The Role of Multi-data Evaluations in Site-based Management: An Examination of an Innovative Teacher Professional Growth Plan

Margot McKinnon

and

J. Tim Goddard

University of Calgary

Abstract

In this paper we present and discuss a new form of teacher evaluation implemented in a western Canadian province. The potential for the teacher professional growth plan (TPGP) to become a process for individual development is examined from within the context of site-based management. We conclude that the TPGP provides a framework for teachers and administrators to analyze their own practice in the spirit of annual professional self renewal.

Introduction

Educational reform is an ongoing struggle for governments and educational institutions. The dynamics of our modern society have changed so dramatically that sweeping reform measures often appear not to be bringing desired results. The concept of site-based management (SBM), which was widely introduced in the 1990s, handed decision-making power over budgets and resource allocation to administrators and teachers within individual schools. The theory was that teachers and school administrators, being closest to the student, were in the best position to know how to effectively manage their own budget and resources. As yet, there is very little evidence to show that self-managing schools use their resources more effectively to improve teaching and learning (Whitty, Power & Halpin, 1995). Indeed Brandt (2001) has argued that policy makers lost confidence in SBM when there was no discernible increase in student achievement.

There is no doubt that SBM should allow individual school staffs to research, discuss, and decide upon ways to educate students particular to their school communities. The problem is that teachers have not routinely been a part of, or even introduced to, the critical inquiry processes required to fulfill the obligation of SBM. The hierarchy of education generally left the governance of education

to those such as superintendents and principals, who already occupied power positions. The role of the teacher was to carry out the decisions made by the "experts", even if such labels were self-applied.

Teachers in the new century expect to be treated in a more professional manner than has perhaps been the case in the past. They are no longer willing to exist as semi-autonomous beings who care only for what happens in their classroom. Rather, they see themselves as integral parts of a greater educational endeavor. SBM provides an opportunity for them to become part of the total organization, making decisions that go beyond their own classrooms.

This empowerment is new to teachers and many tread carefully into the morass of SBM. One reason for this is that in many institutions, the principal continues to be both supervisor and evaluator of instructional practice and as a result holds the teacher's career in hand. Realistically, SBM must allow teachers and administrators to honestly and openly discuss problems and successes encountered in the institution. SBM in the 1980s and 1990s challenged the role of the principal and the relationship with teachers (Glanz, 1997). He observed that supervisors, to be effective, must maintain collegial and helpful relationships in a new shared decision-making model. In successful schools, teachers are treated as colleagues of the principal, not subordinates (Glickman, 1993), all engaged in "predicaments, competing views, and apparent conflicts" (Glickman, 2001, p. 152). Unfortunately, collegial relationships become jeopardized when teacher evaluations must be done (Glanz, 1997). Teachers often become fearful that any disagreement with the supervisor may have a negative implication on their supervisory report. By removing the threat of evaluation from the teacher-administrator discourse, the potential for honest and open professional relationships and professional learning are more likely to occur.

Context

In the past fifteen years, supervision and evaluation methods have experienced an evolution from a very hierarchical system (where the principal as expert evaluated teachers every four to five years to ensure that they were carrying out curriculum set by the government) to a more teacher-centered method where teachers are recognized as professionals with individual teaching goals distinct from curriculum goals. Different jurisdictions in North America have attempted to address this situation through a variety of initiatives. In this article we examine how the education branch of one western Canadian province responded to the need for change in its teacher supervision and evaluation policy by eliminating mandatory teacher evaluations of tenured teachers and instituting the Teacher Professional Growth Plan (TPGP). The TPGP is a teacher designed document which outlines specific goals for the improvement of an individual's teaching practice. :

From Theory to Practice: The Teacher Professional Growth Plan

In response to current research on educational reform, particularly in supervision and evaluation policy, one western Canadian province revised its teacher supervision policy for experienced teachers. Prior to 1997, the government mandated administrative supervision of experienced, tenured teachers every

three to five years. When decision making was devolved to schools in 1997, the teacher supervision policy was revised to ensure teacher voices in collaborative decision-making governance bodies were unimpeded by the threat of administrative evaluation. It was recognized that if teachers were to be truly engaged in active decision making and reflective practice, there needed to be a shift in the hierarchy. Principals continued to be responsible for the overall teaching and learning in their schools, but teachers were given the responsibility of outlining their own professional growth initiatives.

Review of the Teacher Growth, Supervision, and Evaluation Policy

As a bold acknowledgment of teacher professionalism, the Teacher Growth, Supervision, and Evaluation policy was introduced in February 1998. This replaced the former supervision policy, which required teachers to be evaluated by an administrator. The intention of the new policy was and is to encourage a holistic, career long pursuit of professional practice. It focuses on educators as leaders of learning, designing their own professional development through reflective practice. The purpose of the policy is to provide a process for superintendents, principals, and teachers to work together to achieve the teaching quality standard and to provide an accountability document that this work was done.

Responsibility of the Teacher and Principal

Each school year, all teachers and administrators who hold teaching contracts for that year are responsible for designing, implementing and completing a teacher professional growth plan (TPGP). The teacher must take into account a growth-directed and continuous assessment of his or her professional learning needs. The TPGP must demonstrate a relationship between the teaching quality standard, as defined by the province, and the education plans of the school and the school board. The principal's role is to ensure that each teacher's growth plan includes these three elements. Ongoing supervision for all teachers in the school is the responsibility of the principal. As the principal may receive information from any source and make observations about the quality of teaching, it is imperative that she or he remains actively aware of the teaching practices in all classrooms. The role of the principal as supervisor is to provide ongoing relevant feedback to teachers on the quality of observed professional practice. The belief is that this supervision process establishes an interactive relationship between a principal and a teacher.

Components of the TPGP

A TPGP must include professional goals and objectives. An action plan, complete with strategies and timelines, must accompany each goal and objective. Since the TPGP is a living document, teachers can modify and adjust strategies in an ongoing reflection of teaching practice. The TPGP can be a component of a

long-term, multi-year plan, and reflect year by year outcomes. Or, it can be a one year growth related action plan. The TPGP must only take into account professional growth, not personal growth, although in practice these two strands are often so inter-twined as to be virtually indistinguishable.

Options for Review

Within the first sixty days of the school year, the teacher has the option of selecting a TPGP review by peers or by an administrator. The purpose of the review is to encourage reflective conversation about the individual teacher's growth. The TPGP is a confidential document, therefore the teacher determines who will have access to the document outside of the principal and/or review body. Within the last sixty days of the school year, the teacher is responsible for arranging and conducting the year end review. The principal keeps staff TPGPs on file for the school year and then returns them to the teachers following the end-of-year review. The TPGP belongs to the teacher; it is a personal statement of commitment to ongoing professional growth. Without teacher permission, it is not to be used as part of a teacher evaluation.

In this process, teachers take control of their own learning by engaging in periodic reflective dialogue with peers whom they have selected to review their TPGP. The principal's role is to ensure that the TPGP and all necessary reviews are completed within the school year. No longer is the tenured teacher evaluated every five years. Instead the teacher designs and conducts his or her own review on an annual basis. The provincial initiative to eliminate evaluations for tenured teachers should be celebrated for its recognition of teacher professionalism. The new policy, however, may not provide the results for which the government is hoping.

A potential weakness of the TPGP is that it focuses more on individual teacher growth rather than organizational growth. We see this as problematic in that we believe that sustainable school renewal will only occur as a result of systemic organizational growth. In Canada, there is no federal department or ministry of education. Thus, as education falls under the mandate of each provincial or territorial government, these governments are responsible for the establishment and implementation of policy affecting the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Strong leadership, adept at coordinating individual and organizational growth, will be necessary. The TPGP could be the tool to transform the history of teacher isolation and reliance on outside experts to a new respect for teacher professionalism.

Review of Related Literature

In the past, "the key was to have the *thinkers* of the organization specify exactly what and how to teach at each grade level and then to provide strict supervision to ensure that teachers did as they were told" (Dufour & Eaker, 1998, p. 21) [emphasis in original]. This system of supervision and evaluation sufficiently provided the paperwork needed for accountability purposes, but it did not encompass the heart of instructional improvement: ongoing teacher inquiry into professional practice. Reitzug (1997) studied images in ten teacher supervision

textbooks, with copyright dates between 1985 and 1995. He found that these textbooks viewed the principal as expert and superior, and the teacher as deficient and voiceless. The textbooks rarely advocate principals to ask questions regarding why teachers teach the way they do or what beliefs underlie their practice.

One textbook included in Reitzug's study was Glatthorn's Supervisory Leadership (1990). Glatthorn believed it important for all schools within a district to use the same evaluation procedures to ensure equity: observations, conferences, and coaching sessions to provide teachers with feedback with a focus on instructional improvement and student achievement. Glatthorn's model emphasized a deficiency in a teacher's practice as it set the principal above the teacher in the evaluation process. It also did not recognize the teacher as an individual, but rather lumped all teachers together in the belief that they can be evaluated in the same way. Reitzug's main argument against the images found in textbooks, such as Glatthorn's, was that these differed significantly from the images of professional growth that emerge from successful schools. The textbooks support the idea that a principal, as an external force, is in a better position to understand and change a teacher's practice than the teacher themselves. This dependence on the principal to understand and value a teacher's work would most certainly interfere with the frank and honest discussions necessary for effective SBM.

The very notion of teacher professionalism is highlighted in the SBM model. Sagor (1997) claimed that "for too many teachers in too many schools, the job of educator is more akin to blue-collar work than creative professional practice" (p. 170). He identified three major factors that keep teachers in the blue-collar role: they work in isolation, are generally excluded from knowledge production, and are subjugated to external quality control. Lieberman and Grolnick (1997) observed that most educators spend "their professional lives in schools that expect self-sufficiency in the classroom, but that encourage dependence on outside sources for expertise" (p. 200). Thus, site-based management ultimately creates a tension within school organizations. Teachers are expected to volunteer for site-based decision making councils and work on an equal partnership with principals, but in the end they will probably be supervised and evaluated by the principal. The result is that the empowerment gained in the decision-making model is lost in the supervision and evaluation practices of the school.

Some do not see that teachers have gained much in the SBM model. Empowerment is at times a nebulous term that is essentially paternalistic. If power is given, it can also be taken away. As the editor of the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision observed, "power to do what? ... Teachers may discuss, but they have authority only to employ resources allocated by others" (Davis, 1997, p. 191). Educational reforms seem to be about regulating teachers as much as about empowering them (Whitty et al., 1995, p. 79). The false card of empowerment can confine as much as it may liberate.

Fullan (1993) believed that one reason for the failure of educational reform was that strategies did not address fundamental instructional reform and the development of a new collaborative culture among educators. He stated that the

"hardest core to crack is the learning core – changes in instructional practices and in the culture of teaching toward greater collaborative relationships among students, teachers and other potential partners" (p. 49). School boards, to improve instructional practice, need to reevaluate their policies regarding how teacher efficacy and professional growth is monitored. It is not enough to simply focus attention on decisions regarding budget and resources; improvements in learning and teaching need to be at the centre of educational reform. Although some Canadian provinces, for example Manitoba (Harris, 2001), are attempting large scale reform initiatives, many still rely on individual efforts rather than collaborative innovation.

In a number of provincial and state governments, including the one discussed here, there seems to be a conflict over how much power to entrust to teachers. On the one hand these governments want to devolve decision making to teachers and administrators but on the other they seem to fear accountability in the eyes of the voters. One government policy that continues to be an accountability measuring stick for teachers mandates provincial exam initiatives for grade three, six, nine and twelve students. Centralized examinations potentially stimulate better learning and teaching through efforts to meet or improve student achievement standards set by the government. Schools might compete with each other for top ranking in an effort to be the "school of choice."

Unfortunately, research shows that centralized examinations have often had the opposite effect on quality of instruction. One argument is that these examinations tend to erode "teacher autonomy by decreasing teachers' responsibility for evaluation, enforcing centralized curriculum, reducing teacher control over the outcome of their labour, and introducing new and inappropriate measures of teacher productivity" (Runte, 1998, p.166). A second is that teachers, in an effort to achieve a good score on the government rankings of schools, might "teach to the test". Cheng and Couture (2000) found that some teachers neglected those teaching materials not tested on centralized examinations and formatted their instruction materials to resemble the mandated tests. Such teachers often have a "sense of living one thing and believing another" (p. 70), for in their conversations they claim a pedagogically pure vocation that is seldom reflected in their practice. Rallis and MacMullen (2000) argue that although collecting and publicizing the data on student academic achievement is meant to stimulate improvements in teaching and learning, no direct link has been made between performance reporting and school improvement. Recent work by Earl and Lee (1998) suggests otherwise, but this debate is not yet finished.

Marks and Louis (1999) argued that, with SBM, teachers often become more autonomous but used their freedom in disparate directions. In their experience, "collective focus on the quality of instruction and the achievement of all students unified [successful] schools in effectively carrying out the core technology of teaching and learning" (p. 710). While traditional teacher evaluation systems seemed to be more about providing the paperwork for accountability, modern practices appeared to be about fostering reflective dialogue and individual teacher ownership of professional practice. Teaching, in the past, has tended to

be a fairly private experience between teacher and students, albeit a practice interrupted every five years for an evaluation. For the most part, teachers worked alone. Supervision of teachers, however, continues to be an important part of the principal's work, "but not in the tough, inspectoral sense suggested by factory images of inspection and control ... instead it implies accountability embedded in tough and tender caring" (Sergiovanni, 1996, p. 91). According to Glickman (1993) "the essence of school renewal is the internal, critical process of studying one's own school - looking at one's covenant, raising critical questions about current educational practice, and then assessing where the greatest priorities abide" (p.60). Important discussions such as these need to be carried out without fear of reprisal in the form of an evaluation. Teachers need to be free to disagree.

Ebmeier and Nicklaus (1999) demonstrate in their work that teaching and learning improved through collaborative supervision. They believed that in the past the role of the supervisor was to act as an "inspector" to ensure that teachers followed curriculum and students learned essential skills. They found that "supervision used as an evaluation tool reduced the possibility of nurturing collegiality, collaboration, and reflective practice" (p. 353). Ebmeier and Nicklaus based their work on the collaborative and non-directive aspects in Glickman's (1990) developmental supervision design. In this model, when a supervisor evaluates an experienced teacher there is a free exchange of ideas. The teacher is encouraged to present his or her own views and the supervisor responds to them with honesty. Disagreement is encouraged, not suppressed. Interesting to note is that the participants in Ebmeier and Nicklaus' (1999) study did not feel any animosity toward the principal, as inspector, but found instead that teacher conferences with principals produced a significantly better result in teacher trust, commitment, desire for collaboration, and efficacy than did teacher conferences with peer supervisors. This study was carried out at the very beginning of SBM and might simply show a reliance on principal directives. The collaborative model appears to be favoured, but with SBM the formal evaluation by a principal may prohibit much needed change within the organization.

Another effort to improve supervision and evaluation policy was the introduction of teacher directed evaluations. Teachers are more likely to take ownership of their teaching practice within an evaluation when they feel that the process is a true reflection of their teaching (Peterson, Stevens & Ponzio, 1998). The evaluation becomes a constructive process of information gathering. A highly effective teacher has the potential to demonstrate expertise in teaching and learning. An ineffective teacher may struggle. Professional training, examinations of teacher knowledge, parent, peer, self evaluation, student performance, and artifacts can all be used as a presentation of teacher performance (Glass as cited in Peterson et al, 1998). Such a multiple data system is less practical and more time consuming than the "check list" style administrative reports of the past, but the payoff is that multiple data sources provide a more valid evaluation of teacher practice (Peterson et al, 1998). There is always the potential that such increased accuracy may lead to less than perfect scores on evaluation forms completed by parents or students. Certainly, it might be expected that multiple data sources will at times produce a less glowing report

than what the principal might have given in an individual review. Such trends should be considered as professionally accurate and more likely to act as a catalyst for teacher growth.

Discussion

As teachers and administrators become more experienced in using multiple data evaluations, they will better understand which results are credible and which are not. Griffin and Pool (1998) believe that student involvement, often through the use of questionnaires, can provide teachers with a rich source of data for reflective practice. We concur, and would argue that the supervision and evaluation of teachers needs to go beyond simply a meeting with the principal. Rather, the process needs to encourage teacher learning through feedback from a variety of sources. Given the practicalities of implementation, such a teacher directed multi-data evaluation would probably only occur every five years. Although more effective than the current models, school boards need to go a step further by building into their supervision and evaluation policy formal opportunities for staff to engage in ongoing reflection and critical inquiry.

Principals who are experienced in creating a climate of reflective practice can be of tremendous benefit to teachers in the evaluation process. However, even under these circumstances, the evaluation directly affects only the teacher and the principal. The indirect effects on others, such as colleagues and students, are outside the scope of this paper. The focus on individual growth and capacity building, while useful, does not enable schools to become engaged in a process of organizational renewal. Fullan (1993) argues that the "spirit of inquiry and continuous learning must characterize the whole enterprise [of schooling], or else all is lost" (p. 67). Organizational renewal, therefore, is about "continuous, critical inquiry into current practice and principled innovation that might improve education" (Smith, 1999, p. 608). Such critical inquiry cannot rest solely within individual teachers during a teacher evaluation. Rather, critical inquiry needs to be a school-wide and ongoing initiative, for renewal is about "the process of individual and organizational change, about nurturing the spiritual, affective, and intellectual connections in the lives of educators working together to understand and improve their practice" (Sirotnik, 1999, pp. 607-608). The current aim of teacher supervision is to encourage teacher ownership of teaching and learning practice. Teachers are encouraged to gather information about their current teaching efficacy from several sources, not just the principal.

It would appear that new supervision and evaluation policies need to take into account how teachers learn. This is essential if such policies are to promote teacher learning which in turn should help to improve student learning and achievement. King and Newmann (2000) conclude that teacher learning is most likely to occur when teachers study instructional practices within the context of what they teach. Sustained opportunities to experiment and receive helpful feedback from professional peers within and outside schools help teachers to integrate innovative teaching strategies into practice. Further, teacher learning is most likely to improve when teachers have influence over the kinds of professional development they need with respect to their program of study.

Many reform efforts, especially in the area of learning and teaching, pay exclusive attention to student learning. We believe that this is insufficient. Teacher learning and professional growth is an important area on which to concentrate. Schools need to move away from the one shot school-wide professional development days that are so common. Such events are out of context to the individual teacher's daily practice and do not provide opportunities for teachers to engage in ongoing meaningful learning.

It is apparent that supervision models are becoming more collaborative and flexible. Many teachers appear to be gaining more authority in the construction and representation of their own professional growth. Accountability, however, remains a significant issue for administrators, who are ultimately responsible for all learning and teaching in their schools. Not only will teachers need to hone their skills to share in effective collaborative supervision and evaluation procedures but administrators also need to train themselves to conduct fair and meaningful interchanges with teachers. In reality, some principals or assistant principals are new to their positions and are still adjusting to the professional transition of teacher to administrator. The supervision of recent peers can be a difficult task and there is a tendency to resort to managerial check lists. This is often an attempt to remove the personal from the activity and to provide the evaluator with a mask of technical competencies. Nevertheless, it is the administrator's responsibility, regardless of experience, to ensure that each teacher becomes and remains a competent professional.

It is possible for a principal to create a culture of reflective practice and consequently conduct evaluations that are genuine and worthwhile for both the principal and the teacher. Blase and Blase (1996), in their study on administrators and teachers in instructional conferences, found that experienced supervisors usually provided a non-threatening opportunity for teachers to explore their work in a reflective talk. Inexperienced supervisors, they discovered, often emphasized personal knowledge and experience as a way of confirming credibility and ended up imposing their agendas on teacher evaluation conferences. In effect, some principals appeared to do more harm than good. Since the confidence and security of the administrator influence the evaluation process, it cannot be assumed that all administrators will conduct equally valid evaluations.

The literature suggests that principals must strive to be site-based leaders, not just site-based managers, and that this will take time and practice. In the contemporary era the role of the principal has shifted from that of dispassionate expert to that of knowledgeable collaborator. No longer expected to have all of the answers, principals now encourage the asking of questions. Assuming the catalyst role of an instrument of change, they encourage teachers to be involved in school-wide inquiry. In this new model of supervision and evaluation, teachers are no longer voiceless. In fact, quite the opposite is true, and teacher voice is valued.

For teachers who are already internally motivated, these models of collaborative supervision and multi-data evaluation processes serve well. The process becomes more meaningful, providing a learning experience in itself. For

ineffective teachers, collaborative supervision provides opportunities for ongoing discussion about instructional improvement. Multi-data evaluations have the potential to reveal strengths and weaknesses in teaching performance, with the collection of data either extensive or limited. We would suggest that if current educational reform is going to achieve any long-lasting effect, teachers need to constantly scrutinize their own instructional practices. Teachers need to take control of their learning to keep abreast of changes in teaching methodology. The traditional supervision and evaluation policies that existed prior to 1990 need to be redesigned so that reflective practice and critical inquiry are at the centre of system-wide reform.

Implications

In essence, the TPGP is an effective response to the argument that teachers need to take control of their own professional practice. It also is in alignment with adult learning theory since teachers can concentrate their professional growth in areas that will help them to be more effective in their immediate context. As such, collaboration between principal and peers is encouraged. Since the TPGP is not to be used for evaluation, teachers can be both experimental and honest in outlining their goals and strategies. Two areas of concern emerge, however, regarding the TPGP: accountability and professional development in the context of organizational growth.

Accountability

Principals are ultimately accountable for the teaching practices within the school, yet the new supervision and evaluation policy does not require evaluations for tenured teachers. The former policy, where teachers were evaluated every five years, may in fact have been simpler for a principal to manage. The TPGP is an annual document. For a large high school, a principal is held accountable for up to a hundred TPGPs a year. The teacher's review team, selected by the teacher, supervises the teacher's progress with regard to goal achievement. Accountability is basically founded on trust that teachers and review committees are doing what is outlined in the TPGP. Principals will need to be comfortable with this kind of trust.

For teachers, who enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy and perhaps anonymity in the past, the annual TPGP may seem invasive. In the past, teachers were basically left alone, accountable only to students and parents. Many teachers enjoyed this freedom. For internally motivated teachers, ones who strive to perfect the art of teaching, the TPGP works well as a formal tool to shape professional growth. In reality, however, not all teachers want to engage in reflective practice, design growth related goals, or participate in review committees. Glickman (1993) observes that "when there is no 'enemy' curtailing behavior, the responsibility for one's freedom can be frightening" (p. 99). The concept of the principal as the "enemy" or at least as "evaluator" may still remain in the collective consciousness of teaching staffs. Teachers who continue to regard the principal as the authority figure may grow suspicious of the principal's

attempts to promote collegiality, fearing that the principal, who formally cannot use the TPGP as an evaluation tool, is doing so mentally and informally. Indeed, teachers may feel that there is a secret agenda. For internally motivated teachers, the TPGP fuels a fundamental desire to improve instructional practice. For others, the TPGP may seem more threatening. Principals will need to learn how to reshape the culture of the school staff to ensure that the TPGP does not further isolate teachers. Instead, the principal will need to concentrate effort on making the TPGP experience a positive one, one that will enhance organizational learning.

There are few incentives, other than intrinsic rewards, to set innovative goals and invest the time required for effective review team meetings. Some teachers may submit a one-goal TPGP, while others enthusiastically draft several goals for the year. Since the TPGP is not to be used for evaluation purposes, and eventually ends up back in the teacher's desk drawer, there is little incentive for the teachers to participate in the time-consuming work of actualizing goals.

A principal must somehow encourage teachers to pursue their professional growth in a meaningful way. For example, perhaps, time can be allotted within the timetable to work on TPGPs. The principal could conscientiously make the effort to ask teachers about their goals and strategies, offering assistance to remove obstacles if necessary. Professional development days could focus on common TPGP goals. Teachers could design their own learning around organizational goals. It is important for teachers and principals to keep the TPGP a living document. The issue of accountability, although difficult, may become simpler once teachers and principals internalize the process and create a school culture based on reflective practice and critical inquiry.

Professional development in the context of organizational growth

While the TPGP provides a flexible method for determining teacher professional growth, the principal and her staff must consider whether teachers would most benefit from individually designed professional development days to pursue TPGP goals, or collaborative development based on school need. Individual development days could fragment the overall school progress toward a common goal. Definitions of professional growth may become a source of conflict. Some teachers may wish to pursue personal goals like, "will enjoy a massage once a month as provided for in the collective agreement," arguing that this is a legitimate wellness goal. Some principals may disagree. Individual growth is extremely important, but so is organizational growth. The TPGP has the potential to be a progressive document that formally allows teachers to take ownership of teaching practice. It does not effectively, however, promote organizational growth. Principals would benefit from educating themselves in methods to motivate staff to look beyond simply improving their own practices and work toward improving the learning and teaching in the school as an organization.

There is very little research to indicate how principals could best undertake the creation of a collaborative learning community with the TPGP as a focus.

Few researchers have investigated how supervision and evaluation has changed since the inception of the TPGP, especially in the area of accountability. Further research would benefit from examining: 1) a documentation of TPGP implementation as it pertains to accountability; 2) teacher isolation and the comfort level with peer review; 3) the benefits of self-directed and school-wide professional development versus school wide efforts; 4) how effective principals might use the TPGP as a foundation for professional learning communities; 5) the TPGP and its use in teacher professional portfolio; and, 6) effective SBM as connected to supervision and evaluation policy.

Conclusion

The TPGP is a progressive initiative that demonstrates that the provincial government values teacher voice, reflective practice, and learning communities. It sets up a framework for teachers and administrators to analyze their own practice in the spirit of annual professional self-renewal. The role of principal has become less that of teacher supervisor and more that of the organizational leader of learning communities. As DePree (1997) has proclaimed, "one of the first things required in movements is spirit lifting leadership, leadership that enables, enriches, holds the organization accountable, and in the end lets go" (p. 25). In the end, principals do not need to hold the ultimate control of teacher supervision. A TPGP can serve to highlight an effective teacher's practice or spotlight an ineffective teacher's difficulties to grow and learn. Either way, a principal can experience a certain freedom from being the teaching "expert" found in the traditional model of supervision and evaluation. At the same time, teachers can enjoy the new professionalism they earn through a commitment to ongoing instructional improvement.

References

- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1996). Micropolitical strategies used by administrators and teachers in instructional conferences. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, XLII (4), 345-360.
- Brandt, R. (2001). No best way: The case for differential schooling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83 (2), 153-156.
- Davis, O.I. (1997) Editorial notes on the nature of power. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12 (3), 189-192.
- DePree, M. (1997). *Leading Without Power*. Holland, MI: Jossey-Bass.
- Dufour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional Learning Communities at Work*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Earl, L., & Lee, L. (1998). *Evaluation of the Manitoba School Improvement Program*. Winnipeg, MB: Manitoba School Improvement Program.
- Ebmeier, H., & Nicklaus, J. (1999). The impact of peer and principal collaborative supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 14 (4), 351-378.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Forces Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Glanz, J. (1997). The Tao of supervision: Taoist insights into the theory and practice of educational supervision. *The Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12 (3), 193-211.
- Glatthorn, A. (1990). *Supervisory Leadership: Introduction to Instructional Leadership*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Glickman, C. (1990). *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Glickman, C. (1993). *Renewing America's Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Glickman, C. D. (2001). Dichotomizing education: Why no one wins and America loses. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 83 (2), 147-152.
- Griffin, B., & Pool, H. (1998). Monitoring and improving instructional practices (and are student evaluations valid?). *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 32 (1), 1-7.
- Harris, A. (2000). Successful school improvement in the United Kingdom and Canada. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 15. [On-line]. Available <http://www.umanitoba.ca/publications/cjeap/issue15.htm>
- King, M., & Newmann, F. (2000). Will teacher learning advance school goals? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81 (8), 576-580.
- Lieberman, A., & Grolnick, M. (1997). Networks, reform, and the professional development of teachers. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *ASCD Yearbook: Rethinking Educational Change with Heart and Mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marks, H., & Louis, K. (1999). Teacher empowerment and the capacity for organizational learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35 (Supplemental), 707-750.
- Peterson, K., Stevens, D., & Ponzio, R. (1998). Variable data sources in teacher evaluation. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 31 (3), 123-132.
- Rallis, S., & MacMullen, M. (2000). Inquiry-minded schools opening the doors for accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 81 (10), 766-771.
- Reitzug, U. (1997). Images of principal leadership. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12 (4), 324-343.
- Runte, R. (1998). The impact of centralized examinations on teacher professionalism. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 23 (2), 166-181.
- Sagor, R. (1997). Collaborative action research for educational change. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *ASCD Yearbook: Rethinking Educational Change with Heart and Mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1996). *Leadership for the Schoolhouse*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sirotnik, K. (1999). Making sense of educational renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80 (8), 606-610.
- Smith, W. (1999). Leadership and educational renewal. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80 (8), 602-605.
- Whitty, G., Power, S & Halpin, D. (1998). *Devolution and Choice in Education*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.