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Abstract

Principals come to their current positions with their own beliefs about their role, about their practice, and about other educational issues related to the nature of education: schools, teachers, students, community, and professional growth. These and all other factors that influence how principals think about their job are what I refer to as "principals' professional beliefs." This study demonstrated that principals bring to change initiatives their professional beliefs and those beliefs influence how they interpret the language of the change initiative, how they conceptualize the change, and how they plan for enactment of the policy change.

I used a multi-case study approach to examine how eight principals in a school district that was undergoing a district policy change, thought about their enactment of the change at the school level. I identified three groups of principals: (1) supporters of teacher decision making, (2) facilitators of shared values, and (3) promoters of mutual respect. These principals differed in their involvement in the negotiation of the way the change would be carried out in the school, how much and what kinds of support they offered to teachers, and the degree of autonomy they allowed teachers in determining how the change would be implemented. Three questions guided the study: (1) What factors influence principals' responses to a change in school district policy? More specifically, what are the professional and context-specific issues the principals consider as they interpret a school district policy change and plan for their own action in carrying out that change process? (2) How do principals enact the policy changes in their own schools? (3) What impact did the principals perceive that the policy change had on their enactment of their role?

This study provides insights into how principals understand and interpret educational policy language, how they work toward the development of collaborative relationships and collegial cultures, and how their professional beliefs inform their practice. The policy change and the language of the policy is mediated through principals' professional belief systems as they determine how they will enact the policy change. This
study disputes findings in existing literature and contributes to our understanding of change in schools by recognizing that principals play significant roles in change at the school level.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Across North America schools are responding to demands for change from parents, students, government, the workplace, the education profession, and school districts themselves. Although money and other resources often accompany these demands, change efforts have not had a history of successful implementation and continuation (McLaughlin, 1990). Past research has examined change from a multitude of perspectives: stages of change (Fullan, 1991), teacher involvement (Fullan, 1991; MacRae-Campbell 1991), power structures (Sarason, 1990), school culture (Fullan, 1994; Goodlad, 1975; Sarason, 1982), role of the principal (Fullan, 1992), forms of change (Cuban, 1992; Fullan, 1991), and other aspects of change such as empowerment and professional development (Barth, 1991; Kanpol, 1990; McLaughlin & Marsh, 1978; Roberts & Wright, 1992).

This Study

This study examines a district-wide change effort that was developed and supported by teachers and administrators. It was supported by the school district with workshops, teacher release time, and financial support for resources. Unlike past research, this study examines the change effort on a micro and humanistic level, closely examining principals' beliefs and their relation to implementation of district-policy change efforts in eight different schools within one school district. This research explores principals' perceptions and understandings of change.

Contributions to Existing Research

Emerging from the ground-breaking research on school change done in the Rand Change Agent Study, McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) identify four broad factors that they describe as crucial in the implementation and continuation of change: "institutional motivation, project implementation strategies, institutional leadership, and certain teacher
Furthermore, they claim that for both long- and short-term success in implementing change, it is necessary to incorporate collaborative planning, a planning strategy that they describe as incorporating "equal input from teachers and district managers" (p. 73). The only two factors at the school level that they were able to identify as significant in assessing long-term continuation of the change were the support of the school principal and the school climate. They defined three important ways principals needed to be involved in change efforts: "early support for the continuation phase of the innovation cycle, administrative participation during the implementation of the innovation, and attention to the organizational as well as financial consideration for program continuation" (p. 93).

Other researchers have identified the important role that the principal plays in change efforts. Fullan (1992) claims that principals have to take an active role in initiating and/or responding to change if effective implementation is to occur. He goes on to say that the principal is a central player in the continuation of reform. MacRae-Campbell (1991) argues that shared control of the project and collaborative work is necessary for lasting change. Although the research seems to confirm the need for the principal to be an active member of the change process, Bamburg and Andrews (1989) argue that principals do not know "how to successfully engage in activities that will result in the initiation, implementation, and institutionalization of change in schools" (p. 30).

In order to understand the implementation of change in schools, it is necessary to understand what occurs at the school level. McLaughlin (1987) states that "change ultimately is a problem of the smallest unit" (p. 174) and that in order to understand change it is necessary to understand the incentives, beliefs and capacity of individuals.

This study contributes to the literature on the principal's role in the change process by examining the beliefs of eight principals involved in a system-wide change effort. It examines, from the perspective of the principal, each principal's involvement in the change effort, and attempts to link the principals' beliefs with their methods of change.
implementation. Thus, this research adds to the literature on the role of the principal in change, as well as McLaughlin's (1987) findings on the necessity to understand the beliefs of individuals involved in the change process.

**Purpose**

Most elementary and secondary school principals have broad leverage in determining how their schools will be run, as long as they do not contravene school district goals and policies. For this reason, principals have the opportunity to define and shape their own roles. Both their broad leverage in running the school and their interpretation of their role may have implications for how they implement school change. The purpose of this study is to develop an understanding of how principals implement school-district policy changes based on their own perceptions of the change, their professional beliefs, and their interpretation of their roles.

**Research Questions**

Three questions guide this research. Each builds upon the other in order to develop an understanding of how principals' professional beliefs influence the way they carry out district policy change.

1. What factors influence principals' responses to a change in school district policy? More specifically, what are the professional and context-specific issues the principals consider as they interpret a school district policy change and plan for their own action in carrying out that change process?
2. How do principals enact the policy changes in their own schools?
3. What impact did the principals perceive that the policy change had on their enactment of their role?

**Research Design**

I employed a qualitative multi-case study approach for this research. I researched eight principals enacting school district policy change over one and one-half school years. The site is of particular interest because the policy change studied was a jointly negotiated
change between the school district's Board of Trustees and the Teachers' Association with direct input from administrators. This policy change redefined the supervision and evaluation of teachers in such a way that continual improvement of instruction was emphasized over cyclical methods of addressing teacher accountability. This policy change had the potential to help principals to reconceptualize both how they lead and how they interact with teachers.

Data collection techniques included both formal and informal interviews as well as journal writing by principals. Written documents were collected from principals in the form of memos, newsletters and meeting agendas which chronicled some aspects of the change process. These documents were primarily intended to provide background information for the cases. District documents were also collected to provide historical perspective to the policy change.

This study consists of eight individual cases plus a cross-case analysis. A case, as defined by Lincoln and Guba (1985), contains an explanation of a problem, a description of context, a description of processes relevant to the problem, a discussion of elements identified as important, and a discussion of outcomes or lessons learned from the study (p. 362). The analysis of the data was carried out using a constant comparative method (Lincoln & Guba). As well, an audit trail was kept and member checking was done throughout the study.

Four levels of transformation (Novak & Gowin, 1984) form the basis for the individual cases and the cross-case analysis. The first level of transformation was the transcription and writing of fieldnotes from the formal and informal interviews. The second level of transformation identified categories for coding. The third level of transformation entailed designing an unordered meta-matrix (Merriam, 1991) of key phrases and short quotes to illustrate categories. The fourth level of transformation involved examining and analyzing the cases in relation to the research questions and the characteristics of the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers.
Limitations of the Study

This study focuses solely on the perceptions of principals as they work through implementation of a district policy change. There was no attempt to gather data from sources other than the principal, with the exception of background data that led to the policy change. This study does not take into account the perceptions of the teaching staff, nor does it look for concrete evidence that change actually occurred in the schools. Neither of these approaches would address the purpose of the study -- developing an understanding of how principals go about the process of implementing changes in a school district policy based on their own perceptions of the change, their professional beliefs, and their interpretation of their roles. The study attempts to understand principals' beliefs in relation to how they go about altering their practices in response to a district policy change.

The participants in the study were, for the most part, self-selected. That is, I explained the study to all principals in the district and gave people the opportunity to volunteer for the study, or to request more information from me. I included in the study the five principals who said they were definitely interested in participating and three principals who expressed interest and had at least three years of administrative experience in the district.

Eight principals participated in this study. Although a larger number of participants might serve to reconfirm the data gathered on the eight, I opted for a smaller number of participants with more in-depth data collection.

Overview of the Chapters

This study is divided into six chapters. The first three chapters introduce the study, present the literature that informs the study and present a detailed review of the research methods. The fourth chapter presents the primary unit of data analysis in the form of eight cases. Chapter 5 examines and analyses the cases in the form of a cross-case analysis. This chapter examines how the cases cluster or do not cluster in response to four
facets of the principals' enactment of the district policy change: principals' professional beliefs, their implementation of Professional Growth Plans, their implementation of the evaluation policy, and their perceived effects of the policy change. The final chapter revisits the research questions and discusses implications for further research and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
ISSUES OF CHANGE IN SCHOOLS

Introduction

Fullan and Miles (1992) state that schools are now under a tremendous amount of pressure, both politically and economically, to restructure. They warn that schools should not grab for the "quick fix", but should cautiously and thoughtfully engage in a change process. Fullan (1991) describes four stages in the change process: initiation, implementation, continuation, and outcome. Each stage of the process has its own perils. Fullan says that the greatest problem schools have is not resistance to change, but the overload and fragmentation that has developed because of the school system's acceptance of too many diverse reforms. One solution to this problem lies in teachers and administrators engaging in honest dialogue about the problems that face schools and the ways that solutions can be sought, given the particular culture and circumstances of the school. Honest dialogue is an important part of the collaboration among teachers and administrators. If collaborative procedures do not exist in the initiation stage of change, they will probably not appear later in the change process. It is, therefore, important that the issue of honest and open discourse is addressed early in the process.

This chapter reviews the literature on change in schools. It begins by examining the reasons behind the initiation of change, then goes on to examine the characteristics of lasting change. Since the development of collaborative relationships and a collegial culture are important components in all stages of the change process, the third section examines these issues. This chapter concludes with an examination of what the research says regarding the role of the principal in the change process. This body of literature informs the present study by describing the existing research on the way change is initiated, implemented and continued, and examining what is currently known about the role of the principal in the change process.
Reasons for Initiating Change

Depending upon the perspective from which an author examines school and its purpose, quite different rationales for change can develop. These rationales include organizational evolution of the school, professional development of teachers, a humanistic view of school, and a cultural perspective on school.

Roberts and Wright (1992) argue that change is part of the continuing evolution of what schools are and what education should become. From this perspective they state that innovation and change need to be coupled for the necessary growth and development of a school. They state that schools that do not grow through innovation will inevitably stagnate.

A second rationale for change in schools is to allow teachers more autonomy to use their professional knowledge to continue to enhance their learning about subject and pedagogy. Nolan and Francis (1992) argue that much of teachers' knowledge remains unused because teachers are not allowed the time and opportunity to work with the concepts and practices of teaching in order to relate those pedagogical concepts to their own knowledge. Nolan and Francis propose that teachers and supervisors become collaborators in constructing knowledge about learning and teaching. The supervisor should help the teacher understand lesson presentation by collecting data through a variety of sources as the lesson unfolds over an extended period of instruction. Teachers then take on the role of "active constructors of their own knowledge about learning and teaching" (p. 50). Through this joint process, change occurs within individual classrooms and ultimately shapes the direction of the school.

Barth's (1991) research exemplifies the humanistic approach to school change by arguing that the direction in which education should move is toward developing an enriched school community in which the inhabitants of the school constantly work to develop methods of working together for the benefit of the students' education. He attributes the major cause of students' social problems to be a school that advocates ability
groups, grade retention, individual work, lack of recognition of students' strengths but a focus on weaknesses, learning that values the transfer of information but does not allow students to transform information into practice, and a curriculum that many students find irrelevant. He states that these mitigating factors in schools extend beyond the school walls to cause societal problems. Barth (1990) claims elsewhere that schools do not meet the needs of the adults within them, either, and discusses the need for developing a community of learners which includes not only students but adults, as well.

Martin (1992) argues that schools should consider the changing needs of society. She views modern society as diverse and individualistic. In order for schools to be responsive to the needs of society, they must also become diverse and individualistic places that both encourage and nurture that diversity and individualism. She states that schools must seriously account for a diverse population, and homes that are not only not educating children, but in many cases are burdening children with their problems. She argues that there was a time when schools could demand that students separate their private life from their school life. However, those two lives are now interwoven and interdependent, so cannot be separated. From this perspective schools must change to meet the needs of a changing society and a changing home.

These four perspectives on the need for change in public education sample the diverse expectations and demands being put upon today's schools. The perspectives are different, yet the conclusions are similar. There is a need for change, not a stagnant do-it-once-and-be-done-with-it change, but a process of change that will continue to examine a changing culture, and help schools respond to the changing needs of students and teachers. Change does not simply happen. For change to be both effective and lasting, it must be done with purpose and determination.

The Characteristics of Lasting Change

There is general consensus in the literature on change that change needs to be discussed and planned close to where it will be implemented and by those people who will
be implementing it (Barth 1990; 1991; Fullan, 1991, 1992; Grimmett, Rostad & Ford, 1992; Kanpol, 1990; Martin, 1992; Miles & Louis, 1990, Nolan & Francis, 1992; Rosow & Zager, 1989; Sarason, 1990; Sergiovanni, 1992). These two important characteristics of lasting change have the possibility of influencing both parts of the organization and the organization as a whole; that is, they have the potential to alter the school culture. The literature on change examines and represents in several ways the effects of culture on change. These include cultural empowerment, culture of continuous change, the need for cultural lenses, and a culture supportive of change.

Kanpol (1990) advocates cultural empowerment for both teachers and principals. The implication for teachers is that cultural empowerment involves teachers' developing an awareness of the effects of their decisions and consequently an action plan to implement change. Principals must work to develop a culture that supports joint decision making and allows change based upon those decisions, change that could affect basic assumptions about the school. Kanpol argues that the process needs to be a continuing one with teachers and principals working together to discuss and critique school issues.

Barth (1991) argues that schools need to accept change and incorporate the idea of change into the way they define themselves. He says that schools traditionally are cautious and conservative places where change is slow to happen. However, it is necessary for schools to recognize that the students' world is changing at a rapid pace. The implication for schools is that they must adopt a culture that encourages "adaptability, experimentation, and invention" (p. 127).

The concept of experimentation is echoed by Martin (1992) who agrees that an experimental stance toward school organization as well as toward curriculum and instruction issues is the best policy. She suggests that change begins by asking teachers "to fit themselves and their students with different cultural lenses" in order "to treasure the uniqueness of a whole range of perspectives without losing sight of commonalties" (p. 56).
In order for organizational change to occur, that is change that reaches beyond an individual classroom and has an effect on the entire school, Fullan (1990, 1992) argues that the change needs to happen at the level of the school culture. Thus, he argues that there is a relationship between long-term changes in people's behaviors and in their beliefs. Often the change in beliefs does not occur until after the change in behavior, but the change in behavior cannot be sustained without the subsequent change in beliefs.

The common thread in each of the above perspectives is that change begins in a school only when its need is defined by those closest to the change process. Only when the culture of the school accepts the change, can the change become long-lasting. McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) report that the Rand Change Agent Study demonstrated that collaborative planning was the only planning strategy they were able to identify that generated the broad-based support that could lead to continuation of a successful change.

Fullan (1991) states that one of the major impediments to change is that people often confuse the terms "change" and "progress". He clarifies the terms by saying that first-order change is simply the evolution of schools, whereas second-order change is the more challenging and lasting change, that is, change that affects the structure and culture of schools. Second-order change often involves the development of collaborative structures such as peer supervision, mentoring, coaching, teacher leadership positions and opportunities for school-based management. Teachers often take on important decision-making roles in curriculum, instruction and school policy. This kind of change is not just progress or intensification of programs, but a change in the structure of at least parts of the school.

For change to begin in any meaningful way, people involved in the change process need to take ownership of the process. "The prospects for successful implementation are greater when those expected to carry out a change agree on the need, on the appropriateness of the innovations selected, and on the priority of the change effort relative to other local concerns" (Fullan, 1992, p. 34). Fullan (1991) warns of two factors
concerning teachers' involvement in a change process. First, over the last thirty years central office staff have assumed that involving a representative few teachers in the change process would increase acceptance of the change by all teachers. This has proved to be untrue. In order for change to occur in a school, *all* teachers and administrators need to be involved in an ongoing dialogue and ongoing professional development around the change process. This includes teachers and administrators new to the school or district, an often overlooked group. A second concern Fullan raises is: if schools are willing to involve teachers in meaningful change, they must start the change process where teachers are; in his words, "starting with routine, overload, and limits to reform, because this is the situation for most teachers" (p. 118). As soon as teachers are involved in educational reform in any meaningful way, the power relationships in a school may be altered. Sarason (1990) warns that "any educational reform that does not explicitly and courageously own up to issues surrounding changing patterns of power relationships is likely to fail" (p. 31). Sarason goes on to say that those changing power relationships involve not only teachers and administrators, but also parents and children. Fullan's and Sarason's concerns call for fundamental changes in the way schools and teachers think about the change process and enact a process that allows the culture to accept and incorporate the change.

Miles and Louis (1990) argue that a change process must address five issues that help teachers move from knowledge to action. The first is clarity; that is, knowledge must be clearly understood by everyone involved in the change process. The second is relevance; that is, everyone involved must see the change as useful, meaningful, and connected to their lives. Next, there must be action images; that is, the knowledge must be exemplified in specific actions so that it may be clearly visualized. There must exist will. The parties involved in the change must be motivated, interested, action oriented, and have a will to do something with the knowledge. And finally, skill must exist; that is, the people involved must have the actual behavioral ability to carry out the envisioned
action. These five statements suggest that success in the change process is more likely when individuals close to the change are involved in its design and implementation, and are prepared for the change. The rules to successful change are negotiable and the actual strategy used should be determined by the individuals within the change setting. Fullan (1991) cautions schools to keep in mind that change is multidimensional, involving changes in our conception of education and skills, and involving dynamic interrelationships. This warning is a reminder that throughout the change process the plan for change has to be evaluated continuously and adjusted; not only are the interrelationships dynamic, but so also are the relationships which evolve in a change process. In order to keep the process collaborative, it is necessary to keep those relationships in the forefront of the change process.

Fullan (1991) argues that the entire change process should be driven by a shared vision because vision "permeates the organization with values, purpose, and integrity for both the what and how of implementation" (p. 81). The question of "whose shared vision" raises issues that will be explored in chapters five and six. Three different conceptions of shared visions of change will be examined: visions that are shared by teachers and supported by administrators, jointly negotiated by teachers and administrators, or left entirely for teachers to construct.

Miles and Louis (1990) concur with Fullan's work stating that "our findings were that broad, ennobling, passionate, shared images of what the school should become do much to guide successful improvement" (p. 59). Although development of a shared school vision can be a necessary component of lasting change, Fullan warns that vision-building is both a sophisticated and a dynamic process that very few organizations can sustain. Because of the dynamic interrelationship between collaboration and vision-building, the two should be used together to initiate and sustain the change process in a school.
Cuban (1992) stresses the importance of differentiating between incremental and fundamental reform. Incremental reform has a close association with Fullan's (1991) term *progress*. Cuban describes incremental reform as suggesting that a school's structure is basically sound, but parts of it need a little work in order to keep the whole structure running smoothly. By contrast, Cuban defines fundamental change in a way that is akin to Fullan's concept of change. Cuban says that fundamental changes transform a school and permanently alter the institutional structure. He states that it is important to question both the purpose and the extent of the change to determine if it is, indeed, change that is sought, or perhaps it is progress that school personnel are masquerading as change.

Fundamental or second-order change is a process that requires organizational and individual commitment. Even when there is an organizational commitment to change, unless the change is continuously supported and facilitated by the organization, it becomes difficult for individuals to sustain the change, and individuals may dismiss the change as just another in a series of initiatives that will have little long-term effect. Leithwood (1992a) describes the role of the administrator in second-order change to be that of facilitator, participating in the development of a shared mission and vision.

A major study of school change, the Rand Change Agent Study, was a four-year, two-phase study that investigated 293 local projects in 18 states in the United States. The study examined the adoption, implementation and long term continuation of four federally funded programs: Title III (innovative projects), Title VII (bilingual education), the Vocational Education Act, and the Right-to-Read Act. The conclusion of the study was that many innovations were adopted in these 293 projects; however, few were successfully implemented, and even fewer continued long-term (McLaughlin, 1990). Although the projects were federally sponsored projects, with additional federal funding attached, they each involved local initiatives. They demonstrated the extent to which investment can be made in school change, and yet the change fail.
It is important to understand the factors that contribute to or hinder lasting change. The process itself is an important determinant in the success or failure of the change -- from the very beginning of the change process, when it is first recognized that there is a need for change, to the point that the change has been in existence for many years. In the planning stages, central planning and coordination have not been found to be effective for lasting change for multi-level systems (Fullan, 1992). "Solutions must come through the development of shared meaning. The interface between individual and collective meaning and action in everyday situations is where change stands or falls" (Fullan, 1991, p. 5). Thus, the school culture must encourage and provide opportunity for collaborative planning within the school setting. Rosow and Zager (1989) warn that one of the reasons for failure of innovation is that we have been led to believe that teachers are experts, and as such should make all of the decisions. They argue that teachers are experts in their jobs, but this expertise should not preclude help from other experts who can provide additional knowledge or technical advice that will help everyone come to better solutions for the identified problems. This raises the question of the role of the principal in the change process, as well as the role of the organization in providing support for lasting change.

Fullan's (1991) description of the four stages in the change process (initiation, implementation, continuation, and outcome) has implications for how the organization and the principal will contribute to the change process. A school that is overloaded with change initiatives will not accept more change. Teachers and principals need to be willing to discuss honestly the problems of their school and come to consensus about solutions, given the particular culture and circumstances of the school.

During the implementation phase of the change process it is important for the school to have a plan. That plan should be frequently reviewed and modified as necessary. If the school does not approach the change in an organized manner there will be needless
activity and time loss. The implementation phase without a plan will be more stressful and less predictable, manageable and successful (MacRae-Campbell, 1991).

During the implementation stage, teacher resistance may occur. Margolis (1991) suggests that resistance can be helpful in this stage because it forces the proponents of the change to test their ideas, improve them and defend them. The reaction to the resistance can provide clarification to the process and actually aid the implementation.

The implementation stage requires concrete action. It is easy to talk about change, but never actually to enact the change. Fullan (1992) states that "policies, written guides, in-service programmes, and preparation in innovation development can help clarify the meaning of change for those involved. True understanding, however, comes only when teachers are given opportunities and time to work with the innovation in the classroom and to talk about what they are doing with others" (p. 31). At the implementation stage of the process, honest discourse along with an opportunity to take risks in a supportive environment are important. This support needs to come from three places: collaboration among teachers and administrators, support from principals, and support from the board office. Fullan (1992) states that change cannot succeed if principals do not initiate and/or respond to change efforts. Although the source of the change does not necessarily have to be central office, when central office administrators actively support the change, the change stands a larger chance of implementation (Fullan, 1991).

A change can progress through the first two stages and yet not last through the continuation stage. For change to last it needs a broad base of support. Typically, reforms have required enormous effort from a few individuals. This level of effort may not be able to be sustained and, therefore, causes the failure of the change effort (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Thus, change must become an integral part of the school culture and develop a broad base of support within the school. Staff must be engaged in open dialogue about the change, work collaboratively to bring the change about, and share control of the change process (MacRae-Campbell, 1991). It can be advantageous to
spread the locus of support beyond the walls of the school. Fullan (1992) reports that community support is not necessary for lasting change to occur, but when community support exists the change can become a factor in community based decisions and community commitment. Support from the district level is imperative to sustain change. Although schools can become innovative for short periods of time without the support of central administration, they have difficulty sustaining the innovation without district action that supports conditions for continuous and long-term improvement (Fullan, 1991).

Change only becomes lasting when the change is institutionalized (Fullan & Miles, 1992). Once the change is built into the normal structure of the school and becomes an integral part of the school culture, it finally takes on the characteristic of the continuation stage, a stage at which the issues of reevaluation are important. MacRae-Campbell (1991) states that only when teachers and administrators view the concept of change itself as an integral part of learning, will schools truly evolve into learning organizations.

**Developing Collegial Cultures in Schools**

Sarason (1982) recognized school culture as having two components. The first is the transactional relationship between schools and communities; that is, the way each affects the other and, in turn, is itself affected by the other. The second is the characteristics of the particular classroom within the particular school within the particular school district. It is these two components in combination that determine the school culture. Recognizing that not only do differences exist in each classroom, school and school district, but also in each community, the concept of school culture must be examined with an eye towards what makes each component in this relationship unique. It is the amassing of these individual characteristics that begins to define the school culture.

Goodlad (1975) found that school culture is affected by both the school system and the community; he states that the components of the school that influence its culture are everything, good or ill, that influences pupil learning. Therefore, to understand school cultures, it is important to consider such factors as school rules, both written and
unwritten; communication, both verbal and nonverbal; curriculum, both formal and operational; leadership behavior, particularly of the principal; physical properties of the school; and pedagogical regularities.

Leithwood (1992b) includes in the definition of school culture the underlying assumptions, norms, beliefs, and values that guide behavior of teachers, parents, administrators, and students in a school. Consequently, much of what happens in a school, the way people act and react, is based on the culture that has evolved in that school.

School culture is, however, changeable. Because a significant component of what determines school culture is the community, as the community changes and exerts new pressures on the school, the culture of the school begins to shift (Goodlad, 1975). The community consists of at least two components. There is the community outside the school, from which students, parents, and some teachers, as well as monetary and psychological support, come. There is also the community that is internal to the school. This community consists of teachers, administrators, students, school staff, and school volunteers. Each of these communities, as well as particular subsets of them, is capable of exerting pressure on the school that could ultimately result in a change in the school culture.

An entire school culture can be considered to be pliable. That is, when pressure from within or without is exerted on the school, the school culture is capable of change. As the school culture changes, so do the individuals within the school (Goodlad, 1975). They begin to re-evaluate what the school does and how their own practice fits within the new school culture. This reflective process may prompt individual teachers to reconsider their own practice.

Traditionally, teachers are understood to function as many independent individuals periodically coming together for meetings. Some school cultures impose this limitation on the teaching body. This type of culture implies that teachers have freedom within their
own classrooms, but encounter obstacles when they try to interact with other teachers. Thus, teacher collaboration can be limited or prohibited by the school culture (Goodlad, 1975).

In order for collaborative relationships to occur, the culture of the particular school may have to be altered. This cannot be done by a single teacher in a single classroom. By definition, collaboration has to involve at least two people. But the school culture may not allow only two people within a school to collaborate. Limitations such as class scheduling, physical plant, teacher planning time, and norms for how teachers plan and carry out their teaching responsibility can inhibit collaboration. Goodlad (1975) suggests that individual teachers "usually are not able to run successfully against these regularities or to create the schoolwide structures and processes necessary to sustain new practices" (p. 113). He advocates that focusing on several components of the school culture, rather than a single component of the culture is the only course that can lead to a significant change in school culture. Thus, in order to change the school culture in a way that would not only allow the development of collaborative relationships, but also encourage them, schools or groups of teachers within a school need to go beyond thinking about only the individual components that comprise school culture to think about culture in terms of communal actions: relationships; interactions between teachers, students, and parents; rules; communication; pedagogy; curriculum; and leadership.

It is within the context of a school culture that we can begin to examine issues of teacher collaboration. Teacher collaboration is the process by which teachers begin to talk about their work, about their practice. The focus is on what they do and how it affects student learning. The development of a culture of collegiality as a part of the school culture is important in this process. Little (1981) defines collegiality as the presence of four behaviors in schools. Teachers and administrators talk about their practice; they observe each other engaged in their practice; they plan, design, research and evaluate curriculum together; and they teach each other what they know about learning, leading
and teaching. Within a collegial culture, the school community can define, shape, and possibly change its culture.

The role of the teacher is an important consideration in the discussion of collegiality and school culture. In a traditional top-down organizational structure, collegiality may be discouraged because, as Lortie (1975) discovered, individual teachers often carry out their teaching responsibilities in isolation. That isolation is sometimes considered to be a teacher's right; however, it constrains the support and recognition that could occur in a more collaborative environment (Rosenholtz & Kyle, 1984 cited in Bird & Little 1986). Isolation can negatively affect the culture of the school by not allowing teachers to stimulate and improve their practice through the support and ideas of their peers. Furthermore, isolation prohibits the collecting and passing on of accumulated teachers' knowledge. Teachers do not have the opportunity to learn either from their peers or from the generation of teachers before them (Bird & Little). However, in schools that attempt to decentralize the organizational structure and nurture the involvement of teachers in the decision making process, collegiality can be allowed and encouraged by the new school culture that emerges. It is within this context that teachers and administrators can begin to develop collaborative relationships.

The development of a collegial culture requires teachers and administrators to take some risks. Teachers venture out of the isolation and security of their own classrooms to engage in developing collaborative relationships with other teachers who may or may not be ready to participate in collaborative structures. These teachers may be viewed by their peers as going against the norms of the existing school culture. The established culture may or may not accept people who do not conform to the evolved set of standards in that culture. However, along with the risks, also come benefits. Grimmett and Crehan (1991) found that as teachers work together to discuss and share their practice, they will continue to encourage each other to try new ideas. They describe this process as "the joint action that flows from the group's purpose and obligations as they shape the shared task and its
outcomes" (p. 56). The second benefit that they determined to accrue from a school culture that fosters collegiality is that teachers gain respect from others within the community -- parents, students, and administrators.

Collegiality is possible only within the context of a school culture that encourages and nurtures it. Grimmett and Crehan (1991) describe this type of culture as "one which sustains those collaborative practices which lead teachers to raise fundamental questions about the nature of teaching and student learning. In short, it represents the intellectual ferment within which ideas for educational change can flourish and expand" (p. 65). Hargreaves (1992) defines three benchmarks of a collaborative culture. (1) There is a sense of unity rather than division about the teachers. They help each other through support, trust and openness. (2) Teachers do not hide, protect or defend failure or inadequacy; instead, they share it and discuss it in order to garner help and support. And (3) educational values are discussed and negotiated. Teachers and administrators come to agreement on what is important. At the same time open disagreement and discussion is encouraged.

Within a culture that encourages collegiality comes the opportunity for new kinds of leadership positions. These leadership positions may be assumed by single individuals or groups of individuals working together to redefine what occurs in schools. Little (1990) argues that teacher leadership is an important part of teachers' professional development for three reasons: (1) teaching and school administration have become so complex and ambiguous that they demand leadership from different sectors within the school, (2) the intellectual and social opportunities afforded in leadership positions are necessary components to the sense of belonging and influence that are a part of career satisfaction, and (3) effective leadership is so complex and demanding that effective leadership cannot be accomplished solely by the administrative team. This point is discussed by Leithwood and Steinbach (1990) who found that as administrators deal with problems that are increasing in complexity and as the expertise and experience of
administrators increases, they are involving staff in collaborative problem solving. Further, Leithwood and Steinbach (1991) substantiated this point in later research where they found that collaborative problem-solving leads to better solutions, professional growth of participants, and increased teacher commitment. The redefinition of leadership and expansion of leadership opportunities have the capacity to contribute to the development of a collegial culture within a school as teachers reach out of their classrooms to work, plan, and problem solve with other teachers.

Collegiality offers limitless possibilities for teacher professionalism and growth through professional development. Little et al. (1987, cited in Little 1990) report that in schools where groups of teachers were actively involved in professional development activities, the norms of the school supported and valued professional growth and, in fact, considered professional growth to be an integral part of what happens in schools. Thus, professional growth becomes a part of the school culture. Collaborative contexts in which teachers are involved in the school's operation and in which they are discussing and solving important school problems can enhance teacher's own individual professional growth efforts (Raymond & Townsend, 1992). Within collegial cultures teachers begin to take responsibility for their own professional growth. Rather than focus on weakness, most teachers will focus on their strengths and use their strengths as a foundation for growth. This runs counter to traditional professional development that is designed to focus on a deficit model of teacher development (Clark, 1992).

Hargreaves (1992) states that ways of teaching and learning are an outgrowth of the culture of the school.

Teaching strategies...arise not just from the demands and constraints of the immediate context, but also from cultures of teaching; from beliefs, values, habits and assumed ways of doing things among communities of teachers who have had to deal with similar demands and constraints over many years. Culture carries the community's historically generated and collectively shared solutions to its new and inexperienced membership. It forms a framework for occupational learning. (p. 217)
Cultures of collegiality offer teachers the opportunity to discuss educational issues, their own practice, and the focus and operations of the school. Within such a context, the educational values of the organization can be discussed and negotiated. Once values are understood, modeled and practiced, change can be based on those negotiated values. School policies will not be sustained if they do not coincide with the negotiated and practiced school values (Louis, 1990). In fact, for change to occur within the context of a collegial culture, that change must coincide with the accepted cultural values.

**The Role of the Principal in Change**

The development of collegial cultures in schools has direct implication for the principal. Three issues that need to be addressed are: (1) what roles can principals play in bringing about change in schools, (2) how do principals help to develop a culture based upon shared values, and (3) what is the principal's role in the development of collegiality.

The existing research on change and the principal's role in the change process concludes that the principal is a strong influence when a change process is successful, but the principal does not usually play an instructional or change leadership role (Fullan, 1991). This may be because the principal does not necessarily understand how to implement change. In general, the major role of the principal in the change process has been as supporter and facilitator of ideas and materials. Bamburg and Andrews (1989), reporting on a three year study of one hundred schools, with responses from five thousand teachers, conclude that principals do not necessarily understand what it means to be an instructional leader nor how to initiate, implement, and institutionalize change in schools. Fullan (1991) and Bamburg and Andrews (1989) agree that principals have little preparation for their role in the change process. Fullan suggests that knowledge of both a psychological and sociological nature is needed and that the principal has to be able to understand the reality of the situation from the viewpoint of the teacher in order to begin to construct a practical theory of the meaning, process and results of the change attempts. Bamburg and Andrews stress the need for principals to possess critical inquiry skills and to
be able to apply those skills to the initiation, implementation, and institutionalization of change.

Although principals may not be prepared to work with change implementation, nor necessarily understand the change process, the principal has an important role to play in the implementation of change. The principal can secure resources, buffer the project from outside interference, encourage participants, and adapt procedures for the change initiative. Involving teachers in decision making is one of the most important things a principal can do to aid the change process. When this happens the principal nurtures an environment that accepts the change, increases commitment to implementation, supports teachers' efforts to adapt their practice to the change, and increases the probability that implementation and continuation of the change will occur (Roberts & Wright, 1992).

Leithwood, Jantzi and Fernandez (1993b) reported on a study of staff perceptions of conditions that affected school improvement issues in nine urban schools. One hundred sixty-eight teachers and administrators took part in the study. They concluded that strong influences on teachers' commitment to the change effort "were the vision-creating and goal consensus-building practices of school leaders" (p. 23). Furthermore, leadership practices that "helped give direction, purpose and meaning to teachers' work" (p. 23) contributed most to the development of teachers' commitment to change.

For principals to involve teachers effectively in all aspects of decision making that are essential to implementing change, the role of the principal has to shift from the traditional managerial and educational leadership roles in order for the change process to begin. Principal as collaborator is perhaps the most important new role of the principal. "When teacher and supervisor become co-creators of knowledge, they produce jointly developed, tentative understandings of the learning-teaching process" (Nolan & Francis, 1992, p. 54). This image may run counter to the traditional image of the principal. The principal has to begin to envision new ways of carrying out the roles of supervisor and evaluator. The image of principal as colleague shifts the role of the principal from critic to
supporter of teachers' professional development, as the role of critic is one that has not proven helpful to the professional growth of most teachers (National Education Association, 1988). When the principal assumes the role of co-creator of knowledge, rather than critic, teachers are more willing to share openly and discuss dilemmas and issues of practice because they do not have to fear critical evaluation from the principal (Nolan & Francis). Principals do have choices about the role they will assume.

Leithwood and Steinbach (1993) reported on a study of nine secondary school principals in an urban district, where principals were identified as effective school leaders who were actively engaged in significant school improvement efforts. Leithwood and Steinbach conclude that for school administrators to be most effective "they need to think expertly about their own school contexts and the consequences for the practices which they choose" (p. 4).

The role of the principal has evolved from principal teacher to manager to educational leader. Kanpol (1990) argues that educational leader implies a hierarchy that can no longer be sustained in education. If a priority for principals is to help teachers to improve their own practice, the principalship needs to be reframed. The change from educational leader to educational equal, facilitator, and collaborator in creating knowledge and understanding the learning-teaching process, is quite a large shift. Prior to attaining the roles of equal, facilitator, and collaborator, principals have to be willing to shift their positions to co-create mutual empowerment between principal and teacher (Kanpol).

Reitzug (1994) defines three levels of teacher empowerment by principals: support, facilitation and possibility. He conceptualizes support as "the creation of a 'supportive environment in which one can find and speak his or her own voice' (Prawat, 1991, p. 744)" (p. 290). He describes the process of facilitation as stimulating critique, and making "it possible for teachers to act on their critique" (p. 290). A principal engaged in one of the last two levels of empowerment can apply empowerment to enactment of change. The implication would be that the principal becomes actively involved in the
change, and, along with teachers, takes responsibility for the successful implementation of the change by actively critiquing the change and its implementation process.

One important aspect of the principalship becomes helping staff to negotiate a clear set of values upon which the development of a school culture can be based. The ultimate motivation or discouragement of teachers in their profession can be linked to both individual and institutional factors (Little, 1990). Thus, it is important for the principal to attempt to secure agreement upon the institutional values that will promote a productive working and learning environment.

It is not a simple task to negotiate institutional values and, therefore, it is not surprising that few values that condition education are ever explored or negotiated by teachers and administrators (Louis, 1990). Louis defines a value system through its components: "The concept of a value system should include interconnected ideals, customs, and institutions that relate to education and about which we have a strong affective regard" (p. 17). The components of the value system should differ between schools, but Louis suggests that those components address three kinds of values that affect education: basic cultural values, professional values, and community values. It is within the context of the negotiated value system that teachers, administrators and community members should determine areas for growth or improvement, and thus define areas of needed change prior to the initiation of policy or other change initiatives.

When principals encourage and model collaborative relationships, they help to build and encourage a collegial culture. Collegiality influences the way that teachers relate to their peers, a factor that has been shown to have a great impact upon how they evolve as teachers (Hargreaves, 1992). Bird and Little (1986) set out five ways that principals and teachers can work together to encourage and nurture the norms of collegiality and experimentation. They claim that principals and teachers should:

(a) describe and call for cooperative experimentation,
(b) model that behavior themselves,
(c) provide material support for those who experiment and collaborate,
(d) reward those who join in the venture (and ignore or punish those who do not),
and
(e) defend colleagues when their initiatives are threatened (p. 498).

Furthermore, they encourage teachers and principals to join together in professional
development and discussion about educational issues. Hargreaves (1992) goes on to say
that leadership through example and encouragement are particularly important in the
development of collegial structures.

Sergiovanni (1990b) advocates what he calls value-added leadership. This type of
leadership provides a prototype for administrative behavior whether or not the principal is
involved in the change process. Sergiovanni claims that value-added leadership can help
to build collegiality in a school.

Empowerment is practiced when authority and obligation are shared in a way that
authorizes and legitimizes action, thus increasing responsibility and accountability.

Enablement is practiced when means and opportunities are provided and obstacles
are removed permitting empowered persons to make things happen, to be
successful. Unless enablement accompanies empowerment, empowerment
becomes a burden and indicators of effectiveness become illusions.

Enhancement leads to enhancement. Followers' roles are enhanced when
empowerment and enablement are practiced and the leader's role is enhanced as a
result. The leader's role is transformed from manager of workers to leader of
leaders. Role enhancement for both results in increased commitment and
extraordinary performance. (p. 96).

Sergiovanni adds that value-added leaders are interested in promoting the development of
shared values and consequently shared goals.

Negotiation of values and the construction of a collegial culture can create a sense
of ambiguity that is indeed a part of the change process. This alternate view of the
principalship may require principals with a different kind of expertise.

They will need a passion for inquiry; commitment to developing an understanding
of the process of learning and teaching; respect for teachers as equal partners in
the process of trying to understand learning and teaching in the context of the
teacher's particular classroom setting; and recognition that both partners contribute
essential expertise to the process. They will also need to feel comfortable with the ambiguity and vulnerability of not having prefabricated answers to the problems that are encountered in the process. Supervisors will need to trust themselves, the teacher, and the process enough to believe that they can find reasonable and workable answers to complex questions and problems. (Nolan & Francis, 1992, p. 54)

Grimmett, Rostad and Ford (1992) state that the principal should be a "builder of collaborative cultures that encourages the seeds of change to take root and grow" (p. 185). They explain that the way a principal develops this ability is through the process of reflective transformation. Reflective transformation of practice "encourages supervisors to view themselves as practitioners, like teachers, learning their craft in a collegially supportive atmosphere" (p. 200). It is through the development of collaborative relationships in their own positions that principals can model and encourage collegiality in schools.

Summary

In this chapter I reviewed the literature on change in schools and related it to what is known about the role of the principal in change. Much of what is known about the role principals plays in bringing about change is not very specific. In fact, we know more about what happens in the change process when the principal is not involved in change; we know that the change initiative does not have much chance of continuation. This study will address the issue of what roles principals can and do play in the change process. It will specifically examine how principals mediate policy change through their professional beliefs to determine what their role will be in district policy change.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

This chapter presents the details of the research design. The research questions focus on how the professional beliefs of principals influence the way they respond to change in school district policy. Of the eight principals in the study, some came to the study as fairly new principals in the district. By the time they became principals, the district had already begun its move in the direction of the new policy. Others, however, had worked as principals in the district prior to the initiation of changes that led to this policy change. Their original approaches to supervision and evaluation had to change significantly if they were to incorporate the new policy into their practice. Other principals in the study assumed their positions somewhere in the transition process. These people became principals during the long negotiation and change process that led to this policy. It is this richness of experience and diversity of perspective that will cumulatively help to explain how principals' professional beliefs influence the ways they enact policy change.

The perspectives of the eight principals are elaborated through a qualitative case study approach. Adelman, Jenkins and Kemmis (1980) define case study as "an umbrella term for a family of research methods having in common the decision to focus on inquiry around an instance" (p. 48). The instance this study reports on is the district policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers.

The Site

The site of the study is a North American school district that draws its students from both urban and suburban areas. It is a fast growing, multicultural community with slightly fewer than forty elementary and ten secondary schools. This site was chosen because the district and the Teachers' Association had recently negotiated a contractual change that has the possibility of significantly changing both administrative and teacher practice. The change was not quickly put in place -- the district worked toward
incorporating the philosophy behind the plan over a fifteen year period. This was an evolutionary process from which the plan emerged. There was support for the plan from both the district and the Teachers' Association. During this time the district embraced such practices as clinical supervision and peer supervision. Professional growth opportunities were offered to teachers and administrators and professional growth became a valued part of the school district culture. In 1989, a committee of three teachers and two administrators was formed to examine the existing supervision and evaluation policy and to propose a new policy that was more in keeping with district values and beliefs. Through collective bargaining, this policy change was incorporated into the collective agreement between the Board of Trustees and the Teachers' Association, July 1, 1990 - June 30, 1992, and officially began in September of 1991.

The contractual change is a new policy on the supervision and evaluation of teachers that was an effort to put forth the goal of continual improvement of instruction.

The collective agreement reads:

The parties commit themselves to an ongoing supervision and assessment program which incorporates active involvement and reflective self-assessment, on the part of each teacher. This program is primarily intended to be developmental, providing for professional growth within a cooperative, supportive environment. (Collective Agreement, 1991)

Under this agreement, the teacher, in consultation with the principal, selects a supervisory model appropriate for his/her teaching and learning situation. The teacher, in consultation with the principal, drafts a plan of action, called a Professional Growth Plan, aimed at improvement of instruction. The teacher identifies the area of instructional improvement. Self-assessment and professional feedback procedures from those staff involved in the supervisory model must be contained in the plan. Each teacher submits a copy of the Professional Growth Plan to the principal by November 1 of each school year. The teacher and principal meet periodically throughout the year to discuss progress and whether modification is needed.
The Board has agreed to make appropriate professional literature dealing with effective teaching available to schools and to establish a committee to outline and make available to staffs a number of supervisory models. At each school, the teaching staff will form an instructional improvement team that includes the school principal. This team will bring the literature to the attention of teachers and assist staff in reviewing and examining the information on effective instruction and the supervisory models.

Prior to the change in policy, principals were required to do a written evaluation of each teacher every three years. The district had incorporated a clinical supervision model into the evaluation process. This meant that the principal was to observe a teacher several times during the year prior to writing the evaluation report. Each observation was preceded by a preconference in which the teacher would share the lesson plan and explain the lesson in light of other lessons on the same topic. The teacher and principal would then agree on a focus for the observation. During the observation the principal observed an entire lesson and gathered data by taking notes or writing a verbatim account of the lesson. A post-lesson conference followed. This could take one of at least two forms. Either the principal analyzed the lesson in terms of the agreed-upon focus and shared the analysis with the teacher, or the teacher and principal did the analysis together during the post observation conference. The result of this conference was usually a critique of the lesson with ideas for the teacher to pursue in subsequent lessons. After a series of observations using a clinical supervisory cycle, the principal would write a final evaluation report with one copy given to the teacher and another copy put into the teacher's file. If the teacher received a "less than satisfactory" report, a third party (generally a district level administrator) could be called in to do another written evaluation. The teacher could request support from the Teachers' Association. This support could take at least two forms: it could help the teacher challenge the decision or help the teacher lobby for resources to improve their practice. Three "less than satisfactory" reports could result in the teacher's dismissal from the district.
The district policy change in supervision and evaluation of teachers changed the above procedure. No longer is every teacher evaluated on a three-year cyclical basis. Rather, if a principal believes that a specific area, beyond that in the teachers' Professional Growth Plan, needs to be addressed, the principal may begin a four step "formal evaluation" process. Step 1 consists of a meeting between principal and teacher in which the principal identifies and clarifies the area(s) of concern. The teacher has the opportunity to respond. If concern remains, the principal and teacher discuss strategies to address it. If the concern is not remedied in Step 1, or the problem recurs, then a second meeting occurs between principal and teacher. This meeting is followed by a memo from the principal to the teacher that outlines the areas of concern, the observation and evaluation process that the principal will use in analyzing and evaluating the teaching situation, the expected standards of performance or objectives that the teacher must meet, and possible means of achieving them. This step includes a formal written report to the teacher. If the report is "less than satisfactory", a copy goes to the Superintendent's office and the process moves to Step 3. Step 3 begins with a meeting of the principal, a representative from the Superintendent's office, the teacher and a representative of the Teachers' Association. Following the meeting the principal writes a memo that includes the area of concern, the expected standards of performance or objectives to be met, and the time frame. The teacher then meets with the principal and other district resource people to develop a supportive plan of remedial action. Following the supervisory process, the principal will write a second formal report. If this report is still "less than satisfactory", the process moves to Step 4. Step 4 involves a meeting between the principal, a representative from the Superintendent's office, the teacher and a representative of the Teachers' Association to discuss an alternative assignment for the teacher. The teacher may then request the alternative assignment or an unpaid leave of absence of up to one year to take an approved program of instruction. If a teacher receives a less than satisfactory report and is put through the formal evaluation process in
the next teaching assignment, the third formal written report will be done by the
Superintendent or Director of Instruction. Three consecutive "less than satisfactory"
reports within 36 months constitutes a basis for termination of the teacher.

It is the broad-reaching effects of this policy change on both principals and
teachers that make this district a logical site for this research.

The Participants

Eight principals participated in this study. Eight was a reasonable number with
which to work: a small enough number of principals to begin to understand their beliefs
and practices over an extended period of time, a large enough number to capture different
beliefs and practices. All participants were volunteers. The superintendent of schools
agreed to my request to present the proposed research project to a meeting of all
principals in the school district. Five principals stated that they definitely would like to
participate and nine others expressed interest in participating but wanted more
information. I narrowed the field to eight by selecting the five principals who said they
were definitely interested in participating and three principals who expressed interest and
had at least three years of administrative experience in the district. A criteria for
participation was a minimum of three years experience as a principal in the district when
the policy change was put in place. The rationale was that all principals in the study
would have experienced both the old policy and the new. I was interested in a range of
experience and equal representation of males and females. Hammersley and Atkinson
(1983, p. 49) suggest sampling the ordinary as well as the extraordinary. Merriam (1991,
p. 48) advocates purposeful sampling, that is, sampling determined by how it is we think
we can learn the most about a phenomenon. Sampling in this study was based on the
desire to gain an understanding of the "instance" from several different perspectives.
Therefore, of the eight principals in the study, six are from the elementary level, two from
secondary. This ratio approximates the ratio of elementary to secondary principals in the
district. There are four male and four female participants: three males and three females
from the elementary level, one male and one female from the secondary level. There are some participants who began the study with three and a half years of experience as principal, two very senior principals in the district, and some principals whose level of experience is in-between.

The district has an unwritten policy of moving principals from one school to another after five to six years. At the start of the study principals ranged from just beginning in their present school to being in their present school for three and one half years. Some principals were in community schools, some in neighborhood schools. No principal was moved from one school to another during the course of the study. All principals volunteered to take part in the study and all principals in the district were given the opportunity to apply to participate. Principals were chosen on a first come first serve basis if they could fit the criteria of having at least three years of experience as a principal in the district and they fell within the sampling expectations.

Case Studies

The case study method was chosen as a means of data representation because case studies are best used for humanistic understanding (Stake, 1980). This study is an attempt to understand principal's beliefs and how their beliefs impact on their enactment of district initiated policy change. The eight case studies describe the context for the principals, explore issues of role of the principal, teacher supervision and evaluation, Professional Growth Plans, and a summary of the principal's approach to the policy change.

The case studies provide "thick description," which, as Geertz (1973) suggests, is appropriate and necessary in qualitative research. The cases will provide a rich and detailed account of the discussions with each principal. Merriam (1991) suggests that "one selects a case study approach because of an interest in understanding the phenomenon in a holistic manner" (p. 153). The eight case studies provide sufficient data to inform "in a holistic manner" the cross-case analysis.
The participants' integrity is critical to the presentation of a case incorporating rich
description. These eight principals have been honest and open in the discussion of their
beliefs and practices. They have shared parts of their practice that I am certain they have
shared with no one else. They would often ask for reassurance that what they were saying
was confidential. Thus, anonymity was an important issue. The tension between rich
description and recognition exists throughout the cases.

Timeline

The research data were collected in two stages. The first stage occurred from
January 1992 through June 1992. The purpose of this phase was to gain access, identify
participants, establish a rapport with participants, establish the routine of data collection
and collect initial information upon which the remainder of the study could be built.
During this stage I met with each of the participants three times. The first occasion was to
introduce myself, gain consent, answer questions about the study, read and comment on
the journal they agreed to keep, and negotiate a shared set of expectations for the study.
The second meeting continued the process of establishing rapport. I also read and
commented on the journal, and answered further questions about the study. The third
meeting was the first formal interview, described in the next section.

The second phase of the study took place during the 1992-1993 school year.
During this time the principals continued journal writing and I conducted formal
interviews with each in October, December, March and June.

Methods of Data Collection

Interviews comprise the primary form of data collection in this study. Patton,
(1980) states that the purpose of interviewing is to find out what we cannot observe, that
is, to learn about feelings, thoughts, intention, and perceptions. Because the intent of the
study was to develop an understanding of principals' beliefs and how principals do or do
not enact policy change in relation to those beliefs, interviewing was the appropriate form
of data collection. I conducted two types of interviews, informal and formal.
Informal Interviews

I conducted two informal interviews with principals in the first five months of the study. This type of interview was what Denzin (1978) would call a nonstandardized interview in which specific areas of inquiry are identified prior to the interview, but actual questions are not formulated until the interview itself. Each of these interviews was conducted in the principal's office. The purpose of these interviews was to get to know each principal, to negotiate an understanding of the research, and to develop a sense of trust and rapport. I did not use a list of prepared questions, nor did I audio-tape or take notes during these conversations. The intent was to simulate a natural conversation in order to develop a comfortable relationship prior to the formal set of interviews. Shortly after the interview I dictated comprehensive field notes which I later transcribed and coded.

Formal Interviews

I conducted five formal interviews with each participant. The first was at the end of the first school year in which the study was conducted, the remaining four were during the second school year. I used a nonscheduled standardized interview format (Denzin, 1978) in which there were prepared questions, but the order of the questions varied, at my discretion. I also added clarifying and follow-up questions as appropriate. Although I had prepared questions, my goal was to simulate a natural conversation in order to put the participant at ease. The formal interviews were audio-taped. All interviews, with the exception of one, occurred in the principal's office. One occurred at a principal's home, at the request of the principal. At the conclusion of each interview I dictated fieldnotes onto the audio-tape and later transcribed both interviews and fieldnotes.

As a guide in designing interview questions I used a typology proposed by Patton (1980). He advocates breaking questions into six cells: (1) questions about experience and behavior that establish what participants do or have done, (2) opinion and value

---

1Copies of all transcripts are available from the researcher.
questions that prompt participants to think about their behaviors and experiences, (3) feeling questions that determine participants’ emotional reaction to their experiences and opinions, (4) knowledge questions that identify what participants know to be true about their situation, (5) sensory questions that ask participants what they see and hear in the situation, and (6) background and demographic questions that prompt participants to describe themselves. Patton suggests that each of these types of question may be asked with respect to past, present and future time frames to elicit different responses. This topology was used only as a general guide to assure that I explored issues thoroughly.²

A second data collection method I used was journal writing. Each journal was to consist of the documentation of some of the principal's daily activities plus issues and problems that the principal confronted. Although journals are partial, they reflect the interests and perspectives of the participant and can provide insight into a situation which could be received no other way (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). I asked the participants to organize their journal around two general concepts: tasks and relationships. I chose these two concepts to prompt principals to think about the things they do and the interactions they have. The two organizers were developed after an initial reading of the journals in which I found that principals' journal writing tended to fall into one of two categories: either they wrote a chronology of what they did during the day or they did an analysis of the issues they were thinking about. Hammersley and Atkinson warn that there is a tendency for the more sophisticated subject to move from description to analysis. The researcher must establish a framework for the participant to provide description that will enable the researcher to check and recheck data and construct and reconstruct theoretical interpretations.

Originally all eight principals agreed to keep a written or audio-taped journal. The usefulness of the journal varied with the participant. I read and commented upon each

²See Appendix A for a list of questions.
journal at every visit and I used the information in the journals to help formulate interview questions. Eventually two principals stopped writing and the other principals became somewhat sporadic in their writing. Thus, I felt that the journals could not be a primary source of data. Walker (1980) addresses this issue when he says, "in case study research particularly, methods and techniques have to emerge from the authority of the subject. They have to be customized to fit the exigencies of the situation" (p. 228). The reality of this situation was that some principals found personal value in writing a journal, and, therefore, continued to do so. Others did not personally gain value from it, and found it an imposition on their already hectic schedules.

I used three additional nonstandardized interviews to gather background information on the district context. These interviews were with the Superintendent of Schools, the Director of Instruction, and the President of the Teachers' Association during the time the contract change was negotiated. All interviews were taped and transcribed.

**Data Analysis**

In qualitative research the researcher often finds, on the one hand, that because of the abundance of data, there is more than the researcher can or wants to report. On the other hand, the researcher rarely finds out all that is necessary (Walker, 1980). Walker goes on to say that "significance has to be won from chaotic patterns; 'meaning' does not naturally fall out of the data, sense has to be made of it" (p. 232). Since it is impossible to know all of the important variables before conducting the study, identification of significant factors is an ongoing process both during data collection and data analysis.

The process of data analysis, according to Merriam (1991), involves looking for underlying patterns or conceptual categories with which the researcher begins to make sense out of the data. The researcher compares incidents to generate categories, then compares incidents with categories. This allows the researcher to reduce many categories to a small number of conceptual categories from which data can be checked for fit into the overall framework. Merriam suggests that the researcher can then use the coded data to
generate theory. This is one way that data can be "sifted through, combined, reduced, and interpreted" (Merriam, p. 121).

Initial codes and categories were based upon the research questions and the literature that informed the research. Through the use of the constant comparative method, I identified categories from the language used by the participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I used four levels of data transformation. The first level of transformation was the transcription and writing of fieldnotes from the formal and informal interviews. The second level of transformation identified categories for coding. These categories came from the literature that informed the study and the transcribed data. At this point I wrote a draft of each case. These drafts were both long and inclusive of all data that I anticipated might be important. Lincoln and Guba concur with an initial comprehensive writing saying "the writer should err on the side of over-inclusion in the first draft of the report" (p. 365). After an initial draft of each case, I reexamined the categories, combining some and eliminating others. The third level of transformation entailed designing an unordered meta-matrix (Merriam, 1991). This was a large chart that was organized by variables of interest. It contained key phrases and short quotes to illustrate categories. The fourth level of transformation involved examining and analyzing the cases in relation to the research questions and the characteristics of the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. These levels of transformation formed the basis for the cross-case analysis.

The levels of transformation are represented in the following chapters. Level one and level two transformations are represented in Chapter 4 in the form of individual cases of each principal's professional beliefs and perceived enactment of the district policy change. Chapter 5, the cross case analysis, draws upon level three and level four transformations.

---

3This subsequently became Tables 1-4 in Chapter 5.
Cross-case Analysis

The purpose of a qualitative inductive multi-case study is to build abstractions across the cases (Merriam, 1991). The eight cases provide the basis upon which to build those abstractions. Glaser and Strauss (1967) suggest that the use of multiple cases allows for differences and similarities to emerge which then forces the researcher to generate categories, and define their properties and their interrelations in order to understand the data. This is the basis upon which the cross-case analysis was built.

Data Review

Two methods of data review, member checks and audit trail, were used to review and check data at various stages of the research.

Member Checks

Member checks were used at two different stages of the research. At the conclusion of the audio-taped formal interviews, I transcribed all audio-taped material. Participants received copies of this raw data throughout the data collection process. As well, all participants received a draft of the case that was written about them. Five out of the eight principals telephoned me or wrote to me. Principals informed me of contextual details about which I was not aware, or told me about their reaction to reading about themselves. In no case was I told that the material was inaccurate or did not represent the principal. The final case study writing reflects the comments of the participants.

Audit Trail

Lincoln and Guba (1985) call the audit trail the major trustworthiness technique examining "both the process and the product of the inquiry" (p. 283). The audit trail in this study existed at four levels. The first level was the fieldnotes that were kept on every conversation with each participant. These fieldnotes consisted of both factual matter such as context, plus my initial reflections and understandings of the research. The second level was the audio-tapes of every formal interview and the complete transcriptions of each. The third level was the coding of the transcripts and the writing of the cases with reference
to the coding. Each reference was coded as to whether it came from an interview (I) or a fieldnote (F), the corresponding number of the interview (1-5) or fieldnote, and the page of the transcription. The fourth level of the audit trail was the development of detailed unordered meta-matrices that then evolved into ordered matrices. These latter matrices appear in the cross-case analysis chapter. These four levels of the audit trail plus the member check ensure that data were collected, analyzed, and confirmed by the participants in a sufficient way to guarantee trustworthiness of the data.

**Generalizability**

Qualitative research is the best form of research if the goal is to understand the process that occurs in a situation or in the beliefs and perceptions of the participants. The researcher must recognize that though generalizability is not a strength in qualitative research, there are things that can be done to increase the broad acceptance and applicability of the findings (Firestone, 1993). Merriam (1991) defines three ways to improve the generalizability of a case study:

- Providing a rich, thick description "so that anyone else interested in transferability has a base of information appropriate to the judgment" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 124-125)
- Establishing the typicality or modal category of the case -- that is describing how typical the program, event, or individual is compared with others in the same class, so that users can make comparisons with their own situations (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984)
- Conducting a cross-site or cross-case analysis (Merriam, p. 177)

The first requirement is met in Chapter 4, the case studies of each participant. The second requirement is met in Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 presents the descriptive case of each participant in preparation for Chapter 5, the cross-case analysis. These categories allow the reader to compare and contrast the beliefs and practices of the eight participants as well as compare and contrast their own situation. The final requirement is met in Chapter 5, the Cross-Case Analysis. With a multi-case study approach the reader has several cases from which to draw in comparing the participants as well as their own
situation. Yin (1988) advocates multiple case studies saying that the overall study is often considered as more robust because the evidence is often seen as more compelling (p. 52). The eight cases presented and analyzed in this research will help guarantee the study's robustness and generalizability.

The concept of reader generalizability is quite appealing in case-study research. It offers an attention to the needs of the reader and ascribes an importance to the reader as primary focus of the research.

Case study and experimental research are based on different views of social science; case study might be seen in the context of an historical or interpretive tradition; experimental research in the context of a natural science tradition. In practice the two most important differences are in the way claims are made against the truth and in the demands made upon the reader. Experimental research 'guarantees' the veracity of its generalisations by reference to formal theories and hands them on intact to the reader; case study research offers a surrogate experience and invites the reader to underwrite the account, by appealing to his [sic] tacit knowledge of human situations. The truths contained in a successful case study report, like those in literature, are 'guaranteed' by 'the shock of recognition'. (Adelman, Jenkins & Kemmis, 1980, p. 52)

Stake (1980) continues this argument saying that:

Case studies will often be the preferred method of research because they may be epistemologically in harmony with the reader's experience and thus to that person a natural basis for generalisation. (p. 64)

Case-study research must have the reader in mind during the entire research process. In considering the audience as central in the research, case-study research can offer insights and illuminate meanings that directly relate to the reader's experience and consequently expand the reader's views of those experiences (Merriam, 1991, p. 32).
CHAPTER 4
THE EIGHT PRINCIPALS

Introduction

Chapter four presents descriptive accounts developed from a series of interviews with each principal. What follows is the primary unit of data analysis in the form of eight cases. Each case is divided into five sections: Context, the Principalship, Teacher Supervision and Evaluation, Professional Growth Plans, and Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change. The section on context briefly describes the principal, the school and the community. The next three sections give the principals' perceptions of how they understand their role, how they approach the issues of teacher supervision and evaluation, and how they have incorporated teachers' Professional Growth Plans into their own practice. The final section summarizes their perceptions of the ways they implemented the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers.

Within each case, I examine the context-specific issues that principals say they consider when they plan their enactment of the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. I present the data that describe how principals think about the actual enactment of the policy. And, finally, I discuss the impact that the principals perceive that the policy change has had on their role.

Chapter 5, the cross-case analysis, will explore similarities in principals' professional beliefs and in the ways that principals perceived their enactment of the policy change. To prepare the reader for the cross-case analysis, I have ordered the cases in this chapter to reflect the clustered similarities that I will explore in the cross-case analysis. Peter, Janet and Gary form one cluster; Vera, Carol and Audrey, a second cluster; and Richard and Steve, yet a third cluster. Note that in reality, Peter, Gary, Richard and Steve are male principals and Janet, Vera, Carol and Audrey are female. The next chapter will present more about the characteristics of these clusters.
Peter

Context

At the start of the study Peter was in his third principalship in the district. Prior to becoming a principal, he spent eight years teaching, two years working at the district level, and two more instructing at a local university. Peter holds a B.A., a B.Ed., and an M.A and had begun taking courses on a part-time basis toward a doctoral degree.

Peter became a principal because he thought he could make a difference in the profession by displaying attitudes that were encouraging and enabling. He said it was important to have people in the principal’s position who had strong enough values to develop a clear vision for the school (I/1/7). It was his strong set of values that he said drove his behavior (I/3/9).

Alpine Elementary School, where Peter is principal, is located in a well established community that sends third and fourth generation students to the school. Both the community and the school value a sense of history and tradition. Located in a largely Italian community, the school recently has grown to include an "English as a Second Language" population of about 22%. The socioeconomic status of the families ranges from very poor to wealthy. In this kindergarten through grade 7 school, there are 400 children with 26 full-time equivalent teachers. Eight teams of teachers job-share.

Alpine was undergoing a transition from a school that was largely a magnet school for children with special education needs to one that was becoming a neighborhood school. Although Alpine still had a large special needs population, because not all of the other schools were equipped to take their special education students, Alpine had moved from isolated, segregated, special classes to full integration of special needs students in regular classroom settings. This put special demands upon staff and was, perhaps, why Alpine had smaller class sizes than most other elementary schools in the district (I/1/6).

Peter said that one of the things that made Alpine unique was the sense of tradition. In fact, Peter claimed that it was so steeped in tradition that staff had to be very
careful about how they did things. There was a joke in the school that if something were done once, it became a tradition. One of the traditions that Peter and the staff were working toward was making Alpine into a neighborhood school. He explained,

Our mandate is, in fact, to reach out to the community and to not just address the K to seven academic program or the K to seven [Ministry of Education] program but the K to seven program plus looking at the needs of the community and what we can do: coordination of agencies, or resources, to the community. (I/1/6)

Peter viewed one of his jobs to be promoting the school as the "hub of the community," something that he said was a natural thing to do since most of the parents had gone to the school themselves, and now their children were coming to the school for their education (I/1/16).

Peter's Principalship

Peter discussed his principalship as consisting primarily of three parts: (a) he was working to develop collaborative relationships in the school, (b) he was developing an organizational structure to get teachers involved in decision making, and (c) he was negotiating with the staff a clear focus for the school.

Peter described his last year's major goal of enhancing communication as a worthy, but limited goal. He shifted his focus this year to developing collaborative relationships which included, but was not limited to, enhancing communication among teachers. He said that through the committee structure, he helped teachers to experience a collaborative decision making process, he now needed to help them to negotiate an understanding of what that process was.

All of them have been through a collaborative process in terms of collaborative decision making, collegial decision making. If they're going to survive, if they're going to bear any fruit, and fruit meaning, are we going to get clear in developing a vision which will sustain our school for the years, then you have to work together and you have to work jointly with others and not as separate individuals. (I/2/5)

Peter claimed that the principal, as well as all other administrators, must be able to offer the necessary skills for group decision making, that is, providing the staff with skills that
were necessary for them to work in a collaborative mode. He said that the most important of these skills were language and communication skills (I/2/5).

Peter had been working with the staff for three years to develop collaborative techniques such as joint planning and team teaching in an effort to develop a collaborative framework: he had the intermediate and primary staff meet as a separate groups; he had intermediate and primary teachers pair their classes and develop joint activities; he had negotiated school-wide interest afternoons and school-wide assemblies. These activities, he hoped, would begin to get people working together. His own personal goals that grew out of this collaboration were: (a) to let people know that they shouldn't be threatened by the principal, (b) to regain some of the classroom skills he was afraid he was losing by being out of the classroom as an administrator, and (c) to explore options for problem solving through dialogue (I/2/12).

Helping teachers learn how to collaborate was an on-going process for Peter. Although the staff had been involved in joint decision making for three years, some still turned to him to make decisions. He spoke about it this way,

I think a few more staff now are taking the chance of assisting in decision making and I think that makes them think, "Well, if I'm starting to make some of these decisions or contribute to some of the decisions [which in their minds traditionally was done by principal] then am I usurping some of the principal's power?" I think there's some misunderstanding there, and that's just going to take some time. (I/4/8)

Peter went on to say that it was necessary for staff to understand what collaborative decision making was all about, otherwise they would approach decision making from an "insurrectionist point of view" which could present severe problems for the principal, the staff, and the school in general (I/4/8). The implication for him was that he needed to continue to model collaborative relationships, but he also needed to continue to help people understand what they were doing and why they were doing it.

It's interesting once the seed is sewn you have to water the plant. That's where we're at now. I'm sure there are more effective ways to water than I know right
now. We're moving along and we have a fairly positive attitude to change here now. It seems less threatening than it did in the beginning of the year and [people] are willing to take the chance, there's a little more trust here. (1/2/12)

Peter described the most powerful vehicle he had to influence the school as the school organization, itself. He had worked over the last three years to change the organizational format from a top-down model to one which incorporated a committee structure for decision making. Decision making by committee was new for the majority of teachers in the school.

It's one thing to say this is a problem, but if you have a problem what do you do? You complain about it all you want or you can do something about it. And one way to do something about it is through the committee structure, and that's probably new for many of the people here, ... a new type of commitment that many staff hadn't experienced before because they said, "Oh, these problems, they'll be solved by the office." I think there was a bit of tradition in that way too, a very traditional role of principal which I don't feel I fit at all, which is probably a bit of a shock to some people. So when they come to me with a problem, I'll deal with the problem but I also put that on my little mental chart and say, here's something that's happening all the time, what can we do about that because it's poor use of my, it's poor use of your time. And that interaction that we're having isn't problem solving, it's reacting. So how can we anticipate that problem coming up again and what can we do in response to it ahead of time so that we can just carry on with other things that are perhaps more pressing? (I/1/10)

The committee structure, a part of the culture of sharing and collaboration that Peter was trying to build, raised several issues of importance. Some teachers felt that they did not belong in the school or that they were not a part of the decision making process, others felt that Peter's expectations of them were too high and consequently the demands he made of them were too high. Issues of student behavior and inclusion were raised. All of this led Peter back to the issue of the mission statement and how he had to continue the discussion of where they were headed as a school (1/3/2).

Peter continuously referred to himself as an "enabler," helping people within the school structure to define and carry out the goals of the school. He created the image of an umbrella for staff to rely upon when thinking about charting the direction of the school. Over the top of the umbrella hung the school's mission statement. All other aspects of the
school would have to directly relate to the mission statement. He and the staff worked
during the year to negotiate a mission statement and the important issues that would make
up each of the segments between the stays of the umbrella. They settled on four:
behavior, inclusion, community school, and the Ministry of Education curriculum
document. The first area, behavior, was to be worked on by the "behavior committee"
and would address the areas of social skills, celebrating and behavior, and school-wide
discipline. The "inclusion committee" would examine integrating ESL and special needs
students into regular classrooms and address the issues of curricular adaptation and
behavioral expectations for these students. The "joint parent-teacher committee" would
work on the community school section, addressing such issues as involving parents and
community with the school, and forming connections between parents and the school foci.
The final segment, the Ministry of Education curriculum document, would be worked on
by the "assessment and evaluation committee" who would examine these issues as well as
other topics such as cooperative teaching, student-led conferences, and articulation of the
primary and intermediate programs. The handle of the umbrella addressed the area of
"wellness," the domain of the planning committee. Through the use of communities and
teacher and parent involvement, Peter hoped to address the issues that were most relevant
for the Alpine Elementary School community.

A sign that the committee structure was beginning to take hold occurred at a staff
meeting when someone said that a committee had not reported back on an issue that had
been brought to them. Peter viewed this as a positive sign that people were aware of the
committee process, they were holding the committee responsible, and were, in fact,
anxious to hear back from committees (I/3/5).

Peter said his first goal for the committee structure was to give teachers a better
understanding of how the school ran and consequently more commitment to it. If they
understood how and why decisions were made, they would be more informed and
consequently better contributors. His second goal had to do with his own place in the school. He said,

There is an ultimate goal to instill the values so strongly that when I'm gone, that it doesn't matter who's here. (1/3/22)

Peter tried to move his role away from that of manager toward that of educational leader. He defined and described several components of his principalship. The first was that of responder. He said that since "the office is still, unfortunately, the hub of the school," (I/1/8) meaning that many demands find their way there, and he had to respond to these demands.

You don't have to be terribly thoughtful in that role all the time. Although this is where your values come in because there are times when stuff comes through your door that you have to then hold up against your values and the goals of the school and where you're going and respond accordingly. (I/1/8)

He talked about the necessity to be proactive in terms of planning ahead and identifying, along with the staff, the needs of the school. He said that working on his own professional development and helping teachers with their professional growth was a new and important role for the principal in this district (I/1/8).

Peter saw himself as a supporter with a responsibility to ask questions in order to clarify teachers' understandings. The questions he repeatedly asked were questions like: What are the best ways to use resources? to spend your time? to meet the needs of students? (I/1/5). As a supporter it was important for him to enable staff.

It's to develop with staff a clear vision of who you are, where you want to go, why you want to go there, because that drives how people spend their time here and how I spend my time and how staff spends their time. So it's to develop a vision....A component of the role is to clarify and to verify and confer over and over again on what we're doing, why we're doing it. (I/1/8)

During the second year of the study, Peter decided that he needed to be more of a supervisor of instruction. He said his plan was to spend every morning in classrooms working on special projects with teachers and team teaching (I/3/7). He had done some of
this during the first half of the year, so some teachers were comfortable with working with him as a colleague in their classrooms.

Peter expressed a concern about how the future role of the principal may be decided upon at the negotiating table. He was concerned that the role of the principal would become only that of manager and that there would be few opportunities for teachers and principals to work effectively together.

The role of principal is really a concern to me and I don't want to work as a principal, or as a teacher for that matter, in a regimented system which is going to say, these are the roles of the teachers, these are the roles of the principal and never the two shall meet. I'm not saying that is going to happen, I'm saying that there is always potential for that to happen when you are working from a them and us scenario. I think both the teacher's association and some board members, including government, are looking at a them and us, manager-teacher kind of vision, as opposed to what can we do collectively. (1/4/18)

**Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers**

The change in policy on the evaluation of teachers had both positive and negative effects according to Peter. He didn't particularly like the three-year cyclical evaluation process because he did not feel it was useful to staff. Also, one teacher to whom he gave a less than satisfactory report, ended up transferring schools and remaining a teacher in the district; therefore, Peter did not have much faith in that system (1/3/17). Moreover, he thought that the Professional Growth Plans that were now a part of the supervision and evaluation system had more potential to address issues of professional competence (1/5/7). The downside of the new policy was that it made it "more politically difficult to go in and say, 'I want to talk to you about your teaching performance because I have concerns'" (1/5/7).

Peter stated that difficulties arise because principals and teachers do not have a shared understanding of the policy. He says teachers think it is no longer the job of the principal to evaluate.
When you talk about evaluation of a teacher, the biggest change that I've noticed is a change in attitude and it's based on lack of understanding by the teachers in what the role of principal is in supervision and evaluation of teachers... I think there is a general understanding that the principal no longer has to do the report every three years on them. And I think that's probably where the common understanding is stopped. I think if I went in and said to teacher X who I'm concerned about, I'm going to write a report on you, or I want to do an evaluation or supervisory cycle with you for these reasons, then I think there would be some questions asked, some clarification sought, some anxiety produced, and some resistance generated because I don't think it's clear to people that if I have a concern that it's my job to express the concern and do something about it. (1/4/3)

When Peter had a concern, or when he was trying to help a teacher develop some aspect of the practice, he relied on the techniques of clinical supervision. He described this as a collaborative effort by principal and teacher to discuss the teacher's lesson and decide on a focus. Following a classroom observation by the principal, they discussed what occurred in the class and why.

We still use the supervisory cycle or variations on the supervision process which is jointly collaborative. Let's find out what the focus is, agree on it and pursue that... I think the attitude that goes along with that has changed. The attitude being that Peter isn't doing this because he has to, and I'm not under the gun as a teacher. This is under the auspices of professional growth. So this teacher has no focus, doesn't know really how to approach that; so we're working on some collaboration. To use the supervisory skills in the process of the cycle, you can take people through to clarify and to ask questions and to give feedback. (1/5/4)

It now becomes the principal's job to initiate a supervisory cycle and to explain to the teacher why it is appropriate to begin the process. Under the previous supervision and evaluation policy the principal conducted the cycle every three years, thus, the rationale was not questioned by the teacher. Consequently, the elimination of cyclical evaluation of teachers means that the principal has one fewer tool.

The fact that you don't have to write a report on people, I think the only thing that really means for me is that's one mechanism that is lost, it's an opportunity that no longer exists in that format. But the opportunity to do supervision and to do the supervisory cycle is still there. We have a different reason for doing that and that's the professional growth program. So if somebody wants some assistance, you note that the key is wants some assistance, or as a result of a discussion it's decided that I'm going to work with that person, then that would be an additional
reason to get into the classroom to do some supervisory like things. But if I had a concern for a teacher, I would go into the classroom which I'm doing right now and do observations, do feedback. (I/4/2)

Professional Growth Plans

Peter's view of Professional Growth Plans was that they had to be kept solely teacher-centered if they were to have any impact on teachers' practice (I/1/12). This belief, then, influenced the Professional Growth Plan procedures that were instituted at Alpine. The first year of the contractual change every teacher submitted a written plan to the office. Peter then spoke to all but one teacher about their plans; the meetings lasted from 10 minutes to one hour depending upon what the project was and how much clarification was needed (I/1/12). The only follow-up that Peter conducted throughout the year was in the few cases in which he was directly involved in the plan. The second year was slightly less formal. He spoke with approximately two-thirds of the staff about their plans, and had no information about the other one-third (I/4/5). Of the two-thirds of the staff to whom he spoke, most came to him with a draft of their plan. After the discussion he requested a written plan. Some teachers gave him written plans, others did not. He did not make a second request (I/5/9).

When Peter discussed a Professional Growth Plan with a teacher, his role was to clarify and support the teacher's plan. He also, on occasion, made suggestions about a different, perhaps more relevant, idea they may want to pursue. But in no case did he push the teacher to accept his idea (I/1/12), thus leaving control of the plan with the teacher.

For Peter, one of the benefits that arose from the plans was that it gave him a greater insight into staff needs from the teacher's point of view. Peter could offer support or suggest someone they may want to work with or use as a resource. He also had the opportunity to suggest an article or a book that the teacher may want to reference (I/2/4). If teachers needed additional support, they could go to the Professional Growth
Committee, a school-based committee made up of staff members whose job it was to highlight the Professional Growth Plan process (I/2/3).

Peter said that out of a staff of thirty-five full and part-time teachers, he thought that approximately six had made a significant change in their practice because of the Professional Growth Plans.

I guess I would say that the ones that have made the most obvious changes are the people who I think had reasonable practice in the past, but because of their relationships with a couple of other key people on staff here and their ability to listen and say, "Oh, gosh, that's a good idea," because of those kinds of connections, I think they began to incorporate some of this into their own practice. I would say that all of the staff who I've seen with visible changes,...have been the group of people...who have been open to examining their practice. (I/3/11)

Peter stated that he thought that the plans had "fantastic potential" in that they could contribute to the development of a collaborative culture. He described the shift in attitude from a competitive attitude to one where people were able to say, "We are now colleagues working on a common goal" (I/4/16).

Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change

Peter's major focus was to develop organizational structures within the school that helped teachers make decisions about and take responsibility for their practice. He viewed the change in policy in supervision and evaluation of teachers as contributing to this goal. He stated that the policy recognized that "we are all responsible people as professionals" and the proof of its effectiveness would be if teachers, over the long term, could maintain a positive attitude toward professional growth (I/4/12).

In implementing teachers' writing of Professional Growth Plans, Peter set up a structure in the school that would assist teachers, but not monitor them. Teachers had the option of bringing their plan to Peter or to the Professional Growth Committee; however, they were not obliged to do either. Although Peter followed the policy guidelines in terms of setting up a school-based committee, his belief that the plans had to be completely
teacher centered prohibited him from using them in the accomplishment of other things he wanted to occur in the school.

Janet

Context

Janet went to school in the same elementary school where she is now principal. She received all of her elementary and secondary education in the district, and has as well spent her entire professional career there. She has worked in nine district schools in total, and been principal of three. When I met Janet she was beginning her eighth year as principal, but first year at Mountain View Elementary.

Janet said that the one thing that is most special about Mountain View is the teachers' commitment to children. She described the teachers as being in the school at 8 A.M. hanging posters and getting ready for the day, running around and doing things with children at lunch time, with at least three teachers ready to sponsor every sport. Mountain View is a growing, medium-sized school with 350 students and 26 full or part time professional staff. It is a dual track school with all programs in French as well as English. Of the nine schools in the district that Janet has been in, she said that Mountain View served the lowest socio-economic area.

Janet's teaching career began after three years of university; during summers and evenings she completed a B.A. and an M.Ed. As a young teacher she had no intention of going into administration and only did so when her principal encouraged her to apply for a head teacher's position. After six years as head teacher, she moved into a principalship. She assessed her strengths and weaknesses as follows:

The type of principal that I see myself as is one that's going to really facilitate learning, really facilitate a warm happy environment; and I try to do that. My negative concerns I have about myself is that I try to do too much myself and I'm not a very good delegator. I'm working at it.
I think a word to describe myself is hard working and caring. I'm not as innovative as some of my colleagues. I like to work with my staff and develop and build on some of the needs of the school rather than say, isn't this a dynamic program; I'll bring it in here. I know every child's name. That's important...For some of them this is the best place they come and that's always in the back of my mind...We have great parents and great kids and I love the programs, but I still feel I'm here for the average child, to bring enrichment in their life. (1/3/4)

Personal organization was an important part of the way Janet lived her principalship. This was evident in everything she approached from her introduction to Mountain View through her processes for supervision of teachers. For example, at her first parent meeting she told the parents that she wanted to get to know them and be involved with the parent group. However, her first task was to get to know the children, then the staff, and thirdly the parents (I/1/24). She quickly set to the task of learning each child's name, she went into classes to read to them and to participate in their instruction, and she set up a VIP program for the kindergarten students so they could be sent to her for recognition, therefore giving her the opportunity to get to know each one. Janet also took it upon herself to spend time with the severely handicapped students in the school, thus giving her a deeper understanding of their needs and the needs of their teachers.

A second example of her organization was the supervision card file that she kept. Every teacher had a card upon which Janet noted the date of each classroom visit and what was happening in the classroom. She flipped through the cards every other week to check that she was getting into everyone's classroom (I/1/39).

Janet often reflected on the principalship in terms of her being a female principal. She said there was a tendency for women to be caught up in detail and not to delegate. She attributed her lack of delegation to feeling that part of her role as a woman was to make jobs easier for people, to do it herself rather than ask someone else to take on the responsibility. However, in this school because of the French Immersion program, a growing and more transient population, and approximately one-third of the students in
English as a Second Language programs, there were so many critical demands that she said she had been forced to learn how to delegate more. (1/1/33).

She struggled with her own feelings about being female and having to make decisions with which others might feel uncomfortable.

You sometimes have to be unpopular. And that has been difficult. The role of being a principal means sometimes having to be unpopular; and being female and always wanting to please, that's hard. You want people to like you. (1/3/3)

Janet said that when she needed advice she almost always called another female principal because she felt their styles coincided in terms of ideas, processes and details (1/3/16). This has changed for her over the years. When she first became a principal there were few other female principals in the district, so when she had a problem she tended to keep it to herself. But now she said, "there's a lot more sharing and I don't know if it's because of the women coming in or whether it's just because we see the need" (1/3/18).

**Janet's Principalship**

Janet viewed her principalship as having two important components. First, through her organizational strategies she developed systems in the school to help the school function smoothly. Second, she valued teachers' knowledge and demonstrated this by setting up systems to encourage teachers to share their knowledge.

Janet was an organizer more than a risk taker (1/1/4). The kinds of change that she implemented early in her principalship at Mountain View were organizational changes: she displayed a weekly schedule of what was happening in the school, developed a brochure to give to new parents, developed a filing and access system for staff meeting minutes and developed an instructional order form (1/1/34). But her main focus was getting to know the children and the staff.

And that's what my goal has been this year, to get a handle on what these people are good at, what the children need and what the parents think and want. And then my role is to say, okay, how can I either motivate that, stimulate it, support it, enhance it, change it. And there aren't a lot of changes that need taking place in this school. (1/1/34)
Janet repeatedly talked of how she valued teachers' knowledge, and consequently brought about change through encouraging teachers to share their knowledge.

Teachers in many areas know a heck of a lot more than I do in their area of specialty and really bowing to their knowledge and bringing them in to be the expert; and my role here is to facilitate a lot more. (I/1/8)

Janet developed some systems which allowed teachers to share their knowledge. She periodically brought in teachers on call for a morning so a subset of the staff could talk to each other about what they were doing. She followed this by offering to cover classes, herself, so that the teacher could observe either her or another teacher (I/1/4).

She made staff meetings a forum in which teachers could share ideas. She often asked two teachers to talk about something they were doing in class that was or was not successful. After the presentations and discussions the floor was opened to anyone who wanted to comment on something they recently tried. Janet thus demonstrated to the staff that she valued both teachers' knowledge and the sharing of that knowledge. She also relinquished the decision on the direction that change would take; that decision became one that teachers made as they choose what to present and what to try from other teachers' presentations.

Janet said she saw herself dropping "little seedlets", then if she sensed interest on staff she invited someone to talk on a topic, structured a session to share knowledge, and supported the idea with literature (I/5/10). She developed a structure that both valued teachers' knowledge and encouraged teachers to work collaboratively.

**Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers**

Janet viewed a large part of her role in the supervision of teachers to be a supporter. One way she supported teachers was that she made herself available to collect data on teaching, if so requested by the teacher. She gave three examples of such requests. One teacher came to her saying that she had some issues she was working on in teaching one particular subject. They arranged for Janet to do a number of observations
with discussion after each. A second request came from a temporary teacher who wanted both some feedback on her teaching and a letter of reference when she left the school. The third request was from a first year teacher who wanted some help in setting up a program in her class. None of these observations was as a result of Janet's initiating a formal evaluation process, but instead was initiated by the teacher for the purpose of feedback (1/1/39).

Problem solving was another area where Janet took the role of facilitator. She said that it was important that when teachers "bellyache" she give them a chance to express their concerns. She proceeded in two ways. She told the teacher the ways that she could help with the problem, but she also held the teacher accountable for some action (1/4/4/). Principal and teacher discussed the problem and together planned the actions that each would take. She did not assume the problem, she supported in the problem solving process.

Although Janet no longer had to collect data on a subset of teachers, she said she had the obligation to know what every teacher was doing. She stated that because the mandated routine was no longer there, it would be very easy for her to go through a year without collecting the type of information she needed to keep her informed about teachers' programs (1/5/1). She kept the card file, described above, so she would know who she had recently seen. Her goal was to visit every teacher each week.

I try to hit everybody's classroom every week and sometimes I might be in there for twenty minutes but it might only be five, and it's just more for "I'm here if you need me,"...just keeping my finger on the pulse rather than keeping my thumb on it. And I think the one is a little more negative and the other a little more positive. (1/4/1)

Janet thought that first-year teachers needed more supervision than seasoned teachers. Thus, she did two things with new teachers that she did not do with others. First, she met with each new teacher on a weekly basis for at least 15 minutes. These were scheduled appointments during which the new teacher could ask for advice, or the
two could discuss matters of mutual interest. Second, Janet found a mentor for each new teacher. The mentorship was an informal process that the teacher voluntarily assumed.

Janet said that the policy change brought with it a redefinition of accountability. Accountability was more than writing a report card or reporting to parents on the results of standardized tests (1/5/11), teachers needed to be able to explain to parents who their children are as learners (1/5/11). This, in turn, implies that Janet needed to ensure that issues of assessment were discussed and understood by the staff (1/5/10). Janet also needed to provide opportunities for teachers to communicate with parents. She was exploring options such as open houses, parent education programs conducted by teachers (1/5/10) and coffee mornings in which teachers promoted what they did (1/1/35). When talking with parents, Janet demonstrated to them that she knew what was happening in classrooms by talking about curriculum implementation (1/5/11).

This redefinition of accountability put responsibility on Janet as well as on teachers. She said that her role was helping teachers to try a variety of methods of assessment, data gathering and reporting on student achievement (1/5/10). She did this through a three-tier process. First, she asked teachers questions about how they incorporated a variety of strategies for student assessment. Second, she provided professional development on such topics as anecdotal reporting, information-gathering techniques, and authentic assessment, to part or all of the staff. Third, she encouraged the experts and leaders on staff to share their knowledge (1/5/10).

Janet devoted extra energy to those teachers who did not feel comfortable with the new assessment techniques. She described the process as one of nurturing these teachers while exposing them to information and discussion (1/5/11).

Supervision was an issue that Janet viewed as important. In fact she, herself, would like to get more feedback on her own practice. She said that she hadn't been evaluated as an administrator and felt that her practice would benefit by it.
If I was a perfect principal then maybe I shouldn't be here; I should be sitting on the right hand of God the Father. I obviously have areas that I need help in. (I/5/17)

Janet compared the supervision and evaluation process she used prior to the change in policy and the one she uses now saying that the new process had much to recommend it, but it also put more responsibility on the administrator. She sensed that there was a collective sigh when principals no longer had to write reports on teachers every three years and, philosophically, there was a shift to supervision as a growth process (I/1/38). She referred to the three year cyclical evaluation process as "a process for the sake of process" (I/1/38) which became repetitive and an unnecessary burden for the principal, teacher and secretary (I/5/1). Thus, the new supervision policy freed the principal from this process, but replaced the process with responsibility.

What is really critical is that if I work with a teacher that I have a concern about, I have to be very, very careful now about how I approach that teacher. It has to be documented from the onset and they have to be part of the process. (I/1/38)

As with many principals, it was difficult for Janet to work with teachers who presented serious concerns, but she counteracted the difficulty by creating organizational systems to identify and work with the problems. She said that with this policy of supervision it was easier to avoid classrooms where there may be problems. Her card file helped to get her into rooms she might otherwise choose to avoid (I/1/23, I/5/5). She described her approach to problem situations to be "not [to] grab the bull by the horns and wrestle it to the ground, but recognize the issue" (I/1/23). For example, she talked about dealing with problems that had evolved over a long period of time.

But what I do in a situation that has a rhythm, that has evolved, developed, is try to play the active listener, try to come to some sort of action plan as a result of the issue. And hopefully get them to reflect on their behavior and say "I need some help, and I need to go and get some help." (I/1/22)

When Janet had a concern about a teacher she began to investigate by collecting data in the classroom. She kept notes on the entire process. She then approached the
teacher verbally to say that she had a concern. She and the teacher would discuss what the options were to help improve the situation. Only if this less formal process did not work, would she move to the formal process stated in the collective agreement (I/4/13).

Janet was careful to document supervision she provided to a teacher. At the end of the year it gave her and the teacher a record of the different techniques she had tried. She could sit with the teacher and review what was done and what the remaining options were. This process provided a sense of accountability in Janet's mind (I/4/8).

**Professional Growth Plan**

Janet discussed the structure she developed in the school to accommodate teachers' writing and collaboratively implementing Professional Growth Plans. She had each teacher give her a written Professional Growth Plan by November 1 of each year. She then sat with each teacher to discuss what the plan was about, how the teacher would carry out the plan, who would collaborate, and how the implementation of the plan would be assessed (I/4/7). There would be a follow-up meeting in the spring if both teacher and principal thought it necessary.

Throughout the year, Janet supported teachers' plans. She kept a list of plans so that she was aware of what each teacher was working on. She often passed on articles that might help them with the plan (I/3/8, I/5/15). She also began a professional library in the school for which she ordered books that supported teachers' professional interests (I/4/16). These books and articles often prompted informal dialogue about research in teaching (I/5/13).

Janet organized a professional growth team in the school. She said that through this team she was "giving a lot more ownership to the teachers, getting this team to take on a lot more of the professional growth" (I/4/16).

Janet attributed the collaborative relationships that occurred between teachers in the school, to the writing and implementing of Professional Growth Plans. Referring to the plans she said,
I just think this has allowed, maybe validated, that professional educators will collaborate. It's really just helped. (I/3/9)

She also said of her own practice,

I think that for me, in particular, it's allowed me to be more collegial in consensus and problem solving. And it fits in very nicely with me because I have this [aspiration of] continuing to grow instead of becoming directive. (I/5/7)

Janet set the tone for collaborative relationships in the school through the structure of staff meetings. By having teachers share their practice, she believed teachers developed an increased awareness of the benefits of collaborative relationships.

I think it's making people aware that through the collaboration and the collegiality process, there's a lot more there for me to learn as an educator. And that because now the Professional Growth Plan says who are you working with? Who are you collaborating with? The Plan expects it of teachers. (I/4/10)

She helped to encourage collaborative relationships by pairing teachers with similar interests. She often shared with a teacher that another teacher was interested in a similar concept and the two teachers might want to collaborate on the idea (I/5/15).

The Professional Growth Plan policy provided money to help teachers develop collaborative relationships. Each teacher was entitled to a substitute teacher for one day for the purpose of working on professional growth. Janet encouraged two teachers to share a substitute for a day, so one teacher had the substitute in the morning, the other in the afternoon. That way, each still had a half day of substitute time for a later date (I/4/16). Encouraging teachers to save some substitute time for a later date transmitted the message that the Professional Growth Plan should continue throughout the year.

Janet put into place other structures to help teachers collaborate. For example, she started early morning muffin meetings at which she supplied refreshments so that teachers had a conducive setting in which they could informally discuss professional issues (I/5/12). She also offered to cover classes, video-tape teaching, or collect data in the classroom (I/4/16).
The supervision and evaluation policy with teachers writing Professional Growth Plans, raised questions for Janet concerning her practice. She said this process was more time consuming and increased demands on her questioning skills. Because she had to ask insightful questions of teachers about their practice, she must be well read and well informed.

I think that this new whole contract demands of me, better questions; is trying to do something where it enhances my role because I don't have the old check list from before. I don't have the old way of doing things. I have to be fairly current and if I'm not current then I have to ask somebody. It's very humbling because the position itself does not bring with it the normal sense of, and I don't like to use power, maybe status. (I/5/8)

The professional growth meetings that Janet held with teachers helped her to know the teachers better.

It's a wonderful way to really see their values and what they believe school should be, and where they come from in terms of their expectations and background. (I/5/15)

But she wondered if the new supervision and evaluation policy would ultimately shift the role of the principal to something she did not want it to become.

My concern would be that our role moves into the management, that we aren't seen as educational leaders, by means of our behavior, our supportive view, our providing of resources, or developing a philosophy of the school or an ethos. (I/4/19)

She also had some concerns about completely eliminating the three-year cyclical evaluation policy. She wondered if she and others would continue to implement the new policy since there were no formal processes to regulate its implementation.

Having a three-tier process: pre-conference, observation, collect data, post-conference; a nice little, tight little cycle was defined. And this is great. It's for people that are self-motivated and professionally motivated and professionally developed people. But I think that we need to still say that some sort of process is going to regulate evaluation and supervision, more for the integrity of program and making sure I'm doing my job than giving the teachers headaches. I think that there has to be some regulation to it or we may ignore it. (I/5/4)
Janet agreed with the philosophy behind the new policy but said that the process by which she supervised teachers was nebulous and without structure, except for the structure she imposed on it.

The plan, itself, is a perfect example of why it's critical to have something defined. They have to get their plan to me by November first. I have to meet with them and go over this plan. Therefore it gives me a deadline. The [supervision] is much more vague. So by having this deadline and knowing this is my job, I have a checklist where I wrote down all the names of the teachers, when did I meet with them, what was their topic. And now if somebody says, do you want to see our professional plans for the year, I'll pull it all out and there's the sheet. So it's the accountability of one of my jobs. Whereas if you said to me, where's your data on the teaching programs in the school. So the plan itself gives a real focus for the structure. (1/5/15)

Janet would prefer a district-wide structure to assess teaching and curriculum implementation in each school.

Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change

Janet used the two parts of her principalship in enacting the district policy change. First, she designed organizational structures to assure herself that she got into each teacher's classroom for supervision of instruction. She also designed a structure for making sure that she had a Professional Growth Plan from each teacher and that she discussed each teacher's plan. Second, because she valued teachers' knowledge, she helped to pair teachers for collaboration. Her criteria for pairing was to match teachers who she thought could learn from each other. She also encouraged the Professional Growth Committee to take responsibility for teachers' professional growth. Janet said that she felt that the change in policy was significant in that it gave more responsibility to teachers to act as professionals, but took away both hierarchical power and status from the principalship (1/4/20).
Gary

Context

Gary is a senior administrator in the district with 30 years of experience split between elementary and secondary. He has taught, served as a department head, vice principal, curriculum coordinator at the district level, and principal. He holds a B.A., a B.Ed., and an M.A. in Educational Administration. I met Gary in his fifth year as principal of Meadowbrook Elementary School. He described the 560 pupil elementary school as largely Caucasian, drawing most of its students from co-operative housing or low income rentals. Gary said that a high percentage of the children come from "welfare homes" and single parent families. Because the area has few recreational facilities, the school serves the greater community. Gary said that the area has a very high rate of breaking and entering, vandalism, drug, alcohol and sexual abuse.

Gary stated that because he had grown up in a poor family, he could empathize with the children in this school.

I guess we're all a product of our background and how we were brought up. But I think probably the biggest single factor in my life is my own upbringing and all the humiliations that I went through. For example in this school now no kid misses anything because of money. We subsidize over a $1000 a year in this school... We put out 35 hampers this year. Each hamper must have been worth over $300 at Christmas. This school has raised $7500 for charities this year, all sorts of different kinds of charities. We do Project Love here every year where we adopt a school in some other part of the world. This school really does reach out to the community and other people as well. And I think that's all part of my background, and a lot of the other people in the school as well... I think there's an empathy in the school that is quite unique and quite different. A lot of the staff here have been involved with special needs kids over the years and I think it was a natural to make this a good neighbor school, move all these kids in. (I/1/15)

The basic philosophy behind the school stems from the background and beliefs of Gary and the staff. Gary discussed it this way,

The school has got to fill every gap that is not being filled by somebody else. Feed, cloth, house, I don't care what it is. It goes back to Maslow's needs, we've got to fill all those things. And this idea about "it's not the school's mandate", is
absolute garbage, that is absolute crap. It may not be our mandate but if nobody else is doing it, we've got to do it. (1/1/16)

Gary's Principalship

Gary saw himself as the person in the school who constantly reminded teachers that they were special and they made Meadowbrook a special place to be.

I think one of the major things for me is that I am a perpetrator of myth. I think that's a really big role for me. I think you have to build an aura in the school. I think people have to feel unique and special in the school they're in. And there is a mystique all about Meadowbrook. There's really not much difference in a lot of ways, but I think the staff thinks it's different. (1/1/10)

He considered nurturing of the culture as one of his primary functions. Furthermore, Gary referred to himself as a cheerleader, "patting people on the back and giving a lot of encouragement" (1/1/10). He told staff and community how wonderful the staff was, how difficult the school is to work in, and what a fantastic environment this staff had developed for the school. He made it sound as if only a very special type of teacher could ever work here, and those that did were absolutely fantastic teachers!

They [teachers] say you want this school to be the best. You want us to be the best. And we know that and that's why we are busting our butts here, you know, everybody. The marginal teachers do not come to Meadowbrook. This is the circus. This is the zoo. This is the light house school. We do the best. Whatever we do, everybody knows it's Meadowbrook and we have that reputation. And they said when we walk into a teachers' meeting and nobody knows who we are, we say we are from Meadowbrook, people "ahhhhhhh," kind of thing. MEADOWBROOK! They either think that you are totally crazy or you're very fortunate to be teaching in this school. (1/2/20)

Gary defined one of his most important jobs to be staffing, saying that the only way the culture of the school could be maintained was through appropriate staffing. He staffed aggressively, contacting teachers he wanted in the school. As he put it, "I don't leave anything to chance in terms of staffing because you live or die on staffing (1/1/10).

Gary had the opportunity to build the staff at Meadowbrook over his tenure at the school. His major goals in choosing teachers had to do with two curricular areas and one instructional area. He stressed that he was interested in teachers who wanted to practice
whole-language techniques and hands-on math instruction, and most importantly, teachers who were team players. Because of these staff attributes, he said that the staff felt very special, much like a family (I/1/7). Not only did the staff look after and take care of each other (I/1/8), they demonstrated their caring for the children.

I've never had a staff that collectively did as much for the kids. I don't mean in terms of, necessarily, going into the community, but rather dealing with kids and their problems in the school. I think this staff is really outstanding on doing those kinds of things... They do more within the school context than any staff I've ever seen. (I/1/17)

This sense of caring within the school community was expressed in the way the staff thought about children. Gary said that because there were a great number of problems brought into the school, fetal alcohol syndrome, learning disabilities, abuse, hunger, dysfunctional family life, to name a few, children must be treated with respect and patience.

We talk about every child in the school is entitled to a new day, three hugs a day. We talk about that but we also say in this school we have not lost the art of rebuke. And there is a very fine line, I know, between that and abusing a child emotionally. I don't think this staff ever crosses that line. I think they always send a child out with dignity and I think they always say to kids, "I don't like what you did today, it has nothing to do with how I feel about you, let's start all over again tomorrow." (I/4/20)

Gary believed that maintenance of the culture of the school was very important. Consequently, he was always visible, talking with staff, keeping a finger on the pulse of the school.

I'm the first one here in the morning, always. And I'm usually the last one to leave, not always, but most often and I try to spend as much friendly cooperative time with teachers as I possibly can, so I start out usually in the office as they're checking in just talk to them at the counter. And then the last fifteen minutes or so I try to slip in the staff room and talk to them at tables, different places just rotate around. And in classrooms again, there's a lot of informal stuff, I walk around, talk to teachers, see them in the halls. I think probably there's more accomplished in the school with the informal kinds of things than there is when you sit down and meet with part of the staff, or with the primary staff or the entire staff. And that's where the trust is built, the term I use is fishing in my lake. Employers use that
term as well. This is where you cut deals. This is where you negotiate, this is where you do all sorts of different kinds of things. And so people end up trusting you and they feel okay. (1/4/10)

Gary said that he would like to be an educational leader, but the time wasn't there. Besides, he had a competent staff who made it less necessary for him to play that role. Instead, he viewed it as important for him to find release time for teachers to get together to work on the projects they felt were important, to provide encouragement for their work, and to provide them the opportunity to take risks (1/1/10).

Gary's role in bringing about change in the school was to stimulate discussion and facilitate teachers' efforts. He planted ideas and engaged teachers in discussion, then allowed them to decide upon the ideas they were willing to pursue. Once the teachers made a commitment to the direction they wanted to take, Gary supported their efforts with release time, appropriate facilities, supplies, and money. He discussed how he would facilitate the intermediate teachers' desire to do multi-aged grouping and collaborative planning and teaching.

We're going to give them time off as a group every third week, one afternoon is the best I could do. Even with that the head teacher and myself, we'll have to cover 140 kids for the afternoon...And we gave them all big rooms close together. That was another big thing they wanted. We pulled from the portables, found them some rooms, that's upset some of the other staff. But on this staff, if you want to try something exciting we'll try to facilitate that...Geographical proximity is really a very important part of collaboration. (1/1/18)...We are also applying for Provincial Site Grants to look at integrated intermediate classrooms. (1/2/12)

Gary spent a significant amount of time doing public relations work. Through his encouragement there were 300 parent volunteers at the school. He nurtured this group by spending time in the community. He went to weddings and funerals, and saw whoever wanted to see him. He viewed "bridge building" as an important part of his principalship.

An issue for Gary was who was responsible for decision making in the school. He struggled with issues of control and what decisions it was appropriate for teachers to make and what decisions he needed to make. He said that the school operated on a committee structure of which his perception was that teachers made all decisions.
We have seven committees in the school that meet. They make all the decisions in the school. They go to the staff meeting with recommendations. I sit on each of those seven committees. I try not to manipulate. But if it's against the school act, or district policy then you have to indicate that because they can't do that. But I'm really now questioning whether Meadowbrook is the "Gary Nelson Dog and Pony Show"...Maybe I give lip service to collaboration, maybe it's not as collaborative a model as I think it is...I'm really concerned, I have to tell you. I'm having second thoughts about a lot of my practices around the school. Maybe I shouldn't sit on so many committees...I don't know. I would like to think I'm a very collaborative administrator. I really would. (1/2/19)

An example Gary gave of teachers' desire to have more control was over school finances. Meadowbrook, like all other schools in the district, was given a certain level of funding. There was a finance committee in the school that was responsible for allocating those funds. If a teacher wanted money for professional development or a special project, the teacher made the request to this committee. Often there were not enough resources to fund what the teacher was interested in. However, over the years Gary had developed several funding sources outside the school; these included the parent association, service organizations, and businesses. If the teacher was not successful with the finance committee, that teacher would then go to Gary who would try to fund the teacher through external resources. This caused friction in the school, because the finance committee members thought they were seen as the "bad guys" and Gary as the "good guy." Gary said he thought it was an important part of his job to secure resources for teachers and did not understand the position of the finance committee (1/2/27). He looked upon this problem as an issue of control and did not understand why the teachers wanted to be involved in tracking down external funding opportunities when they did not have time to do it.

They have a finance committee that controls all the funds in the school, so I don't know where that's a major concern for them...The professional growth and professional development people make all of the decisions in terms of our professional development days and what the programs are going to be and who the speakers are and all that other kind of stuff. I don't know how much else I can give away. I don't...What can I give? What are they talking about? I don't even
know any more. There are some things I can't give away, because it contravenes the Act, and there's no way I'm going to do that. There are some final decisions that rest with the principal and I couldn't give that away if I wanted to. (I/3/5)

A second issue of control came with report cards. Gary, like most principals in the district, has always signed all report cards before they go home. But recently he said that some teachers in the school objected to submitting report cards to him.

They say they don't want to submit report cards for me to read. Well that's a very interesting problem, because I have to sign them, every single report card. The first thing is, I am not going to send out a final report card unless it's perfect in terms of spelling, grammar, punctuation...I pick up dozens and dozens of mistakes with each and every division, then they go back and they correct them. Okay, that's number one. Secondly, I try to read the report cards like a parent, and if there's a lot of jargonese, I don't say to the teacher, "You have to change it," I simply say, "Look, you know I didn't really understand what you meant by this. Is there some other way you might be able..." and I don't force them. I would have thought that was professional support, it's certainly not criticism. (I/3/6)

The struggle over control and who has the right and the ability to make decisions in a school, and the sorting out of what comprises a collaborative culture were major issues for Gary over the course of the study.

In seven years in this school I don't think a single item has gone on the staff committee agenda that I haven't put there. I can't think of one since the school opened that any staff member has put on the staff committee agenda...I put things on there as a sounding board to get people talking and discussing so that recommendations will go to the staff. But one year I decided not to put anything to the staff committee just to see what would happen and we only met once all year. At the first meeting we elected a chairperson and we never met again. So I don't know what that tells you. (I/4/14)

During the second year of the study, the Teachers' Association began job action across the district. Their contract had expired prior to the beginning of the school year and they were working without contract. The action began with refusal to do paper work, escalated to refusal to do supervision during recess and lunch, and extended to include preparation of report cards and anything beyond classroom teaching. Gary said that the strategy of the union was to put pressure on building administrators who would then, in turn, put pressure on the Board for a settlement (I/4/4). Gary thought this kind of job
action could put the culture of the school in jeopardy; thus, it was his responsibility to hold the culture together.

With the teachers being in the union now, that has changed things. To try to maintain the rapport between administration and staff takes so much energy, you're walking on eggs all the time. (1/2/23)

The issue of decision making was impacted by the demands of the Teachers' Association. Gary said that both he and the teachers expressed time and again that one of their biggest problems was that there was not enough time to discuss issues that affected the school. Yet, one of the non-budgetary items that the union bargained for was a maximum of one mandatory staff meeting per month that could go no later than 4:30, with a school dismissal of 3:00. Prior to this change the staff at Meadowbrook had decided to hold two staff meetings per month, one to discuss administrative matters and the other for professional development. The union said that the professional development committee was allowed to call a second meeting during the month, but staff need not attend. Gary worried that if only a segment of the staff attended, they were the only ones who would buy into the decisions that were made; thus the vision of the school was no longer a shared vision (1/3/6).

Gary said that he felt that in two ways the union action had a detrimental effect on the school culture. First, he said the union put its own needs before those of the children. Some of them are very good classroom teachers, but I think when push comes to shove the union thing would come before kids, I don't think there's any question. And their argument is, in the long term kids are going to be better off because of this, you can't just look at the immediate. So a kid doesn't get a quality year this year, but next year will be better, because we're feeling better about things...My argument is the kids only get one crack at it each year and you've got to give it your best. And if there's going to be a fight with the Board, have a fight with the Board, but don't put the kids in the way...because it's not fair to the kids. (1/3/8)

Second, Gary said that the culture was being affected by what was not occurring in the school: staff meetings, recess supervision, extracurricular fine arts and athletics, finance committee, social committee, professional development committee, and so on. Gary had
to make all decisions in the school, knowing that at a later date he would be called upon to justify those decisions (I/4/2). He stated that he had always thought about Meadowbrook as a special place, a family, but now the culture of that family was rapidly changing.

Despite the disruption to school culture caused by teachers' job action, Gary said that as principal he had "the major role" in terms of determining what the culture and climate of the school could be.

It is my experience that the principal plays a much greater role in the culture and climate than the research indicates, by far. I've seen schools change over night with a change in administrator and no change in staff. I know that all the research says that the principal does play a role, I'm saying that the principal plays THE major role, I don't care how you place it. And I don't care whether it is collegial decision making in the school or anything else, the principal may not create the vision, but he is such an important part of that. (I/2/13)

Gary went on to say that the principal was the key person in the school in terms of setting the tone, the focus, and the vision, so that when a principal left a school, the school underwent dramatic change. It would not be the same school (I/3/10). However, he said that in terms of innovation it was important for the administrator to be in the middle of the pack.

I really believe that a good administrator is in the middle pushing some people ahead and pulling some people behind. I think it's just as dangerous for an administrator to be a way out in front of the pack so the people have no idea where the hell he's going, or she's going, than it is for somebody who's dragging, holding everybody back. I think that both of those things are wrong. (I/4/27)

Supervision and Evaluation of Teacher

The change in policy in the supervision and evaluation of teachers changed the relationship that Gary had with teachers. He said that after the policy change, relationships became more relaxed, a fact that he attributed to his not being an evaluator anymore (I/3/17). There was no one on the staff of Meadowbrook whom Gary felt it necessary to take through the formal evaluation process. In fact, he had serious concerns
about initiating a formal evaluation procedure at all. His first concern was that evaluation was no longer the norm in the school district.

The evaluation procedure now is so stark, so unusual, so different, that if you're going to do it, you've got to go all the way with it. It is not something I would do lightly. I would only do it if I wanted the person turfed out of the profession, not just out of this school...I would rather use all of the other opportunities we've got to help that person, so I will do all sorts of other things, and I would not go to evaluation. (1/3/17)

Gary's second concern was that if he did decide to go through the evaluation process with a teacher, he would want the full support of the superintendent. In fact, he said that he would bring all of the documentation to the superintendent and get a commitment of support prior to initiating the formal procedure because, as he stated, "otherwise the person ends up hating your guts, staying on your staff anyway, and there's absolutely no benefit to you or to him or to anyone else" (1/3/17).

Gary said that if a teacher was unsatisfactory, he found it difficult to go into the class as an evaluator. He preferred to work with the teacher indirectly, rather than confront the teacher about the weakness.

It's hard for me to go in and say "you've got to shape up, you've got to do this, you've got to do that." My style tends to be almost sneaky, almost slyly to say something like, "I've got these two fantastic lessons on Paris. Is there any chance I can come in and do something with the class?" And so I try to work that way with them. (1/4/18)

Gary had mixed feelings about the change in policy on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Although he stated that his relationship with teachers was more relaxed, he expressed concern that teachers were not completely comfortable with the change. Cyclical teacher evaluation had been removed, but nothing equivalent had replaced it.

I think there is a feeling right now that there's a void. That this new process has left something, that these teachers still need somebody to say "I'm okay, doing a good job." (1/5/5)
Gary went on to say that he was asked to write letters for close to one third of the staff this year. He attributes this to the teachers' need for affirmation, something that is not accomplished through the contractual change (1/5/4).

**Professional Growth Plans**

Gary's view of the Professional Growth Plan process was that the plan belonged to the teacher, so the teacher should be in charge of the plan and responsible for its implementation. Thus, he, as principal, should be careful not to try to influence or monitor the plan.

My concern is that if principals get involved at the ground level, other than to offer ideas and suggestions, that if they get involved with individual teachers in helping them plan the Professional Growth Plan, it's really not the teacher's Professional Growth Plan at all. So I stayed out of that. Completely. (1/2/7)

The role he played was largely determined by the teacher. The growth plan was due into the principal's office in mid-November. Gary said that approximately one third of the staff did not get their plans in on time. When he got them he read them over, and scheduled an interview with each teacher. The interview was not required, but was left to the discretion of the individual teacher. If a teacher chose to keep the appointment, Gary would point out the interesting aspects of the plan, ask some clarifying questions such as how long the plan might take, what kinds of resources were required, what might an appropriate follow-up be, and how could he be of assistance. For many teachers that was the last discussion he would have with them about their plans. However, with other teachers he might play a larger role in the plan where he was involved in their classroom or in periodic discussions with them (1/5/9). Gary tried to keep up with current educational research and pass articles of interest onto the staff (1/4/13). Gary did not view writing of Professional Growth Plans as problematic to the staff because he felt that most of them had already incorporated into their practice the setting and writing of growth goals (1/1/17).

Gary said that the Professional Growth Plans would have future implications for the role of the principal; first, though, credibility of the plan had to be established. Gary
said that he thought that many teachers had concern that the Professional Growth Plan process was instituted by the Board as a way to check up on what teachers were doing in classrooms. He said that it could take as long as five to ten years for credibility to be established and for teachers to understand that the attempt was to do nothing more than enhance their own professional growth and professional development (1/2/10). Gary said that once the credibility of the plans was established, teachers would feel more comfortable with having the principal in their classroom and therefore invite the principal to play a larger role in the plans. This might include working together, setting goals together, and looking at programs for special needs children, to name a few opportunities for collaboration (1/2/11). But this would take time to establish and could not be forced.

As the professional growth process stood now, Gary said that he was somewhat uncomfortable with his role. Because he did not directly monitor teacher's plans, he could not use them as a vehicle for influencing the direction of a teacher's practice.

The way the system's designed right now, the principal doesn't really monitor, on a regular basis, the Professional Growth Plan. You sit down, discuss it with the staff member and you talk about timelines, you talk about who they're collaborating with, all this kind of stuff, and "I'm here if you need me, come and talk to me." But I don't revisit those Professional Growth Plans, and I have no real avenue to revisit those, other than to do it casually, "How are things going, did you set a timeline, did you get a chance to contact the teacher, did you apply for the conference?" that kind of stuff. But to actually sit down and monitor, I just don't do that. (1/3/12)

Gary stated that he thought there still needed to be some fine tuning of the process. The principal must explicitly be a greater part of it. And there had to be more accountability built in for teachers.

There has to be some more direct way that the principal can be involved with that process rather than just on a volunteer basis...Maybe there still has to be some monitoring somewhere. Maybe it's because it's a new process, I feel guilty at this point even suggesting to somebody that their Professional Growth Plan either doesn't really address a particular situation or, in my opinion, there's something else you should pursue. I would never get into that because the understanding in
the district is that it is their Professional Growth Plan. They make the decision and I'm only involved if they want me involved. (I/5/10)

A second part of Gary's concern about the limited involvement of the principal centered around his notion that although many teachers had interesting plans, he was not sure of how much of what the teacher was doing got transferred into practice.

The process itself, theoretically, is fantastic. You can't argue it philosophically, but...[the plans] are only as good as the people who are doing it. And what's happening on this staff and some other staffs as well, is that people are coming up with Professional Growth Plans, we sit down and we talk about it, but you know that that's not actually being translated in the classroom...You encourage, you get equipment, supplies whatever they need. But a lot of them just aren't capable of conceptualizing something and then taking it back. (I/1/17)

Gary saw his role affected in several ways by teachers' writing Professional Growth Plans. He did not like the process of going through the supervisory cycle with teachers every three years, so enjoyed the relief from that responsibility. He felt the tone of the school was much more positive, more collegial (I/4/23). Yet, he thought it had negatively influenced his practice, as well. For example, he no longer got into classrooms explicitly to observe teacher's practice.

In terms of the difference, basically there's a good side and bad side to it. The one thing about the evaluations with the supervisory cycle, it forced you to be in the classroom for whatever period of time, whether you wanted to or not. You had to do one third of your staff every year and I would go in there at least seven times, plus the supervisory cycle first where we sat down and did it and then the debriefing after. So I guess it forced me into a kind of a model where at least I was in the classroom. Now it's more informal, and my contact in the classroom tends to be if a teacher invites me for a special event I go in, if I'm taking a tour through the school I go in. But I almost never go in on my own and sit down and watch a lesson. (I/5/5)

Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change

Gary viewed his major role as spokesperson for the vision of the school, or as he stated, perpetrator of the myth. He viewed the change in contract as significant in terms of the more collaborative relationship he now had with teachers. However, he said that he thought the policy needed to be fine tuned to include more direct supervision of
Professional Growth Plans by the principal. Because he viewed a primary component of his practice to be the nurturing of the culture of the school, a school in which teachers had assumed responsibility for their own professional development, Gary remained a supporter, but left implementation of Professional Growth Plans up to individual teachers.

Vera

Context

Vera, principal of Boundary Elementary School for four years, had actually begun her teaching career there twenty-five years ago. Like many beginning teachers of that era, Vera began teaching with only three years of undergraduate work, completing her degree requirements part-time. Prior to becoming principal, she was a primary and intermediate teacher, a head teacher for two years, took one year off to earn a Masters Degree in Curriculum and Instruction, and worked as a district curriculum specialist.

During her teaching career she found that she was at times defending her educational views with other teachers or her principal. She believed in initiating and continuing a dialogue around educational issues. A few of her colleagues found this threatening; most welcomed her approach. She taught in one school where she said she and another teacher surreptitiously team taught because the principal believed that children should not be active in the classroom. Vera said that even as a young teacher, she was interested in active learning and authentic assessment.

Soon after completion of her masters degree, Vera became a district consultant in the areas of program implementation in language arts, social studies, fine arts, gifted and multicultural education. She attributed the development of her leadership skills to this five-year experience.

Vera actively sought the principalship because she said, "I like being a catalyst. I like being in the middle of things" (1/1/13). She pondered whether her decision had something to do with issues of power.
I guess power does have something to do about it, maybe power in the sense of autonomy because the consultant position was not a supervisory position, not that one wants to be necessarily having that kind of power. But the autonomy that goes with being able to manage and set directions and that kind of thing is exciting. (I/1/13)

Vera stated that there was a certain kind of teacher who liked to work with her and consequently kept her excited about being a principal.

People who are stuck in neutral and don't want to go anywhere aren't comfortable working with me. You have to kind of be an energetic professional. What turns me on to the principalship is that. (I/1/14)

Vera explained that she had a firm understanding of what her educational values were and how that affected her staff.

I have very strong values about what a school should be and hopefully we have some sharing of those values. I think we do. But getting about the business of doing it is quite individual and I think teachers know that they've got a lot of latitude, that it is a school where people take a lot of risks. People who aren't comfortable with that probably aren't too comfortable working here. (I/1/15)

She lived by those values as demonstrated by her statement,

I get tenacious if I think things are going in a direction that's negative. A couple of years ago I was extremely tenacious, to the point of looking like a Pitt Bull. We had some people who felt that authoritarian kinds of punitive things were the way to go with kids and I simply wouldn't have it. (I/1/15)

She described herself as a "high-energy lady who really loves to learn and be a part of the action with kids" (I/1/16).

Boundary Elementary School is a small school with nine enrolling divisions, and 13.4 full-time equivalent teachers. Vera likened the school to an inner city school in terms of socio-economic make-up of the families, but not in terms of the way it looked or felt (I/1/11). She described the school this way.

There are various ways people talk about Boundary. Talk to people who have been principals there, they'll tell you that it's a challenging yet rewarding school. Talk to some teachers who wouldn't go near it...It's got a very diverse mix of kids. There are some very needy kids that come from the south part of our catchment area, along Main Street and south of Main where it's sort of mixed small industry
and crummy rental houses that are left over from where they've taken out places for industrial things. And then the northern part of our catchment is quite middle class. So you get a quite broad range of children. The unfortunate thing is that there are just a sufficient number of needy kids for a lack of a force of positive role models. While we have some positive role models in our school, sometimes they are not the majority of the kids. So we have to work really hard on social development and social/emotional issues at the school. (I/1/9)

Vera said that a fair amount of her time was spent in crisis management because "of the volatility of people with low self esteem and emotional needs and certain morals" (I/1/14). She worked with teachers, supporting their efforts and helping them not to feel inadequate when they were working in very difficult situations. She also spent a great deal of time with parents in what she referred to as:

friendly chats, listening, helping them to be less hostile and less ridiculous with their kids. Some people have fairly primitive ideas of what parenting is all about. Sometimes it's quite abusive and yet they don't mean to be. (I/1/14)

Vera's Principalship

Vera spoke of her role as primarily consisting of three parts: encouraging the development of a collegial culture, helping staff to develop a shared set of values, and modeling actions that follow from those values.

Vera said she constantly and consistently worked toward the development of a collegial culture. She disagreed with "Fullan and Hargreaves who say contrived collegiality is not the way to go" (I/1/19). She said that teachers are not accustomed to working collegially through group planning and decision making (I/1/19); therefore, it was her responsibility to put people into situations in which they have the opportunity to see how collegiality works: to try out collegial decision making and planning.

She repeatedly spoke about her practice in terms of establishing and nurturing collegial norms because although collegiality was a value she brought to the principalship, not all teachers were ready to accept it.

I came into the principalship with the value of "I am an instructional leader, and I am a colleague in curriculum with these people." I didn't see myself as the administrator/supervisor as a first role, I saw it as part of what I have to do. I
wanted to develop the norm in the school of "we are one team of people working for kids and we are here to help one another." Sometimes that met with resistance...If I was going to be in this school, I was part of the educational team. (I/4/2)

Because collegiality was not necessarily the norm when she began her principalship, Vera helped teachers learn how to be collegial by putting them into situations to experience the benefits of collegiality. They could then jointly decide if this was a process they wished to continue (F1/1). For example, staff meetings were a time for joint problem solving and decision making. She divided teachers into small groups with structured tasks, then pulled the entire group together to come to consensus (I/1/19). This kind of activity provided teachers with an opportunity for "purposeful talk," which Vera viewed as the backbone to collegiality.

We have to build in structures for collegiality, we have to provide time in our staff meetings and professional development time, so that teachers can get together and do that kind of talking. But I want to be included in those discussions. (I/5/5)

Vera kept values in the forefront of discussion saying, "I would keep reiterating values. I made it very clear that we were going to develop a mission statement, and we did. I made sure that we kept issues on the discussion table around aspects of curriculum" (I/1/20). She encouraged teachers to engage in the discussion and enact the negotiated values in ways that corresponded with their own style of teaching. She said one of her responsibilities was:

to keep afloat some norms, some values, some cultural things that are growing in the school, but not to enculturate to the point that we want clones. To keep it going and let it grow and get input from people, that's quite complex. (I/2/14)

According to Vera, the primary values that the staff negotiated had to do with collegiality, a positive climate, treating adults and children with respect, and dealing with the social and emotional demands of the children.

Vera said that values had to be in the forefront of discussion because even after lengthy discussion and after the staff's developing a mission statement, some teachers had
not incorporated those values into the way they worked with children. For example, one teacher responded to negative student behavior by putting children in the hallway. She called the teacher in and asked him to help her understand what he was doing and how his reactions fit into the mission that they had all composed. She explained,

I think you can pre-empt a lot of this stuff by talking about the values, because kicking kids out in the hall, people know that that is not the way we want to do business here. I've had to talk to people about cornering kids and belittling kids; that's about as far as it's gone with the way we treat kids, though. (I/4/11)

Vera said that she and the staff valued a culture that incorporated a positive climate and collegiality. They decided to form a Positive Climate Committee that would oversee the general direction of the school and alert staff to issues needing attention. This extended to students as well as teachers. She sat on the committee and encouraged members to develop avenues for children to deal with feelings, as well as ways to recognize positive student contributions within the school (I/1/12). Collegiality was the backbone of school climate and the way in which Vera enacted her role nurtured the growth of collegiality.

What has made a big change is that the encouragement of collegiality has meant that...I have to look at how I behave as a principal. I'm not sure that all principals read that into it but I feel that this whole thing [referring to the policy change] can only survive in a climate of collegiality...So I have had to model collegiality and implement structures in this school that promote collegiality. (I/5/4)

The structure that Vera referred to was the nurturing of an atmosphere that encouraged educational dialogue, joint problem solving, and a common approach to working toward the social and emotional well-being of the school community. To this end, she said, she continuously asked herself a series of questions.

I'm thinking back on how I have done certain things. How will I do them in the future? How can I do them in the future? What is most important to me? Will I keep working towards it? What can I simply not let go? I don't mean in a power sense, but in the development of norms in the school. What has to be maintained to make this a viable and interesting place for people to be and develop it for the kids? (I/4/8)
She concluded by saying that it is only through taking every opportunity for dialogue that the norms and values in the school would survive.

Problem solving as a norm (I/4/4) took several different forms, but most importantly, problem solving was always done by the people closest to the problem. Vera gave two examples. The first had to do with how she handled parental complaints.

I try not to give the parent a definitive answer until I have talked to the teacher. I think that is the only way to deal with something respectably, even though I may know that the parent is absolutely right. There is a process...I try to acknowledge the parent "Yes, I hear what you're saying and I certainly will ask about it and either I will get back to you or the teacher will get back to you or maybe we all need to meet together." We also try to built the norm that we all work together to help the child, parent included, so there isn't just a school responsibility and a home responsibility, it's a joint responsibility. (I/4/11)

The second example concerned disagreements between staff members.

We have tried to develop here that you go directly to somebody with an issue. I have said that I will help mediate if they would like, but basically we try to be ethical and go directly to the person that seems to be causing the difficulty. (I/4/4)

For Vera, the process of getting people closest to the problem to solve it was one part of developing a culture of collegiality.

Discipline in the school was handled according to the negotiated norms. Together, Vera and the teachers established an umbrella of school behavior guidelines. The guidelines were quite general, but ones to which each teacher could commit. Teachers took these guidelines into the classroom and used them as a starting point to negotiate personalized classroom rules. The classroom rules were sent to Vera, so she knew what behavior was expected in each classroom (I/1/1).

When a problem occurred, Vera tried to work with the teacher in the classroom, thus modeling joint problem solving. However, if a teacher thought that a child needed to leave the classroom, the teacher had the opportunity to fill out a quick checklist form and send the child to the resource room for a time-out period. Sometimes a child was sent to Vera's office. The first time a child came to her, Vera took a reading of the situation,
discussed it with the child and recorded it in a card file. The second time the child was sent to her, she got the parent involved, either through a problem solving session, or just a letter home, depending upon what was appropriate for the situation. However, once a child was sent to her, she told teachers that she had the discretion to handle the problem as she saw appropriate.

We're dealing with youngsters, they are going to make lots of mistakes. I have to be given the trust that I can make a judgment, that this is serious enough to warrant keeping a record of it or it's a misdemeanor and we'll talk to that child and away they go...It's very flexible depending on what the child is doing, and the pattern of what they do. (I/1/1)

The thread that ran through Vera's discussions of school climate was that the norm of collegiality was important and set the tone for how the school functioned.

Vera said it was important for the development and acceptance of negotiated values that she model for staff what the actions looked like. She demonstrated the importance of professional dialogue by taking every opportunity to talk with teachers and encourage them to talk with each other about educational issues. She went into classrooms and modeled instruction. For example, she designed a program called "The Principal Reads, Too" whereby each month she chose a book, often with an issue she thought needed to be addressed school-wide. She read the book aloud and discussed it in each class (I/1/11), thus illustrating to staff and students the value of working on social and emotional issues.

Adult learning strategies were important to Vera as she worked with the staff. She described the necessity of learning within a social context. That is, she said that the way adults learn is through mirroring each other and through constant dialogue and interaction. She modeled collegiality by co-planning and team teaching with her colleagues (I/1/17). She demonstrated teaching techniques and strategies by conducting staff meetings in a workshop format where small cooperative learning groups discussed an issue, then reported back to the whole group (I/1/19).
Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers

Collegiality, as a value within the school, influenced how Vera supervised teachers. Supervision for Vera meant spending time talking with teachers about curriculum and pedagogy, but it also meant being actively involved in their classrooms.

I play out my role as a partner in education so that the input I give is of a team member. Rather than being this person at the back of the room observing the teacher teach, which I think is the old model, I try to make that more casual and collegial. (1/4/2)

The supervision and evaluation policy was adopted by the Board and by the Teachers' Association only after a several-year transition period. During this time principals and teachers learned and used a clinical supervision model whereby teacher and supervisor met in a preconference to identify a focus for the observer; the supervisor observed the teaching and collected data; then in a postconference, the supervisor shared and analyzed the data with the teacher and discussed implications for the teacher's practice. This process was also used in peer supervision. Vera stated that supervisory skills and peer supervision helped to develop professional dialogue and collegiality over a several year period (1/4/3).

Vera said that over the transition period an ethic of professional trust was established that works for 99% of the teachers (1/1/2). The new policy becomes problematic when professional trust breaks down or when the teachers are less-than-average teachers.

I really like the PGP for the teachers who are average and better. For the marginal teacher and for the incompetent teacher I think it has put the principal in something of a bind because of going the route of the PGP and then going further. Or maybe it's learning about how the process works from our point of view: to feel confident to walk into that classroom and say, "I have concerns, I would like to talk with you about them." And it might be my misunderstanding about the entry point of formal supervision and how that process works, if it looks as if there are areas of concern that are either related to or unrelated to what the person has chosen to do in their professional growth program. (1/2/9)
Vera stated that she felt quite comfortable with supervising teachers in a supportive way. If she thought a teacher needed help, she could easily access resource people in the district to provide support and she could provide constructive feedback. But she said that she thought the Professional Growth Plan process slowed down the shift to formal supervision. She went on to wonder if this reflection was only her perception.

I think the PGP has slowed it down towards the issue of formal supervision, but maybe that's just because we're shifting gears and I don't know how to do it properly. (1/2/10)

Vera's uncertainty about how and when to begin a formal supervision process was less a lack of understanding of the written policy and more of a discomfort with recognizing when she had exhausted her supportive supervisory skills and needed to move toward a more formal and structured approach to evaluation.

For Vera, the nature of evaluation and, thus accountability, shifted. She said that in the past accountability came through inspection of teachers' previews and their teaching. Now accountability is different:

Accountability comes through with "knowledge of" and working together through that "knowledge of." And what I mean by that is there's knowledge of the curriculum, there's knowledge of the needs in the school, there's knowledge of the changes that are taking place. And so I think the question we have to ask ourselves is how do we create that "knowledge of"? And that's through the dialogue and the meetings...We have to build in structures for collegiality...I want to be included in those discussions, that is my measure of accountability, that I am involved and know what's going on...If we're all part of the group decision making process and dialoguing together, then we know what one another is doing. (1/5/5)

For Vera collegiality can be an avenue to and one measure of accountability (F/6/1).

**Professional Growth Plans**

Vera played two important roles in the policy change that concerned teachers' developing and writing Professional Growth Plans. One role was her school-based activities, the second was her service on the district-wide Professional Growth Plan committee. Vera said that the Professional Growth Plan process had expanded her role as
an instructional leader within the school. To be an active listener and a facilitator in teacher's work, Vera explained that she had the responsibility to continue to learn about curriculum and instructional design.

On the district level, Vera brought to the table the importance of collegiality as the basis for professional growth.

I sit on the joint PGP committee in the district, and one of the things that I keep harping about is what else are you doing in the school to support this because I cannot see it surviving in isolation if the rest of the operation of the school is not working towards a collegial model. It can't just steer through a mine field and survive. So what I would like to see in the district over time is that other in-service, other policy directions, support the developing of a collegial norm...It's got to happen in a context. (1/4/14)

Within the context of a collegial structure, Vera talked about the interplay of the supervision of teachers and the Professional Growth Plans. She still had the responsibility to supervise and to evaluate teachers, but she said her role was expanded to include being a part of the teaching team.

I think in a professionally oriented climate, it has greatly enhanced my role because it's freed me to be a colleague with my staff in the areas of professional development and professional growth. Given the way the contract is written, I still have the avenues open to me as an administrator if formal supervision is required...I can still be that kind of supervisor if necessary. But I think it's freed up everyone to just sit back and relax a little bit. (1/5/4)

She saw her responsibility to be in classrooms as much as possible.

I need the time to visit with my teachers. I need the time to be able to talk with my teachers and while the professional growth team can facilitate the ethics, if I as a supervisor have the responsibility to ensure that each plan is going along, I need to be directly involved. (1/2/11)

Vera started teachers thinking about Professional Growth Plans by inviting a district consultant to present the concept at a staff meeting. In subsequent staff meetings she had teachers break into small groups to examine what Professional Growth Plans meant for them and how they could benefit professionally from them. She presented the
contract changes and facilitated teachers' thinking about how they could personalize a process to their own school (I/1/21).

Vera met with each teacher three times per year about their plans. The first time was in the early fall prior to the plan being written. This was a brainstorming session in which ideas were shared and the collegial aspects of the plan discussed.

The strict letter of the contract is not being followed here. We're going well beyond that and the expectation I have, and the teachers know, is that I am a resource person, as well, because I'm on the PGP committee. And the more we talk, the more helpful we can be to one another. They came to chat with me before they actually wrote their plans to go through their ideas. What I tried to do is be very sensitive to what they wanted and who they wanted to work with and gave them ideas around facilitating that so they could see that this was a constructive, helpful exercise. (I/4/9)

Her next meeting with each teacher followed the submission of the written plan. They talked about fine tuning the plan, what release time was needed, how Vera could be helpful and whether they would like the opportunity to present the plan to the school-based professional growth committee (I/1/4). The final meeting occurred in the spring to review progress on the plan.

The Professional Growth Plan Committee in the school supported teachers as they worked through their plans. They organized activities at staff meetings for dialogue around the process teachers would go through as well as around implementation of a variety of plans. Teachers had the opportunity to discuss questions, concerns and triumphs (I/4/9). Teachers could also opt to bring their plans to the PGP committee for ideas and support.

The Professional Growth Committee decided to dedicate a small room in the school to be a teachers' resource room. They were outfitting it with comfortable furniture, a blackboard, bulletin board, desk, coffee table and a professional library, hoping it would be a place where teachers could work individually or in small groups (I/4/9).
Vera said that the professional growth team shared her belief that it was only within the context of a collaborative culture that the policy change could work; that is, the policy change could not be imposed upon an environment which did not support collegiality (1/2/3). She said that collegiality was not completely in place; however, it would continue to develop as teachers worked toward incorporating Professional Growth Plans into their practice. Only, she said, when Professional Growth Plans became incorporated into the culture would a collegial framework become the norm (1/3/1).

The opportunity for dialogue that was opened through Professional Growth Plans allowed Vera to be more of a part of the staff than when she was responsible for doing formal, written evaluations of every teacher (1/1/21). The Professional Growth Plans provided a formal mechanism for her to enter into a collegial relationship with teachers as well as for teachers to enter into collegial relationships with other teachers (1/5/6).

Vera said that the reason the Professional Growth Plans were working at Boundary was because of the culture of collegiality and the way she and the Professional Growth Plan Committee supported teachers in the writing of their plans. They structured staff meeting time for small groups to talk about progress and dilemmas concerning their plans. The Professional Growth Plan Committee held, each month, a second staff meeting called a Professional Forum. The Professional Development and Professional Growth Committees decided on topics and teachers could come on a voluntary basis (1/4/6). The topics were those identified as needs in the school or as professional growth interests. Vera was able to support teachers in their writing and execution of Professional Growth Plans because of the structure of collegiality that she and the staff had worked toward for several years.

**Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change**

Vera's approach to introducing the policy change in the supervision and evaluation of teachers to the staff was consistent with the mechanisms for solving any problem within the school. She provided teachers with the necessary knowledge to solve the problem. In
this case, she explained the contractual change and enlisted district support to help teachers understand what the changes would look like. She then drew on the collegial culture that she and the staff were developing. She encouraged teachers to form a Professional Growth Committee of which she was a member. The committee helped the staff to establish a process in the school for Professional Growth Plans. The process grew out of the collegial culture and relied upon collegiality to function well. Collegiality was the mechanism by which Professional Growth Plans became an accepted part of teachers' practice. Professional Growth Plans, in turn, helped to continue the development of collegiality.

Carol

Context

Carol, in her third year of her first principalship, worked at Lakeside Secondary School, a school of 1400 students and 91 staff members. She holds a masters degree in educational administration. Prior to becoming principal, she was a teacher, department head, district level coordinator, and vice principal in the school district.

Lakeside Secondary is a large comprehensive high school with programs ranging from technical education, to English as a second language, to an International Baccalaureate program. With the exception of students on special programs, each student is required to take a full course load of eight subjects with no free blocks. This was not the case when Carol came to the school five years before as a vice principal, when over half of all students had at least one free block. Educationally, Carol thought this was unacceptable.

I really panicked. I read the accreditation booklet and there were some statements about students not taking certain electives that were so good. So I thought, I'll use this...and since then I have always used research to back me up in a school when people say, "Hey, why are we doing this?"...Well, it was interesting because the staff really wasn't sure what was happening. The elective people went off in
the summer with classes of 8 and 10 and came back with classes of 24. They were a little annoyed because they were used to having small classes, but they were excited because they had kids that they had never had before, like academic kids were in the art classes...Actually the change was phenomenal. (I/1/18)

It was interesting to watch the dynamics...Now the very best students in our school take all the electives. So there's a mix and the spin off is that in the art room that girl who is really good in mathematics probably is not that great in art. She's sitting in there with the person who isn't that super in math looking and thinking, I can show her something. So the whole tone and feeling,...that's what makes Lakeside unique. (I/1/24)

Carol's principalship is guided by her willingness to confront obstacles, combined with a professional flexibility. For example, she spoke of her undergraduate degree in mathematics from an all women's university, saying "It didn't occur to me that there wasn't anything that I couldn't do" (I/1/1/). And when she spoke of the people who had the greatest influence on her, she referred to their ability to help her to be reflective, saying, "it was like I had to examine myself all the time. It was like there was a mirror in front of me" (I/1/30).

Carol talked about how she began to think about issues of evaluation, particularly about clinical supervision, and about how she later decided to pursue a career in educational administration. Her comments here, in part, explain the personal conflict she experienced between her views on supervision and evaluation and those commonly expressed at that time in the school district. She pursued her interest in supervision, not because of positive role models, but because of frustration with existing role models.

She talked about the principal who decided to use her as his demonstration teacher for clinical supervision. He was learning the process of clinical supervision and she got caught between his desire to try a new technique and his lack of thorough understanding of the process. "I've learned a lot from this experience as an administrator...It really affected me on how you can affect a good teacher. He came in and I actually just panicked" (I/1/6). The principal's analysis showed weakness in Carol's teaching, but the principal could offer little help or explanation. "Right away I was told that what I was
doing was not right. It really upset me. And from then on everything was bad" (I/1/7).

Confusion culminated when Carol received her final report.

So I get my principal's report. Well, it's a phenomenal report...He writes about five pages on the things I was doing in the school and how I affected the students, how I affected the district, my love for teaching, the whole thing. It was totally opposite of what I'd gone through. (I/1/7)

This incident was the impetus for Carol's enrolling in a week long clinical supervision workshop.

I went on supervisory skills because I thought, "what are they doing in this district?" I was very angry that they were doing this to everybody and making this a terrible thing. I went as the worse skeptic on earth. (I/1/8)

Carol's ability to analyze the situation and remain open-minded came into play.

They started showing us the qualities of an effective teacher, and they're showing us stuff to read. I never saw research before...It was a turning point for me. (I/1/8)

Prior to the clinical supervision workshop and her introduction to educational research, Carol did not consider a career in administration because she felt her philosophy of education was counter to many of the existing school district policies.

I'm not criticizing because they ran the schools well, but they were very much of the army type: lots of policies and lots of rules and regulations. It was just the opposite of what I was like. (I/1/10)

However, in a meeting with all teachers in the school district, the Superintendent, Dr. Grant, asked if they realized what knowledge there was to gain from university courses. Open to new ideas, Carol decided to sample some. She subsequently enrolled in a masters degree program in educational administration, which, in turn, led to a vice-principalship. This was followed, six years later, by a principalship.

Because of her interest in supervision and evaluation, Carol was a logical choice to join another administrator and three teachers on a district committee to assess and ultimately make recommendations for an alternative method of teacher supervision and
evaluation. The plan this committee proposed was accepted by both the administration and the teachers' association, and with relatively few changes was put into the teachers' collective agreement.

**Carol's Principalship**

Carol's discussion about her principalship stressed the necessity of negotiating a culture that was based on shared values, the necessity for her to model what she and others value, and the importance of reading and sharing research with teachers.

Carol discussed policies and practices at Lakeside in terms of a culture built upon "purposeful talk" centering around values and beliefs. She shared an example in which the culture was tested over an issue of student behavior. One grade was exhibiting some behaviors with which teachers were uncomfortable. The reaction of a group of teachers was that there needed to be a policy book of rules and regulations developed so that behavioral limits and consequences for misbehavior were well defined. Carol recalled her days as a teacher saying if she had a policy book she would have filed it in September and not seen it again until June. What she felt was more important than a policy book was a set of values and beliefs that everyone agreed upon and enacted (F/2/13).

That was one of the things that I've been fighting all the way along. There's not a rule in this school. If you want to go to a school where there are lots of rules, fine, but I can't work as principal of that school. (I/1/30)

She described her strategy and goals for the next staff meeting:

So that's one of my biggest goals to get people to honestly get policy that follows through from practice, and follows through some values, so that's going to be my major focus. (I/2/14)

She explained that she would divide teachers into groups to do "purposeful talking" about the kinds of behaviors they would like to see and the indicators of those behaviors (I/3/41). From teachers' "purposeful talk" she would nurture the negotiated belief system and expectations that form the basis for the school culture.
Carol expressed concern about her role and who could and would determine the components of her role. She said that from the time she stepped into Lakeside Secondary as a vice principal, role determination became an issue for her. She was handed a new policy book that discussed appropriate student behavior and outlined specific consequences for inappropriate behavior. Most of these consequences fell upon Carol, as Vice Principal, to implement. Carol, upset about this, said:

I'll never forget this, this was going to be given out to the staff, and I almost cried. There was page after page of what my job was; my job was defined by the policy book. (1/2/14)

This incident set Carol on the course of helping staff to reflect on their values and beliefs. She resolved that each day she schedule time to do what she called "purposeful talking" with staff and other administrators (1/3/31). She stated that through purposeful discussion she and her staff could together build a school culture based on consensus about values and roles. She said of her own role,

I'm not sure that I really want to be a principal in a system that is going to determine what my job is. And I'm worried that my colleagues don't see this. (1/5/24)

Carol stated that she needed the freedom to determine what her role would be depending on the values and beliefs jointly negotiated by her and the school staff.

Carol tried to build a culture based upon the negotiated values of staff. One problem she confronted was a changing staff. Since she needed to get everyone to agree upon a common set of values, she had to keep values issues in the foreground of discussion.

I realize that there are a lot of things that you take for granted that people know. You build the culture. You bring twenty people in this year and twenty people in the next year, you forget that you need to reinforce it and the things that you take for granted as common sense aren't really that common. (1/4/5)

Once values have been negotiated, Carol deemed it an important part of her job to model for staff the resulting actions. She shared several examples of how she did this.
Carol tried to model problem solving techniques and accessibility. She had an open door policy and encouraged staff to discuss problems; however, she did not allow problems to be left with her. That is, she discussed strategies for problem solving in order to help the teacher deal with the problem (1/3/31).

Accessibility for Carol extended to her presence around the school. She discouraged meetings that took her from the building the half hour before or after school. This was "prime time" for Carol when she could walk the halls and talk to students and staff.

She spoke about how important it was for her to encourage other people in the school, especially department heads, to model. The next example occurred when she and the staff were moving into a newly constructed high-technology building with a networked computer in each room.

The Social Studies Department Head said, "They won't leave their maps, it's going to be an uprising." I said, "Then you leave maps, you can't bring one map." "Oh," she said, "I have to bring one." I said, "Fran, it's hard being a leader, you have to bite the bullet. I love writing little notes to people. Now I have to use this CC-mail all the time. I have to model it. There are all kinds of things that I have to change, and I'm going to." And I said, "You have to model." (1/4/16)

She expected district personnel to have the same responsibility to her as she had to teachers. Consequently, she felt that after purposeful talking with administrators, district personnel should decide on what the focus would be for the year. Then, just as she models what needs to be done in the school, they need to model what needs to be done on a district level (1/5/27).

A third important part of Carol's role was a personal obligation on her part to read current literature and bring it to the attention of staff.

As a math teacher I have to know my mathematics. I have to spend all my time doing that. I expect somebody else to be at the next level knowing the trends, sharing them with me, making me aware and bringing me up to speed as a teacher. And I really see that as a role or there's no need for us in the school. (1/5/24)
Carol encouraged the other members of the administrative team to model basing practice on research. She explained how she represented this idea to the team.

It's going be critical that part of our team meeting is devoted to discussing. Each person's going to take a turn at giving something to each of us to read, something current. And we're going to discuss it. I believe in that and I think this is the perfect opportunity. It's also a model. We're not just doing maintenance and we're not just reacting. (I/1/42)

Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers

For Carol, implementation of the policy change in the structure of teachers' supervision and evaluation took the same route as any change within the school. It was brought to the staff for discussion. Out of this discussion, or "purposeful talk", came an understanding, a set of values, that led to a course of implementation.

Carol referred to supervision and evaluation of teachers, sometimes interchangeably, but always on a continuum, saying it was her responsibility to supervise teachers' professional growth. It was only when the supervision process yielded no results that she would begin the more formal evaluation process. However, even when she discussed the formal evaluation process, she often referred to it as supervision. This seemed to be less a state of confusion on her part, than a refusal to believe that, in the end, she could not be successful with helping a teacher to grow professionally.

She talked about the large number of invitations she received to visit classrooms, saying she was asked in so many times because she was viewed as being nonjudgemental. She said she always went in with a smile because she wanted to be seen as supportive. When she did have a concern it would always be delivered verbally, not in writing, because when people get a written memo about a concern, she said, "they find a word that's really hurtful and they live with it. And no matter what you write, there is going to be something that is going to hurt someone. I know because I've been there" (I/4/33).
However, when a teacher experienced difficulties and ordinary supervision and support of the teacher yielded no positive results, Carol felt obligated to begin the formal evaluation process. She talked about a discussion she had with one of the vice principals.

I'm working with someone here who hasn't been an administrator that long, four or five years. We have one person who is not very satisfactory and we started dealing with it in October, asking what are we going to do, how are we going to deal with this as a team? One of his comments was "Let's give him English next year." I just about fainted. I said, "Hold it, if we give him English, he'll move. We can't do that, that's the old boys, that's what they did, they shuffled them around from school to school. It's called forced transfer now. The whole thing doesn't make sense. If the person isn't satisfactory, then you start the due process." (1/5/23)

Carol described the change in policy as better defining the process that an administrator must use when teaching is unsatisfactory.

There's a process there, it's known to all and it still gives the person the out to improve. But eventually if the person is less than adequate the process is there and the expectation is that I do it. Whereas before, if there were 80 people and you did this on one person, the other people would think, "Oh my God, that could be me. She could go after me." Because it was the principal's report that got you, it wasn't a process. Now there is a process in place: Professional Growth Plan, that's for your 99.7%, but that other .3, what are you going to do? Well that process is clearly defined. (1/4/35)

Carol has only had to initiate the evaluation process twice since the policy change. She talked about a young teacher who she discovered was having problems when the counselor came to Carol to say that several students were asking to transfer from this teacher's class. The department head came to Carol to express concern; and finally the learning assistance teacher came to say that when students from that class came to the learning assistance classroom to take tests, they seemed to have very little understanding of the concepts being tested. Carol immediately went into the classroom to begin observing and gathering data on an informal basis. In turn, the teacher contacted the Teachers' Association. Carol saw this as an opportunity to remind the Teachers' Association that the supervision of teachers was an important part of the principal's role. She continued the supervision on an informal basis, meeting with the teacher, discussing
what she observed, and suggesting several strategies for improvement, including the opportunity to visit other teachers' classrooms. It was only after opportunity for improvement, support from Carol, and several more observations in which the teacher demonstrated no improvement, that Carol saw a need to move into a formal evaluation process (I/3/25).

Carol said that she thought that the policy change had made it easier for the principal to provide supportive supervision and evaluation to teachers because now everyone in the school, teachers and administrators alike, understood exactly what the process entailed (F4/36).

**Professional Growth Plans**

As a vice principal, Carol served as one of two administrative representatives to the five person committee that developed the policy changes for the supervision and evaluation of teachers. She said that committee members were taken out of school for a week, then continued to meet on their own, evenings, often until 11 or 12:00 at night. She stated that the exciting part of the committee meetings was that there was no such thing as an administrator or teacher, everyone worked together as a cohesive group (I/1/34). When they presented their proposal for Professional Growth Plans combined with a formal evaluation process, the bargaining committee accepted it. It was written into contract with relatively few changes.

Carol introduced Professional Growth Plans into her school in 1989, two years prior to the mandatory enactment date. The staff identified a Professional Growth Plan team who put together a day long workshop to engage teachers in discussion about the plans. The committee asked for some teachers to volunteer to write Professional Growth Plans as a model for the staff. The following year each teacher was asked to think about a plan, but it wasn't until November of 1991 that each teacher had to have a plan in place. In the fall of 1991, each teacher identified an administrator with whom they would talk.
about their plans. Carol told the staff that she did not want any plans written until after
the teacher and administrator discussed the plan.

I don't want to find some fancy dancy plan done on the Mac in my letter tray and
it's got nice little boxes and nice little things and signed so and so. It doesn't get
read, it doesn't mean anything to me. (1/1/34)

When people come in with their plan all ready and it's nice and it's typed up
on the word processor, you're now criticizing rather than discussing and it
becomes a "we-they" thing. (1/2/5)

Carol explained that the change in policy on the supervision and evaluation of
teachers, influenced the way she carried out her role. Her discussions with teachers
obligated Carol to present herself with a degree of credibility (1/2/29). In the process of
maintaining her credibility, she was personally obligated to keep her own practice current.
She explained the way she presented the problem to other administrators.

I think some of these teachers didn't want to have to discuss the plan with an
administrator, they wanted to be in charge of their own plans. That's why I keep
saying to other administrators, "Folks, we have to keep our involvement right up
there. It's got to be positive, and we have to be leaders...We have to be very
aware of the literature on effective instruction, on climate, on cooperative learning.
If we don't know what's there, how can we discuss it with somebody?" I think it's
going to make us better leaders and more informed. (1/2/28)

Carol modeled the Professional Growth Plan process through her own plan. At a
staff meeting she explained that when she presented her plan to her district supervisor, she
went in for discussion without a written plan. This was not entirely comfortable for her,
but she thought it important to model her own values for district personnel as well as for
staff.

And I told him, "It's not written up. I didn't want to write it up and give it to you.
I know the other administrators have handed it to you, but I can't do that. I'm
modeling." (1/5/12)

During the three years Carol worked at Lakeside several new teachers and
administrators took positions there. Originally, Carol's assumption was that since the
Professional Growth Plans were part of a district-wide policy, everyone in the district
would have the same understanding of how the policy was to be implemented. She found that she and the Lakeside staff had negotiated a different understanding of the policy than had staff in other schools. She stated,

There are all these things that you've been doing in the school, all those norms that you've built up over the last couple of years; you presume that everybody has those same values and beliefs about the Professional Growth Plan. And that's not necessarily so, even with the administrators, which is something that I'm finding. I want to move on from where I left off in June and I'm finding that I have to do some backtracking because people have come in with different perceptions of the plan, as administrators, and how they deal with teachers on it. (1/2/6)

Discussing teachers' practice and issues in education is not confined to the discussions that Carol has with teachers in her office. The Professional Growth Plan process has given Carol a knowledge of individual teacher's interests that she utilizes as she meets teachers throughout the day.

It's really changed my practice because four years ago when I would go in I would talk about a child or talk about a current event, but I did not have something on which to focus my talking. It's also changed my practice because it's made me keep aware of the literature more...Now since Joanne said that on portfolios, I know exactly what I'm going to do tonight. Before I leave I'm going to go in there and pull out my from last May on portfolio. It's also made me think, how I can help teachers professionally...This is what I always thought a principal should be doing,...that they should have the current issues of the literature out, that they should talk to staff about this, that when they come down and talk about students, that you say, "How about looking at the general practice rather than the individual child?" (1/3/22)

Carol kept in mind school goals when she discussed teachers' Professional Growth Plans. She attempted to weave the teacher's goal in with the direction the school was headed, so she discussed the culture of the school and how individual teachers could take ownership and positively influence the direction of the school through their own professional growth (1/3/19).

Carol explained what it was like to discuss Professional Growth Plans with teachers. Some came with very safe plans, perhaps something they had already begun and knew they would be successful at; some came with a plan that was much too large to
accomplish; some came with an idea, but nothing more; and others came with a plan in one area, but needing attention to a different area.

With people's plans, you really have to work. It looks casual because they're nervous and some of their plans are just unbelievably difficult to accomplish. And they're saying what I want to hear...So I say, you know, Jenny is doing that same thing in business ed. You may want to hook up with her. Or John is...phenomenal at classroom management, it amazes me. You may want to hook up with him and pick up the ideas from him. And so people were leaving here and I was hearing in the grapevine that God, all that woman does is pair people up, which was really nice to hear. So they felt good. I could see the difference when they left. I felt wonderful. I'm actually doing what I thought administrators ten years ago were supposed to do. I was talking about education with people. And it was just great. (I/1/36)

Since one part of the Professional Growth Plan is that the process should be a collaborative one, Carol found herself pairing people to work together. She said this necessitated her having a good working knowledge of her staff. She knew the partnership was more likely to succeed if the two people had common planning times, or if they at least had proximity to each other in the building. Carol explained that an important part of the Professional Growth Plan process was teachers reflecting together about their practice (I/3/17).

In order to help teachers to develop a workable and beneficial plan, Carol said she had to know teachers' styles as well as their strengths and weaknesses (I/1/39). Knowledge of teachers' practice helped her to negotiate Professional Development Plans. Carol gave an example.

One person last year came in with a plan that would take him the rest of his life to accomplish, he was a second year teacher...Now I knew him, I knew what his weaknesses were, I also knew his strengths. The best part of the administrative role is for you to swing them from that point to this point without their being pushed. Like you're swinging together and you get them right there and you feel so good. Somebody who comes in here and knows their plan, very cut and tried and is quite good, that's wonderful, but it's not nearly the excitement of taking someone from a plan that's almost impossible, or one that's weak to one that they're comfortable with and they know they need to work for. (I/2/10)
One of the side benefits of the Professional Growth Plans, Carol said, was the opportunity for leadership development. A teacher who has chosen to do a Professional Growth Plan in an area that is largely unexplored by other staff in a school, can then act as a leader in helping other teachers to learn about that concept. Carol said it was very important to teacher morale that a school district offer several different opportunities for leadership aside from the traditional administrative route (1/3/13).

Carol said that she felt accountable to parents and the public through the Professional Growth Plans. It was her obligation to get into classrooms to understand what teachers were doing and how their practices were changing (1/3/24). She also demonstrated her own accountability to teachers by knowing what they were doing and engaging in talk about teaching. She shared comments by two teachers,

But even David, like the president [of the Teachers' Association], said to me, "That's what it's all about, you and I sitting here talking about teaching," and Bill came in, he said, "You know, you're the first principal in 27 years that actually talked to me about teaching." And you know, that's just an absolutely wonderful compliment, isn't it? (1/3/25)

Although the Professional Growth Plan is one that the teacher decides upon, when a teacher is experiencing difficulty in practice and is genuinely interested in improvement, Carol found that the teacher is often willing to have her suggest a professional growth strategy that will allow the teacher to explore something of interest and of concern. She shared an example of such a situation.

I had a sticky situation this fall where I had to have another administrator and a Teachers' Association person there and I didn't know how it was going to go. The person said, "Well, what am I going to do?", which I didn't expect. So I said, "You could perhaps look at your Professional Growth Plan and get one of your colleagues that you are working with to come in and observe you and give you some feedback. I don't have to be part of that, you could do that." And I thought this was wonderful. It helps people focus.

Somebody else is having discipline problems, so I said to them in the formal meeting,...perhaps you would like to look at this as part of your Professional Growth Plan, there are some books here on discipline with dignity, and I know that so and so has done such and such in the classroom; you may want
to go in and observe their classroom to see that. It's given me that avenue to do that, the spring board. (I/4/30)

Carol was able to utilize the Professional Growth Plans in a proactive way in dealing with issues of supervision and school culture. She said the significance in the change in policy was that it demanded that people were knowledgeable about issues of instruction and it kept people talking about those issues (I/4/42). Consequently, teachers have changed the professional development that has occurred in the school by demanding that professional development looks specifically at classroom practice (I/5/28). And finally, Carol said that the Professional Growth Plan process has begun to change the practice of some of the teachers who are teaming with each other and using their shared expertise to expand and introduce new concepts to their practice (I/5/29).

**Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change**

Although the change in supervision and evaluation of teachers was jointly negotiated by the Teachers' Association and the Board, it fell upon the principal to initiate implementation of the policy. Carol's approach was twofold: (1) she immediately involved teachers by forming a Professional Growth Committee that would be responsible for designing staff development and providing staff support; and (2) she initiated discussion and negotiated values upon which the change in her own practice and teachers' practices would be based. She followed through by using the three elements of her role that she described as important. That is, she continued to negotiate a culture based on the new shared values, she modeled what the changes would look like, and she continued to share research with teachers that would help them to understand their own practice in light of the changes brought about by the new policy.
Audrey

Context

Audrey, in the fourth year of her first principalship at Pondside Elementary School, started teaching twenty three years ago after completion of three years of university. She taught for three years then went back to university to complete her B.A. and B.Ed. She taught for fifteen years, worked as a primary consultant at the district level for two years, and was a head teacher for two years prior to becoming a principal.

She described herself as a learner, saying she enjoyed professional reading to remain knowledgeable on research in education. To keep up her teaching techniques she taught at least one class per day and during the summer conducted teacher institutes throughout the U.S. and Canada. She also said that she was a people pleaser, someone who wanted people to like her (I/1/22).

Pondside Elementary, a school of 350 students, has grown by almost one third since Audrey arrived at the school four years ago. With fourteen enrolling divisions and 18.4 full time equivalent staff members, the majority of Pondside students came from working class families of Italian origin. A segment of the student population was quite poor, living in co-op housing, while a number of international families from a nearby university gave the school a bit of a cosmopolitan atmosphere.

Audrey stated that two things that made Pondside special were the staff and the culture of the school. She described the staff as a professional staff, one in which professional dialogue was commonly heard. The staff was very supportive of each other and of the children, with mutual respect being a key to understanding the culture of Pondside. Audrey stated,

You respect children and you expect the same kind of respect from them...All children are viewed as worthy. (I/4/18)
Audrey's Principalship

Audrey spoke of three parts of her role that were particularly important for her: to model attitudes and values; to support teachers, students and parents; and to nurture the growth of collegiality. She saw herself as needing to model important aspects of school culture including the need for professional dialogue, a practice based on research, and the need to support the social and emotional needs of students, parents and teachers.

An important role for Audrey was that of modeling important attitudes and values in the school. She said the primary purpose of the school was education and she viewed herself primarily as an educator. She, therefore, said it was important that teachers saw her as a competent teacher, one who could model good teaching practice. She said she was also a counselor of children, parents and teachers. Many children came to the school with social and emotional problems and she worked with them either as a supporter or as a disciplinarian. Often parents came to her seeking advice on how to handle their children, and teachers came to her to share both their professional and personal worries (I/1/15). A large and important part of her role was in the area of modeling appropriate responses to social and emotional needs. One way she did this was by engaging with children during lunch-time activities.

Almost every child in this school I can stop and talk to and know something about the child. The way I've done that is I've been in classes, but I try each term to sponsor one club and I try to vary the range so ... I did poster club and chess club in winter. The poster club was the primary [grades], the chess club was 3 to 7. I sponsored the math club. Not only do I get to know the kids this way, but the teachers see me doing this. So, it's not like, "She just says we should have clubs and what does she ever do about it?" I get in there, I try to be supportive that way. (I/1/15)

Audrey saw her role as supporter to be very important. She divided that role into three sub roles: organizer, protector and helper. She said that organizer was an important behind-the-scenes role. Because she had the total picture of what was happening in the school, where the school was going, she was able to keep it running smoothly. She gave
the example of noninstructional days. There was a professional development committee that was in charge of planning these days and Audrey sat on the committee, but did not chair it. However, she supported the committee by publishing a calendar for the year so that everyone on staff could plan effectively by knowing the dates of workshops and the topics to be investigated (I/1/5).

Another part of being a supporter called on her to protect teachers. She explained,

Protecter,...if you hear something, if a parent comes to you about a teacher. Right now I'm getting requests about where parents want their kids next year. I don't guarantee them anything, but I listen to them. Sometimes they're really hard on the teacher; and I always support the teacher. And sometimes you disagree totally with what the teacher has done and yet you also protect the teacher. That's sometimes the hard role. (I/1/16)

A third part of the supporting role was helping. She gave the example of reading all of the report cards, not to check teachers' work, but to catch spelling and grammatical errors (I/1/17). Under supporter came all of the smaller roles she played daily: accountant and bill collector, contacting parents who sent in checks that later bounced; nurse, dispensing medicine, supplying ice packs, bandaging cuts (I/1/15); and driver, taking a sick child home from school or to the hospital for care (I/1/17).

One of the most important roles Audrey played was that of colleague, which she said was similar to what is sometimes described as instructional leader. In this role she wanted to be seen as working with teachers as colleagues in discussion about educational topics, dialoguing and supporting each other for the children's benefit (F/1/18). She had, however, experienced some degree of frustration in this role, particularly in regard to the committee structure in the school.

We work by committee in this school. Now this is one area where I don't feel I've been all that successful. I'm on most of the committees, however, not chairperson...If I'm away that day, the committee doesn't meet, which really bothers me. If I were being truly successful the committee would meet and carry on without me. (I/1/15)
However, Audrey acknowledged that independence would hopefully grow over time.

The committee structure in the school was one of the ways that Audrey tried to promote a sense of professionalism within the school. She struggled with understanding to what extent teachers were willing to participate in decision making and problem solving saying that she thought that a new part of the teachers’ contract that addressed staff meetings was antithetical to this goal.

My approach to staff meetings is, even though they are the administrator's meetings, I've always shared the chair. At the beginning of the year I ask them who would like to chair a staff meeting and then we rotate. I really believe that professional growth and professional dialogue has to be part of the staff meetings, so always the number one item on our agenda is something from the professional growth committee; either it's commenting on an article or maybe somebody reporting about their Professional Growth Plan. (1/4/9)

The Teachers' Association negotiated to have only one mandatory staff meeting per month that could last no longer than one hour and fifteen minutes. Audrey expressed the concern that with such short meeting time only once per month, there would be little time for professional dialogue and the meeting would largely be subsumed by committee reports, with no opportunity for whole staff input into decisions.

The direction Audrey was trying to take the staff was toward a more collegial culture. When she began her principalship at Pondside, teachers worked in isolation. Over the course of her tenure she initiated various techniques to help people work together. For example, a problem that was identified by staff was the lack of time for teachers to get together to talk about their practice (1/2/22). Consequently, Audrey attempted to build in mechanisms for teachers to have time to talk. One year she gave teachers copies of her schedule and said that she would like to teach their classes periodically in order to free them to work with other teachers. No one took advantage of her offer. The next year, having decided that it might be too threatening for teachers to ask the principal to take a class, she decided to take on a larger teaching load, freeing her
head teacher to be available to cover teachers' classes. Again, most teachers did not take advantage of the time offered (1/2/14).

Audrey decided that teachers were not taking advantage of the time because they did not know how to collaborate. She, therefore, scheduled common planning time for all of the primary teachers, hoping that if the entire group were together, collaborative planning on curricular issues might be more successfully accomplished. She scheduled the entire group of primary level students into choir with the choir teacher and one other teacher, on a rotating basis, to help with supervision (1/2/14). She, thus, organizationally-induced collegiality to offer teachers the opportunity to experience a collaborative planning situation without having to initiate it themselves. It proved to be successful in that teachers were planning together. However, Audrey said that her presence at those meetings was essential at this time, but she hoped that over time, as teachers understood the value of collegial planning and as it became part of the school culture, they would initiate and participate in the process independently.

Another way that Audrey tried to get teachers involved in cooperative decision making was through staff meetings. She shared an example of how she facilitated the staff's interest on student self-evaluation. She disseminated an article for the staff to read, then at a staff meeting initiated discussion with the goal that it would stimulate further discussion on the topic and a decision on whether the staff would encourage student self-evaluation (1/4/23).

**Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers**

Audrey was often in classrooms doing a variety of things, most of which involved getting to know children and participating in the class in a variety of ways. Whether she was specifically observing the teacher, or participating in other ways, she was always observant and gathering data. She said that there were two differences between her supervision now and prior to the contractual change in the supervision and evaluation of
teachers. The first was the amount of time she spent observing teaching and the second was the discussion with the teacher about the lesson.

I look for a variety of things but it's not shared information, which I don't think is fair in regard to the teacher. When I go in and watch a lesson I look for things like interaction or how does the lesson develop. It depends. But I do look for all those things that you used to talk to people about coming in to look for. (I/4/5)

She attempted to learn about what happened in classrooms through discussion on teachers' prepared previews. Through questioning the teacher about how the teaching program was to be constructed, Audrey gained an understanding of what occurred in the classroom. She could combine this with the empirical knowledge she gained through classroom observation. She stated,

I try to probe because I don't think that walking into a classroom for fifteen or twenty minutes is a very valid way of [evaluating]. I mean, if the kids are swinging from the light and there's absolute pandemonium, that's different. But in terms of program, just being in there is not enough, you need to really talk to people. So I try to explore it when we do our meetings or previews. (I/4/15)

Audrey said that she thought the Professional Growth Plans made supervision more complicated for the principal. The teacher has the right to choose the topic and the principal cannot veto that topic. The principal can, however, try to persuade the teacher that a different topic might be more beneficial. Audrey explained,

I think with the Professional Growth Plan that the principal doesn't really have any supervisory say...You as the teacher decides on your Professional Growth Plan. You might have rotten discipline but you decide you want to learn about spelling this year and so when you sit and talk to me, again this is where people skills come in...I try to talk with you and say, "yes, spelling skills are really important but don't you think that perhaps the way kids are responding in class might be important?" So rather than being direct and saying, "no, I think discipline seems to be an area of concern" we play this careful game. (I/4/20)

Audrey expressed concern that with the formal, cyclical evaluations gone, there were areas in which teachers should have been, but were not, getting feedback; for example, classroom management, discipline, behavior, respect and regard for children (I/5/2) and classroom organization (I/4/3). The Professional Growth Plans did not always
provide a forum for that type of discussion because ultimately the topic of the plan was the sole responsibility of the teacher (1/4/20). The teacher evaluation that was done prior to the change in contract kept teachers thinking about some of the details of teaching: what is good management, what is good planning, am I continuing to do my day book, do I make the room an attractive place, do I present myself as a professional? Audrey said that professionals felt these things were overly valued in that form of evaluation and, consequently, they moved to a different form of evaluation. She stated,

I think the Professional Growth Plan is established and I think that it should stay in place for everybody. I think it's really important and good teachers have always identified their strengths. But I'm becoming more and more supportive of the idea that there should also be a formal evaluation with common expectations stated and adhered to, because I think in a lot of cases it's getting very, very loose. It's quite wonderful to have your Professional Growth Plan, but the job is so complex and so big that you can't have the luxury of just focusing on one thing. You can in terms of really developing, but there are all these other things that have to be going on too, and I think you need to be held accountable for those things. (1/5/1)

Audrey suggested that the supervision and evaluation system be altered to include a three year formal report. She described what she would want the report to consist of:

I think there is a place for a combination report that deals 80% with professional growth and development because that's what it's all about. But I think you also need to have some of the old things back there. (1/5/2)

Audrey expressed concern about the evaluation process for beginning teachers. As in any profession, there is a period during which the new employee is expected to experiment and to show rapid professional growth. Audrey stated that she thought the new teacher should be evaluated, not only on professional development, but also on generally expected classroom procedures. She explained,

I think it takes a long time to truly become professional and I don't think a beginning teacher can really be deemed a professional. I think the job is so complex and so overwhelming, there's so much to learn that maybe for the first five years the reporting system should be more the old way...If I'm starting, can I remember everything: how do I teach, how do I do behavior management, how do I write report cards, how do I collect data for assessment? That's all major learning. You want them to be establishing things that will make their classroom
run smoothly and become a natural way of life so that they can then become professional... I think for a beginning teacher there should be a different form of reporting. Maybe the weight would be for an experienced teacher, 80% on the Professional Growth Plan and development and 20% on regular routines. But maybe for beginning teachers it should be 70% on establishment of routines and behavior management and 30% on identifying professional growth goals and working towards them. Maybe there needs to be two tiers. (1/5/5)

Audrey thought the new teacher supervision and evaluation process was an important direction for the district to head. However, she had concern that there was not enough accountability in the new process. She would propose a combination of teachers' working on professional growth goals and a version of the three year evaluation cycle.

Professional Growth Plans

The process that Audrey followed with regard to Professional Growth Plans was that each teacher submitted a plan to her by November first. She read the plans and discussed them with teachers during November and December. She met with each teacher again in April to review progress on the plan.

Prior to teachers beginning the process of writing Professional Growth Plans, Audrey asked for teacher volunteers to form a Professional Growth Committee. As with other committees in the school, Audrey sat on the committee, but did not chair it. The Professional Growth Committee decided to devote a segment of each staff meeting to teachers' plans. Either a teacher would present a plan, or everyone would read and discuss an article of common interest. Audrey believed that if everyone was aware of everyone's plans, people would pass on articles and information as part of a developing collegial structure (1/5/9).

Audrey viewed her role in the Professional Growth Plan process as moving the school along toward developing a culture that accepted teachers' preparing and carrying out growth plans. To this end she talked about the plans, supported teachers' plans, and set the expectation that professional growth was expected of everyone (1/2/25). She said that most teachers at Pondside supported doing Professional Growth Plans and that they
were becoming an accepted part of the culture (I/2/10). However, some teachers looked upon them as an added burden. Audrey said that, for those teachers, her role shifted from facilitator of teachers' Professional Growth Plans, to monitor, whereby she was expected to assure that everyone got a plan in on time and everyone continued to work on their plans throughout the year (I/3/15). She saw herself as someone who had to model the Professional Growth Plan process for her staff. She said,

I have to model that I do Professional Growth Plans and that they are important. That's a very important role for the administrator of a building. I can't make jokes about it... When you treat it lightly, your staff is going to treat it lightly. I think that my role is that this is an expectation, this is serious stuff and I'm really quite excited to be learning about such and such this year. And the rest of your staff, even if they don't agree with it, they certainly wouldn't say anything to your face about it, and slowly the culture will change. (I/5/10)

Audrey saw several benefits develop out of teachers' writing of Professional Growth Plans. One of the benefits of substituting growth plans for periodic teacher evaluation was that Audrey thought that approximately 90% of the teachers felt very comfortable with her going into their classrooms (I/1/24). She also enjoyed the kinds of discussions she could have with teachers around their plans. The discussions provided an opportunity for professional dialogue around a teacher's interest area (I/1/25).

She said that the process of teachers' choosing an area for professional growth had boosted the self-esteem of some teachers and had helped them to set high expectations for themselves. She explained,

I think it's given teachers more confidence that they are the professional. They know what their needs are. They have the opportunity to determine where their growth should be rather than it being imposed upon them. And I think, also, that it is an expectation, which for some teachers comes as a great shock. "What do you mean I have to have a professional growth area for development?" So it has placed an expectation on all teachers to develop this. But I think it's also given them a different level of respect for themselves and their professional judgment. I think that's a real strength. It causes you to do reflection, it causes you to do self assessment. (I/5/10)
Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change

Audrey's approach to implementing Professional Growth Plans at Pondside involved forming a Professional Growth Committee that initiated discussion throughout the year on teachers Professional Growth Plan topics. The committee used staff meetings as the forum in which to encourage discussion and introduce ideas. Audrey used the three parts of her role to support the change. She modeled Professional Growth Plans by sharing both her plan and updates on its progress. Both at staff meetings and in individual meetings with teachers, she modeled the seriousness with which she treated the plan. She supported teachers in their plans through the two meetings she had with them, through distribution of literature on teachers' topics, and by allocating a part of each staff meeting to Professional Growth Plans. And finally she nurtured the growth of collegiality by showing interest in teachers' plans, by encouraging the Professional Growth Committee to work directly with individual teachers as well as with the total staff, and by encouraging teachers at staff meetings to engage in discussion about teachers' plans and to share their own plan. Thus, she used Professional Growth Plans as one way to continue the development of collegiality at Pondside.

Richard

Context

When I met Richard he had been principal of Center Elementary School for only five months. This is not to imply that he has little school experience. He graduated from normal school and began teaching at age 18. Through evening and summer courses he earned his B.A., B.Ed. and Master's degree. Richard was in his thirty-eighth year in education, 20 of those spent as principal.

Center School is a medium-size school, approximately 350 students, and 19 full-time equivalent teachers, kindergarten through grade seven. It houses a late French Immersion program for grades six and seven. Richard described the community as
conservative, both in social and educational interests. The school is multicultural with 37 different nationalities represented in the student body, fewer than 50% are Caucasian. The teaching staff does not represent this diversity.

When I asked Richard what was special about Center, he immediately responded that the caring attitude of the staff was quite unique. He added that although the staff seemed to be brought together by more than its share of tragedy (through illness or death of staff members or their families), Center has moved beyond being "just a school, somehow it is a community" (I/1/4). He said a second unique aspect of Center was its commitment to music and tradition, saying the instrumental and voice program was "finely developed" (I/1/4). He talked about traditions in public education which were long ago dropped in many other schools, but were still being carried on here; for example, the national anthem was sung at most assemblies (I/1/4).

School climate was very important for Richard and he often thought about the implications of his actions on climate. He wanted the school to be a place where people respected and trusted each other, and could openly express and discuss concerns.

Because I have always perceived myself as being a 'people-first' person, my top priority was public relations, climate, making the workplace a place where people wanted to be each day, and planning all the time, so that was happening; that it was a positive climate so that people felt they could talk to me, talk to anyone at any time and deal with issues. (I/3/5)

Children were very important to Richard. If he had one concern about being a principal, it was that it took him too far away from children. To counteract that effect, he conducted the school choir, met with all of the primary children for an assembly once a week, and requested that teachers send children to his office for recognition of their work.

Richard's Principalship

Richard discussed his principalship in terms of moving from managing a school to providing educational leadership. He did this in three ways. First, he gradually introduced teachers to new ideas and encouraged discussion of those ideas. He then left it to teachers
to determine if they would incorporate these ideas into their practice. Second, he encouraged the building and maintenance of a positive school culture in which people trusted and respected one another. Third, he continued to keep his practice current through attendance at professional development seminars and through professional reading in order to "be better equipped to lead" (1/1/6).

Richard found the teaching staff at Center to hold a more traditional view of teaching than his own. He came to the school supporting many educational initiatives such as cooperative learning techniques, student centered learning, anecdotal report cards, and student-led parent conferences. He did not feel that it was his role to force these changes on the school. His approach was gradually to introduce ideas to teachers and parents, with the hope that they would think about them, talk about them, and develop a course for enactment. He shared some examples of ideas he introduced and his approach with teachers. He was interested in multi-age classroom groupings. He raised the issue at a staff meeting to begin teachers' thinking and talking about it. He later brought teachers to a school that used the technique. He said he wanted one or two teachers to pilot a program, but wasn't about to push anyone in that direction. A second example was with the concept of student-led conferences. His approach was to begin the discussion and try to find ways to help teachers continue the discussion. But he would leave any decision up to the teachers.

A third and more extensive example occurred when he was interested in having teachers think about organizing their instruction in less traditional ways. He divided the staff in half, sent one half to each of two schools known for their instructional approaches. He then sent each group to the other school. He followed this with a staff meeting where teachers listed things they liked and disliked about the two programs and began to develop a plan for implementing what they saw as valuable to them. Richard followed this exercise by distributing research articles to the teachers on the kinds of programs they saw. He
knew his initiatives were taking hold when he began to see many teachers using them as a basis for their Professional Growth Plans.

Prior to September '91, movement towards implementation of this program was tentative and cautious. My observations led me to believe that attempting to push too hard, or move too fast would prove to be dysfunctional, if not disastrous. I felt I could move ahead when I noted that each primary teacher's Professional Growth Plan was related in some way to one or more of the goals or principles of the new primary program. (I/1/7)

For Richard, building a positive climate was a primary function of his position. He used the trust and relationships he built to begin to get teachers to think about changing elements of their practice. Once the appropriate climate was established, Richard said he could introduce teachers to new ideas.

Building a positive climate is very important. Along with that goes trust. ... that we can look at each other, deal with each other with mutual trust and respect. That can do a lot to release tensions that sometimes exist between administrator and teacher. That doesn't mean that there are not times that I have to raise the anxiety level a little bit. And that's healthy. I know it is for me. If I raise it too much then it becomes difficult. But, to a certain extent, it's motivating. (I/2/5)

He said that it was up to the principal to recognize when the school culture was ready to entertain the idea of change (I/1/8). He needed to know when the staff was with him and when they were ready to move ahead for, as he stated, "It is not important enough that I make a difference, but for us together to make a difference" (I/1/10).

Timing was an important element for Richard, an element that he could use to his advantage in building a positive school culture. It was also important in his decisions about change and problem solving. An interesting problem occurred when Richard discovered, shortly after arriving at Center School, that there was no stated philosophy. As educational leader, Richard felt it was important that the school have a stated philosophy that everyone agreed upon. Yet he was faced with a dilemma in that he would like some changes to occur in the school that could then be reflected in the philosophy statement. Richard solved the conflict of the necessity of a school philosophy statement.
and the time he needed to implement change by buying time. He presented the staff with the philosophy from his last school; the staff made minor changes and voted its acceptance. His plan was then to wait for a year, until hopefully some of the change initiatives would be in place, and review the philosophy in terms of the new direction of the school. (F/2/1). He was thus able to state that the school had a philosophy, without harming school climate by asking teachers to confront changes that they were not yet able to accept. He, perhaps, minimized the initial importance of the actual philosophy in order to get a philosophical statement for the school and to start teachers thinking about the concept of a school philosophy. He justified the adaptation of another school's philosophy by saying that he did not want a philosophy put into place which would represent the present status of the school; rather, he would like the philosophy to reflect a future direction, one which was not yet established. Timing was important in Richard's practice because inattention to time may have a negative effect on school climate.

Richard's view of the principalship changed over his career. He described his practice when he first became a principal, as primarily managerial: "to keep things running smoothly but not being disrespectful to people, keeping people happy, opening doors, facilitating, making sure that things are well organized, offering encouragement, 10% leadership" (I/1/6). The turning point in his career was the influence of Dr. Grant, a new superintendent in the district.

He not only gave us opportunities, but made sure that things happened. He provided the professional development that we as administrators needed. He never stopped supplying us with professional reading, workshops, seminars, so that we could be equipped to lead. I've enjoyed that. I've been inspired by that. (I/1/6)

Richard often talked about whether the principal could and should be a manager or an educational leader. He recognized that management was a necessary component of the principalship, but often lamented the time he spent managing when he said he would like to be involved in educational leadership.
I'm highly efficient, I think, in terms of the management aspect. I always felt, more so the last few years, guilty about not having enough time or maybe not taking enough time for the leadership role. But at the same time, I saw myself as being a highly organized person. Almost to the point of being fanatical. (I/3/5)

Richard was not much of a risk taker in his early years as principal, but later saw risk taking as a component of leadership. He said, "When I say 'take some risks', I never did this 10 years ago, step a little bit beyond the bounds of, or the guidelines of, whether it's school policy, district policy, or so on" (I/3/6). However, recently he saw the benefits of risk taking and experimented with it in some areas.

I like to think I'm intellectually honest, and by saying that, I have to recognize that there are times, because of the nature of this job, where I can be, I have been and I am—if not political—manipulative, manipulative to an extent, where if there's something I really want to happen, to have, or feel I have to do, and I can see a way of doing it, without hurting people, I go ahead. And I sometimes rationalize what I'm doing if I'm stretching a little bit the ethics or the rules or the policies. And the older I get, the more I'm ready, willing and able to take such risks. And I see that risk-taking as an important part of this job if you want to accomplish something. (I/3/6)

Perhaps what led Richard to take some risks was that he saw things in other schools which he wanted for his own school, but for which he did not have the budget. "I observed some of my colleagues over the last few years, taking substantial risks and getting away with it. 'How did you get that?' 'What about this?' 'You can't do that.'" And their response, "Well, I did" (I/3/7). And so did Richard, rationalizing that if it was for the benefit of the children, it was worth doing.

But then I noticed I was willing to take some risks to help children who might be in trouble or have some special needs, to phone someone or step on a few toes, because if that child needs it, deserves it, let's get it done. And if in the process I have a couple of people angry with me over the way I carried out that maneuver, or strategy, so be it. That doesn't happen often, but once in a while. (I/3/6)

Richard is cautious and takes into consideration the norms of the community. He is beginning to see that there are benefits to the school community, and particularly to the students, if he flexes the fences of what he once viewed as very well-defined boundaries to his behavior.
Richard said that the new policy on supervision and evaluation of teachers was preferable for him to the method of observing and writing evaluations of teachers every three years. In fact, he decided that he would do no written evaluations of teachers in his first year at the school. He admitted that his decision was not based on what he viewed as the competency level of teachers, but rather on trying to build a positive school climate and trying some other methods of initiating change. He preferred first to develop a climate of positive rapport and trust, then to talk with the teacher who needed help. Even after he had taken care to establish a positive climate, it was not easy for him to talk with teachers about their weaknesses. This created internal pressure for Richard as well as some tension with his peers.

One of my faults is that I'm too kind. I'm hesitant to criticize. And others say that I should because there are people in our system that criticism is going to help and I should do more to lead them to look more closely at what they are doing. (1/4/5)

Richard's analysis of which supervision and evaluation system he preferred to work with was based on the one he thought teachers felt more comfortable with. He viewed the new policy on supervision and evaluation to be superior to the former because he sensed that the former system was often frightening to teachers, particularly teachers who either did not know the principal or who viewed the principal as a "hard-nosed ogre" (1/5/7).

By the second year of his principalship at Center, Richard felt it was time to face a problem a teacher was having.

I sat down with a teacher last week. I said, "Now that we've had a year together I feel more comfortable with what I'm going to say and I hope you will, too, in terms of being very open and frank about what we are going to discuss." And it was a very good discussion...I'm not that direct, but had I explored some of the things with him at this time last year, I possibly would have been offended by his response. Now that I know him, we were able to do that. (1/2/6)
Richard tried to spend time in the classroom to carry out the supervision part of the policy. The purpose behind his being in classrooms was primarily to get to know students and to provide support for the teacher.

I always felt that it was important for me to be visible in classrooms during instruction for a number of reasons...To get to know the students, to get to know what they are doing and to praise the students and support the teachers in terms of observing something that I felt was worthy of praise so I could give some feedback to the teacher to build morale, climate. (1/4/4)

Thorough supervision was not always possible for Richard because of the many other demands on his time. On one occasion a problem was brought to his attention by a parent. This caused Richard to examine both the time he spent in classrooms and how he supervised when he was there.

I had a parent come in who was very bright, his wife was an elementary school teacher, very much into implementation of the new program, and they had a long list of concerns about, not what was happening in this classroom, but what wasn't happening. It was a very difficult problem because I was caught between these people who appeared to have a justifiable concern, and a teacher who I see as hard-working and personable, that I like, but certainly not as far along in terms of implementation of new programs as these people felt she should be, and maybe I recognized she should be. Now we were able to deal with that by transferring the child, which I very seldom do. But this got to the point where I moved the child and the teacher welcomed that...But it did surface a number of issues as far as the program in that classroom, and I was able to bring in the primary consultant from the resource Center to work with the teacher. In fact, her Professional Growth Plan now has been developed around what the primary consultant has helped her with in terms of Year 2000. A lot of guilt on my part about recognizing that I hadn't found the time to really know what was happening in that classroom. I thought I knew what was happening. But the teacher was kind of pulling one over on me in terms of what I was receiving in writing, what I was observing when I went in, superficially. It was really not happening. (1/3/11)

Richard's view of whether this model for supervision and evaluation of teachers provided a sense of accountability to the public, lies with what teachers are able to do with the implementation of the Professional Growth Plans. He said:

I believe, I don't have any empirical data to support this, but my experience leads me to believe that there could be, should be, will be, more accountability with this
new model than with the old, given that the teacher is on a basis demonstrating his or her professional competence and professional growth. And if it is obvious that the teacher is not attempting to grow professionally, we still have within the contract the terms by which we can initiate a formal evaluation as we did before. So, I think that there is more accountability with this model. (1/5/5)

The accountability issue was related to Richard's trust that individual teachers would do what was best for them and their profession.

Professional Growth Plans

Richard was a very organized person, and therefore the way in which he implemented Professional Growth Plans was organized. He designed a process by which he could receive a written copy of each teacher's plan and discuss it with the teacher. After a teacher submitted a written Professional Growth Plan, Richard met with each teacher for a half-hour in the fall to discuss the plan and give positive feedback on it. A second half hour appointment was made in the spring to review implementation and progress on the plan.

Richard said that the Professional Growth Plans and the process he went through with each teacher helped to build a climate of collaboration.

I'm now doing more of what I've always felt I've wanted to do and that is work collegially and collaboratively in program implementation and program development with teachers. And they notice that there is a certain amount of pressure off them, too, now. Although I think they still see the principal in some way as evaluating their Professional Growth Plans. But I certainly wouldn't open this and say, "Sorry, now that's nonsense, redo it." It would be a matter of building from this to say, "Hey, could we go a little bit further here?" (1/2/6)

Richard defined his role in the Professional Growth Plans in two ways. First, he saw himself as helping with "materials, problems or questions" (1/2/4). Second, he saw himself as providing positive feedback, helping to focus or give direction to the plan if it was too broad, and encouraging the teacher in the implementation of the plan.

Some of the plans are more professional than others. Some are more frivolous. That's where I have to come in, play a role without appearing to be arbitrary or autocratic because we are supposed to be facilitating this whole thing. (1/2/4)
At Center, as in every other school in the district, there was a Professional Growth Plan committee. In this case it consisted of the principal, head teacher, and a primary classroom teacher. The committee at this school was charged with three tasks: (1) to stimulate the program among the staff, (2) to share literature that is passed on to them, and (3) to attend district-wide workshops and bring back information that would help teachers in the development of their plans (1/2/4).

Richard used teachers' Professional Growth Plans as a tool in his own planning. He used them as a barometer to assess the readiness of the staff for acceptance of his ideas. He carefully introduced the staff to new instructional methods, cultivated the ideas and nurtured them with discussion and supporting research documents. Only when staff demonstrated, through Professional Growth Plans, their willingness to try some of these techniques, did Richard proceed with his plan to introduce teachers to more instructional strategies (1/1/9).

One area in which Richard said he underutilized the Professional Growth Plans was in their potential to open doors to communication about professional issues.

I think with the new programs there is more opportunity now than there was when I was more of a manager and less of a leader to have interaction about what's going on in the classroom regarding the development of a certain program or some professional growth aspect of what the teachers do. But I have to be honest and say that that isn't happening that often...It's very seldom that I sit down beside someone in the staffroom or stop them in the hall and say, I noticed when I was in your classroom that this was going on can we talk about it? I often do that while I'm in the classroom. I go to the teacher when I'm about to leave and we talk about the lesson. (1/4/2)

Richard said that another part of his job was to monitor the plans. He believed that the Professional Growth Plan process would continue only if it was monitored (1/1/9). This presented a conflict for him because he said that he did not have the time to monitor because of the every-day demands on him.

Most of the plans, in fact all of them, are directly related to classroom practice, instructional improvement, development of programs, this implementation, this
change, this new strategy, whatever. So I see that very much part of my responsibility and involvement in terms of facilitating, monitoring, and collaborating to help build better instructional programs. And we're right back to where we were 15 years ago, and that is finding the time to do that. Someone might say, "But shouldn't that be one of the top priorities, if you have things that you list as priorities during the day?" And I would agree, but you can't log the trees if the forest is on fire, and we're putting out fires most of the day, and that's time-consuming. (1/3/8)

Richard incorporated his own Professional Growth Plan into his own conception of the principalship. His plan was to read three books on educational leadership in order to maintain and expand his leadership skills.

I'm quite excited about what I'm doing this year. I'm reading. I have a plan and I purchased a number of books, and these two, I think are going to be most helpful to me. (Holds up Leadership Strategies to Build Staff Moral.) That's just on professional growth. I'm into this one right now, Strategic Planning in Education. ...I am really excited about it in terms of not just improving my knowledge, but my leadership skills. (1/3/8)

Although implementation of the Professional Growth Plan process has been somewhat frustrating for Richard, he benefited from its inception in two ways. First, the plans allowed him to judge the readiness of his staff to move on in the change process.

Second, the discussions with teachers about their plans gave Richard another window into their classroom practice.

I found those meetings to be more than enlightening in terms of finding out what happens in any particular classroom. While I can and do visit classrooms on numerous occasions, there is never enough time to really know. To have teachers come in and spread out their projects, plans or their previews regarding implementation of a new program or the development of a theme or unit is a vital first step. So I felt after that first year I was far more involved and knowledgeable about what was going on than I had ever been in the past...It opened doors for me. (1/5/4)

Furthermore, Richard said that the significance of the Professional Growth Plans depended upon the personal effort of the individual teacher. He removed himself from responsibility by saying that the more a teacher committed to the process and the plan, the
more that teacher would benefit from it, and the more significance the professional growth process would have for them both individually and collectively (I/4/10).

Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change

Richard's approach to implementing teachers' writing of Professional Growth Plans was consistent with the organized way he managed the school. He set up a mechanism by which he could see the teacher's plan, talk with the teacher about it, and monitor the progress of the plan. He incorporated the three important parts of the way he interpreted the principalship into his implementation of the policy change. First, since he was interested in introducing some new ideas to the teaching staff, but not mandating their implementation, he was able to use what the teachers wrote as their plans to judge whether implementation of his ideas was occurring. Second, since he was interested in building a culture of trust and respect, he accepted teachers' plans and encouraged few modifications. He thus demonstrated to teachers that he valued their judgment. Third, since his own professional development was important to him and provided opportunities for him to reflect on his practice, his Professional Growth Plan was to read books on school climate and leadership. Thus, Richard's implementation of the new policy on supervision and evaluation of teachers was consistent with his view of the principalship.

Steve

Context

Steve, like several other principals in the district, began his teaching career in this district. He spent all but one of his twenty eight years in education working here. He has been a teacher, department head, vice principal and principal. During seven of his teaching years he worked with a Ministry of Education curriculum committee whereby he gave workshops throughout the Province, and spent several summers teaching education courses at a local university. His own formal education consists of a B.A. and a B.Ed.
Arbutusgrove Secondary School is a 1400 student school with 73 full-time equivalent teachers. Steve worked closely with two vice principals: one male, one female. Students in the school came from a range of income levels, some quite poor, some very wealthy, but most middle income. Because Steve wanted to stay in touch with the student body, the three administrators divided the school by floors, each one taking administrative responsibility for students and teachers on one floor. Since Steve valued proximity as a form of management, each of the administrators walked their corridors, talking with teachers and students, getting the "pulse" of the school, before school, at class changes, lunch and at school end.

Steve said that his philosophy of administration boiled down to a belief "in tight values and loose organization" (1/1/16), a phrase which captured his principalship. He clearly understood his values, articulated them, and explained how his practice followed from his values. He placed importance on his understanding of school culture and curriculum requirements, but said that the most important thing in the school was the climate, because without an appropriate climate other important things didn't happen (1/1/9).

My responsibility is the school and to me it's important that school be safe for teachers, the teachers are looked after and the kids are looked after and it's a good school. (1/4/9)

Steve described his style of leadership as his being behind the scenes, developing individual relationships with people. He said that the sum total of the relationships comprised the organization.

Wherever they can assume power and the accountability that goes with it, they're given it, or they take it, and that's fine. Simply put, it's tight values, clearly understood relationships and expectations, and then all kinds of freedom. (1/3/2)

Steve's Principalship

Steve discussed four aspects of his principalship that were particularly important to him. First, he worked to establish a positive school climate on which all other aspects of
the school could be built. Second, he clearly understood his own set of values and worked to help teachers to understand them. Third, he actively worked to develop and nurture relationships with each staff member. Fourth, he worked to empower staff so that when a new principal came to the school, the school would continue to operate without change.

As Steve discussed his principalship, he kept coming back to the importance of establishing a positive school climate. Without the appropriate climate, other things did not occur. He stated that if someone were a good teacher in a school that did not have a positive environment, that teacher had the option of going into the classroom and closing the door. As principal, however, he did not have that luxury. His major challenge was to assure that there was pride, *esprit de corps*, baseline expectations, and that people looked after each other (1/1/8). One of the ways Steve accomplished these goals was through modeling behavior. For example, he modeled how to handle student discipline by assuming behavioral responsibility for one-third of the student body.

I've always dealt with discipline. With the vice principals, we just share it, whatever comes, comes. And the reason I like to do that is it demonstrates to them, "he can be part of the action." As principal I could just say, "You guys do the discipline, I'm going to go on to higher stuff." And I could have a pretty nice time. But I still go out in the courtyard and I still suspend kids a lot and I still deal with parents and I still go to the Board and I still deal with assault, intimidation, all that kind of stuff. (I/1/11)

In order for the school to function in a way that Steve was comfortable with, he said it was necessary for him to make his values clear, and to ensure that everyone understood his values. He enumerated them as "courtesy, kindness to others, fairness, honesty to the degree people understand honesty, accountability, responsibility for staff; you're getting paid to do a job, you should do it as well as you can, that kind of thing" (I/3/1).

Prior to starting a project or instituting any kind of change, Steve viewed it important to develop an appropriate climate in which the change could occur. He referred to this as "picking his spots."
The Chinese guru on war, Sanzu, says that the art of war is knowing when to fight and when not to fight. So if there's a project or a goal that I would like to achieve, I pick my spots, I don't just like to go ahead assuming everybody will be on board. You test the waters, you see where people are on the issue, you decide the strengths that you're going to need on the staff, the degree of involvement, and then you make the necessary moves with the necessary people in the necessary order, so that down the line everybody will come to understand what the goal is, and why it's beneficial to everybody. And everyone develops a vested interest in ensuring that whatever is done, it's done well and it's kept being done because it's good for everything. (I/3/2)

Steve considered a large part of his role to be working with individuals, setting clear and shared expectations, and encouraging people to perform at a high professional level (I/4/9). This tenet seemed to underlie every aspect of his principalship.

Steve reiterated over the course of the study that his style of management was based on the relationships he developed with teachers. It was through personal relationships that he established an understanding, a direction, and a purpose for the school (I/4/10). The relationships were often unique to the individual, with Steve stating that he thought carefully about the kind of relationship he had with each teacher. He said that different teachers earned different kinds of relationships (I5/16).

The underlying goal for all my behavior is to provide an environment where the kids have a chance to learn but have a good time, where the stress is on the person, the relationships. Relationships are highly important to me, not personally, but professionally for the staff. I am the kind of administrator that deals with individuals rather than groups. So I have a relationship of one kind or another with every single person in this building. In a lot of cases it's a designed relationship. Call it situational leadership, or whatever you like, but the relationship is proportionate to the goal I have for the person and to the person's ability to handle it. So with some I'm very easy going. With some I'm more directive. With some I'm just totally blunt and honest and normal. With others I'm quite polite.

I had a teacher the other day who I've been disappointed in lately. And I just got fed up so I shut down with that teacher. It's not hard to tell when I close the door on a relationship. And he came to see me and asked if something was wrong. And I said, "Yeah." He said, "Well, can we talk about it?" And I said, "No, I'm not ready to yet." Then about a week later I asked him to come in and we sat down and we talked about it. I told him that I felt that I had supported him and looked after him and bloody well protected him in a variety of situations and
that it wasn't being returned. And I wanted to know why I didn't have the trust and support that I gave him. And then we discussed it. (I/1/6)

Steve told me that relationships were important in the school because they were a means to helping teachers improve their practice. Different teachers had different relationships with him because of the level of effort they were willing to put into their classroom practice.

Relationships are a means to an end, not an end. The end is that in that classroom that teacher is bloody good, knows it, and is pleased with it, and has administrative support and direction that's worked out together. And teachers who are less than that are aware and they're being helped by their colleagues or the administration to improve. (I/1/7)

As an outcome of Steve's attention to relationship building, came a willingness on the part of staff to take on decision making and the responsibilities that go with decisions. For example, staff committees were formed to be responsible for professional development, curricular improvement and student success. Steve sat on each committee as an observer and a resource person, but said that he did not participate much, leaving control of the committee largely to teachers (I/4/9). Steve said his goal was to develop a sense of teacher empowerment in the school. In fact, his goal was to establish a school that would run the way the teachers wanted it to, no matter who the principal was.

Trying to empower staff, that's my main role in this school and it's a struggle. This staff is as close to it as I've ever seen. But we've talked about it, you've got to get past the trust. There has to be trust in order for empowerment to be effective because if you don't trust then it's like an illusion, it's not real and everybody's always skeptical and the first little thing that goes wrong, it can blow up. So, for three years we've been building and working towards this, and more and more decision making and more and more input and involvement by staff is going on. (I/1/9)

One of the major factors in the school that interfered with teacher empowerment, according to Steve, was the teachers' contract. He said that it was difficult to establish an atmosphere that incorporated the metaphor of "family" when at any time a family member had the right to bring in an outsider as an arbitrator (I/1/8). He would like a culture to
develop whereby people inside the culture solved their own problems. He attempted to
use the relationships he developed and nurtured with teachers to form this culture.

What I try to do is set up relationships that supersede the contract and that's about
95% [of the relationships] that stand. There are some two or three who think the
contract supersedes everything. And for those, they are dealt with as if they were
clauses...I treat them by the book. They don't get to leave school. They don't get
to go to the doctor's. They don't get the freedom the others have. They don't get
it. I won't sign the field trip forms. They have to backup whatever they do. I
mean, they can't have it both ways. I trust the others, we have an understanding.
These guys don't want to play that way, hey...it's okay. (I/4/8)

For those teachers with whom he had developed a positive relationship, he would
put the relationship before the contract. He often received requests that, although,
technically, they would break the contract, they could generally be accommodated within
the school. These were such things as leaving early for a doctor's appointment or to
attend to a sick child. His decision on whether to agree to the request and whether to ask
for compensation by the teacher, would be based upon the kind of relationship he had with
the teacher.

I break the contract all the time, but where a relationship is, like if a guy has a
family emergency, I'll let him go. If he asked the Board, the Board would say no,
or he would pay the cost of the sub. They have to behave according to the
contract. I can break it. But I expect when I do that it's a quid pro quo, based on
trust. No one is taking advantage of people, we will make up the difference if
necessary...It's sort of the informality based on real need, and we don't let the
contract get in the way. That's the relationship thing. (I/1/8)

Steve viewed it as important to establish relationships within the parent group. He
used these relationships to get out the message that the school was a safe environment
with a high academic standard. He said that the school was accountable in the eyes of the
community if they understood those two factors. Further, he worked to resolve
complaints that parents had with teachers, thus fulfilling his role of assuring accountability
to the public (I/5/13).
One of Steve's goals was that before he was transferred to another school he would like to bring the staff to a point at which they could take on the operation of the school and maintain the culture, no matter who the principal. There were two issues in this regard. The first was the way staff meetings were run, the second was the writing of a constitution.

The format for staff meetings had been jointly negotiated by staff and administration. A teacher who took on the position of speaker ran the meeting. There would be no announcements made at the meeting, instead announcements were printed on the back of the agenda. The administration was responsible for a portion of the meeting, there was a short time for sharing, then the Professional Development Committee decided on a single issue of importance to the school that would be discussed for the remaining time (1/4/4).

The idea of a constitution came from a member of a visiting accreditation team the previous year. The staff found this to be an interesting concept, requested a copy of the one developed in the accreditation team member's school, and set about the process of developing their own constitution. Out of the constitution developed the idea of teachers' running staff meetings. Other issues raised included decision making, powers of the staff committee, policy development, and change initiation.

This is all in the struggle toward having a staff that accepts responsibility for what goes on in the school and being involved and the consequences of that. And in order to do that they have to be part of the decision-making, responsible, and that's the tough part. They've done a lot of growing but they have some more to go. (1/2/8)

So what they are trying to build here is something that will reflect the relationship that exists now so that when I go, someone comes in, if that someone were to be someone opposite, that person coming in would have a terrible, terrible time trying to diminish the strength of this plan and their right to be involved. (1/9/2)

Steve claimed that the constitution would be a valuable document because it would reinforce the culture of the school. It would stress the importance of treating people as
individuals, respecting and trusting each other, and addressing the welfare of the school (I/2/10). He said that one of the most difficult parts of the process of helping teachers to establish their rights was to get representation from the entire staff because often the best teachers remained silent.

Sometimes I can see an administrator just saying "Screw it, I'll make these decisions, if they don't like it they can go somewhere else," because it is so much easier. But if you want a strong staff, if you want a staff that can bloody well run the place without you, which is what I'd like, then you have to go through a lot of this stuff. Sometimes the biggest fight is to get the good people to get involved and to say something. They are so bloody passive, all those good people that feel exactly the same way that you do that don't say anything. That really ticks me. And then there are four or five negative yappers that do all the talking and that's one of the things that the staff has to come to grips with. They can't allow that. You know, they have to deal with those negative people themselves. (I/2/11)

Steve said that a large part of getting staff to take responsibility for themselves included not only their writing a constitution, but also their coming to understand that they would be held accountable for their decisions.

**Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers**

Steve spoke positively about the move away from evaluating every teacher on a three year cycle to evaluation when a weakness was identified. He said it freed him to allocate his time and energy where it was most needed.

I can give the kind of informal encouragement and support to the good guys and spend some time with those guys who think they're good, but are not [good] for kids. (I/1/15)

At Arbutusgrove several teachers were going through a formal evaluation process. Steve explained the many methods he used to identify teaching problems. He talked with students in hallways, but particularly in the smoking area. He was alerted to a problem if a number of students tried to transfer out of a class, or if he or a counselor started to receive parental complaints. As soon as he sensed that there might be problem, he or a vice principal observed the teacher. He said that about every two weeks he took an hour and went into every classroom on a floor. He looked at student work, participated in
discussions, asked the students what they were doing and why they thought they were doing it. He looked at students' notebooks and asked students to explain what was in the notebooks. Through student notebooks he got a picture of the presentation of material, the order in which it was presented, evaluation techniques, and whether students had the opportunity to improve based upon evaluation (1/3/11). He noted teacher-student interaction, whether the teacher was monitoring student work, what teachers were doing when students were working in small groups, and on-task and on-time behavior (1/1/14). The three categories of weakness that would prompt a start to the evaluation process were "less than acceptable classroom management skills, less than acceptable pupil-teacher relationships, less than acceptable instructional deliveries" (1/3/6).

There were also those teachers in the school who were not on a formal evaluation process, but who were under careful monitoring. Since administrators divided supervisory responsibility by floor, they were responsible for monitoring teachers on that floor. The administrative team decided on which teachers needed more supervision. A formal evaluation process might or might not grow out of the monitoring.

Steve explained the evaluation process from a principal's perspective. The process had two steps. The first was an informal process through which the teacher had the opportunity to improve prior to the initiation of the formal process. There was still room for improvement during the formal process, but the process itself was much more complicated and structured. Steve said that because of the way the collective agreement was written, once he began the formal process he was committed to carrying it through (1/3/10).

It's all laid out in the contract and what the contract says that I'm to do. I'm to tell the teacher that I have a concern. I'm to illustrate exactly what I mean, and the teacher is supposed to explain that, okay he understands and it will be all better. The next step is, if I still have a concern, to write it down for him. Usually there's the president of the Teachers' Association or a representative with the teacher, so there's this kind of feeling, except nobody says it, but that's what they try and do now, make it very difficult. Anything you haven't listed as a concern can't be used
down the road. So if you leave anything out, you can't refer to it for report-writing. It's like a contract deal. Okay, this is the interesting part... You need to explain in detail how that teacher is to go about improving and then you have to state how you would recognize that improvement has been reached. So basically what you have to do is the whole damn thing... I have to do that for every one of my concerns, and then that's the basis of the report, nothing else. (I/3/6)

Each teacher is given three chances in the district. That is, the teacher must receive three negative evaluations before being asked to leave the district. Steve was troubled by that because the teacher goes on teaching and interacting with children throughout the time required for the three evaluations. Steve said, "That's what I have difficulty with, the focus is not on the kids, it's on the teacher" (I/3/6).

Steve shared a concern he had about teachers' desire for feedback. Since teachers are no longer automatically given reports on their teaching, several asked him for letters of reference. The process Steve used was to do some class observations, then write a letter. He found that a couple of teachers were concerned with his letters because, although in his opinion, they were an accurate reflection of what occurred in the classroom, they were not what the teacher wanted to see in a letter, and of course, because of the change in policy the clinical supervision model did not have to be followed. Thus, the focus of observation was left solely to the principal and was not jointly negotiated as in the clinical supervision model. Steve stated that teachers either had to accept letters based on his focus, or renegotiate into the contract a clinical supervision cycle.

**Professional Growth Plans**

There were two things about teachers' writing Professional Growth Plans that Steve particularly approved of. First, they supported his style of leadership.

It totally supports the way I'm approaching leadership in the school which is empowerment of staff and treating them as professionals who are accountable and responsible. (I/1/3)

Second, he said that he thought that more teachers than ever before were focusing on improving some aspect of their instruction. And because plans were carried out with a peer, the opportunity for collegial relationships had increased (I/3/3).
Staff members had the opportunity to submit their plans to any one of the three administrators. Steve initially talked informally with each of the teachers who signed up with him. He then invited each teacher to drop in and let him know how they were doing with the plan. Some teachers chose to do that (I/1/3). Steve kept a file of the plans, and a list of all plans with a brief summary. His intent was to talk informally with teachers throughout the year, but admitted he did not do as much of that as would have liked (I/2/6).

Steve expressed some concern over what his role was and should be in the development and enactment of the growth plans. The concept of Professional Growth Plans to replace cyclical evaluation of every teacher was jointly negotiated and agreed to by the Board and the Teachers' Association. However, Steve expressed the concern that the Teachers' Association was almost invisible in its effort to support the policy. Consequently, that lack of support presented a difficult situation for administrators.

A certain percentage of staff see it as an exercise. The more the administration has something to do with it, the more of an exercise it appears to be. So the catch 22 for administrators is that if we take the initiative to encourage teachers to do their Professional Growth Plans it is seen as an administrative maneuver. And there's a variety of ways they can look at that, but the initiative comes from the administration, and I won't do that...I told the staff at the meeting that the role of the administration in this school is to be there so that when you want to come and talk about it, we'll be available. (I/2/2)

It was Steve's opinion that if he became more than a sounding board for the teacher's plan, then it was no longer the teacher's plan, but now his plan (I/2/6). He talked about the process he went through when teachers came to him with their plans.

I just ask some questions to try and clarify it, and make it simple for me to understand, like what the hell's the point of the whole thing. But it's your plan, and that's the key for me; there has to be, if not the trust, the perceived trust that it is your plan and you are responsible for it. I won't tell you how to do it, when to do it, I won't tell you you have to do it, I won't take any responsibility for it. I will help if I'm asked. To me that's the key. The other side of it is, if it's a phony plan, I will point that out, down the line, if I believe that. (I/3/3)
Steve expressed two concerns about the policy change. First, it would be easy for him not to spend time in classrooms, so he had to program himself to make sure that he got in to observe teaching practices (1/4/2). Second, he was concerned that the Professional Growth Plans did not provide enough accountability. He said that he would like teachers to provide a yearly analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of their plan which would then become part of their personal record (1/5/14).

Steve said that the majority of the teachers do take the Professional Growth Plans seriously. He stated that the Professional Growth Plan policy encouraged teachers to work together and model for each other (1/4/4).

**Summary of the Principal's Approach to Policy Change**

The development and evolution of relationships between Steve and the staff played a key role in the way Steve brought about the change of policy on supervision and evaluation of teachers. He said that the policy change did not have a significant impact on him or the way he went about his job (1/2/6). He continued to work through the four aspects of his principalship: school climate, values, relationships and empowerment. Since he viewed Professional Growth Plans as the responsibility of the teacher, he did not try to monitor or influence those plans. Thus, because of his established practice and his understanding of the intent of the policy change, the policy change did not alter his practice.
CHAPTER 5
CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter will examine and analyze the cases of the eight principals that were presented in Chapter 4. As noted in the introduction to Chapter 4, I clustered the cases as follows: Peter, Janet and Gary form one cluster; Vera, Carol and Audrey a second; and Richard and Steve a third. This chapter will examine the nature of this clustering regarding four facets of the principals' enactment of the district policy change: their professional beliefs, their supervision of teachers through professional growth plans, their evaluation of teachers, and their perceived effects of the policy change. Principals came to their current positions with their own beliefs about their role, about their practice, and about other educational issues related to the nature of education: schools, teachers, students, community, and professional growth. These and all other factors that influence how principals think about their job are what I have referred to as "principals' professional beliefs."

The clusters were composed in response to the first research question: "What factors influence principals' responses to a change in school district policy? More specifically, what are the professional and context-specific issues the principals consider as they interpret a school district policy change and plan for their own action in carrying out that change process?" Furthermore, in addressing the second research question, "How do principals enact the policy changes in their own schools?" similar principal clusters appeared to emerge, that is, principals who shared a similar view of the principalship within a particular school context tended to enact the policy change in similar ways. It is important to note that the first question examines the principals' professional beliefs within a specific school context. There is no claim that if principals were moved to different schools, they would, in the short run, be able to implement policy change in the same manner.
The first part of this chapter, then, examines four facets of the principals' enactment of the district policy change in teacher supervision and evaluation: (1) principals' professional beliefs, (2) implementation of Professional Growth Plans, (3) implementation of the evaluation policy, and (4) perceived effects of the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. In analyzing the first two facets, the principals clustered into the same three groups, supporters of teacher decision making, facilitators of shared values, and promoters of mutual respect. No apparent clustering occurred for the third and fourth facets.

The second part of this chapter examines the way district policy is mediated by principals' professional beliefs when principals enact a district policy change in their schools. It examines the influence of principals' professional beliefs on their enactment of Professional Growth Plans and teacher evaluation.

Four Facets of Principals' Enactment of the Policy Change in Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers

Principals' Professional Beliefs

The analysis of the data on the principals' professional beliefs revealed that these beliefs can be placed into five categories. They talked about the climate and culture of the school, assisting teacher's work, respecting teachers' knowledge, initiating ideas, and modeling behaviors. Not all principals discussed their beliefs in each of the categories. Table 1, entitled Principals' Professional Beliefs, lists the professional beliefs of each principal within their existing context. An empty cell does not necessarily mean that a principal did not support the ideas or beliefs represented by that cell; rather, it means that the principal did not explicitly discuss those beliefs in our interviews as a major part of his or her practice. As the table suggests, principals can be clustered into three groups in this stage of the analysis.
Supporters of Teacher Decision Making

The first cluster of principals, Peter, Janet, and Gary, I call supporters of teacher decision making. As the analysis of the data will show, this cluster of principals was concerned that teachers had a voice in school decision making and were supported in their practice with ideas and resources. They worked to create a culture that supported teachers in finding and using their own voice. As noted in Table 1, they supported teacher decision making in four ways: they worked to build a positive school climate; they assisted teachers' in their work; they respected teachers' knowledge; and they initiated ideas about practice and school for teachers to consider.

The first way this cluster of principals supported teacher decision making was by working to create a positive or supportive culture -- a climate that was inviting to students, staff and parents. They believed that teacher involvement was an important element in school culture. Thus, they used such mechanisms as committees and grade-cluster meetings to encourage teachers to be involved in school decision making. Each of these principals supported teachers so that they could have the time and appropriate atmosphere in which to talk and plan. They viewed the climate as the backbone of the school and important aspects of that climate were their respect for teachers' knowledge and assistance of teachers' work.

This cluster of principals had clear understandings of how the school organization should contribute to the school climate. Each developed a committee structure in the school that fostered teachers' meeting to discuss how the school should function and to problem solve when issues arose. Through committees they helped staff to understand the importance of each teacher to the committee structure. These committees included curriculum committees, grade level committees, social committees, professional development committees, finance committees, school climate committees, and so on. This cluster of principals participated in many of these committee meetings, influenced the committee through proposing agenda items, raising ideas and issues, but then turned
### Table 1

#### Principals' Professional Beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports of Teacher Decision Making</th>
<th>Facilitators of Shared Values</th>
<th>Promoters of Mutual Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Gary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models behavior</td>
<td>1. professional dialogue</td>
<td>1. professional dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. shared values</td>
<td>2. shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. research-based practice</td>
<td>3. research-based practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. collegiality</td>
<td>5. reflection on values and beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. joint problem solving</td>
<td>1. based on shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. creates a warm and happy environment</td>
<td>2. encourages collegial culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate and culture</td>
<td>creates a warm and happy environment</td>
<td>creates positive and nurturing culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. develops collaboration</td>
<td>1. drops ideas in conversation</td>
<td>1. based on shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. school as hub of the community</td>
<td>2. puts items on committee agendas</td>
<td>2. encourages shared values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiates ideas</td>
<td>3. creates vision for school</td>
<td>3. encourages risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. helps teachers to define a clear school focus</td>
<td>1. drops &quot;seedles&quot;</td>
<td>1. drops ideas in conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. supports what teachers choose</td>
<td>2. supports teachers' initiatives</td>
<td>2. puts items on committee agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assists teachers' work</td>
<td>1. supports teachers' initiatives</td>
<td>3. creates vision for school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. encourages teachers and enables</td>
<td>2. distributes literature</td>
<td>3. through her organizational skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. supports teachers' initiatives</td>
<td>1. supports teachers' initiatives</td>
<td>2. distributes literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respects teachers' knowledge</td>
<td>1. supports teachers' initiatives</td>
<td>2. distributes literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. helps staff define and implement goals</td>
<td>1. supports knowledge sharing</td>
<td>1. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. supports knowledge sharing</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. supports knowledge sharing</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. supports knowledge sharing</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>1. promotes teacher decision making through committee structure</td>
<td>2. supports knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decision making over to teachers. The principals in this cluster did not view themselves as
directing discussion or decisions. They voiced their own support for decisions that were
made within committees. Thus, they raised the status of committees and helped to lend
credibility to committee decisions by supporting the process and helping to implement the
outcomes.

They said that one of the ways they designed a positive school climate, was by
reaching out to the community to encourage parents to be involved in the activities of the
school, including fundraising and extracurricular activities; however, they did not allow
parents to impinge upon the teachers' right to make curriculum and instructional decisions.
They believed that parental support for the school helped to build a positive climate, but
that it was teachers who should develop a clear focus for the school, make decisions, and
take responsibility for their decisions. They valued teacher knowledge and worked to help
teachers understand how to make decisions and take responsibility for those decisions.
They influenced the school through working to develop a culture supportive of teacher
decision making.

A second defining characteristic of these principals was that they assisted teachers'
work. They went to great lengths to free teachers to talk together and plan together. They
provided congenial environments, covered classes for teachers (sometimes for several
teachers at one time), they built school structures for decision making and taught teachers
how to participate productively in those structures. For example, Janet offered to take
teachers' classes so that they could observe her teach or watch someone else's class. Gary
scheduled himself and the head teacher to work with the entire set of intermediate students
so those teachers would be free to plan together every third week. He also allocated a
significant portion of the budget toward intermediate teaching supplies and he rearranged
teaching assignments so they would be teaching in adjacent classrooms.

The third way this cluster of principals supported teacher decision making was
through initiating ideas. The principals in this cluster could articulate a clear vision for the
school and for themselves as principal. They all felt it was important to keep up with current educational research and share that research with teachers. For example, Peter, through the committee structure he set up, led teachers through a collaborative decision making process. He then worked to help them negotiate a vision of what that process looked like so it could be repeated and incorporated into the way the school was run. He, as well as other teachers, could then introduce curriculum or instructional ideas, knowing that a collaborative decision making process was in effect to determine if those ideas were feasible within the particular school context.

The fourth way this cluster of principals supported teacher decision making was through their respect for teachers' knowledge. They spoke often about teachers being experts in the classroom and how teachers learn best from each other. The structures and opportunities they developed to allow teachers to work together demonstrated this respect. For example, they brought teachers together to talk about school issues and issues of practice through morning muffin meetings, teaching teachers' classes to provide release time, providing the opportunity for subgroups of teachers to plan together, or scheduling groups of teachers to have the same planning time. They referred to themselves at times as enablers, supporters, providers and cheerleaders. They enabled teacher decision making by providing opportunities for teachers to talk and plan together. They supported teachers' decisions by providing resources to help teachers implement their plans. They were cheerleaders in that they visibly supported teachers' decisions and often talked about the positive work of teachers. They used staff meetings as an opportunity to show their respect for teachers' knowledge by encouraging committees to report their decisions to the entire staff, or by encouraging teachers to talk about new things they have tried in the classroom. In each case, the principal found ways to demonstrate respect for teachers' knowledge through devising structures that allowed teachers to share their knowledge.
Inherent in the beliefs and hence the actions of this cluster of principals is the notion that teachers have the knowledge and the expertise to provide intellectual stimulation for other teachers and to engage in discussion and decision making about school issues. These principals consider the organizational structure of schools to be the major impediment in teachers' sharing their practice. Thus, their job was to help organize time and place in order to give teachers opportunities to share knowledge and to participate in school decision making. These principals said it was important for them not to control the direction of the discussion nor the final decision, but to honor the knowledge and the expertise of the teacher by taking a more passive role in the discussion and decision making process. Thus, the supporters of shared decision making enabled teachers in their attempts to make important decisions about the school, but they fell short of engaging teachers in the process of proactively critiquing their own practice and school policy.

Facilitators of Shared Values

The second cluster of principals, Vera, Carol, and Audrey, the *facilitators of shared values*, held strong beliefs about how, within the culture of the school, jointly negotiated values are actualized. The analysis of these cases will show that these principals believed that they should play an active role in all aspects of the collegial culture of the school. Specifically, their role in facilitation was to stimulate critique of beliefs and values; that is to engage teachers in discussion that caused them to critique current practice and policy. This cluster of principals, as noted in Table 1, facilitated the negotiation of and the actualization of shared values in two ways: they worked to build a positive school climate and culture; and they modeled behavior that exemplified the negotiated shared values.

The first way this cluster of principals facilitated the development of shared values was through building a culture that was jointly negotiated and based upon values that the staff understood and believed in. For example, Vera used staff meetings to get small
groups of teachers to discuss specific issues, then pulled the entire group together to come
to consensus. She used this process to help teachers, herself an active participant, to
decide on what values were important and shared, and then to develop a mission statement
based upon those values. These principals raised issues for discussion and encouraged
teachers to also raise issues. They took active, but not dominant roles in the discussion
and decision-making process. In these discussions, the principals did not present
themselves in authoritative positions, but became participants in the debate.

Within the set of negotiated values, this cluster of principals worked to ensure that
there was freedom of difference. Vera expressed her concern saying that she needed to be
careful in encouraging the development of common norms and values such that teachers
are not enculturated to the point of becoming clones. It was important to encourage the
development of shared values while retaining independence of thought. The shared,
negotiated values concerned basic issues of working together, such as, positive climate,
colloquiality, treating adults and children with respect, decision making and problem
solving.

One important aspect of school culture for these principals was the development of
collaborative relationships within a collegial culture. Collaborative relationships are
conceptualized as pairs or small groups of people who talk about practice and plan,
design, research and problem solve together. A collegial culture goes beyond individual or
small group relationships to become a norm within the school. Some of the characteristics
that permeated the culture in these schools were that teachers and administrators engaged
in purposeful talk about their practice, planned together, designed and evaluated
curriculum, and read and discussed research. Through the "purposeful talk" that each
principal said was so valuable, teachers and administrators taught each other about what
they knew about learning and teaching. And teachers moved in and out of informal
leadership positions by sharing their knowledge and teaching other teachers. In these
colloquial cultures, collaboration existed between and among individuals or small groups,
open communication was becoming a norm, and the entire culture valued collaborative relationships and actively pursued those relationships. These principals wanted to be seen working with teachers as colleagues in discussions about educational ideas and about the ways those ideas could help student learning. In discussions with teachers, they reflected on their own values and beliefs and helped teachers to do the same. They encouraged teachers to talk about and test new approaches to learning and teaching; thus, they encouraged and supported risk taking within this culture. They helped to further the development of a collegial culture through taking an active role as a collegial member. They were active participants, though not dominant forces, in most major decisions that were made in the school.

A second defining characteristic of the principals in this cluster was that they encouraged the actualization of decisions by modeling negotiated behaviors. For example, they engaged in professional dialogue with teachers, thus encouraging a culture in which teachers discussed their practice. Teachers in these schools were interested in reading research that augmented their practice. These principals modeled how to base a practice on research by basing their own practice on research and sharing research literature with teachers. They encouraged joint problem solving with reference to the values that had been negotiated. They tested decisions by asking whether they were consistent with those values. These school practices contributed to the development of a collegial culture based on negotiated values.

This cluster of principals modeled the role of facilitator as an important part of their practice. As facilitators, they stimulated discussion and critique of practice and school policy. Thus, they become partners with teachers in discussion, analysis and decision making about school matters. They were committed to developing a collegial culture based upon the negotiation of values, but they were not without strong values of their own. This cluster of principals shared the valuing of a school culture that involved
everyone, including themselves, as active participants in critique, discussion and decision making.

Promoters of Mutual Respect

The third cluster of principals, Richard and Steve, I call promoters of mutual respect. Relationships between principal and teacher were the fundamental mechanism by which these principals ran the school. They shared a belief that each individual within the school was important and should be respected and treated well. As Table 1 indicates, these principals promoted mutual respect in two ways: they worked to build a positive school climate and they initiated ideas about changes in teachers' practice.

The first way this cluster of principals promoted mutual respect was by working to create a positive school climate. They talked about a school culture in which there was personal trust and respect for other people. For example, Steve said that the values that are important in a school are kindness, courtesy, fairness, honesty, accountability and responsibility. Richard said it was his responsibility to be nice to people, although other administrators sometimes said that he was so nice that he would not confront a teacher who needed help. Both principals said that because of the complex nature of schools and society, it was important that staff looked after each other. For these principals, a sense of caring, courtesy and fairness was important in building a positive school climate.

A second defining characteristic of these principals was the way in which they promoted mutual respect through initiating new ideas about teachers' practice. They talked about the importance of carefully introducing ideas and preparing staff for the ideas. They drew upon the relationships they had established with teachers to gain acceptance, or at least consideration, for the idea. Because these principals were interested in promoting mutual trust, they would initiate ideas, but then wait for teachers to make a decision about implementation. The authority of the teacher in decision making was important for this cluster of principals. Thus, once a principal introduced an idea, he
allowed the teacher the authority to decide whether the idea would be incorporated into practice, and if so, how.

In order to allow teacher autonomy in decisions about practice, these principals often relied upon subtle means of influencing teacher decision making. For example, "time" became a significant factor in the way they introduced ideas. Time was important in several different dimensions of the change process. The first issue of time involved time to develop relationships. These principals carefully nurtured relationships over time, as they believed individual relationships to be a significant factor in change implementation. It was often through this work with individual teachers that they could assess readiness for acceptance of new ideas. Prior to introducing new ideas they carefully evaluated relationships within the staff to determine how ideas would be understood and, therefore, accepted or rejected. Based upon their strong beliefs about relationships, they worked within the confines of those relationships to introduce to the staff ideas for change. They viewed it as their responsibility to empower staff to make decisions and to take responsibility for those decisions. The act of empowerment thus became an act of giving power from the principal to the teacher.

Because these principals allowed teachers to decide whether ideas should be implemented, they were concerned about waiting for the right time to ask a question, plant an idea, arrange for a workshop, or raise an item for discussion. Each of these principals said it was important to determine the appropriate time, as in a strategic game plan, for the principal to introduce an idea. For example, Steve compared his job to being a participant in a war game, trying to decide strategically on the next best move.

These principals said it was necessary to allow teachers time to understand and become comfortable with an idea, prior to their asking for commitment to the idea. Teachers needed time to think about a concept, become comfortable with it and understand how it would fit into their classroom or the school. For example, Richard talked about how he gradually introduced ideas about student-centered instruction. It was
only after he saw some of his ideas appear in teachers' Professional Growth Plans that he knew his ideas were being used. By allowing teachers time to understand an idea and by allowing themselves time to work with teachers to develop a trusting relationship around the idea, the principals in this cluster were able to initiate ideas in a way that promoted mutual respect.

Implementation of Professional Growth Plans

The analysis of the data on the way the eight principals worked with staff to implement the Professional Growth Plan part of the district policy change can be grouped into four categories: what principals did to introduce Professional Growth Plans to staff, what the Professional Growth Plan Committee did to support implementation of the policy, what was done at staff meetings to support policy implementation, and what the principals believed to be the underlying philosophy behind the implementation of the Professional Growth Plan policy. Table 2, entitled Implementation of Professional Growth Plans, lists some of the principals' primary actions and beliefs regarding the implementation of the plans. As before, an empty cell does not necessarily mean that a principal did not support the ideas or actions represented by that cell. As the table depicts, principals' actions and beliefs can be clustered into the same three groups in this facet of the analysis as in the previous section on Principals' Professional Beliefs.

Supporters of Teacher Decision Making

The analysis of the data will show that the first cluster of principals, the supporters of teacher decision making (Peter, Janet and Gary), supported teachers' writing and implementing Professional Growth Plans by providing time, place, resources and opportunity for teachers. All three principals believed that Professional Growth Plans had the capability of influencing teacher's practice. However, of primary importance, all three thought that the plan had to be solely the teacher's plan in order for it to fall within contractual guidelines and to have an impact on teachers practice. That is, these principals would not suggest ideas for the plan, nor encourage the teacher to analyze critically the
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementors of Professional Growth Plans</th>
<th>Facilitators of Shared Values</th>
<th>Promoters of Mutual Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporters of Teacher Decision Making</strong></td>
<td><strong>Facilitators of Shared Values</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promoters of Mutual Respect</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Janet</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develops organizational structures to help teachers take responsibility for their practice</td>
<td>1. Supports PGP plans</td>
<td>1. Designs organizational structure where teacher can choose administrator to whom to submit PGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers can discuss PGP with the principal</td>
<td>3. His role in the PGP is determined by the teacher</td>
<td>3. His role in the PGP is determined by the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cannot alter teachers' plans</td>
<td>5. Meets with each teacher 3 times per year on PGP</td>
<td>5. Meets with each teacher 3 times per year on PGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Suggestions for resources</td>
<td>6. Accepts written plan from teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Growth Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Growth Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers can discuss PGP with the committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Support professional growth plan process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Professional Growth Plan Committee organized activities for teachers to discuss PGP share plans as part of collegial culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers discuss concerns and triumphs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Understanding of the Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The plan must be solely teacher centered to have an impact on teacher practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals could not be directive in teachers' plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher is in charge of plan and responsible for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGP can assist in the development of a collegial culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implementation of Professional Growth Plans

1. **Supporters of Teacher Decision Making**
2. **Facilitators of Shared Values**
3. **Promoters of Mutual Respect**
plan; rather the principal would accept the plan and support the teacher's enactment of it. As shown in Table 2, I organized the discussion by the principals into three groups of issues: what principals did to introduce Professional Growth Plans to staff, what the Professional Growth Plan Committee did to support implementation of the policy, and what the principal believed to be the underlying philosophy behind the implementation of the Professional Growth Plan policy.

The first group of issues, concerning what principals did to introduce Professional Growth Plans to staff, had several similar characteristics across the cluster. All three principals devised organizational structures whereby teachers could submit their plans and have the opportunity to talk about them. Although Janet was the only principal in this cluster to insist that all teachers discuss their plans with her, the other principals made themselves available for discussion. Because these principals were concerned with teachers retaining ownership and responsibility for their plan, they accepted teachers' plans without negotiation. That is not to say that the principals did not influence the plans. Their influence came in the form of support during implementation when and if a teacher discussed the plan with them or asked for resources. With this cluster of principals, teachers could choose the level of interaction with the principal in carrying out their Professional Growth Plan. Because these principals respected teachers' knowledge, and trusted teachers to work in a professional and timely manner, they did not feel the need to hold teachers accountable throughout the teachers' implementation of their plans. They would engage in discussion with the teacher about the plan, but would not try to change a teacher's plan.

Through the committee structure that each of these principals initiated, the open discussion they encouraged in committee and staff meetings, and other mechanisms they used to provide teachers the opportunity to talk about professional issues, these principals worked to develop a climate that encouraged collaborative relationships. They then incorporated Professional Growth Plans into the school culture that they were
endeavoring to establish. In these schools, there were already in existence routines and procedures for teacher collaboration that prepared teachers for the collaborative aspects of Professional Growth Plans. For example, Gary said that many of the teachers in the school were experts in child-centered instruction. In fact, some had given workshops together, within and outside the district. These teachers had established patterns of talking and planning together. Thus, it was natural for them to formalize collaborative Professional Growth Plans.

This cluster of principals demonstrated their support for teachers' work by asking questions about Professional Growth Plans that helped teachers clarify their ideas. They also offered support for teachers' plans in the form of material and intellectual resources. For example, they helped pairs of teachers obtain release time to work collaboratively on plans, thus demonstrating the value they placed upon collaborative relationships. As well, they passed along pertinent literature that would help teachers accomplish their plans.

A second group of issues consisted of the establishment of school-based Professional Growth Plan Committees. These committees became an important mechanism for supporting teachers' plans. They were consultative committees in which teachers could initiate discussion about their plans. The committees were instrumental in planning professional development activities that supported teachers' plans.

The third common group of issues was the principals' understanding of the philosophy behind Professional Growth Plan implementation. They believed that they should not have influence over teachers' Professional Growth Plans. Peter summarized the discussion of this cluster of principals when he said that for the Professional Growth Plan to have impact on teachers' practice it must be kept solely teacher centered and teacher directed. Thus, he did not force teachers to discuss their plan with him, nor did he monitor or follow up on plans unless he was directly involved as a participant in the teacher's plan. This cluster of principals would not use Professional Growth Plans to stimulate a teacher's practice nor to help a teacher improve in an area of deficit, but would
support teachers by providing a context in which they could determine their professional growth needs, and construct and implement their professional growth goals.

**Facilitators of Shared Values**

The second cluster of principals, the *facilitators of shared values* (Vera, Carol and Audrey), had a very different outlook on the implementation of Professional Growth Plans. They also respected teachers' knowledge, but expressed that respect in a different way. For all three of them, the development of a school culture based upon collegiality and shared values was very important. Therefore, each of these principals discussed with staff the ways that the implementation of the Professional Growth Plans would be accomplished in the context of the existing negotiated school values. As Table 2 shows, data in all four groups of issues were discussed by principals in this cluster. These principals implemented the Professional Growth Plans using two action strategies that coincided with their professional beliefs: that is, through the continuous development of a school culture that supported the negotiation of shared values and through modeling behaviors.

The first group of issues that contained common characteristics was what the principals did to introduce Professional Growth Plans to staff. These principals believed that school culture should be built upon the negotiated values of the staff. In introducing Professional Growth Plans, they worked with staff to help them gain an understanding of the policy and to incorporate Professional Growth Plans into the established norms, values and beliefs inherent in the school culture. Some of these shared values within each school were also shared by the three schools. For example, in each case professional dialogue was valued. The implication for Professional Growth Plans was that this dialogue should continue and should largely center on teachers' growth plans. Some of the principals in this group asked that teachers not submit a written plan until after an initial discussion.

---

*See section entitled "Principals' Professional Beliefs" subsection "Facilitators of Shared Values"*
between teacher and principal. Carol summarized the feeling about this when she stated that when people came to her to discuss an already written plan, she sometimes felt she was criticizing rather than discussing the teacher's plan. If there were no written plan, but only an idea, the principal and teacher could jointly work to further the idea prior to its being solidified in writing. For these three principals it was important to carry on the educational discussion without criticism, for that is the atmosphere they wished to nurture in order for professional growth to occur. Following the initial discussion on Professional Growth Plans, teachers sometimes went away from the discussion with a modified version of what they came in with. Because these principals understood the process to be a learning process and a growth process, a modified plan was viewed as positive because it meant that through discussion the teacher's and principal's knowledge and understanding had grown.

Another value that was shared in each of the three schools was that practice should be based upon research. Therefore each principal, and often teachers, would collect and distribute pertinent literature to each other. This was a practice that occurred prior to the policy change and was now used in conjunction with the policy change.

The second group of issues containing common characteristics was in the role the Professional Growth Plan Committee played in the policy implementation. These principals encouraged the Professional Growth Plan Committees in the schools to take active roles in helping teachers with their plans. The committees did such things as design school-wide professional growth activities around the kinds of issues teachers were working with in their growth plans. The committees offered teachers the opportunity to talk through their plans and to get help and ideas to carry out the plans. In one school, some teachers on the Professional Growth Plan committee volunteered to do Professional Growth Plans one year prior to their becoming a requirement of district policy. They, thus, modeled the procedure for other teachers in the school. The Professional Growth Plan policy provided many opportunities for teachers to take on leadership roles in the
school. Some modeled the process of developing and implementing a plan, some shared the knowledge they learned from doing a plan, and others worked to support teachers who ran into problems implementing their plans. Carol stated that she thought it was important to good teacher morale that a school offer many kinds of leadership opportunities for teachers, not just the traditional administrative roles. Through the Professional Growth Plan policy, this group of principals and the Professional Growth Plan Committee in the school helped to offer those leadership opportunities.

The third common group of issues concerned the way staff meetings were used in Professional Growth Plan implementation. This cluster of principals, as members of the Professional Growth Plan Committees, developed activities for staff meetings to help clarify the process of Professional Growth Plan implementation, to examine ways Professional Growth Plans could become part of the school culture, and to help teachers resolve issues they had around their plans. For example, in Audrey's school the Professional Growth Plan Committee decided that a part of each staff meeting would be devoted to teachers' Professional Growth Plans. Either teachers shared their plans or the committee distributed a research article pertinent to some teachers' plans. The staff read the article prior to the meeting, then discussed it at the meeting. Thus, the staff meetings became a support mechanism for teachers' Professional Growth Plans.

The fourth common group of issues concerned the principal's understanding of the philosophy behind the implementation of the Professional Growth Plan. These principals looked at Professional Growth Plans as a means of encouraging people to talk together, plan together, teach together and problem solve together. Integrating Professional Growth Plans into school practices allowed principals to use them as one mechanism for building the school culture. Each believed that if incorporated into the culture of the school, teachers' plans had the potential to assist in the development of the collegial culture they were working to build and maintain.
Promoters of Mutual Respect

The third cluster of principals, the *promoters of mutual respect*, (Steve and Richard) had yet a third approach to the implementation of Professional Growth Plans. These principals used the Professional Growth Plan to build trust and respect between the principal and the teacher. As the analysis of the data will show, this cluster of principals discussed two groups of issues in the implementation of Professional Growth Plans: what they did to introduce the Professional Growth Plan to staff and what they believed to be the underlying philosophy behind the implementation of the Professional Growth Plan policy.

The first group of issues, what the principals did to implement Professional Growth Plans, had several similar characteristics across the cluster. These principals designed an organizational structure in the school through which they could collect and account for plans. For example, Richard requested that each teacher submit a plan by November first. He then set up a one-half hour meeting in the fall and another in the spring for each teacher to present and discuss the plan.

The principals in this cluster attempted to build a culture in which they promoted mutual respect. They demonstrated their respect for teachers and their trust in teachers by discussing Professional Growth Plans for the purpose of clarifying ideas, but did not expect the teacher to modify the plan. Steve encapsulated this view when he said that if he were anything more than a sounding board for the teacher's plan, it was no longer the teacher's plan, but now his plan. Their acceptance of teachers' plans demonstrated their respect for teachers' ideas and teachers' work.

The principals in this cluster saw their responsibility for Professional Growth Plans to be collecting and filing the plans and offering assistance in the form of material resources, when requested by the teacher. Each of these principals kept all plans on file, but because they believed the plan had to be implemented and monitored by the teacher, they seldom referred back to the plans on file.
This cluster of principals expressed the belief that they empowered teachers to take responsibility for their own professional careers. They said that given time to understand the purpose of the Professional Growth Plan, teachers would be able to incorporate them into their practice. Since the professional beliefs of these principals prohibited them from trying to influence the direction of teachers' plans, they relied on the stability of the policy initiative over a period of time to incorporate it into the school culture.

The second group of issues in which the analysis showed common characteristics was in the principals' understanding of the philosophy behind the implementation of Professional Growth Plans. The principals in this cluster expressed the belief that the Professional Growth Plan had to be solely teacher initiated and teacher directed in order for it to have an impact on the teacher's practice and in order for the principal to demonstrate his trust in and respect for the teacher. For example, Richard said that the more committed the teacher was to doing a Professional Growth Plan, the more significant the plan would be to the teacher's practice, a factor over which he had no control. The teacher would become committed to a plan only if that plan were totally of the teacher's own design.

These principals were willing to devise organizational structures to help manage the policy change and were willing to work with teachers who actively sought their help. However, their belief in the authority and autonomy of teachers prohibited them from moving beyond organizational structures to active support or facilitation in an attempt to incorporate such mechanisms as Professional Growth Plans into the culture of the school.

Implementation of Evaluation Policy

My discussion with the principals regarding their implementation of the evaluation part of the policy change in the supervision and evaluation of teachers produced a wide

---

3See section entitled "Principals' Professional Beliefs" for a complete description.
range of responses that did not cluster. This section will explain the analysis of the principals' implementation of the new evaluation policy.

The analysis of the data in this section examined two groups of issues under the implementation of the evaluation policy: what the principals perceived their responsibilities to be in the evaluation process and what their concerns were regarding their evaluation of teachers. (See Table 3, Implementation of Evaluation Policy.) The principals in this study all expressed relief that they no longer had to spend a significant portion of their job in the role of evaluator. They said that the Professional Growth Plan policy allowed them to shift their role away from that of evaluator in favor of supervisor, a role that principals felt more comfortable with, and one that contained less ambiguity for them.

The first group of issues, concerning what the principals perceived their responsibilities to be in the evaluation process, produced a variety of responses across the set of eight principals. It was clear that no principal in the study used a clinical supervision model with teachers on a regular basis and that all of the principals stopped doing a three year cyclical evaluation of teachers. Clinical supervision was used sporadically by two principals who were working with teachers to help improve specific parts of their practice. In one case, the principal had entered into the steps of the formal evaluation procedure, in the other case the clinical supervision was done as part of the teacher's Professional Growth Plan.

All principals said that the evaluation process was a continuation of the supervisory process. Thus, they set up support mechanisms to try to avert problems that would lead to formal evaluation. For example, Janet put in place a mentoring program for new teachers, Peter and Gary team taught with teachers in order to model good teaching, Vera and Audrey were actively involved in classrooms on a continuous basis, Carol encouraged the growth of collegiality to support teachers, Steve tried to get into each classroom every two weeks, and Richard went into classrooms to show his support for teachers.
### Table 3

#### Implementation of Evaluation Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's Job</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Janet</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Vera</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Audrey</th>
<th>Richard</th>
<th>Steve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Team teach with teachers to model good teaching</td>
<td>1. Designs organizational structure to observe teachers</td>
<td>1. Prior to initiating a formal evaluation he would ask for support from superintendent</td>
<td>1. Actively involved in classrooms</td>
<td>1. Discusses school improvement with teachers</td>
<td>1. Develops a climate of positive rapport and trust before critiquing teachers' practice</td>
<td>1. Tries to get into every classroom every two weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When he has a concern about a teacher's practice he uses a clinical supervision model</td>
<td>2. Meets with new teachers once per week</td>
<td>2. Works with teachers indirectly rather than confronting them with a weakness</td>
<td>2. Works through PGP, then further if she has a concern</td>
<td>2. Encourages and evaluates are on continuum</td>
<td>2. Always observant and gathering data</td>
<td>2. Examiners student work and student notebooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Finds mentor for new teachers</td>
<td>3. Principal is no longer an evaluator</td>
<td>3. Accesses resource people in the district to provide support for teachers</td>
<td>3. Supervision and evaluation are decentralized</td>
<td>3. Encourages collegiality</td>
<td>3. Encourages and evaluates formal process only after exhausting informal process</td>
<td>3. Participates in discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Encourages teachers to share knowledge</td>
<td>7. Furthers ethic of professional trust</td>
<td>7. Encourages and evaluates formal process only after exhausting informal process</td>
<td>7. Supports supervision</td>
<td>7. Encourages the administration to understand curriculum implementation</td>
<td>7. Encourages the administration to understand curriculum implementation</td>
<td>7. Encourages the administration to understand curriculum implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Helps teachers recognize a problem and understand a solution</td>
<td>10. Provides a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>10. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>10. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>10. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>10. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>10. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Janet</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Vera</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Audrey</th>
<th>Richard</th>
<th>Steve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is politically difficult to talk with a teacher about a concern</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
<td>1. It is easier to avoid classrooms where there are teaching concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers think it is no longer the job of the principal to evaluate</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
<td>2. Principal must develop a structure for evaluation of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PGP should not be eliminated</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
<td>3. Evaluation is not based on the observed classroom behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
<td>4. Teachers need for affirmation are not fulfilled in change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He no longer goes into classrooms explicitly to observe teachers' practice</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
<td>5. Evaluation process is unclear about when to begin a formal supervisory process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The second group of issues, the concerns of the principal about the policy change in teacher evaluation, also produced a range of responses. One concern was that there was so much emphasis now put on supervision that evaluation was no longer a norm in the district. Both Gary and Peter expressed concern that under the present policy teachers do not understand that part of a principal's role is to evaluate teachers as well as supervise them.

A second concern identified by principals was that it was now easier to avoid classrooms with problems. Since principals no longer had to evaluate each teacher every three years, principals could find excuses for not going into classrooms where there might be poor teaching practices. Both Janet and Steve said that to avoid this problem they devised routines to make sure they got into all classrooms.

A third concern was expressed by Audrey who said that she was actively involved in classrooms and took supervision very seriously. However, when she saw little problems emerging, there was no formal mechanism for sharing those concerns with the teacher. Thus, the teacher did not always get feedback on all areas of teaching.

There was concern expressed about when to stop a supervisory process and begin a formal evaluation. That point became a judgment call by the principal and consequently was ambiguous. For example, Vera, who preferred to work in a supervisory rather than an evaluative role, said she wondered if she would be apt to supervise longer than she perhaps should before she moved into a formal evaluation process. Her concern was for which process, supervision or evaluation, would be of more benefit to the students and teacher.

In sum, all principals expressed a preference for the role of supervisor over that of evaluator. They said that usually they could have greater positive influence over a teacher's practice when they were engaged in supervision rather than evaluation. During the course of the study only one principal was involved in a formal evaluation process. Most principals said that if necessary they would engage a teacher in the formal evaluation
process, but only after they had exhausted all other avenues of helping the teacher. A number of principals said that they were uncomfortable with taking a teacher through the formal evaluation process. This discomfort originated from two sources. The first was a distrust of the evaluation process. Two principals said that in the past when they had given a teacher a negative evaluation, it was not supported by district level administration. Thus, the teacher remained in the district only to be transferred to another school. The second source of discomfort was a lack of clarity as to when to admit that they had exhausted all supervisory possibilities and should begin a formal evaluation process.

Perceived Effects of the Policy Change on the Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers

This section discusses what the principals saw happening in the schools as a result of the policy change as well as what the principals anticipated would be the long term effects of the policy change. The analysis showed that the principals' discussions on this topic grouped into two sets of issues: the positive effects of the change and the concerns the principals had that they thought needed to be addressed for the policy change to be most effective. Table 4, entitled Perceived Effects of the Policy Change on the Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers, depicts this information.

The policy change was long in coming in this district, and principals and teachers were well prepared for it. District documents show that the district began its long, slow, and well-grounded move in this direction in 1975 when the first Supervisory Skills workshop was conducted. This was a week-long workshop done in cooperation with another school district and was open only to principals. Later workshops were open to vice principals, supervisors and teachers. The workshop addressed issues of interpersonal relations skills, and observation and analysis of instruction. Supervisory Skills workshops continued to develop and evolve as more people in the district became trained in the clinical supervision techniques that were being taught. These workshops also led to many workshops on a variety of topics held in this district and open to administrators and teachers. Since 1975, principals have been involved in workshops, retreats and an
Table 4

Perceived Effects of Policy Change on the Supervision and Evaluation of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits of Policy Change</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Janet</th>
<th>Gary</th>
<th>Vera</th>
<th>Carol</th>
<th>Audrey</th>
<th>Richard</th>
<th>Steve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gives principal insight into staff needs</td>
<td>1. Gives responsibility to teachers to act as professionals</td>
<td>1. Helps to develop collaborative relationships between teacher and principal</td>
<td>1. Must keep her practice current</td>
<td>1. Promotes a culture that values teachers' professional growth</td>
<td>1. Allows him to demonstrate that he values teachers' professional judgment</td>
<td>1. Allows him to empower staff and treat teachers as professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Helps some teachers to make significant change in practice</td>
<td>2. Encourages teachers to share their practice</td>
<td>2. Tone of the school became more positive, more collaborative</td>
<td>2. Must read educational research</td>
<td>2. Teachers feel comfortable with principal in classroom</td>
<td>2.Give the teacher the opportunity to demonstrate professional competence and professional growth</td>
<td>2. Many teachers focus on improving an aspect of their teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Concerns | 1. Teachers and principals do not have a shared understanding of the policy | 1. No formal process to regulate implementation of supervision and evaluation policy | 1. Principals should supervise PGPs | 1. Teachers receive little formal feedback on their teaching | 1. Not enough time to monitor PGPs | 1. Not certain of what his role should be in the development and enactment of PGPs | 1. Teachers Association is almost invisible in supporting the policy change |
|          | 2. Elimination of cyclical evaluation of teachers is one less tool the principal can use to help teachers | 2. Supervision policy is nebulous and without structure | 2. Credibility of PGPs is not yet established | 2. There should be a combination report done on teachers that is 80% professional growth and 20% teaching | 2. No direct control over how much a teacher benefits from PGPs | 2. Teachers Association is almost invisible in supporting the policy change |
|          | 3. Potential to shift principal's role to only a manager | 3. Potential to shift principal's role to only a manager | 3. After credibility is established, principals will be invited to play a larger role in PGPs | 3. Beginning teachers need regular feedback on their teaching | 3. Needs built in accountability for teachers | 3. Unsure about how much of PG gets put into practice |
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administrative caucus that addressed issues such as a vision of education, developing school culture with implications for leadership, alternative approaches to helping teachers improve instruction, and values and expectations with implications for leadership. Once the policy change was agreed to, a group of fourteen principals met to discuss issues around implementing the policy. For example, at one meeting their agenda was to determine how to decentralize the Professional Growth program by building an "authentic teaching/learning community" in which everyone feels they "own" the program, as well as to establish positive and proactive networks that support individual and collective efforts on staff.

Principals worked on implementation of the policy change at their regular bi-monthly district-wide meetings, at special workshops and on retreats. All principals in the study went though the same district-wide principal orientation to the policy change. Thus, all principals heard similar ideas expressed as to the possible benefits of the policy change. Although implementation for both the supervision and evaluation parts of the policy was discussed at these orientations, a cookbook approach was not dictated. Thus, principals enacted the policy change in different ways, ways that were consistent with their professional beliefs; however, they had in mind similar long and short term effects that could be achieved through the shift in policy away from evaluation and toward supervision.

The first group of issues concerned the positive effects of the policy change. All principals said that Professional Growth Plans helped to build a culture that incorporated collaboration between and among teachers or teachers and administrators. One principal, Gary, added that the tone of the school became more positive.

---

6See sections entitled "Principals' Professional Beliefs" and "Implementation of Professional Growth Plans"
Several principals saw direct benefit for teachers from the Professional Growth Plan part of the policy change. Four principals, Peter, Carol, Audrey and Steve, said that the policy change promoted teachers' reflection on practice and, consequently, helped them to make beneficial changes to their teaching. Janet, Carol and Audrey said that the policy change created opportunities for leadership through teachers modeling what they learned for other teachers. Audrey said that the policy change encouraged teachers to set high expectations for themselves and thus build self-esteem. Janet and Richard said it allowed teachers to take responsibility to act as professionals.

Principals also saw the policy benefiting themselves. Three principals, Janet, Vera and Carol, spoke about the need for principals to keep their practice current by continuing to read and learn about curriculum and pedagogy. Janet said that it took away the principal's hierarchical power, something that became important in a collaborative culture. Carol and Peter stated that it had given them a better understanding of individual teacher's interests and needs. Richard said that he used the policy change as a mechanism for demonstrating to teachers that he valued their judgment, while Steve used it to empower teachers and treat them as professionals. Finally, Peter said it had the potential to address professional competence.

The benefits to staff, themselves and the school that principals saw coming from the policy change were quite similar. Since all principals had been through the same orientation process preparing them for the policy change, they all heard about and discussed similar possible effects stemming from the policy. Even though the principals enacted the policy change in different ways, they all worked towards similar end results. Thus, the principals approached policy implementation in a variety of ways, but saw similar effects, or the potential for similar effects, coming from the policy change.

The second group of issues examined the concerns principals had about the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Not all principals expressed concerns.
One concern, expressed by Peter, was about the degree of common understanding and support for the policy change among teachers and administrators. Steve concurred, stating that the Teachers' Association needed to be more vocal in their support for the policy.

Another concern was about the lack of structure in the supervision part of the policy change. Janet said there needed to be a more formal procedure developed for its implementation and Gary and Steve thought the principal's role should be better defined. Gary went on to say that he thought principals should be given the role of monitor and teachers should be held more accountable. However, Richard, who said it was his job to monitor Professional Growth Plans, said he did not have the time to monitor them.

Gary was concerned about the transition from planning to classroom practice. He did not think some teachers were capable of transferring what they were learning into what they did in the classroom. Richard expressed concern that it was solely up to the teacher, with little influence from him, to determine how they did or did not benefit from their growth plan.

A fourth concern was about the elimination of the three-year cyclical evaluation of teachers. Both Peter and Audrey said that this was one less tool that they had to work with. Audrey suggested that a regular schedule of evaluation was particularly helpful for new teachers who needed more feedback on their work.

With the exception of the last concern discussed, the concerns were about implementation of the policy. The principals who expressed these concerns, Peter, Janet, Gary, Richard and Steve, were the principals who, when they discussed their implementation of the policy change, did not talk about negotiating with teachers the way the policy would be implemented. Thus, the ambiguity appeared to originate from their not developing a shared understanding with their staff of the implementation process within the school.
Principals' Professional Beliefs and District Policy Mediate Principals' Practice

This chapter has presented an examination of four facets of the principals' enactment of the district policy change in teacher supervision and evaluation: (1) principals' professional beliefs, (2) supervision of teachers through the implementation of Professional Growth Plans, (3) implementation of the evaluation policy, and (4) principals' perceived effects of the policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. District policy, one more important factor that was alluded to in this chapter, had an effect upon the principals' enactment of the policy change. This part of the chapter will examine the influence of these factors on each other as principals carried out the enactment of the policy change.

The district shift in direction that led to the district policy change on teacher supervision and evaluation of teachers began in 1975. Through the many workshops, retreats, committee meetings and the administrative caucus organized by district administration, a new language and a different kind of practice in terms of supervision and evaluation of teachers was being introduced to administrators and teachers. The overall goal of these changes was to improve student learning. The new goal of supervision and evaluation of teachers was toward improvement of instruction, rather than merely rating the teacher as "satisfactory" or "less than satisfactory." Clinical supervision techniques were introduced to administrators and teachers. Through example, that is through the district's sponsoring and providing these kinds of workshops, it sent the message to district staff that professional growth was important and that the district valued teachers and administrators who chose to continue to learn about their profession. Through the professional development sponsored by the district, a new language was introduced to teachers and administrators. There was discussion about the importance of school climate and culture, shared values, collaboration, collegiality, valuing teachers' knowledge, professional development, a practice based upon research, administrators' supporting teachers' work, modeling, and peer supervision, among other terms. This gradual shift in
emphasis concerning the supervision and evaluation of teachers, and the principal's role in
that supervision and evaluation was greatly influenced by district workshops and research
reports that were sent to school-based administrators.

Principals come to their positions with their own beliefs about their role, about
their practice, about school, education, teachers, students, community, and professional
growth. These and the other factors that influence how principals think about their job are
what I have referred to as "principals' professional beliefs." One of the influences on
principals' professional beliefs was the direction of district policy. All principals in this
study had been employed by the district, either as teacher or administrator, in 1975 when
this shift in district emphasis began. All were actively involved in workshops, retreats, and
district-based committees that were introducing the new language and helping staff to
understand what it meant. Each of the eight principals used the language that the district
introduced. They all talked about school climate, values, collaboration, the importance of
teacher knowledge, and the importance of teachers working together to make decisions.
However, when principals enacted the contractual change in teacher supervision and
evaluation, they filtered district policy through their own professional belief system; thus,
different principals enacted the policy change in different ways. The next two sections will
explore how district policy was mediated by principals' professional beliefs when principals
enacted the policy change.

**Teacher Supervision Through Professional Growth Plans**

As described earlier in this chapter\(^7\), principals' professional beliefs and their
supervision of teachers through use of Professional Growth Plans clustered the principals
into three groups: *supporters of teacher decision making, facilitators of shared values,*
and *promoters of mutual respect.* In all three groups a common vocabulary was used, but

\(^7\)See sections entitled "Principals' Professional Beliefs" and "Implementation of Professional Growth Plans"
the meaning ascribed to that vocabulary differed among the groups. For example, all three groups said they "valued teachers' knowledge." The way this was interpreted in practice in relation to enactment of the Professional Growth Plans was different in each of the three groups. The supporters of teacher decision making interpreted it to mean that teachers should have sole responsibility for deciding on what their Professional Growth Plan should be in order for that plan to fall within contractual guidelines and to have an impact on teachers' practice. These principals would not critique the plans or encourage the teacher to analyze the plan critically, rather the principal would accept and support the plan in terms of providing time, place, resources, and opportunity. They showed that they valued teachers' knowledge through their acceptance of the plan and their active support of the plan.

The facilitators of shared values also said they "valued teachers' knowledge," but their enactment in terms of the Professional Growth Plan was different from that of the supporters of teacher decision making. The facilitators of shared values felt it was their responsibility to engage in discussion with teachers in order to explore together ideas about professional growth and to critique the teacher's plan. Thus, they did such things as engage in conversation with teachers about their plans prior to the plan being put in writing. Then, throughout the year they raised the issue of teachers' Professional Growth Plans both with individual teachers and through such mechanisms as staff meetings and committee meetings. In this way Professional Growth Plans were continuously being discussed, negotiated and critiqued by teachers and principal. Thus, a principal "valued teachers' knowledge" by engaging that teacher in professional dialogue and critique of school practice and policy.

The promoters of mutual respect "valued teachers' knowledge" as well. In their enactment of the Professional Growth Plan, they demonstrated it through leaving their level of involvement in a teacher's plan completely up to the teacher. They said that if they took an active role in critiquing or monitoring the teachers' Professional Growth Plan, the
plan was no longer the teacher's, but now their own. Thus, they set up a system for collecting and filing the plan. They were available for the teacher to explain the plan to them, they would provide support if that support were requested by the teacher, but because they "valued teachers' knowledge," they would not try to influence the plan or the teacher's implementation of the plan.

The first part of this chapter presents a number of other examples of how each cluster of principals filtered the vocabulary that the district had introduced to them through their professional beliefs and developed definitions that influenced the enactment of the Professional Growth Plan part of the policy change. For example, each cluster had different definitions and therefore different ways of bringing about a positive climate, collaboration, and collegiality. Principals' professional beliefs were mediated by district policy, but not transformed into a uniform set of beliefs shared by all principals across the district. It was these mediated professional beliefs that guided principals' enactment of the policy change in teacher supervision.

**Teacher Evaluation**

All eight principals expressed some common understanding of the policy change on teacher evaluation. For example, all said that they no longer spent a significant portion of their time in the role of evaluator; most of that time was taken over by supervision, a role that they said they felt more comfortable with. Most said that they usually could positively influence a teacher's practice through supervision, but were not sure they could as often achieve that positive influence through a formal evaluation process. District policy documents show that principals attended workshops on supervision for improved instruction, alternate forms for helping teachers improve instruction, collaboration, peer supervision, and other methods of helping teachers improve their practice. Through examination of these documents, it seems that district

---

8For a description of this policy see section entitled "Implementation of Evaluation Policy."
policy was that the purpose of principal supervision should be to help the teacher grow in his or her practice. The evaluation component was in existence only if all else failed. The professional beliefs of principals in this cluster coincided with district beliefs. The principals viewed themselves primarily as supervisors whose job it was to help teachers improve instruction. Evaluation was an important part of their job, but these principals said that they would only enter into formal evaluation procedures if they had exhausted all other possibilities of working with the teacher.

**Principals' Enactment of the Supervision and Evaluation Policy**

District policy concerning the intended outcomes of the Policy change are laid out in a booklet entitled "Professional Growth Program," published by the school district. It states that the district will distribute literature to help teachers learn about effective teaching and collaboration approaches. It states that Professional Growth Plans will promote reflection and discussion about the professional literature. The plans that teachers develop will keep their practice current and help them to appreciate the value of being a life long learner. Professional Growth Plans will add to the building of a supportive culture that encourages openness and collaboration. Through reflection and dialogue, teachers will assume professional responsibility by learning and teaching others what they have learned.

The three clusters of principals, *supporters of teacher decision making, facilitators of shared values, and promoters of mutual respect*, enacted the Professional Growth Plan part of the policy change in different ways, but with similar goals in mind. These goals incorporated the vocabulary that the district sponsored workshops had presented and that appeared in district publications. For example, all principals said that the Professional Growth Plans helped to develop collaborative relationships in the school. Several principals said that they helped teachers to focus on and to value professional growth. Several principals talked about Profession Growth Plans promoting professional dialogue and the development of practice based upon research. Although this vocabulary was used
by several principals, it can be understood only as it is filtered through the professional beliefs of the principals. For example, when *supporters of teacher decision making* talk about collaboration they refer to the development of collaborative relationships whereby principals support teachers' talking together, planning together and problem solving together. When *facilitators of shared values* talk about collaboration, they talk about it in terms of developing a collegial culture where collaborative relationships become part of the norms, beliefs and values that guide what occurs in the school. In a collegial culture, there is joint problem solving and sharing of practice between and among teachers and administrators. When *promoters of mutual respect* talk about collaboration, they talk about relationships between teachers that are initiated and nurtured by teachers. These collaborative relationships exist so that teachers can help each other in their practice. The relationships are not influenced or supported by the principal, but are the sole responsibility of the teachers.

Because principals interpreted district goals for the policy change in the supervision and evaluation of teachers, district goals were mediated by principals' professional beliefs when principals enacted the policy change in their schools. Thus, the enactment of the policy change and the interpretation of the policy change was different in schools, depending upon the professional beliefs of the principal.

**Summary of Cross-Case Analysis**

In the first part of this chapter, I examined four facets of the principals' enactment of the district policy change: principals' professional beliefs, their perceived enactment of the policy change in terms of both Professional Growth Plans and evaluation of teachers, and their perceived long and short term effects of the policy change on supervision and evaluation of teachers. I clustered principal by their professional beliefs: *supporters of teacher decision making*, *facilitators of shared values* and *promoters of mutual respect*. The *supporters of teacher decision making* were categorized as those principals who worked to create a culture that supports teachers in finding and speaking their own voice.
They supported the work of teachers in the form of time, place and opportunity. They valued the work of teachers and respected their knowledge. The *facilitators of shared values* were conceptualized as those principals who facilitated the work of the school through acting in ways that caused teachers to critique current practice and policy. These principals worked with teachers to negotiate values and beliefs upon which the culture of the school could then be built. They worked continuously to help build collaborative relationships within a culture of collegiality. They valued the development of a school culture that involved everyone, including themselves, in critique, discussion and decision making. The third group, the *promoters of mutual respect*, were conceptualized as those principals who believed, above all, that the individual in the school is important and should be respected and treated well. These principals carefully nurtured the development of relationships between themselves and individual teachers. They believed in individual teacher autonomy, and the authority of the teacher. They worked to create a culture that valued mutual respect and trust between staff members.

The principals' perceived implementation of Professional Growth Plans flowed from their professional beliefs. That is *supporters of teacher decision making* tended to accept teachers' Professional Growth Plans with little or no negotiation. They then worked throughout the year to support teachers' completion of plans. They provided resources, time, and opportunity for teachers to work together on plan implementation. The *facilitators of shared values* were often more involved in the negotiation of the plan. They wanted to discuss the plan with the teacher prior to the plan being put into writing. They provided opportunity for teachers to critique their plans, and consequently their practice, in a supportive environment. The *promoters of mutual respect* gave authority and autonomy for Professional Growth Plans to the teachers. They collected plans, were available to talk with teachers about the plans, supported the plans if support were requested, but they believed that for the plans to be effective it had to be the sole responsibility of the teacher.
The principals' implementation of the evaluation policy did not cluster the principals. Most principals said that there was a point at which they would enact the policy and take a teacher through the formal evaluation process, if that were necessary. However, there was wide variation on where that point was. Only one principal had a teacher going through the formal evaluation process. Other principals expressed confusion about where to end the process of supervision and where to begin the process of evaluation. Two principals expressed deep concern about bringing any teacher into the formal evaluation process.

My analysis of the principals' perceptions of the long and short term effects of the policy change did not cluster the principals' responses. All principals said that the policy change had the potential to help teachers improve their practice and to promote collaboration among teachers. Some principals expressed the belief that the policy could allow them to be a colleague with teachers. As well, some principals said that the policy change demanded that they keep up with current research and create opportunities for discussion about practice in relation to research. Some principals said the policy change had the potential to create teacher leaders.

In the second part of this chapter, I examined how the principals mediated the changes in district policy with their own professional beliefs. These beliefs determined, to a large extent, their enactment of the policy change. I found that when principals are not mandated to follow a set routine, but when they have leverage in determining how the policy will be implemented, their implementation is influenced by both their own professional beliefs and the district policy. That is, principals interpret and enact policy change in different ways, depending upon their professional beliefs.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This chapter presents findings, conclusions, discussion, implications for theory and practice, and directions for further research, as the result of analyzing the data I collected on the discussions with and reflections of eight principals who were in the process of implementing a district policy change. The chapter is divided into two sections: findings and conclusions that emerge from the research questions; and discussion, implications and directions for further research. For ease of reading, all conclusions and implications appear in italics in this chapter.

Major Findings and Conclusions Emerging from the Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to develop an understanding of how principals determine how they will go about the process of implementing school district policy changes. I studied the ways that a group of eight principals, in the same school district, interpreted and enacted a district-wide policy change. There were three questions that guided the research. The following answers to the research questions provide a summary of the findings and conclusions in response to those questions. The conclusions should be viewed in the context of the limitations of this study. That is, principals were, for the most part, self selected and the number of principals in the study was limited to eight.

The school district prepared principals and teachers for the policy change over a fifteen year period. Although the school district did not know that the result of their efforts would be this particular policy change, they provided administrators and teachers with professional development activities and research literature intended to shift their thinking in the direction of the resulting policy. The policy change was a logical development of the school district's efforts. During the lead-up to the policy change, all principals participated in the same professional development activities concerning the change. These activities included workshops, retreats, receiving research literature,
discussions among administrators and teachers, and planning sessions. The resulting policy change was negotiated by a group of teachers and administrators and written into contract. The contract specified both the nature of the policy and guidelines for what the policy would look like in practice. Despite both a policy that was written into the Teachers' Collective Agreement and carefully orchestrated professional development activities intended both to enculturate and train administrators about the school-district policy, principals enacted the policy change in different ways.

**Question One**

What factors influence principals' responses to a change in school district policy? More specifically, what are the professional and context-specific issues the principals consider as they interpret a school district policy change and plan for their own action in carrying out that change process?

Principals interpret policy change initiatives based upon the professional belief system that they bring to the change and through which they mediate the change. I identified three groups of principals, each of whom approached policy change differently. These three groups differed, in part, in terms of their professional belief systems. Principals came to their current positions with beliefs about their role, about their practice, and about other educational issues related to the nature of education: schools, teachers, students, community, and professional growth. These and all other factors that influence how principals think about their job are what I have referred to as "principals' professional beliefs." These differences in professional beliefs account for principals' differing interpretations of policy change initiatives.¹

One group of principals, the SUPPORTERS OF TEACHER DECISION MAKING, believe that they must assist teachers in their work, but not direct what teachers actually do. These principals support teachers with resources, time, encouragement, and opportunity.

¹See Chapter 5, section entitled Principals' Professional Beliefs, for analysis leading to this finding.
They work to create a culture that supports teachers in finding and speaking their own voices. They support teacher decision making in four ways: they work to build a positive school climate; they assist teachers' in their work; they respect teachers' knowledge; and they initiate ideas about practice and school for teachers to consider.

A second group of principals, the FACILITATORS OF SHARED VALUES, believe that they should stimulate the negotiation and actualization of values upon which the culture of the school is built. They do this in two ways: they work to build a positive school climate and culture, and they model behavior that exemplifies the negotiated shared values. Specifically, they believe their role in facilitation is to stimulate critique of beliefs and values; that is, to engage teachers in discussion that cause them to critique current practice and policy. These principals value a school culture that involves everyone, including themselves, as active participants in critique, discussion and decision making. They stimulate discussion and critique of the change being implemented and its relationship to negotiated school values, teachers' practice, and school policy.

A third group of principals, the PROMOTERS OF MUTUAL RESPECT, are concerned about the relationships that develop among administrators and teachers. They believe that these relationships are a fundamental mechanism by which they can manage the operations of the school. They promote mutual respect by building a positive school climate and initiating ideas about changes in teachers' practice. They build trust and relationships by giving teachers authority in decision making. For these principals, teacher autonomy in decision making about change is of prime importance. They express the belief that if teachers do not independently incorporate change into their practice, the change will not become a part of their practice; that is, the change will not last. These principals are willing to provide support, but only if it is requested by the teacher.
Question Two

How do principals enact the policy changes in their own schools?

Principals' Roles in Policy Change

Principals enact policy change in different ways because their roles in policy change are strongly influenced by their professional beliefs and their understanding of their role as principal. The principals grouped in their enactment of the policy change according to their grouping by their professional belief system.

Supporters of shared decision making assist teachers in their attempts to make important decisions about the school, or about the change process that is being implemented, but these principals fall short of sharing with teachers the process of proactively critiquing school policy and change issues. These principals actively support teachers' decisions in the form of time, resources, encouragement and opportunity. They develop organizational structures within the school that bring teachers together for the purpose of discussion. Prawat (1991) conceptualized support as the creation of a "supportive environment in which one can find and speak his or her own voice" (p. 744). These principals work to create a culture that supports teachers in finding and speaking their own voice. However, these principals do not engage with teachers in critique of school issues. They do not participate in the negotiation of shared values; rather they provide only the opportunity for teachers to discuss their values and develop school values. Reitzug (1994) notes that the concept of support is "passive in that it provides a conducive context for critique," but, as in the case of this cluster of principals, the principal does not stimulate discussion about teachers' practice, school policy or the change process.

Since the principal is not actively involved in the critique and negotiation of policy change, the principal's role in the change process is unclear. These principals rely on teachers' negotiated understanding of the policy change in order to define their own roles.
Since they develop their roles in reaction to teachers' negotiation of the change process, their role is somewhat ambiguous and uncomfortable for the principals.

**Facilitators of Shared Values** stimulate discussion and critique of the change being implemented and its relationship to negotiated school values, teachers' practice and school policy. They, along with teachers, negotiate what the change process will look like in the school. The negotiation of the change process is with respect to already negotiated school values. This negotiation assures that both teachers and administrators are clear about their own and each other's roles in the change process. The role in change of facilitator is not a passive one. These principals not only provide a context that is conducive to critique, but they stimulate and participate in the resulting discussion. Thus, these principals are active participants, though not dominant figures, in the negotiation of the change process and of its relationship to existing negotiated school values.

**Promoters of Mutual Respect** are not active participants in the change. They give responsibility for success or failure of the change to teachers because these principals believe that the only way teachers will incorporate change into their practice is if they are given autonomy and authority for the change. Principals in this group demonstrate their trust for teachers by allowing teachers the authority to decide whether they will incorporate the idea into practice, and if so, how it will be incorporated. These principals do clerical and organizational management of the change, but do little to stimulate discussion, critique, or action in the change process. Because these principals believe in teacher autonomy they are willing to provide support, but only if it is requested by the teacher. Principals in this cluster put their energies into developing relationships that will contribute to the acceptance of ideas rather than the development of the ideas themselves.

**Policy Language**

* Principals understand school district policy through their personal understanding and interpretation of the language of the policy. The education community has developed a language that is often technical and different from common language used in
conversation. The findings of this study show that principals do not necessarily have a common understanding of that language. Without a common understanding of language, policy is open to individual interpretation. Principals in this study had different working definitions for collaboration, collegiality, supervision, shared values, positive climate, and valuing teachers' knowledge. These terms were used in the Collective Agreement and/or district documents that explained the policy change. Principals interpret district documents in light of their own definitions of the language in these documents. In a like manner, when school districts conduct professional development sessions on these issues, principals mediate the concepts and ideas presented through their professional belief system to interpret or develop a working definition of the concepts being introduced.

**Question Three**

*What impact did the principals perceive that the policy change had on their enactment of their role?*

**Collegial and Collaborative Relationships**

*Principals actions can encourage and support collegial and collaborative relationships.* The terms collegial and collaborative are often confused in the literature and were often used interchangeably by the participants in this study. Little (1981) conceptualized collegiality as teachers and administrators talking about their practice; observing each other engaged in their practice; planning, designing, researching and evaluating curriculum together; and teaching each other what they know about learning, leading and teaching. Collaborative relationships are formed by groups of people who work together on particular long- and short-term projects. Collegiality refers to the culture of the school that, as Leithwood (1992b) describes, includes the underlying assumptions, the norms, beliefs and the values that guide behavior in the school. The norms and practices in the school act in such a way as to generate an environment

---

10See Chapter 5 for analysis leading to this finding.
conducive to collaborative relationships. Collaborative relationships refer to specific practices within the collegial culture. The following explains how each of the three groups of principals encourage or support collegial and collaborative relationships.

**Supporters of Shared Decision Making** promote the development of collaborative relationships within the school. They provide the opportunity for teachers to work together and they support teachers' efforts. However, because they do not engage in the negotiation of shared values and beliefs, they do not promote a collegial culture in which everyone, including administrators, participates in the elements of Little's (1981) definition.

**Facilitators of Shared Values** promote the development of a collegial culture by working with teachers to develop a shared set of beliefs and values that guide what occurs in the school. They facilitate and become a part of the discussion about practice, they observe teachers and teachers observe them in their practice, they work together with teachers on issues of curriculum and change, and they engage in discussion with teachers about professional issues. They facilitate decision making by relating decisions back to negotiated beliefs and values.

**Promoters of Mutual Respect** develop relationships with individual teachers and groups of teachers, but give responsibility for teachers' developing collaborative relationships to the teachers, themselves, if they so choose. These principals do not promote a culture of collegiality because they believe in teacher autonomy, a concept that runs counter to the negotiation by everyone in the school of shared beliefs and values.

**Risk Taking**

*Principals actions can encourage and support risk taking by teachers.*

In schools where a collegial culture exists, principals and teachers are engaged in joint problem solving and in discussion about their practice. Because principals are engaged in these acts, they have the opportunity to model risk taking and to encourage teachers to take risks. This encouragement can be followed by principals' support in the
form of time, resources, encouragement or opportunity. Because of the level of involvement of the principal in discussion with teachers, the principal is knowledgeable about what kinds of support the teacher may need. Principals in schools where collaborative relationships occur, but a collegial culture does not exist, may not be able to encourage risk taking because they often do not participate in the discussion and decision making with teachers. However, once teachers decide to take risks in their practice, these principals have the opportunity to support the teacher in the risk taking. Principals who are supporters of teacher decision making do not initially encourage risk taking, but once some initiative is in place they support it with time, encouragement, resources, and opportunity. Principals who encourage teacher autonomy and provide support for teachers only when requested by the teacher, have little opportunity to support risk taking and no mechanism by which to encourage it.

Discussion, Implications and Directions for Further Research

This section is divided into four parts: principals' role in change, policy language, collaborative relationships among principals and district standardization of policy change. In each section, I discuss implications for theory and practice, the relationship of this study to existing research, and directions for further research.

Principals' Roles in Change

There are multiple interpretations of principals' roles in directing policy change in their schools. Principals' role in policy change is shaped by their professional beliefs, their understanding and interpretation of the language of the policy, and their interpretation of their role as principal. This view of the principal's role in change is somewhat different from Fullan's (1991) position. He argues that the principal is a strong influence when the change process is successful, but the principal does not usually play an instructional or change leadership role. He adds that the major role the principal plays is as a supporter of ideas and materials. In contrast, this study suggests that principals' professional beliefs, their understanding and interpretation of the language of the policy,
and their interpretation of their role as principal, shape their role in policy change. Further, only principals who are willing to be a part of the process of negotiating with teachers the school values that will drive decision making, and only principals who facilitate joint problem solving and decision making about change, can be principals who understand how change will be carried out in the school, and, therefore, can play a leadership role in change. It is the principals who are willing to be part of the negotiation process who can be a strong influence in a successful change process.

This argument implies that principals are not completely controlled by their beliefs, but have the opportunity to rethink and re-evaluate their beliefs and, consequently, their role. This opportunity for principals to choose their role was confirmed by Leithwood and Steinbach (1993) who state that principals need to engage in expert thinking about their school context and about the consequences of the practice they choose. Principals do have choice of the role they will assume in the change process and they exercise that choice consistently using their professional beliefs to guide their practice.

Bamburg and Andrews (1989) argue that principals do not necessarily understand how to initiate, implement, and institutionalize change in schools. In contrast, this study suggests that it is not a question of principals' understanding how to initiate, implement, and institutionalize change, rather it is a question of the role that the principal chooses to play at the school level in the negotiation and implementation of the change. The role of FACILITATOR OF SHARED VALUES will yield a more thorough understanding of the change process than will the role of SUPPORTER OF SHARED DECISION MAKING or PROMOTER OF MUTUAL RESPECT. Those principals who are willing to be facilitators and, thus, participate with teachers in the negotiation of the change process, develop an understanding of initiation, implementation and institutionalization of change at the school level. Those principals who choose to play different roles in the change process, for example, SUPPORTER OF SHARED DECISION MAKING, or PROMOTER OF MUTUAL RESPECT, are not part of the decision making that determines what the change process will look like, and,
consequently, may, as Bamburg and Andrews suggest, not develop a thorough understanding of the change process.

Louis (1990) states that the negotiation of instructional values is a complex task that few principals are willing to take on. Principals who fall into the FACILITATORS OF SHARED VALUES group, assume the role of facilitator which, as defined by Reitzug (1994), is a proactive role that stimulates discussion and critique of practice, school policy and issues of change. Leithwood (1992a) states that principals must use their facilitative power in order to make second-order changes in schools. Although the principals in this cluster are committed to developing a collegial culture based upon the negotiation of values, they are not without strong values of their own. Reitzug (1994) notes that it is acceptable and appropriate for principals, as well as teachers, to bring their own values to impact upon school culture. Change becomes a negotiated process among teachers and administrators, each of whom brings an individual perspective to the table.

This understanding of the multiple interpretations of principals' roles differs from the understanding in existing literature, of the role that the principal plays in change, and therefore can contribute to the ongoing development of an understanding of the principalship, particularly in the way that the principal approaches change initiatives. This study indicates that principals make conscious decisions as to what role they will play in the change process. It is this decision that leads to their understanding of the change process.

The findings of this study recognized three roles that principals may play in change. These roles result from the professional beliefs and understandings of the principal. Further development, in at least two ways, of the role of the principal in change is, however, necessary. First, there is a need to understand better the professional frames from which principals work in order to understand how change may be incorporated into a principal's practice. Second, there is a need to understand the change process on a micro
level, particularly in the way principals understand their own beliefs and the way they see change interfacing with their beliefs and school goals.

There is a need to understand change on a humanistic level as well as on a micro level. McLaughlin (1987) argued that change was a problem of the smallest unit and to understand change it was necessary to understand the "incentives, beliefs and capacities of individuals" (p. 174). However, she did not continue the study of change from that perspective, a perspective that is necessary to explore if change in schools is to be understood. This study begins to understand change at the micro and humanistic level. It begins to fill a void in the literature by examining carefully principals' beliefs and their relationship to the role of the principal in change. However, the number of participants was small and there may be other approaches to professional beliefs that influence how principals determine their role as principal and their role in change. Further research is necessary to understand if there are principals with substantially different sets of professional beliefs and, if so, how those beliefs impact upon the change process. To gain a better understanding of the role that principals' professional beliefs play in how change is enacted, it is necessary to investigate the change beyond the principalship. For example, how do principals' professional beliefs influence the way teachers interpret and enact change? This would necessitate furthering our understanding of how principals' professional beliefs affect the change process, to examine what the implications for change are within the school. There are two areas of research that should be conducted into these issues. The first would examine the impact that principals with different professional beliefs might have on teachers who may have yet a different set of professional beliefs. The second would extend to student learning, and how student learning is affected when a policy change in the area of curriculum or instruction is filtered through the beliefs of principals, then through the beliefs of teachers.

Investigation of policy change might also examine how school-district administration takes into account the influence of principals' professional beliefs on the
implementation of that policy change across district schools. That is, in instances in which change is initiated on the district level, how is that change introduced and nurtured in ways that recognize and build upon the professional beliefs of school-based administrators. An understanding by district policy makers of ways to introduce change concepts to people with different professional beliefs, has the potential to influence how change is enacted in schools and, therefore, could have implications for understanding and improving chances of initiating change that will last.

Another extension of this study would examine how moving principals from one school to another influences the change process in the schools, particularly when a principal with one set of professional beliefs replaces a principal with a different set of professional beliefs. Many school districts have as written or unwritten policy that principals are to be moved from school to school, typically every five to seven years. Research should examine how change is interpreted and enacted when a new principal comes to a school. There is presently little research on whether principals should be rotated from school to school on a regular basis, or whether they should be assigned to one school until they, or the school community, request a change. Undertaking such a study may help us understand some of the implications of principal transfer.

Finally, this study presents unresolved implications of the principal's role in lasting change. This study examined the role of the principal in change and presented research that described three different profiles of how principals perceived their role and the possible relationship of these different approaches to the issue of lasting change. This was purely speculative. There is a need to continue the research on the three identified clusters to substantiate or refute these speculations.

The results of the above research can be used by universities working with school districts to help principals understand what their professional beliefs are and what might be the possible implications of holding such beliefs. School districts can use such information to anticipate how principals' beliefs will influence how change is enacted in schools.
Principals need to understand how their professional beliefs influence the way they implement school policy. Educational administration programs must offer administrators and prospective administrators the opportunity to learn how to become reflective in order to understand better their own beliefs and style of leadership. This is one way to help administrators make informed decisions about how they will carry out change initiatives.

**Policy Language**

*School districts cannot make assumptions that all principals understand and interpret policy language in similar ways.* School district administrators must carefully try to define complex terms such as collaboration, collegiality, supervision, shared values, positive climate, and valuing teachers' knowledge, if they expect principals to have common understandings of their meanings. Principals need to be able to define and use these words in ways that are consistent with district-level meanings if there is any hope for some uniformity in the way change is carried out across district schools.

The study of education, not unlike the study of other disciplines, has created a language that is unique to itself. Words take on technical meanings that can be somewhat different from those meanings in common use. This becomes problematic when people confuse the meaning of the word in the particular context. We have a professional obligation to avoid the use of jargon, or to avoid assigning alternative meanings to words. If research is reported clearly and concisely, we not only inform ourselves, and clarify further research, but also we inform practitioners in a way that is direct, useful, and less confusing.

Principals in this study did not have a common understanding of professional language. There are at least two possible explanations. One explanation is that universities are not helping prospective administrators to understand the importance of continuing their education by reading broadly on educational issues. A second explanation is that principals may choose not to read current educational literature, but may rely upon only professional development activities that school districts offer. In either case, more
consideration needs to be given to methods of bridging the gap for administrators between theory and practice. I would suggest that closer working relationships between universities and school districts could begin to bring administrators a clearer understanding of educational language and of how theory relates to practice.

School districts, in their professional development sessions, have an obligation not only to define carefully the language of the policy, but also to help principals and teachers to understand the nature of the practice that might follow. This means that districts cannot expect administrators to understand new educational concepts when administrators are given an individual workshop with no follow-up. Administrators, like teachers, will better understand new concepts and put them into practice only when their learning is supported through a series of workshops, as well as through individual assistance in initiating and sustaining the concept in their own practice.

Districts have choices in whether they wish to try to control the understanding of the practice that follows from policy language, if they want principals to decide collaboratively the practice that should follow, or if they want principals, in negotiation with school staff, to establish the practice that follows from policy.

**Collaborative Relationships**

**Principals**

*Principals, by themselves, are seldom able to develop collaborative relationships with other principals.* Because the principalship is such a complex and demanding position, principals seldom have the time or opportunity to develop relationships with other principals through which they can discuss practice, plan, and solve problems together. There is seldom the opportunity or time for principals to observe each other in their practice and to give each other feedback. Because these collaborative relationships seldom exist, or, if they exist, are rarely sustained, principals have to rely upon other sources for ideas, feedback, and professional growth. This is particularly problematic in schools where there is only one administrator. These principals, if part of a collegial
school culture, can satisfy some, but not all, of their needs for ideas and input through relationships with teachers. However, formal mechanisms, such as principals and teachers belonging to separate unions or professional organizations, can interfere with those collaborative relationships.

There have been some attempts in the school district in which this research took place to develop collaborative relationships. Principals sit with other principals on district-wide committees. Principals and/or vice principals are brought together twice per month for administrative meetings, principals attend yearly retreats and participate together in professional development. The PALS program, which was not done in the district in the last two years, reportedly worked quite well for a few years. Pairs of principals would agree to shadow and provide feedback to each other several times during the year. Principals in this study spoke highly of this program and some of them said that they had retained contact on a social or professional level with the other principal. But no principal said that they had a truly collaborative relationship with another principal.

The benefits, if there are any, of principals developing collaborative relationships with other principals have not been explored in the literature. Certainly, if there are examples of districts that encourage collaborative relationships between administrators, those districts should be studied to inform research and practice about the structure of such programs, the benefits or disadvantages of having principals involved in collaborative relationships, and the sustainability of such a program. Such knowledge would have benefit to universities that work with school administrators as well as school districts that are attempting to develop an ethos that includes the development of collaborative relationships.

School districts should work to develop a culture of collegiality between district and school level administrators. Within such a culture, administrators should problem solve together, design together the mechanisms for change, evaluate the change process, and share their ideas, methods, successes and problems in the change process. This is not
an easy prospect for a school district. Principals are busy and often do not have the time or the energy to engage with other principals in these efforts. In addition, some school districts use mechanisms to differentiate the status or importance of principals. For example, principals of secondary schools are often paid more than principals of junior secondary or middle schools, who are paid more than principals of elementary schools. Principals are sometimes paid on the basis of the number of pupils in their schools, so there is competition among schools to attract students away from one school and into another. Some schools are awarded extra resources for reasons that are not always understood by other principals in the district. The list goes on, but the result is that unless principals are informed about and involved in collaborative-decision making within a collegial culture, the isolation of the position of principal will continue, denying the district of the ideas that can be generated when administrators discuss, plan and problem solve together.

**Principals and Teachers**

*Within a culture of collegiality principals have the opportunity to become a partner with teachers in discussion, analysis and decision making about school matters and about the change process.* When a school has developed a culture of collegiality in which teachers and administrators work closely together, problem solve together, and share decisions and problems about their practice, they share the valuing of a school culture that involves everyone as active participants in critique, discussion and decision making. Principals and teachers can become partners in many aspects of school problem solving, decision making, and change determination. Principals can stimulate discussion and critique of the change being implemented and its relationship to negotiated school values, teachers' and administrators' practice, and school policy.
District Approach to Policy Change

Principal's Roles

The ways that district policy change is implemented across district schools vary from school to school and are conditioned, in part, by the role the principal plays in negotiating a shared understanding of the policy implementation. Fullan (1991) argues that for change to be successful it needs to be driven by a shared vision that permeates the organization. All of the principals in this study expressed the opinion that their understanding of how the policy change was to be implemented was shared by the district, including the teachers. However, there appear to have been three kinds of shared understanding of the policy implementation. The SUPPORTERS OF TEACHER DECISION MAKING, because they provided opportunity for teachers to critique the policy change but did not share in the critique or negotiation of a vision of policy change implementation, acted on a vision that it was important that the policy change should be shared by teachers, but only supported by administrators. The FACILITATORS OF SHARED VALUES, because they insisted on taking part in the discussion, negotiation, and the critique of the policy change implementation, acted on a vision of policy implementation that was jointly negotiated by teachers and administrators. The PROMOTERS OF MUTUAL RESPECT, because they expressed the belief that the change would not be incorporated into teachers' practice unless it was the sole responsibility of teachers, left a vision of policy implementation entirely to teachers to construct and implement. The question of "whose vision is it" has implications for whether or not the change will last. Cuban (1992) argues that unless the change is continuously supported and facilitated by the organization, including the principal, it is difficult for individuals to sustain a change and they eventually dismiss it as just one more in a series of initiatives that have little long-term effect. Thus, it is important that the vision of the policy change process be negotiated and supported by teachers and administrators.
Standardization of Policy Change

Districts cannot standardize how policy change will be implemented at the school level. The implementation of policy change is affected by school culture and every school has its own micro-culture. This micro-culture is determined by a number of factors: the underlying assumptions of the norms, beliefs, and values that guide behavior of the teachers, administrators, and the community (Leithwood, 1992b); the transactional relationship between school and community, as well as what goes on in individual classrooms (Sarason, 1982); and everything that influences student learning (Goodlad, 1975). Unless strict guidelines for change are written, followed and carefully monitored, change cannot be standardized. However, that is not to say that school districts cannot decide if they would like to work toward homogeneity or heterogeneity in change across district schools.

There is some research to support a district working toward a homogeneous approach to change. It is easier for district administrators to support change when they have an understanding of what that change looks like in schools. Fullan (1991) found that although change efforts do not have to be initiated by district administration, when central office actively supports change, the change has a greater chance of implementation. Fullan (1992) later reported that change not only has a greater chance of implementation with district support, but also, district support is essential to sustain change.

There are some things that a school district can do to promote a homogeneous approach to change. District-level administrators can conduct interviews for new principals to the district to determine whether their professional beliefs are consistent with the change implementation goals of the district. Central office can carefully develop a plan for change, thoroughly train principals and teachers, and carefully monitor implementation of the change process. However, these approaches to change implementation run counter to some of the findings about lasting change.
Kanpol (1990) argues that unless there is cultural empowerment for both teachers and administrators, whereby they work together to discuss and critique school issues and develop a change plan for their school, change will not be sustained. Fullan (1990, 1992) argues that change needs to happen at the level of the school culture, a place where broad-based ownership of the change can occur and both behaviors and beliefs can change. Solutions to questions of change must grow out of the shared meaning that is negotiated at the school (Fullan, 1992). At the level of the school, the process of change can accommodate the multidimensional nature of change; that is, change in the conception of education and skill as well as the dynamic interrelationships of teachers, administrators, students and community (Fullan, 1991).

School districts can no longer pretend that because they would like change to occur in similar ways across district schools, it will. Instead, they can implement procedures to influence and to understand how principals will implement district policy change at the school level. First, district-level administrators can ask principals to write and periodically update statements of educational philosophy. They can then discuss with principals the implications of their professional beliefs and how those professional beliefs influence policy change implementation at the school level. Second, district-level administrators can help principals to develop collaborative relationships with other principals so these principals can begin to understand how policy implementation can differ from school to school. Third, district-level administrators can model change implementation procedures so principals can see and understand methods and views that are different from their own.

Many school districts have a policy of moving principals from one school to another after five to seven years. Although there may be logical reasons to do this, the practice has the potential to interfere with change implementation. When a new principal comes into a school, the teachers and principal must renegotiate a set of shared values and beliefs by which the school and the change initiative will function. This may cause
interruption to the change process, as well as the possibility of a rethinking and, consequently, a new course of action for the change. If the change is in an unstable state, it may not be able to be sustained with such pressures upon it.

District-level administrators should decide whether they want schools to be homogeneous or heterogeneous in their approach to district policy change and devise organizational structures to help them work toward their goal. District-level administrators should be aware that principals mediate policy change through their own professional belief system. If district-level administrators believe that change should be interpreted and implemented in ways that are peculiar to the unique characteristics of each school, they should work to encourage the individuality of principals, the development of school mission statements, involvement of community, and negotiation of shared values at the school level. However, if district-level administrators are working toward a level of uniformity across schools, they must train administrators and teachers in the specific steps to implement the proposed change; they must carefully monitor change efforts; and they must continue training teachers and administrators throughout what Fullan (1991) refers to as the four stages of change.

Regardless of whether a school district is interested in homogeneous change or heterogeneous change, the district must understand the professional beliefs of principals and develop ways of working with individual principals so that district goals may be accomplished in similar ways across district schools. Principals in this study who were determined to incorporate the policy change into the culture of the school said that they continuously had to keep the policy change in the forefront of what they did as principal. In the same manner, the district has to keep such policy changes in the forefront of what they do. They need continuously to offer support and time for professional dialogue for administrators. They need to examine the goals of policy change and incorporate those goals into the district culture. For example, just as those principals who valued those aspects of the policy that nurtured the growth of collaborative relationships among
themselves and teachers, the district needs to nurture collaborative relationships among administrators. Just as school-level administrators modeled the importance of Professional Growth Plans, district-level administrators must do the same. District-level administrators should consider becoming models for administrative behavior in the particular change enactment in similar ways as principals might work with teachers. District-level administrators have an obligation to nurture and support school based administrators in district-level policy changes.

Second-order Change

*By developing a culture that is accepting of first-order change, a school district can prepare teachers and administrators for the acceptance of the more substantial second-order change.* The district in this study prepared staff for second-order change through fifteen years of first-order change. That is, the district moved in the direction of second-order change by implementing a long and purposeful course of first-order change. First-order change is the progress that an organization makes in order to continue to run smoothly. Second-order change alters the beliefs and values of the organization. By introducing change gradually and purposefully, the district developed what Fullan (1990, 1992) described as a culture supportive of change and what Barth (1991) referred to as a culture of continuous change. Barth's argument that schools need to incorporate change into their definition of themselves, may be akin to Fullan's (1991) concept of progress or Cuban's (1992) concept of incremental reform. Fullan and Cuban warn that first-order change should not be confused with the more substantial second-order change. Second-order change does not only alter practice, but it also changes beliefs (Fullan); fundamental change transforms a school and permanently alters the institutional structure (Cuban). A policy change, such as the one studied, that changes the supervision and evaluation of teachers is a second-order change as it alters the priorities of the school district from an organization that values a bureaucratic system of accountability to one that values teachers' professional growth.
Teachers and administrators were prepared for the change as a result of the district's moving in that direction for a long time period. And although principals interpreted their role in change through their own professional frame, all principals thought the change to be a worthy pursuit.

**Concluding Thoughts**

Principals come to their current positions with their own beliefs about their role, about their practice, and about other educational issues related to the nature of education: schools, teachers, students, community, and professional growth. These and all other factors that influence how principals think about their job are what I refer to as "principals' professional beliefs." This study demonstrated that principals bring to change initiatives their professional beliefs and those beliefs influence how they interpret the language of the change initiative, how they conceptualize the change, and how they plan for enactment of the policy change. This study contributes to our understanding of change in schools by recognizing that principals play significant roles in change at the school level.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Appendix A

Interview Protocol

Formal Interview #1

Spring 1992

1. I would like to begin the interview by having you talk a bit about yourself. Can you tell me about your professional background? What degrees you hold, from where, when?
   How long were you a teacher? In what schools?
   When did you become a principal? In what schools? For How long?
   What degree did you hold when you became a principal?

2. Now tell me about this school.
   The number of students?
   The number of full time teaching positions?
   The number of full and part time teachers?
   Total professional staff?
   Total staff?
   Socio-economic character of the student body?
   What is special or interesting about this school?

3. Why did you become a principal?

4. Would you talk about how you would define the components of your role as principal?

5. Has your role changed since you first became a principal? If so, how?

6. Is your job as principal what you anticipated it would be prior to assuming the position? If not, how is it different?

7. If you were able to create the ideal school with ideal teachers, students, parents, central administration, building, supplies and equipment, how would you define your role as principal?
8. The supervision of teachers and their writing of Professional Growth Plans is mentioned in the teachers contract for the first time this year.

   How has that impacted what you, as principal, do in the school?
   How do you work with teachers in the PGP?
   How much time do you spend talking with teachers individually and in groups about professional issues?

Formal Interview #2

Fall 1992

1. I would like to begin by talking about the professional growth plans that you and your staff are doing. Tell me about the process that is occurring this year and how that differs or is the same as what occurred last year.

2. Thinking back over the first official year of the district policy change on the supervision and evaluation of teachers, what kinds of things that you do as a principal have changed? I am interested in both the things that relate directly to supervision and evaluation of teachers, and also other parts of your job that have changed or evolved.

3. What are the major issues or themes that you will devote time to this year? Or, what are your goals for this year?

4. What are the factors in your position which enhance or interfere with your accomplishing your goals?

5. There is a lot of talk these days about teacher empowerment. What does that mean to you as a principal? And does it interfere with or enhance your ability to do your job?

6. Would you list your major job responsibilities?

Formal Interview #3

Winter 1992

1. Begin by describing yourself. What kind of a principal are you?
2. Let's talk about what is happening in the school as you and your staff continue to work through the supervision and evaluation plan, specifically the writing and carrying out of Professional Growth Plans for teachers.
   a. Are teachers changing their practice as a result of their doing PGPs?
   b. How or why not?
   c. Is your practice changing?
   d. How or why not?

3. Tell me about the evaluation process. Since the contractual changes, have you worked with any teachers in the formal evaluation process?
   If no, why not?
   Have you considered using it and rejected the idea?
   If yes, what were the circumstances which prompted you or another administrator to begin the process? What were the results?
   Prior to this contract change, had you ever given a teacher a negative evaluation?
   What prompted it?
   What were the results?

4. How much of what you do is because of a conscious decision that you have made to perform that task or enact that role, and how much is reacting to other people or other circumstances which develop?

5. Do you have much interaction with the other principals? Tell me about it?

   Formal Interview #4
   March 1993

1. This is a comparison question. I will give you some situations and I would like you to compare your behavior in these situations prior to the change in supervision and evaluation policy being put into contract and after it became part of the contract. There
may be no change. If there has been a change, could you talk about what you think
caused the change.

1. How often you go into teachers' classrooms.
2. What you do when you are in a teacher's classroom.
3. The kinds of informal discussions you have with teachers in hallways, staff rooms,
   before school, etc.
4. The kinds of discussions you have with teachers in your office.
5. The kinds of written correspondence you have with teachers.
6. Staff meetings.
7. Your relationships with teachers.
8. How you relate with teachers.
10. It comes to your attention that a teacher is barely adequate in his/her teaching
    abilities.
11. It comes to your attention that something a teacher is doing could be harmful to
    children.
12. A parental complaint comes to you.
13. A parental complaint comes to you from either the board office or from a
    trustee.

Are there other areas which you can identify where you see that your role has
change over the last 1 1/2 school years?

2. Have you specifically decided in the last 2 school years that you would like your role to
be different? And have you been able to enact this change?
3. Does your conception of your role have built in limitations to change?
4. Is the change in policy in supervision and evaluation of teachers significant?
I would like you to think back over the kinds of things that you did as a principal before the change in contract which initiated professional growth plans and eliminated the evaluation of teacher every three years.

1. Since that time, has what you do as a principal changed in any significant way?
2. Has the change in contract enhanced or limited your role as principal? How?
3. The reason we give for conducting formal, periodic teacher evaluations is that they provide a sense of accountability in the schools. Could you reflect on the issue of accountability in relation to both the old and new methods of supervision and evaluation?
4. How important is the part that PGPs play in your talking about your role?
5. Hypothetical situation: The School District Trustees comes to you and say that they need advice on whether they should retain the new policy on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Please tell them what you think that the impact of this policy has been on your school and what your recommendation to them would be.
6. Are you planning to make any changes in the way you handle the PGP process next year?
Appendix B

Sample Fieldnotes on Informal Interviews

9 March 1992, 9:30 am

First Informal interview with Janet, Principal of Mountain View Elementary School

Place: Janet's Office

I met with Janet this morning for the first time. We chatted for about 1 hour, I then spent an additional half hour with her journal. We talked in a corner of her office where she had two chairs and an end table set up. It was cozy and inviting.

Janet is very open and personable. She is one of the principals who stood out at the meeting of principals because she was so well dressed, not a hair out of place. I realized as soon as I saw her that I thought she would be quite formal and stuffy, hard to talk with, but she was not. She has a relaxed manner and a good sense of humor.

This is her eighth year as a principal, but her first year at Mountain View. She was a strong union supporter as a teacher. She says this is why she can empathize with both teachers and administrators.

She said that in the last school she was in, the teachers considered themselves to be professional. They were always in favor of staff development to improve their teaching. She says that this is a very different school. The teachers are not quite so interested in self improvement, but they are VERY interested in kids. She says that some teachers work very late. Hours don't bother them. They do what they need to do for the benefit of the kids. She is not a morning person and tends to stay late herself. She says that one of the teachers has begun to come in to talk with her on a regular basis on Thursday afternoons. She enjoys this.

When I left she said that she welcomed reading the comments that I put in her journal because being an elementary principal she does not have an assistant with whom
she can close the door and "bitch". She has a head teacher and they can talk about most
everything, but there is a difference.

We talked about confidentiality. She kept asking me if the Superintendent or
Assistant Superintendent had given me this or that (example: principal's evaluation
criteria). I kept answering "no." At first I thought that I might look ill informed, but I
think in the end it worked for me in terms of my apparent lack of attachment to Central
Office. I asked her if I could copy her journal. When I finished she said "You won't show
this to anyone, will you? And when the study is over we will put them all in a big box and
burn them?" I assured her this would be the case.

I made several comments in her journal. I wanted her to know it was well done
and the information she provided was useful, yet I wanted to help her to see what kinds of
explanation would be helpful to me. I also asked her if she would keep a copy of all her
memos for me - of course, with names blacked out. She agreed.

We discussed an interesting issue in her school. She had a teacher who she felt
was capable intellectually, but having management problems. She had tried to support this
teacher in several different ways. One day at noon the teacher said she was leaving. Janet
let her leave but phoned her later on that day. After a couple of days the teacher called
and said that she wanted to set up a meeting between herself, Janet and Jim Jones, head of
the Teachers' Association. Janet's reaction to this was interesting. She said that involving
the Teachers' Association shed new light on the situation, brought a new dimension to it.
Janet said that she was somewhat disappointed that this occurred. She felt that she would
have liked the teacher to talk with just her at first. This led to an interesting discussion. I
shared a similar situation I had had as principal, hoping this sharing would help to establish
rapport. Anyway, the teacher came back to teach, lasted less than a week and decided she
was going to quit. Janet is in the process of interviewing for the position, while spending
some time each day teaching the class herself. To complicate matters, one of the parents
in the class is trying to get her child moved out of the class. This child is apparently one of
the ringleaders in terms of disturbing the class. Janet is confronting the problem, which she interprets to be one of manipulation on the part of the student.

This is Janet's eighth year as a principal and a year in which her contract is up. (I need to investigate this process.) As part of her evaluation two Assistant Superintendents spent a morning with her to discuss her own goals and her school goals. She said that with what is happening in the district in terms of goal writing, she felt more open to share both her successes and her problems with them.

I left saying that we would get together probably at the end of May for our extended interview and I would probably drop by once before then to read her journal.

23 April 1992, 9:00 - 11:00 am
Second Informal Interview with Janet, Principal of Mountain View Elementary School
Place: Janet's office

This was supposed to be just a short meeting to look at Janet's journal. It lasted two hours and only broke off because I said that I felt that I was taking too much of her time. At the end of the meeting she said, "I was so excited that you were coming today because it gives me a chance to talk to somebody about my job. What is especially nice is that you were a principal so you understand what is going on and we can really discuss issues and share ideas." This made me feel that I had begun to develop a sense of rapport with Janet.

We had a very interesting discussion. I would say that the main theme of the discussion was principal as counselor. Janet has three parents who she calls "offensive parents" who have been causing problems in the school. She has one teacher who quit three times, the last time being the final time. She has replaced that teacher, but has had to do a lot of counseling with students and with parents over the issues.

She says she spends a lot of time on "administrivia". For example, deciding whether the hot dogs for Hot Dog Day should be all beef or beef-pork. Looking at the
student population, there is a Moslem student who just moved into the school, so this
must be taken into account.

We talked about the seniors community and how you get them involved in the
school. Apparently as many as 75% of the people who live in this city do not have
children in the schools. We discussed ways that they could become involved in the school.

We spent a good deal of time talking about parents and the parent group that is in
the school. This is Janet's first year in the school and one of the big issues that she has had
to deal with is this parent group. Apparently, the past principal has taken a Central Office
position and had spent much of last year doing Central Office and Ministry work.
Consequently, the parent group became very independent. There was little organization in
the structure of the school and in the office area, in particular. Consequently Janet has
restructured the office and has made some minor changes for the parent group, but some
changes which have obviously caused some tension in the school. For example, when they
would have a hot dog day, money could be brought in any day for a week and a half prior
to the hot dog day. She changed that to money being collected only on the day before the
Hot Dog Day. Apparently this caused lots of problems with parents who did not see the
need for change. She realized that she should have explained to parents that collecting
money for a week and a half caused a good deal of work for the secretary. When she
explained that to the parents, they understood. The issue of making changes and not fully
explaining the rational for those changes seemed to be a little bit of a theme for her. This
process has caused some friction, so she is learning to give more rationale for changes.
Another example: along with the notice for Hot Dog Day, a little brown envelope was
stapled to each notice so that the parents could return money. She has eliminated the
envelope since it cost them $8.50 a month to them. She felt that money could be put to
better use. Again, because she did it without explanation, there were some people who
were upset. She felt that once it was explained, it was fine. I will need to keep these two
incidents in mind when I examine the issues that Janet says occur as she is implementing
the change in district policy on the supervision and evaluation of teachers. A question I need to keep in mind is: Does Janet make changes without consultation or explanation to teachers?

Janet said that the parent group was fairly unstructured, so she has helped them to become more structured. They are looking at various sample constitutions from other parent groups and putting together a constitution of their own. There is an issue here over who controls the money that the parent group raises. This will be included in the constitution design.

Janet is concerned with how to get parents involved in productive ways and to let them know what is happening in the school. She has run two evening events to talk about the Year 2000 Curriculum changes and how they are being implemented in the school. Both times they attracted no more than 8 or 12 people. So we talked about different structures for parent education. I told her about the National Education Week structure that we used in Mansfield. She was excited about it and took many notes.

This school is different from the last school she was in. She was at Tall Timber Elementary School prior to coming here. She said Tall Timber Elementary serves a slightly higher socioeconomic area, so the parents are slightly better educated. And the teachers are very interested in their own professional growth, but they did everything by the book. They would do no extra lunch time duties. They adhered to the letter of the contract. Here the teachers are not quite so interested in professional growth, but they are very child centered. She says she has all kinds of things going on at lunch time, from choir to writing to equipment lending. She says that teachers here give "their all" for kids, although, they are not quite so interested in professional development. She is working with that issue, trying to encourage a little more professional development, but still keeping the emphasis on children and children's needs.

This is a French Immersion school, but the French Immersion population has been declining. Her grade 4 has only 12 French Immersion students. She has made that into a
split class, which will probably remain as a split. She finds that French Immersion students tend to leave the program, but few move into it. They have seen a declining trend all over the city in the French Immersion program. One of her concerns for next year is scheduling multi-age grouping, particularly with French Immersion classes.

Janet mentioned two other people in the study. She mentions that she speaks to Vera quite often, and Vera mentioned that a close friend of hers was in this study, so I think Vera and Janet are friends. When Janet mentioned Vera I didn't respond because I want to let them know that what they tell me is completely confidential. I think that one way of demonstrating this is not to engage in this type of discussion. Although, it would be convenient to respond and say, "Oh, yes, I know Vera." I think it best not to do that. It keeps up the professional aspects of the study. She also plays bridge with another principal once every six weeks. She told me both of those things in terms of saying that she enjoys professional conversation, but doesn't have a lot of opportunity to get it. So I think that I am meeting her needs in that way. I also see that principals talk about my study and are curious about who else is in it.

We also did some personal chit-chatting. She told me about her husband who is an engineer, a Harvard graduate '56, who will speak at Harvard next week. Of course, I shared that Clark was a Harvard grad, as well. We talked about other personal things. I feel that we are beginning to develop a very nice relationship. She also told me that in this district there is a cap on principal's salaries at $80,000. She hasn't quite met it, yet, but she will by next year.

We set a date for the first formal interview on Tuesday, June 2, 1992.
Appendix C

Sample Fieldnotes on Formal Interviews

Vera, 3 December, 1992, Formal Interview #3

Place: Vera's Office

It's 10:30. I've just finished my interview with Vera. I always find Vera to be a fascinating person who approaches her job in a very intellectual way. I have a feeling that she doesn't have much time for people who are not sincere and serious about their profession. One interesting thing that I found was that her perspective on PGPs is quite different from the perspective that I heard yesterday with Steve. I think that's largely attributable to the fact that this is Vera's fifth year as a principal and fifth year at Boundary Elementary, as well, and that she did not come into the principalship with the same expectations as some people who have been principals for a longer period of time. She came in valuing collegiality and recognizing that collegiality is quite important. And she may have come in as a less bureaucratic principal than some of the principals who have been in the system for a lot longer. So I see that in her perception, there is not as much change in her practice or in the practice of teachers since the new contractual agreement.

This is an issue that I will to continue to look at: do principals' views link with their number of years as principal. I don't expect to use number of years of experience as a major part of the analysis, but it will be interesting to examine the attitude of principals who have been principals for a very long period of time and those who are fairly new to the principalship. I wonder, if principals cluster for other reasons, will those clusters also be according to number of years as principal? New to the principalship might be defined as becoming a principal in the last three to five years.
It's 1:50 and I've just completed my interview with Vera. Vera was so concerned with the job action that she had a fairly difficult time concentrating on the questions at hand. Not that she didn't answer them, because she did, but generally she is more expansive. Usually I can come in with three or four questions and we can spend quite a long time on those three or four questions. In fact I feel that I sometimes need to cut her off and move her along, but her answers today were fairly expedient and, instead, she spent a period of time both prior to the start of questions and afterwards talking about the job action and how it has affected the school and how it has affected her role, particularly in terms of supervision and evaluation. So all of that is good information and necessary information for the study.

In terms of PGPs, two issues that she addressed that I thought were really quite interesting was when I asked her what part the PGPs play in her talking about her role and what impact the PGPs have had on the school. Her answer was "not very much." This was interesting because I heard this same answer from Steve, however because the contexts of the two schools were very different, the answers took on different meanings. In Steve's case, he gets the PGP, talks to the teacher about it, if the teacher so chooses, then files it and doesn't spend time on it from that point on, unless the teacher requests a conference about it in the spring. With Vera, the reason that the PGPs do not play an important role is because her thrust is towards professional development and so what she is continually working on is professional development, collegiality, and encouraging a professional dialogue. So when she says that the PGPs don't have much of an impact, it's not because professional growth is not important, that is, what the PGPs stand for are not having an impact, it's just that PGPs are one of many things in that school which encourage teacher's professional growth. So she's come at it from a completely different
context and given a very different meaning to the answer PGPs have not had much of an impact in the school.
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Sample of Responses to Member Check on Cases

3/1/94 Gary

Gary said that in reading the transcript he though it was an accurate representation of him, but did he really come off as being that manipulative? I told him that was not my intent in writing it and could he give me a specific example. The quote that seemed to bother him was the one about being a "perpetrator of myth." He admitted that he said it, but said that he did not know how it "sounded" until he read it. I offered to take it out if he was concerned by it, but he said, no, he said it, he believes it, and I should keep it in. I asked him if there was anything else he could point to that made him uncomfortable. He said "no." I told him that I would read it again and if I thought there was a place where I was portraying him as manipulative, I would rewrite it. He said, "No, I want you to keep it exactly like it is. I think you captured me accurately."

We then chatted about a new assignment the district was thinking of offering him next year, as principal of the detention center and the two alternate programs for students in trouble.

3/1/94 Richard

Richard said he was "humbled" by the way I wrote about him and was very pleased with how I portrayed him and what I said about him.

He did, however, have some concerns. He said he had a tendency to babble on and he did not realize what this would mean when he was quoted. He though he would be easily recognizable in the district, and that was okay with him. However, he found some of the quotes to be personally embarrassing, not because of what he said, but of how he said it. He thought if a word could be added here or there (mostly missing articles) he
thought the quotes would read better, sound more intelligent, and consequently portray him better in the eyes of his peers. I said I had no intent of embarrassing him and would welcome his suggestions. He assured me they would not change the intent of the quotes. So he will send me his comments and I promised I would carefully review them.

3/14/94 Steve

Steve began by listing a few typos. He felt that he came across as controlling; as someone who has an idea of what is right. He kept using the word controlling.

On page 6 (F/4/8) where he says he "treats them by the book" what he meant is that some relationships supersede the contract.

Page 4, quote F/1/7 we agreed to leave out a descriptive phrase that did not add to the quote. It is too strong and John did not feel comfortable with it.

Reading his words gives him an impression of control.

He is disappointed in himself because he comes across as being less than articulate.

Often the way he said things is not the way he would like to see it said.

He said it was an attitudinal type of thing where he appears to be less caring than he thinks he is.

Aside from the typos and the quote removal, he wanted no changes.

3/17/94 Janet

Janet felt that I should include in the context that the school is dual track school, that is, she is running two schools in one. One of her greatest challenges is to create a sense of unity between the French Immersion teachers and the English teachers.

Over the course of the study the student population increased from 350 to 460, so allocation of her time is an important issue.

With the 38 students who did not have band last year she ran a fine arts drama film making course with the French and English classes together.
She thought the issue of supervision of program when you are not a Francaphone was important.

This year she received a new language arts revision for French immersion teachers. At least three times per year she pulls French immersion teachers together to discuss program.

The issue of delegation is now essential as the school grows. The issue she said is "Who can she delegate roles to and monitor?"

The sense of unity and positive school climate become important as the school grows. The school's ESL component has grown to 105. It is largely transient. This year she had 65 students come in and 40 go out. This has been going on since January 1993. Part of the transient problem has to do with a change in catchment areas.

When a new student comes in she immediately learns their name, meets their parents, shows them around. Her role was to come up with a process to help the teachers and secretary cope with the large number of transient students.

She said that her husband added that it was important that the spouse value the principal's position and the time it takes to be a professional.

She suggested that during the interviews it would have been good to have a time out for reflection. When I came was the only time she really thought about her work. If she had had the questions before I came she could have thought about them.

Could I clean up the quotes a bit more?

In quote I/1/4, page 3 I said she told me she was not a risk taker. She asked if I could modify that to say that we are all risk takers to varying degrees, she is low on the scale.

I should use "staff" meetings not "faculty" meetings. Faculty meetings sounds too American.