National Board approved science teaching videos. Elena was always active in those conversations, often pointing out the successful strategies employed by the practicing National Board Certified Teachers and the student learning she observed. The preservice teacher discourse with her peers was dynamic and the walkthrough observation assessment seemed formative and approachable to Elena when employed in this setting. At the conclusion of the fall field experience semester, her class was asked to apply the same walkthrough observation form to a prerecorded video vignette of their own teaching from their final week in the semester. While Elena quickly realized that she was far more critical of her own teaching than any external reviewer would probably ever be, her classmates were quick to remind her that her teaching was effective and student learning was present.

As Elena began her spring student teaching semester, she yearned for as much feedback as she could gather from her partnership teacher and her university supervisor. As she assumed responsibility for her first Honors Biology class, Elena was asked to again video record her teaching at the beginning of the experience. She recorded an entire 90-minute block and carefully selected a 20-minute vignette to share online as assigned. While Elena invited any additional feedback, she was very nervous when she was assigned to Alex, a principal preparation student with a background as a secondary science educator. She was afraid of being “judged.” Accessing the password protected online platform, Alex would review her teaching video and assign formative walkthrough feedback. Upon completion, he uploaded the walkthrough feedback to the online platform.

Elena was elated to read the following week that Alex enjoyed watching her vignette and was impressed with her classroom presence so early in the semester. And she appreciated the variety of authentic reactions, critical reflections, and suggestions he had offered. Elena communicated back with Alex, often apologizing for her self-perceived novice mistakes and hoping to do better based upon his feedback. Alex assured her that she was exactly where she needed to be. One month later in the student teaching semester, Elena was asked to submit another teaching vignette to Alex. This time around, Elena was excited, not anxious, to submit her video. She was clear as to what the observation would look like. She wasn't intimidated by the walkthrough, the formative feedback, or the dialogue she would have with Alex. In fact, Elena was able to better focus on the particulars of his feedback, ask questions about pedagogical strategies employed in her class, and engage in conversations about the science content. The discourse was reciprocal and the outcomes were collaborative.

**Scenario 2: The Master of School Administration (MSA) Student.** Carrie, a veteran middle grades social studies teacher, was enrolled in the second semester of a year-long principal internship. She had nearly ten years of experience as a teacher and served as both the 7th grade team leader and the Beginning Teacher Mentor to all social studies and language arts teachers at her school, all while completing her MSA degree part-time. Her internship involved logging hours before and after school with her principal and three assistant principals, and she often spent her 90-minute planning period engaged in visiting other classrooms and department-level teams.

She had strong trust and respect among her colleagues, who knew she kept students first and valued high-quality instruction. When visitors came to her award-winning urban middle school, administrators and teachers alike often pointed them to Carrie's classroom.

Despite her accolades, she had reservations about stepping into an instructional leadership role as an administrator because she had never taught math or science. "How can I provide meaningful feedback to others in these content areas? What value do I add to their classrooms?" Her MSA program, though, had given her a boost of confidence as she had learned about the collaborative nature of walkthrough observations, and the powerful potential of formative evaluation. This practice would allow her regular immersion to observe student learning. Not only would it provide Carrie with a better understanding of teaching and learning beyond her own subject area, it also would provide her with opportunity to have reflective conversations with the teacher after each visit. Carrie felt these conversations would be as helpful for her as they were for the teacher because of the two-way dialogue that occurred.

In her final semester of the program, Carrie had the opportunity to provide formative walkthrough feedback to a preservice science teacher as part of her internship course. Yasmin was student teaching eighth grade science. At the beginning of the spring semester, Yasmin recorded a 20-minute video of her lesson on organism interaction and sent it to Carrie with a brief written description of the entire lesson, learning objectives, and other important information she thought needed to be shared. The video would simulate the walkthrough environment. Carrie reviewed the video (as if she was conducting the walkthrough in person). After completing the "walkthrough" and the form, Carrie recorded a video for Yasmin based on her walkthrough, including formative feedback she could use to improve future lessons. Carrie then sent her video off to Dr. Marcus, her internship instructor, to receive feedback before forwarding her video on to Yasmin. While Dr. Marcus commended Carrie for the detailed feedback that Carrie provided Yasmin in the video, she reminded her that the only type of feedback that should be provided is that requested on the walkthrough form. Carrie had included additional thoughts about classroom management which was not the focus of the walkthrough. Carrie modified her video to only focus on the content found on the walkthrough form and then sent it off to Yasmin.

Yasmin had the opportunity to review Carrie's video and accompanying walkthrough form based on the video she had submitted. From the feedback Carrie had provided, Yasmin responded to Carrie's comments with her thoughts about the lesson and what she planned to do differently next time in the lesson. Yasmin also thanked Carrie for taking the time for watching her video and for providing relevant feedback, as she was committed to improving her teaching.

One month later, the process started again. Carrie already felt more comfortable because she had "seen" Yasmin's classroom once and she was familiar with the walkthrough tool. She also knew to be more focused on the content of the walkthrough form and not anything else that was occurring during the video. She was excited to have the opportunity to see how Yasmin had grown in the month since she had last seen her teach. She also was looking forward to the conversation that would occur after the walkthrough.

***Scenario 3: The iTALL Faculty Team.*** Bill, Kerry, and Steven had served as educational leadership professors in the same department and had often co-taught multiple sections of the

administrative internship course together. They planned for guest speakers, facilitated large seminars with all three professors' course sections together, and collaborated on course planning and culminating project work together. As their MSA students graduated, most became assistant principals, and often were tasked first with managerial leadership items such as scheduling or duties, eventually easing into instructional leadership tasks such as walkthrough observations. Often when visiting a classroom and providing a teacher with feedback, they learned with the principal, from the principal's perspective. Bill, Kerry, and Steven realized this was often a "learning curve" for the students.

Just several hallways away in the College of Education, Dennis and Angie worked to prepare pre-service teachers to teach in science classrooms, and Ginger taught math education students. They focused on content and pedagogy, and infused teacher leadership standards throughout their courses. The notion of the principalship, however, was largely absent from their coursework and discussions. Administrator observations and evaluation were concepts that were far off in the future, well beyond the immediacy of a successful student teaching experience. As Bill, Kerry, Steven, Dennis, Angie, and Ginger collaborated on various committees and research efforts, they realized there existed great potential to connect their preparation program silos, and bring teachers and principals together long before the first crucial year of a beginning teacher's career. Both principals and teachers could stand to gain from building a deeper awareness of each other's work, in an effort to focus on innovative teaching, learning, and leadership.

After securing start-up funding for three years, the six faculty in the principal and teacher preparation programs, along with a colleague, Andy, who taught program evaluation to higher education students, planned what it might look like to connect the silos. Infusing the theory and practice of authentic observations, and building in time and space for bidirectional conversations took an enormous amount of time, intentionality, and reflection. But it was well worth it. The professors across three departments gained a greater awareness of each other's work, and their students learned empathy and professional collaboration as they were going through the process. With the help of Andy's evaluation students, the iTALL team gained the important perspective of what this work looked like through a logic model, and also focused on student insights regarding the work. Over a three-year period, their regular planning and discussion meetings not only moved forward the work of their grant award, but it created an ethos of supervision synthesis amongst the teacher and leadership preparation programs. This work changed the way the future teachers and principals viewed teaching and learning and brought previously siloed programs together in a new way.

## **Conclusion**

Educational supervision is not just for school principals. Shared leadership that involves reflection and collaboration offers the powerful potential to reshape the fields of teaching and administration and position instructional supervision in a context of a professional learning community. As Glatthorn et al. (2019) observe, "teaching is no longer a solitary discipline where teachers go into their classrooms and close the door" (p. 349). Similarly, the principalship is not a discipline where the principal visits only when required and expected, only to deliver a summary check-box format of one-sided critiques. We posit that we must reshape the supervision narrative to be bidirectional and continuous, where teachers and principals frequently

observe, reflect, share, and change their teaching and learning to meet the needs of a rapidly changing student population. Familiarizing aspiring teachers and principals with the nature of formative evaluation practices can strengthen the field by infusing collaborative awareness in preparation programs that extends into their careers.

The iTALL model holds the potential to re-shape the way programs teach aspiring teachers and principals. This effort seeks to improve both the work of future teachers and principals and to strengthen the preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, 2014). The model can serve as a supervision roadmap preparing both teachers and principals, a shift that could ultimately foster more sustained shared leadership and more effective teaching and learning.

## References

- Antonetti, J. V., & Garver, J. R. (2015). *17,000 classroom visits can't be wrong: Strategies that engage students, promote active learning, and boost achievement*. ASCD.
- Boston, M., Dillon, F., & Smith, M. S. (2017). *Taking action: Implementing effective mathematics teaching practices*. S. Miller (Ed.). National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Buckner, T., & Boyd, B. (2015). *STEM leadership: How do I create a STEM culture in my school?* ASCD.
- Bybee R.W. (2006) Scientific inquiry and science teaching. In: Flick L.B., Lederman N.G. (Eds.) *Scientific inquiry and nature of science. Science & technology education library*. Springer.
- Bybee, R. W. (2013). *The case for STEM education: Challenges and opportunities*. National Science Teachers Association.
- Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (2018). *Teacher leadership skills framework: Overview*. <http://cstp-wa.org/cstp2013/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Teacher-Leadership-Framework.pdf>
- City, E. A., Elmore, R. F., Fiarman, S. E., & Teitel, L (2018). *Instructional rounds in education: A network to improving teaching and learning*. Harvard Education Press.
- Czerniak, C. M., & Johnson, C. C. (2014). Interdisciplinary science and STEM teaching. In, N. G. Lederman, & S. K. Abell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education* (Vol. 2) (pp. 395–411). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The Holy Grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 89(4), 547-561. doi: 10.1080/0161956X.2014.939009
- Davis, S. H., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Innovative principal preparation programs: What works and how we know. *Planning and Changing*, 43(1/2), 25–45.
- Dodson, R. L. (2014). Which field experiences best prepare future school leaders? An analysis of Kentucky's principal preparation program. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 37(4), 41.
- Fossey, R., & Crow, G.M. (2011). The elements of a good case. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 14(3) 4-10. doi: 10.1177/1555458911426467
- Glanz, J., & Hazi, H, (2019). Shedding light on the phenomenon of supervision traveling incognito: A field's struggles for visibility. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 2(1), 1-15. doi: 10.31045/jes.2.1.1
- Glatthorn, A.A., Boschee, F., Whitehead, B.M., & Boschee, B.F. (2019). *Curriculum leadership: Strategies for development and implementation* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Sage.
- Glickman, C.D.; Gordon, S. P.; & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (2010). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach* (8<sup>th</sup> ed). Allyn & Bacon.
- Gordon, S.P., & McGhee, M.W. (2019). The power of formative evaluation of teaching. In M. L. Derrington & J. Brandon (Eds). *Differentiated Teacher Evaluation and Professional Learning* (pp. 15-36). Palgrave Macmillan
- Hill, H. C., & Grossman, P. (2013). Learning from teacher observations: Challenges and opportunities posed by new teacher evaluation systems. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(2), 371-384,401. <https://search-proquest-com.liblink.uncw.edu/docview/1399327195?accountid=14606>

- Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Hein, S., Wang, K., Roberts, A., Cui, J., Smith, M., Bullock Mann, F., Barmer, A., and Dilig, R. (2020). *The Condition of Education 2020* (NCES 2020-144). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020144>.
- Kachur, D. S., Stout, J. A., & Edwards, C. S. (2013). *Engaging teachers in classroom walkthroughs*. ASCD.
- Kearney, W. S., & Valadez, A. (2015). Ready from day one: An examination of one principal preparation program's redesign in collaboration with local school districts. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 26, 27–38.
- Kubasko, D., Rhodes, G. & Sterrett, W. (2019). A case study approach to STEM Supervision: A collaborative model for teaching and principal preparation. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Teacher Leadership*, 4(1), 1-11. doi:10.46767/kfp.2016-0029
- Lochmiller, C. R. (2016). Examining administrators' instructional feedback to high school math and science teachers. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 52(1), 75-109. doi: 10.1177/0013161X15616660
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher. A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press
- Loucks-Horsley, S., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, S., Love, N., & Hewson, P. W. (2010). *Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics* (3rd ed.). Corwin Press.
- Luehmann, A.L. (2007), Identity development as a lens to science teacher preparation. *Science Education*, 91(5), 822-839. doi:10.1002/sce.20209
- Marzano, R. (2012). The two purposes of teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership*, 70(3), 14-19. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/nov12/vol70/num03/The-Two-Purposes-of-Teacher-Evaluation.aspx>
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. ASCD.
- Myers, A., & Berkowicz, J. (2015). *The STEM shift: A guide for school leaders*. Corwin Press.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). *Professional standards for educational leaders 2015*. Author.
- Rigby, J. G., Larbi-Cherif, A., Rosenquest, B. A., Sharpe, C. J., Cobb, P., & Smith, T. (2017). Administrator observation and feedback: Does it lead toward improvement in inquiry-oriented math instruction? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53, 475–516. doi: 10.1177/0013161X16687006
- Sterrett, W. (2016). *Igniting teacher leadership: How do I empower my teachers to lead and learn?* ASCD.
- Sterrett, W., Parker, M. A., & Mitzner, K. (2018). Maximizing teacher time: The collaborative leadership role of the principal. *Journal of Organizational and Educational Leadership*, 3(2), 1-26.
- Sterrett, W., Rhodes, G., Kubasko, D., & Fischetti, J. (2018). A different “noticing”: Examining principal perceptions of STEM instruction. *American Journal of Educational Science*, 4(4), 180-187.
- Sutcher, L., Darling-Hammond, L., & Carver-Thomas, D. (2016). *A coming crisis in teaching? Teacher supply, demand, and shortages in the U.S.* Learning Policy Institute.
- Thanh, N. & Thanh, T. (2015). The interconnection between interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods in education. *American Journal of Educational Science*, 1(2), 24-27.



University of North Carolina Wilmington (n.d.) Seahawk points of pride.

<https://uncw.edu/aboutuncw/pointsofpride.html>

University of North Carolina Wilmington ETEAL (n.d.). *Applied learning strategic initiatives program*. <https://uncw.edu/eteal/initiatives/strategic-initiatives.html>

van Es, E.A., & Sherin, M. G. (2008). Mathematics teachers' "learning to notice" in the context of a video club. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(2), 244-276.  
doi:10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.005

Zepeda, S. (2009). *The instructional leader's guide to informal classroom observations (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Eye on Education.

## Author Biographies

**William L. Sterrett** is an Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and serves as Associate Dean of Teacher Education and Outreach in the Watson College of Education at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. His research interests include principal leadership, teacher leadership, STEM and innovation, and school improvement. He has authored three ASCD books, including *Igniting Teacher Leadership*. You can follow him on Twitter (@billsterrett) to learn more about his work.

**Ginger Rhodes** is a professor of mathematics education in the Mathematics and Statistics Department at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. Her research includes mathematics teachers' knowledge, observational skills and instructional practices. In recent work she has expanded her work to consider what mentors and instructional leaders notice when they observe classrooms and how they use that information to support teacher growth.

**Dennis S. Kubasko, Jr.** is currently an Associate Professor of STEM Education at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. His research interests include outdoor education and island ecology, teacher leadership, and STEM instructional innovation. Dr. Kubasko directed UNCW's Center for Education in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (CESTEM) from 2011-2016. Dr. Kubasko taught middle school science and high school Biology in the suburban Philadelphia public schools.

**Angelia Reid-Griffin** is a Professor of Science Education at the University of North Carolina-Wilmington. Research interests include using technology as a tool in STEM education, minority teacher shortage efforts, and STEM Mentorship. She also serves as the director of the Watson College of Education Junior Seahawk Academy (a STEM/Health academy for school-aged students) and is a member of the NC STEM ecosystem (STEM SENC). You can follow on her projects on Twitter (@WCEJrseahawk) and [www.linkedin.com/in/griffina1stem](http://www.linkedin.com/in/griffina1stem).

**Kerry K. Robinson** is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership and serves as the Master of School Administration program coordinator at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. Her research interests include women in leadership, the superintendency, administrators' health and well-being, and leadership preparation. You can follow her on Twitter (@kerkatrob) to learn more about her work.

**Steven D. Hooker** is currently an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. Prior to that he served as an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Arcadia University in Glenside, PA, and at Morehead State University in Morehead, KY. He earned his doctoral degree in Educational Leadership from the University of Cincinnati in 2010. He has taught language arts in middle and high school in Atlanta, Georgia, and Cincinnati, Ohio. He has also served as an administrator of an elementary (K-8) school in Cincinnati.

**Andrew Ryder** is an Associate Professor of Higher Education and serves as Department Chair in Educational Leadership. He has expertise in using assessment to improve professional practices. He earned his Ph.D. and Master's degree in higher education at Iowa State and his Bachelor's degree from the College of William and Mary.