2024

Conceptualizing Images of Supervisors in Teacher Education

Steve Haberlin
University of Central Florida, steve.haberlin@ucf.edu

Rebecca W. Burns
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania, burns@kutztown.edu

Conceptualizing Images of Supervisors in Teacher Education

Steve Haberlin[1] and Rebecca West Burns[2]

Abstract

Due to the marginalization of supervision (Butler, et al., 2023; Nolan, 2022) and few frameworks to conceptualize supervision in teacher preparation, educational supervision of clinical experiences receives less attention and fewer resources, which perpetuates its marginalization. It is imperative that scholars develop additional theoretical models or constructs to improve the understanding and practice of supervision to elevate its status beyond technical helping. In this paper, we draw upon several sources in the instructional supervision literature to re-conceptualize commonly used images of supervisors in teacher education. In addition to traditional conceptions (The Critic, the Popular Parent, the Co-Inquirer), we 'introduce' two new images, The Advocate and The Contemplative, to reflect changes and movements in education. These images can serve as one theoretical model or construct to improve understanding and practice of supervision to elevate its status.

Keywords

supervision; supervisor images; conceptions of supervision; teacher education

[1] University of Central Florida
[2] Kutztown University of Pennysylvania

Corresponding Author:
Steve Haberlin (College of Community Innovation & Education, University of Central Florida, 4000 Central Florida Blvd., Orlando, FL 32816 USA)
email: stevehaberlin@ucf.edu

Introduction

Instructional supervision has long focused on the improvement of teachers' instructional practice. In fact, there is a wealth of literature focused on supervision with inservice teachers. However, attention to supervision of teachers in their certification years is garnering increased attention. Over the last decade, educational reformers have called for transformation in the way in which teachers are prepared. National reports have advocated for greater connections and relationships between schools and universities to center teacher preparation curricula around clinical practice (American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education [AACTE] (2010), 2018; National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE] (2010).

Increased emphasis on clinical preparation means increased emphasis on the quality of supervision of clinical experiences to ensure teacher candidate learning (Darling-Hammond, 2014). This attention to clinical practice and specifically to supervision of clinical practice creates opportunities for the literature associated with the supervision of inservice teachers and the supervision of teacher candidates to converge. In this way, teacher preparation and inservice teacher learning connect to create a seamless curriculum of lifelong learning for teachers known as teacher education (Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

Despite its robust literature base, supervision has been criticized as a technical practice and dismissed as a scholarly discipline (Cuenca, 2013; Labaree, 2004; Zeichner, 2006). In teacher preparation, supervision of teacher candidates has a lower status in the academy than disciplines like science, mathematics, and literacy due to what Nolan (2022) referred to as "nested marginalization." He shared that supervision of clinical experiences is marginalized within teacher preparation programs, which are marginalized in colleges of education, which are marginalized in the university at large. Thus, supervision of clinical experiences gets less attention and fewer resources due to its nested marginalization. This leads to a cycle of marginalization of supervision (Butler, et al., 2023). Oftentimes, the essential but time-intensive nature of supervision has been relegated to adjunct or retired faculty without attention to their preparation or ongoing professional learning (Cuenca, 2013; NCATE, 2010; Slick, 1998; Zeichner, 2005).

Perhaps this struggle with status persists because few frameworks exist to conceptualize supervision in *teacher preparation*. However, with this new focus on clinical practice in teacher preparation and the need for quality supervision in *teacher education*, it will be imperative that supervision scholars develop theoretical models or constructs to improve the understanding and practice of supervision as well as elevate its status beyond technical helping. The purpose of this conceptual paper is to draw upon several sources of literature in instructional supervision of inservice teachers and supervision of teacher candidates to conceptualize images of supervisors in teacher education.

Defining Key Terms

Teacher education has been criticized for a lack of common nomenclature (AACTE, 2018; Parker et al., 2019; Teitel, 1998; Zeichner, 2005), which also may contribute to its marginalization. This lack of common terminology and understanding can contribute to

confusion, affect implementation, and have consequences in practice. For example, the terms supervision and supervisor are often used interchangeably even though they are different, and the terms supervision and evaluation are often conflated in practice even though they are fundamentally different (Nolan & Hoover, 2010). The conflation of supervision and evaluation can negatively affect teacher learning (Basmadjian, 2011; Burns & Badiali, 2015; Ochieng et al., 2011). In response to this critique, Jacobs and Burns (2021) created a lexicon for clinically based teacher preparation generated from research, policy reports, and their own experiences in designing and facilitating award-winning clinically based teacher education programs, and we use those terms and definitions specifically related to supervision. In this section we define teacher preparation, teacher education, supervision, and supervisor, and we use those definitions to distinguish between teacher preparation and teacher education as well as supervision and supervisor.

The Difference between Teacher Preparation and Teacher Education

The terms teacher preparation and teacher education are often used interchangeably when, in fact, they have different meanings. Teacher preparation includes all pre-certification and licensure activities (Jacobs & Burns, 2021). On the other hand, teacher education is broader; it includes the continuum of teacher learning beginning with teacher preparation, continuing through induction, and extending throughout a teacher's career (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Teacher education has historically been criticized for a disconnect between teacher preparation and the ongoing professional learning of teachers once they are certified and teaching in schools. Teacher education, though, should be a coherent continuum of teacher learning (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). Creating this coherent continuum of teacher learning is possible when schools and universities work more collaboratively in clinically based teacher education (AACTE, 2018; Jacobs & Burns, 2021; NCATE, 2010). We situate this paper intentionally in teacher education because we aim to unite literature on supervision of teacher candidates and supervision of inservice teachers to construct images of supervisors. Thus, we intentionally use the term teacher education to be more inclusive of teacher learning across a teacher's career span - from certification through retirement.

Defining Supervision and Supervisor

Supervision scholars have long debated about the definition of supervision. For inservice teachers, instructional supervision has been defined as a developmental process that improves teachers' practice to improve K-12 student achievement (Glickman et al., 2018). For teacher candidates, supervision has been defined as the enactment of tasks and practices aimed at improving teacher candidate learning (Burns et al., 2016), and most recently as "the function, or act, of supporting teachers candidates' growth and development in becoming equity-minded and equity-driven in their practice while they are learning to teach in their clinical experiences" (Jacobs & Burns, 2021, p. 314).

Supervision as Teaching

In defining the role of the supervisor, we also believe as other scholars have asserted, that supervising in its essence is "teaching" (Burns & Badiali, 2015; Levin & Nolan, 2014;

Sergiovanni, 1982). Like teaching, supervision is a pedagogical function featuring its own set of knowledge and skills. Pedagogy involves understanding effective practices and strategies for facilitating learning. Teachers must know their students and what teaching practices work for those particular students. We believe that supervision is similar in the sense that supervisors must understand and practice specific skills to help teachers or teacher candidates grow and enhance their own practice. Both supervision and teaching rely heavily on building relationships and community. Furthermore, like teaching, where teachers assign grades, supervisors operate within a power dynamic, for example, wielding "power" over evaluation outcomes.

For the purposes of this paper, we bring together the definitions of supervision for inservice teachers and teacher candidates to define supervision in teacher education as the function, or process, aimed at developing or enhancing teachers' (both inservice and preservice) growth and development in becoming equity-minded and equity-driving in their instructional practice to improve PK-12 student learning.

Although sometimes used interchangeably, supervision and supervisor are not synonymous; supervision is a function and supervisor is a role (Glickman et al., 2018). Individuals who enact the function of supervision of inservice teachers may be in roles with titles such as principal, teacher leader, instructional coach, department chair, professional learning community facilitator, etc. Individuals who enact the function of supervision of teacher candidates may be in roles with titles such as university supervisor, cooperating teacher, mentor teacher, school-based teacher educator, university-based teacher educator, clinical educator, etc. (Burns & Baker, 2016). For the purposes of this paper, we unite these formal roles under the term supervisor to mean *any individual in a formal role who enacts the function of supervision in teacher education*.

Conceptual Framework

Our conceptual paper draws upon several key concepts in supervision that focus on the supervisor, their thinking, and their ways of operating in the world. We present these concepts in chronological order, which illustrates the evolution of the supervisory lens, a construct that strongly influences the enactment of practice. This section begins with Garman's (1982) descriptions of collegiality in clinical supervision and is followed by Sergiovanni and Starratt's (2007) images of supervisors in schools. Then we share Levin and Nolan's (2014) authority bases followed by espoused platforms and educational philosophies (Nolan & Hoover, 2011) and supervision for social justice (Jacobs & Casciola, 2016). Finally, we conclude this section by using these key concepts to define what we mean by "supervisory lens".

Garman's Descriptions of Collegiality in Clinical Supervision

One of the earliest characterizations or images of clinical supervision was Noreen Garman's work in the early 1980s. During this time, supervisors began implementing Cogan's (1973) and Goldhammer's (1969) concept of clinical supervision. Unfortunately, the concept of clinical supervision had been distilled and oversimplified in practice to a cyclical model of pre-conference, observation, and post-conference. Garman, who was Cogan's student, pushed back at this distillation and instead argued that clinical supervision was more than a three-step cycle.

Instead, clinical supervision was about the supervisor's frame of mind and that collegial frame of mind significantly influenced the enactment of supervision, including the pre-conference, observation, and post-conference cycle. Garman (1982) identified four "metaphors" for collegiality in clinical supervision to describe those frames of mind: (1) the alienated critic, (2) the neutral observer, (3) the connected participant, and (4) the organic member.

The Alienated Critic has no emotional investment in the process, which allows the supervisor to be completely removed or alienated from the process of supervision. Their past experiences give them the authority to critique teaching. The Alienated Critic does not identify with the teacher and instead sees the role of supervisor as telling the teacher what they have done right and what they have done wrong. The Alienated Critic does not seek to understand the reasoning or rationale behind teaching, instructional decision-making, student behavior, etc; their job is to pass judgment on and perhaps correct teacher behavior.

The Neutral Observer is characterized as dispassionate, neutral, and objective, and maintains a detached position in the clinical supervisory relationship. There is a lack of compassion for the teacher. The Neutral Observer sees the responsibility of the supervisor to be capturing or recording the facts and leaving the interpretation and the responsibility to improve practice to the teacher.

The Connected Participant is considered the first step toward collegiality and is characterized by mutual affinity, respect, and affection even if there is disagreement. The Connected Participant recognizes that both the supervisor and the teacher each have their own roles and responsibilities and that they need to work together to improve teaching and learning. The hierarchical relationship between supervisor and teacher still exists but is not as wide as with the Neutral Observer or the Alienated Critic.

The Organic Member is characterized by honesty, trustworthiness, genuine participation, and a shared and invested commitment to supporting K-12 student learning. The Organic Member and teacher are indistinguishable and even interchangeable in the supervisory process. They see teaching as a problem-solving activity and genuinely exchange ideas, resolve disagreements, and analyze data collaboratively to improve teaching and learning. With this relationship a dynamic tension is ever present that challenges and stimulates thinking and conversation to solve educational dilemmas within the classroom.

Garman argued that the supervisor's frame of mind was so powerful that it truly determined the strength of the relationship and the opportunity for collaboration and collegiality. She shared,

> "Many supervisors get stuck somewhere between alienated critic and neutral observer. They have developed the facile skills and language associated with scientific-like techniques and can assume a neutral, descriptive position for a period of time only to return, even more articulate, to the comforts of the *alienated critic,* not wanting the responsibility for action and accountability" (p. 41).

It is possible that Garman's metaphors of collegiality were the beginning of thinking about and conceptualizing the important role that the supervisory lens has in influencing the enactment of supervision.

Sergiovanni and Starratt's Images of Supervisors

Another characterization of how a supervisor's frame of mind can influence the enactment of supervision can be found in Sergiovanni and Starratt's (2007) images of supervisors. To illustrate how supervisors are grounded in different theoretical frameworks, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) depicted a fictional scenario in which a school's teachers were dissatisfied with the curriculum and climate, causing the principal to request a transfer. They asked the reader to imagine, as a supervisor, how they might respond to the situation. To illustrate how supervisors from different theoretical positions, or frames of mind, might handle the situation, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) created four images and labeled them: Supervisor A, B, C, and D.

Supervisor A represents a scientific management theory, supporting a "highly structured and finely tuned teaching and learning system characterized by close connections among objectives, curriculum, teaching methods, and testing" (p. 21). This supervisor blames the situation on the teacher's being unwilling and unable to "do what they are supposed to do" (p. 12). The solution, from this supervisor's point of view, is training teachers to become more effective.

On the other hand, Supervisor B embraces a human relations strategy and is more concerned with how the teachers in this situation are treated. Supervisor B places the most emphasis on relationships among everyone involved. This supervisor believes the solution lies in talking with administration about treating the teachers with more appreciation and respect and noting how the competitive performance evaluation system is causing problems.

Like Supervisor B, Supervisor C also subscribes to a human relations model but instead focuses on shared values and goals, which leads to increased commitment and motivation among the teachers; this means providing teachers with decision making and responsibility. In Supervisor C's eyes, the solution lies in giving teachers more autonomy and responsibility to make decisions about their work; "The best strategy is to provide the overall framework and let teachers figure out how to implement it" (p. 13).

Finally, Supervisor D also emphasizes shared values, but Sergiovanni and Starratt felt that it was, "...hard to put a label on supervisor D's theory of supervision" as "shared values can take many forms" (p. 21). These norms can manifest as professional or community norms or a felt need among the teachers to look after one another. To deal with the situation, this supervisor takes a moral perspective, asking to put the current system on hold and reexamine the shared values and norms among the parties. As a result, less emphasis will be placed on "prescribing what needs to be done and to providing direct supervision" (p. 14).

In summarizing these images, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) conceded that the images were an "oversimplification" and "probably none is exclusively adequate" (p. 22). They noted that depending on changing circumstances, different models may be more appropriate than others. However, by creating these images, Sergiovanni and Starratt propelled the field of supervision

forward giving perhaps oversimplified and extreme but illustrative visions of how a supervisor's lens could so strongly influence their practice. These models demonstrated the power and influence the supervisor's theoretical position can have on the enactment of supervision and, by consequence, on teacher learning and student achievement.

Authority Bases

As noted earlier, we subscribe to the notion of the act of supervision as an "act of teaching," and thus, turned to a theoretical framework to help inform the power dynamic inherent within supervision and how power might influence the various images we posit in this paper. We contend that supervisors use different authority bases that influence their supervision. Building on the work of French and Raven (1960), Levin and Nolan (1991, 2014) posited four types of authority bases that teachers use to influence student behavior. The four bases include: (1) referent authority, (2) expert authority, (3) legitimate authority, and (4) reward/coercive authority. They are presented in a hierarchy, starting with those that encourage student-centered control to those that exercise the most teacher-based control.

Known as *referent authority,* this power base is grounded in the idea that students follow the teacher because the two have a positive relationship. The teacher develops this relationship with students through positive communication (e.g. non-verbal gestures, written, verbal, providing time and attention). Students respond to the teacher's directions because they like the teacher as a person.

Expert authority allows teachers to influence student behavior because they perceive the teacher as knowledgeable in a particular area of study. For this to occur, students must value learning and view the teacher as possessing knowledge and the ability to teach that knowledge.

Moving towards teacher-centered power, *legitimate authority* operates under the notion that teachers, being in a position of legal, formal authority, believe and expect students to behave and follow directions. If students "view them as fitting the stereotypical images of the teacher (e.g., in dress, speech, and mannerisms)" (p. 94) and accept this positioning, then they will respond positively to this form of authority.

Teachers using *reward/coercive authority* to influence student behavior through consistent use of rewards and punishment, which may involve "praise, gold stars, free time" as well as "verbal reprimands, loss of recess or free time, detention" or suspension (p. 95). Students respond to reward/coercive authority if the reward or punishment is worth it.

Levin and Nolan point out that effective teachers likely use a combination of these authority bases as they get to know students and can align their authority base with positive student behavior. Although Levin and Nolan's authority bases describe student response to teacher behavior, we draw upon this literature to posit how teachers may respond to supervisor behavior as supervisors use different authority bases in their supervision of teachers to support student learning. The supervisory lens likely influences the kind of authority base used when working with teachers.

Supervisory Platform and Educational Philosophies

Platforms are an individual's beliefs, values, attitudes, assumptions, etc. that are either espoused or enacted without articulation (Nolan & Hoover, 2010). They may also be synonymous with what Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) referred to as personal theories. Just as platforms exist for education, supervisors also should examine their own platforms by questioning, for example, how they define instructional supervision, the purpose of supervision, the recipients and providers of supervision, and the necessary skills, knowledge, values, and attitudes (Glickman et al., 2018). Furthermore, a supervisory platform relates to the major educational philosophies of essentialism, experimentalism, and existentialism. Essentialism views the supervisor as someone who teaches truth. Within this philosophy, the supervisor is the most knowledgeable; teachers then "feed content" to students, and in the process of teaching truths, advance closer to become successful teachers.

On the other hand, supervision grounded in experimentalism, found in the writings of Dewey, involves preparing teachers who are not satisfied with current states of knowledge. Thus, supervisors envision schools as spaces for experimentation and innovation (Glickman et al., 2018). Rather than hold the truths, supervisors grounded in experientialism work collectively with teachers to pass on existing knowledge but also pursue exploratory learning. Applying existentialism to supervision means a major emphasis on individual teacher choice, where teachers explore their own abilities and intrinsically drive their own learning. While the supervisor does not volunteer sharing of knowledge, they are there to help and guide teachers.

Some supervision scholars have framed supervision grounded in experimentalism as a co-generative activity where supervisor and teacher look at the classroom through an inquiry stance (Cook, 1996; Glanz & Heimann, 2019; Gordon, 2008; Nolan, 2000; Sergiovanni, 1984). This platform recognizes the complexity of classrooms, sees problems as opportunities for learning, and engages teachers as active participants in developing a reflective stance toward their practice. Platforms influence the supervisory lens and strongly contribute to how a supervisor sees and enacts supervision.

Jacobs and Casciola's Supervision for Social Justice

Noting continuous cultural, linguistic, and economic diversity in schools, Jacobs and Casciola (2016) contend that the structure of schools can lead to inequities and disparities in access to pre-school, well-funded schools, various support services, and nurturing environments for students. Emphasizing the need for social justice leaders, Jacobs and Casciola (2016) conceptualized supervision as social justice by tying it to ideas of morality discussed by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), framing supervision as critical inquiry (Smyth, 2011), and connecting supervision to cultural responsiveness (Bowers & Flinders, 1991; Gay, 1998).

Beginning with one's platform, examining one's beliefs, values, opinions, and attitudes, and engaging in readings, cultural autobiographies, reflective journals, and other inward searching activities, supervisors can develop a social justice lens, thus connecting "their platforms to issues of equity and justice in order to support the leaning of ALL children" (p. 227). Jacobs and Casciola assert that this social justice lens then influences the enactment of one's supervision.

The Supervisory Lens

When supervisors enact supervision, they draw upon a knowledge base and skill set that is filtered through the ways in which they see and exist in the world (Glickman et al., 2018). This filter is composed of their values, attitudes, assumptions, and beliefs, which are referred to as personal theories (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Nolan and Hoover (2010) argued for supervisors to make transparent their personal theories, which they called an espoused platform, and they advocated for supervisors to align that which they espouse with that which they practice, known as a platform-in-action. Jacobs and Casciola (2016) developed a supervisory lens that "influences the supervisor's personal characteristics, which in turn influences how a supervisor enacts the function of supervision" (p. 227). Personal characteristics include knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills, which Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2018) referred to as prerequisites. Likewise, Arnold (2016) asserts that culturally responsive supervisors embody a set of values and principles and demonstrate certain attitudes and behaviors, which allow them to operate cross-culturally in schools.

For the purposes of this paper, we add to this line of thinking by drawing upon the concept of frame of reference (Mezirow, 1997, 2000) to continue to define a supervisory lens. Mezirow argued that an individual's frame of reference consists of habits of mind and includes a person's point of view. A habit of mind is a "set of assumptions-broad, generalized, orienting predispositions that act as a filter for interpreting the meaning of experience" Mezirow, 2000, p. 17). For example, habits of mind could involve one's social norms, religious philosophy, learning style, personality, and self-concept. Drawing on this work as well as the aforementioned work, we contend that a supervisor's lens, or supervisory frame of reference, would *involve the supervisor's beliefs and values about practice, their knowledge, their overarching theoretical framework(s), and their concepts, ideas, and philosophies about supervision in general*. This frame might have resulted from past experiences in the field, interactions with teachers, students, and other supervisors and professors, readings, reflection, research, and exposure to new ideas through conferences and coursework. As Glickman and colleagues' (2018) model of supervision asserts, a supervisor's lens is also informed by their knowledge and skill. For instance, an experienced supervisor's lens, and thus, how they enact the function of supervision, would likely look different from the lens of a newly appointed supervisor, say a graduate student who recently emerged from a K-12 classroom.

Revised Images of the Supervisor in Teacher Education

The purpose of this conceptual paper is to draw upon several sources of literature in instructional supervision of inservice teachers and teacher candidates to re-conceptualize images of supervisors in teacher education. Throughout the decades, supervision approaches have evolved for several areas, for example, a premodern era, where the focus was on inspection, a modern era where the movement was towards democratizing supervision, and a postmodern period, where supervision is highly technical in nature (Glanz, 2000). While there might be other supervision frameworks, such as cognitive coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1989) that have helped us understand the field, in the section below, we focus on what we believe have been the fundamental frameworks guiding supervision.

Our process of arriving at revised images of supervisors began with considering early conceptualizations of the supervisor, in this case, Garman's (1982) writings about how a supervisor's frame of mind strongly influences collaboration and collegiality. We synthesized this conceptualization with Glickman, Gordon's, and Ross-Gordon's (2018) ideas on the process of supervision and how education philosophies might impact the frame of reference of supervisors, as these philosophies influence how knowledge and learning is conceived. We further complexified our conceptualization by factoring in the four images posed by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007), which breathed additional life into the notion of supervisors subscribing to various theoretical frameworks; we also revisited Burns' (2012) contributions to these images, including providing the images with monikers and connecting them to Levin and Nolan's (2014) power bases and sources of influence.

During this process, we consulted "newly evolving" images resulting from added emphasis on social justice and cultural diversity emanating in schools. We also turned to Haberlin's (2020) work on introducing contemplative practices to supervision. Based on the mindfulness movement in schools and teacher education, and the inclusion of contemplative pedagogy in higher education, Haberlin has argued that supervision should consider this paradigm to expand current, Westernized notions of supervision models.

With this literature synthesis in hand, we held regular discussions on how these ideas might merge and morph into revised, refreshed conceptualizations of supervisors that might push the field forward to better envision how supervisors might perceive themselves and the frame of reference that impacts their decisions and actions in practice. In addition, we presented these images to supervision scholars, requesting feedback (Burns & Haberlin, 2021).

This merging of ideas involved re-naming the images, pinpointing their theoretical orientations, identifying sources of influence, and providing characteristic descriptions. We define sources of influence as being the kinds of authority (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007) and power bases (Levin & Nolan, 2014) used to influence teachers to change their behavior. Thus, we present to you five revised images of supervisors in teacher education, which we have named: (1) The Critic, (2) The Popular Parent, (3) The Co-Inquirer, (4) The Advocate, and (5) The Contemplative Supervisor. For each image, we provide a description and characteristics and the supervisory lens, which is composed of the theoretical frame and the sources of influence, that influences how the supervisor sees and enacts supervision. Table 1 provides a snapshot of these images, their distinctive characteristics, and the supervisory lens composed of theoretical orientation(s) and source(s) of influence.

In the spirit of transparency, we are aware that our conceptions are latent with inherent biases, stemming from our own knowledge, backgrounds, and experiences with instructional supervision. For example, we both believe that evaluation and effective supervision *are not the same thing*. We take the stance that supervision requires coaching, developing a culture of collegiality and care, helping teachers make theory-to-practice connections, and relationship-building (Burns et al., 2016, 2020). Thus, we naturally "lean" toward images that better represent this approach. Nevertheless, we believe presenting these reimagined images – even if flawed – can spark new discussions, theoretical frameworks, and lines of research.

Table 1: *Revised Images of the Supervisor*

Image	Characteristics	Supervisory Lens	
		Theoretical Frame	**Source of Influence**
The Critic	Efficient, Compliance-driven, Detached, Judgmental, Evaluative, Directive, and Narcissistic, Narrow-minded	Scientific Management	Bureaucratic Authority, Legitimate Power
The Popular Parent	Congenial, Caring, Amicable Concerned, Warm, Well-liked	Humans Relations	Personal Authority, Referent Power
The Co-Inquirer	Collegial, Problem-poser, Inquisitive, Collaborative	Human Resource, Transformative Leadership	Technical-rational Authority, Professional Power
The Advocate	Discerning, Equitable, Culturally competent, Mediator, Sense of agency, trying to address educational inequities, Confident disruptor	Critical Social Justice	Moral authority, Equity-centered, Persuasive Power
The Contemplative	Expanded awareness, Wisdom from both mind and heart, Present, Mindful Embracing-rather than shying away-from suffering, uncomfortableness	Eastern views grounded in Mahayana Buddhism and Contemplative Studies	Mindful presence Compassion Interconnectedness

As you read these images, keep in mind a few things. First, the images are intended to be caricatures, accentuating features that distinguish them from each other. These features may be aspects of selves that they admire, or they may be aspects that they dislike, detest, or even fear about themselves. Sometimes these features of self are things that can be changed if there is enough access to resources, will power, and desire. Since caricatures show how others view the manifestations of the inward self, these revised images illustrate how teachers and teacher candidates may perceive supervisors.

Second, it should be assumed that each of these revised images operate from the stance of instructional improvement. However, how they approach that process differs greatly. No image's

intention is to do harm; they are all intended to do good - to improve outcomes, but how they approach supervision and the resulting unintended outcomes vary greatly based on their supervisory lens and how that lens influences their practice.

The Critic

The first revised image of a supervisor in teacher education is *The Critic.* This image is characterized by descriptors like efficient, compliance-driven, detached, judgmental, evaluative, directive, and narcissistic. The Critic approaches supervision from a hierarchical perspective - the supervisor is the knowledgeable other. It is their job to identify what a teacher, be it an inservice or preservice teacher, is doing wrong and tell them how to fix it. Thus, their status and positioning as *the* knowledgeable other allows them to self-justify or rationalize their directive, judgmental, and evaluative behavior. Their supervision is highly influenced, if not dictated by, compliance-driven activities like rules and regulations, requirements, standards, and paperwork. They are often highly efficient and have distilled supervision primarily to the technical practice of pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation or even checklists to observe teaching behaviors. The Critic has certain visions, standards, and expectations of what teaching is and what "best practice" entails, and they see their role as helping all teachers achieve that perfect status of teacher. Their "sage on the stage" mentality of "they know best," often due to their experiences as veteran teacher or administrator coupled with their perceived positional status of supervisor, produces narcissistic supervision (Pajak, 2012). Although The Critic aims to improve instruction practice, which they may do, the unintended outcomes of narcissistic supervision create a false preoccupation with achieving perfection in teaching, which stifles creativity, diminishes adaptability, and discourages risk taking and innovation (Pajak, 2012).

This image is rooted in the theoretical frame of scientific management, which is an orientation characterized by process/product and efficiency (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992; MacNeil, 1980; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). Improvement in outcomes resides in fixing the cogs, or teachers in this case, in the system through identifying flaws and providing direct feedback for improvement. The Critic's supervisory lens implies that improvement, or better outcomes for kids, resides in the teacher; teachers are the key to student learning. Thus, they need better training and better performance to impact student achievement. Therefore, the Critic is concerned with analyzing, assessing, and judging teachers' performance to tell them what they did wrong and how they can improve. The Critic acts much like Garman's (1982) conception of the alienated critic in that they are distanced and detached from the emotional and human component of supervision.

The Critic has total control over the supervision process; the teacher has little, if any, voice. Thus, The Critic draws from a bureaucratic source of authority, which means that teachers are expected to comply with the standards, guidelines, rules, and other regulations set forth by the overarching institution like school district policies, university guidelines, teacher preparation program expectations, state boards of education rules, state standards for education, and so on (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The Critic uses the legitimate power base, which means that a person has power because of their position or status (Levin & Nolan, 2014). Teachers respond to The Critic because The Critic is in a position of power or in a perceived position of power. Although The Critic is not always adversarial, bureaucratic authority and legitimate power

coupled with a scientific management theoretical frame often create an adversarial environment for teachers.

In today's high stakes accountability, The Critic could be likened to peer evaluators, department of education inspectors, school district leaders, or university supervisors who make infrequent or few visits a semester to observe teaching. These individuals are basically outsiders, who step into schools and classrooms for brief moments of time, to document and "ding" teachers for what they perceive teachers are doing incorrectly without having deep or vested conversations with teachers. In teacher preparation, The Critic could be a university supervisor who visits a few times a semester to "observe," essentially inspect, the progress of the teacher candidate. The university supervisor makes little to no attempt to know the schools, the classrooms, the school-based teacher educators, or anything else connected to the clinical experiences. This supervisor may even conduct observations using technology from the comfort of their office or have teacher candidates videotape their lessons and send them in for feedback.

The Popular Parent

The second revised image of a supervisor in teacher education is *The Popular Parent.* This image is characterized by descriptors like congenial, caring, amicable, concerned, warm, and well-liked. While not as hierarchical in positionality as The Critic, The Popular Parent still maintains distance in the relationship between supervisor and teacher as this image sees their supervision as practically parental. The Popular Parent perceives that their experience in education and teaching helps them guide teachers. Their parental approach is very caring, and they are greatly concerned with teachers, their happiness, and teachers' perceptions of them as supervisors. They perceive the status that comes with "supervisor" exists but wish to diminish it by being liked by teachers - in essence, they are concerned greatly with teachers' happiness and how well teachers like them as a person. The unintended consequences of parental supervision can be enabling, an overabundance of reliance on supervisors to solve problems for teachers; thus, teachers may struggle to develop the abilities to self-reflect, problem solve, and inquire into their practice.

This image is rooted in the theoretical frame of human relations, which is an orientation characterized by likeability (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007). The Popular Parent's supervisory lens implies that if the teacher is happy, then student learning will occur. Thus, teachers' wellbeing and happiness in teaching drives their supervision and takes priority over student learning outcomes. The Popular Parent may spend a great deal of their time talking with teachers and responding to their emotional needs. Thus, The Popular Parent and their teachers have a true affinity for each other but struggle to translate the power of those relationships into outcomes for students.

The Popular Parent supervisor still drives much of the supervision process, but their decisions are based on teachers' happiness and how well the teachers respond to them. This image draws upon referent power, which argues that teachers respond to a supervisor because of how well they like the supervisor as a person (Levin & Nolan, 2014). The Popular Parent's source of authority is personal (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007) and parental in that they position themselves as a "caring elder," like a parent or big brother/sister, who can provide supportive guidance. The

Popular Parent dislikes discontent and discord; thus, they may avoid conflict in their supervision to preserve teachers' happiness and teachers' positive perceptions of them as supervisor.

In today's context of school, The Popular Parent could be likened to many roles like instructional coach, principal, mentor teacher, or university supervisor. For example, they could be an instructional coach who was selected to be in their role because they were well liked by their peers. Thus, maintaining these strong relationships and their position as confidant is important. This instructional coach would spend more time talking with teachers about issues and concerns, the latest lunchroom gossip, etc. than conversations about instruction, student needs, and learning outcomes. An example of The Popular Parent in teacher preparation could be likened to a mentor teacher who does not want to upset their teacher candidate, so they withhold their perspective or avoid conversations. Since they do not like conflict, they avoid difficult conversations and instead seek out others, like another mentor teacher or the university supervisor, to have conversations about practice and address issues and concerns.

The Co-Inquirer

The third revised image of a supervisor in teacher education is *The Co-Inquirer*. This image is characterized by collegiality. Unlike The Popular Parent who was more congenial, The Co-Inquirer approaches supervision from the perspective of comradery. The Co-Inquirer recognizes teaching as highly complex and sees problems of practice as opportunities for investigation and learning. They are inquisitive and work with teachers to see problems as possibilities. They reframe problems as questions to be explored together. Their relationship with teachers is practically flat, recognizing that each of them has assets and can contribute to conversations about practice. The Co-Inquirer recognizes and values teachers as colleagues; together, they are in pursuit of solving problems to make better outcomes for kids. This image is rooted in the theoretical frame of human resource management, which is an orientation characterized by focusing on the nature of relationships and commitment to organizational or mutual goals (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2007).

The Co-Inquirer draws from a technical-rational source of authority coupled with a professional power base. A technical-rational source of authority means teachers respond to the supervision process because of data and evidence rather than the likability of the other person. Thus, The Co-Inquirer approaches supervision from a data-driven perspective in that the supervisor and teacher generate tools to gather data, co-analyze those data, and make evidence-based claims about the question of practice they are collaboratively exploring. The Co-Inquirer believes that data will be convincing enough to influence changes in practice. In addition to a technical-rational source of authority, The Co-Inquirer draws from a professional power base, meaning they operate from the stance of educator and leader as professional.

The Advocate

The next image is that of *The Advocate.* This image is characterized by notions of equity, social justice, racial justice, and cultural responsiveness. This supervisor is deeply concerned with social inequities, such as racial injustice, lack of resources or low socio-economic students, and bridging differences for culturally rich students. This person speaks out against inequities,

intentionally disrupts systems, procedures, and practices that do not serve teachers and students. They are very much about "righting wrongs" and "leveling the playing field."

This image is grounded in theoretical frameworks of critical race theory (see Crenshaw et al., 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 201), which emerged in the 1970s as a group of scholars, activist, and lawyers responded against the stalling and regressions of advances of the Civil Rights movement. Among its basic tents, critical race theory posits that racism is a social construct that is difficult to "cure" since it is not acknowledged (i.e. "color blindness) and large segments of society – particularly elite-class and working class whites – have little motivation to eradicate it (Delgado & Stefancic, 2017). Regarding the U.S. education system, critical race theory scholars have argued that, while some might suggest that poor students in general struggle academically, regardless of their race, "the cause of their poverty in conjunction with the condition of their schools and schooling is institutional and structural racism" (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2016, p. 55).

The Advocate draws power from intensifying geo-political and societal movements, including Diversity, Equity, Inclusion (DEI) initiatives and a groundswell of anti-racism and equality activism, including an unprecedented number of protests focused on racial justice following the death of George Floyd (United Nations, 2021). Though, it should be noted that ,as of writing, there have been stark attacks on the DEI movement and related initiatives, including in k-12 schools and higher education from conservative leaders such as Florida Governor Ron DeSantis. In practice, the Advocate supervisor spends time getting to know a teacher or teacher candidate, trying to understand their life histories, cultural lens, fund of knowledge, and assets. In addition, instructional planning and conferencing are likely full of conversations about whose voice "gets represented" in the classroom and whose perspective might be missing. As Mette and colleagues (2023) advise when writing about culturally responsive school leaders, The Advocate intentionally works to dismantle harmful educational practices (e.g., biased assignments/tests, disproportionate/inequitable discipline policies).

The Contemplative

The most recently conceived image is that of the *Contemplative*. This image is characterized by descriptors such as: expanded awareness, acting from both the mind and heart, being mindful of self and others, having presence, exercising recognition and choice in the moment, and a strong sense of compassion and altruism, for example, embracing-rather than shying away from suffering, uncomfortableness. Rather than based in a hierarchical position, the Contemplative operates from a connected, shared sense of humanity. They value equanimity and interconnectedness, thus working closely with teachers and grounded in empathy and compassion. They are driven by the desire to help all teachers and students unfold potential and decrease varying degrees of suffering.

The Contemplative image is grounded in the theoretical frame of Mahayana Buddhism and Westernized notions of contemplative studies, including current application of mindfulness in society, including education (see Jennings, 2015; Magee, 2019; Neale, 2017; Owens, 2020). This supervisor operates from a space that we might call the *awakened heart-mind* or *bodhicitta*, as it is referred to in the Mahayana Buddhist tradition. The Contemplative supervisor works to

increase their awareness, potential, and compassion not to merely benefit herself or relieve stress but rather to make themselves more beneficial to others. With increased compassion and insight, this supervisor positions themselves to contribute more to teachers and students, to become part of the solution.

Practices for this supervisor include mindfulness and meditation but also heart-practices such as *metta* or loving kindness and giving and taking meditation or *tonglen* (Owens, 2020), a technique that's currently being explored to assist with racial justice and equity issues. Rather than shy away from suffering and discomfort, the Contemplative views challenges and negatives that happen within schools as "good medicine," using those situations to bring out their best qualities, such as compassion, kindness, generosity, and insight. By being present and practicing mindfulness, or present-moment, non-judgmental, awareness, this supervisor works to create a holding space or gap, where they can empathically relate to others and respond consciously and more positively rather than from a place of habitual reactivity. Drawing on what is known as "attitudes of mindfulness," the contemplative might approach his work with beginner's mind (an open, curious mindset), practice patience, acceptance, and letting go of expectations of how things *should be*.

The Contemplative source of power is more of an internal strength (known in Chinese as *chi* or Indian traditions as *prana*) where teachers might respond to them based on their sincere compassion, present-centered energy and attention, and heightened sense of connectedness. Unlike supervising through authority or being "liked," this supervisor leads through an "presence of shared humanity."

Discussion

As noted, the creation of supervisory images enables educational leaders to further ponder and reflect on their own practices, the lenses, the theoretical frameworks, and power and authority sources that inform and influence their work. While a supervisor may be a combination of images, perhaps drawing characteristics from multiple caricatures, these exaggerated caricatures can serve as a sort of mirror to hold up—to see what resonates, what "bounces back," thus causing instructional leaders to deeply examine their beliefs, knowledge, and skills. The revised conceptions in this paper represent an updated version, accounting for recent changes in education, societal issues, and other factors. For example, while incredibly helpful Sergiovanni and Starratt's images were conceived in the early 2000s—a lot has changed since then. National and worldwide movements, including racial and social justice attention as well as social emotional learning and mindfulness, certainly play a role in influencing school policy, curriculum, instructional practices, and thus, supervisory beliefs and approaches. It should also be noted that we do not believe there is an implied hierarchy among the images, that one should be ranked above or below another since the images represent more supervisory stances, approaches, and beliefs, which are a matter of preference. The images ordered in Table 1 represent more as a chronology, reflecting societal changes and educational reforms and how certain supervision stances and beliefs took precedence. While some might believe the various images serve as a sort of evolution of practice, the paper's purpose is not to judge the images or tell supervisors what to adopt.

Of course, these newly conceived images can easily be problematized (and should be fully examined to hold their weight). One tension is sorting out whether a supervisor can embody more than one image, particularly two images that are apparently at odds, at least in some instances. For example, could someone with a scientific management perspective embody a social justice platform? Could The Critic—bent on efficiency, evaluation, and directing others to follow specific standards and guidelines—truly also fight for racial equality in their assigned school? Would they have the time, interest, motivation, and a "wide-enough" lens to tackle such an endeavor? Whether such contradictory images could be reconciled to support teacher preparation and learning is debatable and provides material for rich discussion among supervision scholars.

On the contrary, might other combinations of images prove more complimentary? If The Advocate embodies aspects of The Contemplative, could this enhance a supervisor's compassion "fuel tank," increasing their drive to lobby for equitable use of academic resources and teaching practices in classrooms—as well as the necessary present-moment awareness to recognize inequities—where they work? Would this supervisor, though, need additional training and guidance to harness their advocacy, so their enhanced mindfulness and compassion doesn't result in their becoming overly sensitive to situations and others, causing heightened stress and angst?

The images can serve as a theoretical framework to encourage future research, which can help us better grasp how supervision beliefs and stances impact teacher and student outcomes. Findings from such studies could inform and shape policy, such as those national initiatives (AACTE, 2010: NCATE, 2010) cited at the beginning of this article. In addition, a framework developed from these images could better inform professional learning of supervisors, helping them to unpack their own beliefs, stance, and views as they color practice.

In essence, are there combinations or *ideal blends* of images that really empower supervisors to use their power, positionality, and privilege responsibly to act in justice-oriented ways to support teacher learning? We wonder, through exploration of these images, and their characteristics and power bases, and by intentionally possibly mixing and overlapping, does the whole become greater than the sum of its parts? Is a different quality created within supervision practice?

Finally, in addition to assisting an individual teacher or teacher candidate, further discourse and examination should be focused on the larger impact of these revised images within the context of supervision, namely teacher preparation being caught in nested marginalization. We believe this updated conceptual framework could serve as a theoretical model to improve the understanding of supervision practice, thus helping to raise its status beyond technical assistance.

References

American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Clinical Practice Commission. (2018). *A pivot toward clinical practice, its lexicon, and the renewal of educator preparation: A report of the AACTE Clinical Practice Commission*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Arnold, N.W. (2016). Cultural competencies and supervision. In J. Glanz & S.J. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice* (pp.201-220). Rowman & Littlefield.

Basmadjian, K. G. (2011). Learning to balance assistance with assessment: A scholarship of field instruction. *Teacher Educator, 46*(2), 98-125. https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.552845

Bolin, F. S., & Panaritis, P. (1992). Searching for a common purpose: A perspective on the history of supervision. *Supervision in Transition*, 30-43.

Bowers, C.A. & Flinders, D.J. (1991). *Culturally responsive teaching and supervision: A handbook for staff development*. Teachers College Press.

Burns, R. W. (2012). *Conceptualizing supervision in the professional development school context: A case analysis* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest.

Burns, R. W., & Badiali, B. (2015). When supervision is conflated with evaluation: Teacher candidates' perception of their novice supervisor. *Action in Teacher Education, 37*(4), 418-437. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2015.1078757

Burns, R. W., & Baker, W. (2016). The boundary spanner in professional development schools: In search of common nomenclature. *School-University Partnerships*, *9*(2), 28-39.

Burns, R.W. & Haberlin, S. (2021). *Re-conceptualizing images of supervisors in teacher education* [Conference presentation]. Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision Annual Conference. Bangor. Maine.

Burns, R., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2016). Preservice teacher supervision within field experiences in a decade of reform. *Teacher Education and Practice*, *29*(1), 46-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1226203

Butler, B., Burns, R. W., & Willey, C. (2023). Toward a renewal of supervisory scholarship and practice in teacher education: A collaborative self-study. *Journal of Educational Supervision, 6*(3), 47-68. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.6.3.3

Burns, R. W., Jacobs, J., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2020). A framework for naming the scope and nature of preservice teacher supervision in clinically based teacher preparation: Tasks, high-leverage practices, and pedagogical routines of practice. *The Teacher Educator, 55*(2), 214-238. DOI: 10.1080/08878730.2019

Cook, G. E. (1996). Using clinical supervision to promote inquiry. *Journal of Staff Development, 17*(4) 46-50.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (1989). The art of cognitive coaching: Supervision for intelligent teaching. *Training Syllabus, Institute for Intelligent Behavior*, *950*.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (1995). *Critical race theory. The key writings that formed the movement.* The New Press.

Cuenca, A. (Ed.). (2013). *Supervising student teachers: Issues, perspectives and future directions*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 547–561. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2014.939009

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2017). Critical race theory: An introduction (Vol. 20). NYU press.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, *103*(6), 1013-1055. https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00141

French, J.R.P. & Raven, B (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics: Research and theory.* Row-Peterson.

Garman, N. B. (1982). The clinical approach to supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Supervision of teaching: 1982 yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* (pp. 35-52). ASCD.

Gay, G. (1998). Cultural, ethnic, and gender issues. In G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (Eds.) *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 1184-1227). Macmillan Library Reference USA.

Glanz, J., & Heimann, R. (2019). Encouraging reflective practice in educational supervision through action research and appreciative inquiry. In S. J. Zepeda & J. A. Ponticell (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Educational Supervision*, pp. 353-378.

Glanz, J. (2000). Supervision: Don't discount the value of the modern. In J. Glanz & L.S. Behar-Horenstein (Eds.), *Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision: Modern and postmodern perspectives* (pp. 70-92). Bergin & Garvey.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2018). *SuperVision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach (10th edition)*. New York City, NY: Pearson.

Gordon, S. P. (2008). Dialogic reflective inquiry: Integrative function of instructional supervision. *Catalyst for Change, 25*(2), 4-11.

Haberlin, S. (2020). Mindfulness-based supervision: Awakening to new possibilities. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, *3*(3), 75. https://doi.org/10.31045/jes.3.3.6

Jacobs, J., & Burns, R. W. (2021). *(Re) designing programs: A vision for equity-centered, clinically based teacher preparation*. IAP.

Jacobs, J. & Casciola, V. (2016). Supervision for social justice. In J. Glanz & S.J. Zepeda (Eds.), *Supervision: New perspectives for theory and practice* (pp.201-220). Rowman & Littlefield.

Jennings, P. A. (2015). *Mindfulness for teachers: Simple skills for peace and productivity in the classroom (the Norton series on the social neuroscience of education)*. WW Norton & Company.

Labaree, D. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2016). Toward a critical race theory of education. In Critical race theory in education (pp. 10-31). Routledge.

Levin, J. & Nolan, J. F. (1991). *Principles of classroom management: A hierarchical approach*. Prentice–Hall Inc.

Levin, J., & Nolan, J. F. (2014). *Principles of classroom management: A professional decision-making model*. New Jersey: Pearson.

MacNeil, R. D. (1980). The relationship of cognitive style and instructional style to the learning performance of undergraduate students. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *73*(6), 354-359. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1980.10885265

Magee, R. V. (2019). *The inner work of racial justice: Healing ourselves and transforming our communities through mindfulness*. TarcherPerigee.

Mette, I. M., Cormier, D. R., & Oliveras, Y. (2023). *Making a difference: Instructional leadership that drives self-reflection and values the expertise of teachers*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* (74), 5-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.7401

Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series*.

National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2010). Transforming teacher education through clinical practice: A national strategy to prepare effective teachers. A report of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Clinical Preparation and Partnership for Improved Student Learning. NCATE

Neale, M. (2017) in Loizzo, J. E., Neale, M. E., & Wolf, E. J. (2017). *Advances in contemplative psychotherapy: Accelerating healing and transformation*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Nolan, J. (2022). Foreword. In R. W. Burns, L. Baecher, & J. McCorvey (Eds.), *Advancing supervision in clinically based teacher education: Advances, challenges, opportunities*. Information Age Publishing.

Nolan, J. (2000). *The influence of the Professional Development School context on my practice as a student teaching supervisor: A personal narrative.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New Orleans, LA, April 24-28.

Nolan, J., & Hoover, L. (2010). Teacher evaluation and supervision. Wiley & Sons.

Ochieng' Ong'ondo, C., & Borg, S. (2011). "We teach plastic lessons to please them": the influence of supervision on the practice of English language student teachers in Kenya. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(4), 509-528. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412881

Owens, L. R. (2020). *Love and rage: The path of liberation through anger*. North Atlantic Books.

Pajak, E. F. (2012). Willard Waller's sociology of teaching reconsidered: "What does teaching do to teachers?" *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(6), 1182-1213. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831212444591

Parker, A., Zenkov, K. & Dennis, D. (2019). Exploring the lexicon or lack thereof in clinical teacher preparation. *Action in Teacher Education, 41*(3), 249-264. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2019.1600601

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982). *Supervision of teaching*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sergiovanni, T. (1984). Expanding conceptions of inquiry and practice in supervision and evaluation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 6*(4), 355-365. https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737006004355

Sergiovanni, S., & Starratt, R.J. (2007). *Supervision: A redefinition*. McGraw-Hill.

Slick, S. K. (1998). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *14*(8), 821-834. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00028-6

Smyth, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy for social justice* (Vol. 2). A&C Black.

Teitel, L. (1998). Professional development schools: A literature review. In M. Levine (Ed.), *Designing standards that work for professional development schools* (pp. 33–80). Washington, DC: The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

United Nations (2021). Anti-racism activists should be supported and protected- racial justice report. https://www.ohchr.org/en/stories/2021/07/anti-racism-activists-should-be-supported-and-protected-racial-justice-report

Zeichner, K. M. (2005). A research agenda for teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 737–760). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zeichner, K. (2006). Reflections of a university-based teacher educator on the future of college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*(3), 326-340. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487105285893

Author Biographies

Steve Haberlin is an assistant professor of curriculum and instruction in the Department of Learning Sciences and Educational Research at the University of Central Florida. His research focuses on the implementation of meditation and mindfulness in educational settings. Steve is the author of *Meditation in the College Classroom: A Pedagogical Tool for Helping Students De-Stress, Focus, and Connect.*

Rebecca West Burns, Ph.D. is the dean of the College of Education at Kutztown University of Pennsylvania. Dr. Burns is a nationally recognized scholar of clinically based teacher education in the United States where she studies school-university partnerships, supervision, and teacher leadership. She has held several leadership positions in national organizations like the National Association for School-University Partnerships, the Council of Scholars of Instructional Supervision, and the American Educational Research Association School-University Partnership Research Special Interest Group. Dr. Burns has also designed award-winning teacher education programs and has received national recognition for her impact on urban education.