

A HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND SUPERVISION  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA 1968-1991

by

MELVIN E. HUNT

(Under the Direction of Sally J. Zepeda)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to document and to describe events surrounding the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia from 1968 to 1991. The data included the perspectives of four retired department faculty members coupled with a review of historical documents and a policy analysis of related legislation that influenced the development, existence, and the eventual merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership.

The researcher conducted a total of 10 videotaped interviews with Dr. Ray Bruce, Dr. Gerald Firth, Dr. Edith Grimsley, and Dr. Virginia Macagnoni from the summer 2005 to fall 2007. The interview tapes were converted to digital video files, allowing the researcher flexibility in navigating the data included in each interview. Following qualitative research methods, themes that emerged were examined through the constant comparison approach using the video taped interviews, and a review of relevant historical documents. Video clips were created and organized by themes and select video clip quotes were linked to quotes in the text of the dissertation.

An analysis of selected educational policy initiatives in Georgia was conducted using the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model (1984). This model allowed for an analysis of historical conditions surrounding the development, establishment, and implementation of the policies included in this study. Results of the analysis were used to describe the impact of implementation of selected educational policy on the development and operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1968 to 1991.

Historical, interview, and policy-related data collected in this study indicated that the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was influenced by a unique combination of regional education conditions, legislative initiatives, and key individuals in the field of supervision. These conditions led to the development of a program for the training of supervisors and research in the field of supervision that became a central focus of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and led to national recognition for the Department and members of its faculty.

**INDEX WORDS:** History of supervision, Instructional supervision, Jeans supervisors, Professors of supervision, Supervision in Georgia schools, Training of supervisors in Georgia, Georgia History

A HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND SUPERVISION  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA 1968-1991

by

MELVIN E. HUNT

B.S. Ed., Georgia State University, 1978

M.Ed., University of Georgia, 1985

Ed. S., University of Georgia, 1991

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2008

© 2008

Melvin E. Hunt

All Rights Reserved

A HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND SUPERVISION  
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA 1968-1991

by

MELVIN E. HUNT

Major Professor: Sally J. Zepeda

Committee: John Dayton  
William Wraga

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
December 2008

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, my colleague, and my friend, Dr. Karen Hunt. I met Karen when she was a professor at the University of Georgia. Karen has supported me with good advice and guidance over the four years of this study. She has endured multiple viewing of interview videos and listened to my incessant ramblings about the history of Georgia, and as an LSU graduate that was no easy task for her. She nursed me through a near fatal battle with heart failure and her love gave strength to that heart. This study is dedicated to the love of my life, Karen.

This dissertation is also dedicated to the memory of my late mother, Joyce Upchurch, who supported my education from first grade to graduate school. She knew how blessed I was when I met Karen. I wish she could be here for the completion of this degree, but I have faith she knows.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have made a contribution to this study. The seed of this study was planted in 1987 when I was a doctoral student and graduate assistant in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. I had completed my comprehensive finals, so my major professor Dr. Gerald Firth suggested I write a history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision that was approaching its' twentieth anniversary in 1988.

Dr. Firth arranged for me to conduct an interview with Dr. Johnnye V. Cox at her home in Athens. I spent an afternoon listening to Dr. Cox describe her experiences from her time at the State Normal School in Athens as a young woman: her training to become a supervisor at South Georgia Teachers College in 1937; her retirement from the University of Georgia in 1972 and her thoughts regarding supervision. I conducted some research at that time, but a series of career opportunities prompted me to change my degree objective and receive an Ed.S. in Instructional Supervision.

I must acknowledge with gratitude Dr. Firth for his original guidance toward a topic that I would eventually appreciate and complete. I also must acknowledge Dr. Johnnye V. Cox for the courtesy and hospitality I was shown. Her enthusiasm for supervision and the rich tradition of supervision in Georgia served as an inspiration in this over-due fulfillment of my doctoral dream.

I would like to acknowledge the four participants of this study for their involvement. Dr. Ray Bruce, Dr. Gerald Firth, Dr. Edith Grimsley, and Dr. Virginia Macagnoni were my original influences in curriculum and supervision and made this study a pleasure for this researcher. These participants contributed their time and knowledge to this study, and each encouraged me

from the beginning. They allowed me access to their personal collection of papers and publications that helped to enrich my understanding of this period of history for the University of Georgia and for the field of instructional supervision.

I also wish to acknowledge my committee for their support and patience granted me during my return to the University of Georgia to fulfill this lifelong dream. A special thanks to former committee member, Dr. Thomas Holmes, who encouraged me to return to the University and complete my degree. Dr. John Dayton, Dr. Bill Wraga, and Dr. Sally Zepeda have all been advocates as I persuaded this degree. Each member has demonstrated total support for every aspect of my work at the University. I acknowledge most, the contributions of my major professor, Dr. Sally Zepeda.

Dr. Zepeda suggested this topic after I had a near fatal bout with heart failure. She had no knowledge of my previous connection to the topic; she simply felt it was a topic that was worthy and important to the University and to supervision. A strong theological conviction rooted in my Southern Methodist background is: *Everything happens for a reason*. Dr. Sally Zepeda has confirmed that belief. I truly believe her being at this place and at this time is more than a coincidence.

I must acknowledge that Dr. Zepeda was not only the ideal major professor for *this* study, but she provides all of her students with hours of direct individual support and direction. I spent numerous all-day sessions at her dining room table editing and refining this study. Dr. Zepeda felt that the participants in this study deserved my best effort and she encouraged me to make that effort. Dr. Sally Zepeda continues the University of Georgia's rich tradition in the field on instructional supervision. Her willingness to attach her name to this study is a great honor. Thank you Dr. Zepeda!



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	xi
CHAPTER	
1 OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Background of the Study .....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Methods and Procedures .....	8
Policy Analysis: Interpretive Framework.....	11
Significance of the Study .....	13
Assumptions of the Study.....	14
Organization of the Study.....	15
2 TRENDS, ISSUES AND THEORY DEVELOPMENT IN SUPERVISION IN THE UNITED STATES (1600-1991) .....	17
Introduction .....	17
Trends and Issues in Supervision .....	17
Theory Development in Supervision.....	29
Supervision of Instruction: Theory into Practice .....	50
Chapter Summary.....	52

3	RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	54
	Introduction .....	54
	Purpose of the study .....	54
	Research Questions .....	55
	Role of the Researcher .....	56
	Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives.....	57
	Data Collection.....	60
	Data Analysis .....	65
	Policy Analysis: Interpretive Framework.....	72
	Validity and Reliability .....	74
	Assumptions of the Study.....	78
	Limitations of the Study .....	78
	Chapter Summary.....	79
4	PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY .....	80
	Introduction .....	80
	Dr. Ray Bruce.....	81
	Dr. Gerald Firth .....	89
	Dr. Edith Grimsley .....	96
	Dr. Virginia Macagnoni .....	105
	Chapter Summary.....	109
5	HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND SUPERVISION .....	111
	Introduction .....	111

	Background of Education in Georgia: 1777 to 1932.....	112
	Background of Education in Georgia: 1933 to 1968.....	122
	Chapter Summary.....	138
6	FORMATION AND OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND SUPERVISION 1968 TO 1991 .....	140
	Introduction .....	140
	The Formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision .....	141
	Select Activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.....	148
	The Merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and the Department of Educational Administration .....	172
	Chapter Summary.....	179
7	ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS.....	181
	Introduction .....	181
	The Kingdon Multiple Streams Model.....	183
	Policy Analysis.....	185
	Policy Analysis Summary .....	212
	Conclusions and Implications .....	215
	REFERENCES .....	220
	APPENDICES .....	231
A	Dr. Lucian Wootton’s Call September 1, 1993.....	231
B	The Johnnye V. Cox Lecture September 27, 1972.....	232
C	First Set of Interview Questions 2005 .....	248
D	Second Set of Interview Questions 2006.....	249

E	Third Set of Interview Questions Dr. Bruce and Dr. Grimsley 10/6/2007 .....	250
F	Third Set of Interview Questions Dr. Firth 10/23/2007 .....	251

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1: Models of Supervision in Schools .....	26
Table 2.2: Framework for Examining Theories of Educational Supervision Based on Human Interactions and Utilization of Human Resources.....	31
Table 3.1: Historical Documents and Artifacts.....	61
Table 3.2: Examples of Interview Questions.....	64
Table 7.1: First Free School Movement: 1777 to 1857 .....	189
Table 7.2: Second Free School Movement: 1857 to 1861 .....	191
Table 7.3: Post Civil War Reforms: 1865 to 1912.....	198
Table 7.4: Instructional Improvement Reforms 1912 to 1945.....	204
Table 7.5: School Improvement Reforms 1945-1991.....	211

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY**

#### Introduction

Dr. Lutian R. Wootton (1916-1996) left a series of documents describing historical events, people, and activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia (Wootton, 1969, 1977, 1993, 1994). In a 1993 memorandum to the faculty accompanying working drafts of a history and chronology of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, Dr. Wootton (1994) wrote:

It is hoped that persons of similar interests and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture as possible. (Appendix A)

In this study, the researcher sought to document and to explain the events described by Dr. Wootton in the development and existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1968-1991) within the context of national and state trends in educational policy and politics. Additional contextual elements that were important included issues, philosophies, and trends in supervision that had effects on instruction, faculty views and activities, as well as program focus during 1968-1991.

Data collection in this study included examining intentional and unpremeditated documents relevant to the development, operation, and restructuring of the department as well as interviewing Wootton's colleagues who were members of the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision during the time frame (1968-1991) commensurate with Wootton's

descriptive papers. National trends and policies in education were gathered through the review of historical and government documents. Trends in the area of supervision were gleaned from a review of research, literature, and minutes and publications of professional organizations.

A review of the literature revealed that there have been many studies and a number of handbooks and texts authored by individual professors of instructional supervision espousing different models, focal points, approaches, procedures, and theoretical and philosophical beliefs about the nature of supervision (e.g., Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1981; Blumberg, 1980; Cogan, 1973; Glanz & Neville, 1997; Glatthorn, 1984, 1997; Glickman, 1985, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969; Harris, 1975; Pajak, 1993; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Zepeda, 2003). Some of these texts and handbooks include brief histories of the field of supervision. This study unlike others, sought to view a period of the history of supervision (1968-1991) and to align perspectives with those of faculty within the context of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.

This study nested the activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the context of trends and issues in supervision as well as within the arenas of state and national politics and policies in education. This study was important because during the time period 1968 to 1991 the University of Georgia was unique in housing the instructional supervision and educational administration programs in separate departments. In addition, this time period (1968-1991) was characterized by sweeping educational reforms at the national and state levels, changing populations of students in public schools, and changes in the field of supervision. This study was of further significance in that the faculty participants were considered “trailblazers” in the field of supervision during the time of the existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

## Background of the Study

Lutian Wootton authored four documents outlining the history of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. These documents are housed along with some of his personal papers in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy at the University of Georgia. Dr. Wootton, founding chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching that later became the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, served as chairman of the department until 1969. Wootton's first document is a 1969 history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The second document is a narrative history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision spanning the department's status within the College of Education from 1968 to 1977. His final two documents, considered drafts (1993, 1994), include both a narrative history of the department and a chronology of persons, concepts, and activities particularly associated with the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1937-1991 (Wootton, L., personal communication to faculty, September 1, 1993).

To understand Wootton's works, this study documents and explains departmental activities with a focus on perspectives of nationally known faculty who were in the College of Education during the time in which the Department of Curriculum and Supervision existed at the University of Georgia. It was in 1991 that the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was reconstituted and merged with the Department of Educational Administration forming the Department of Educational Leadership which was in 2000 put into receivership and made into a program area.

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia was first established in 1966 as the Department of Curriculum and Teaching and then officially became the Department of Curriculum and Supervision on July 1, 1968 (Wootton, 1969). The foundation



for this department began in June, 1960, under Dean John A. Dotson who established a six-member curriculum study committee. The need for this committee was in part a response to the loss of the College of Education's Demonstration School and the perceived need by faculty to have curriculum viewed as a whole, not as an element of a specific content area. This committee's work before it was disbanded in 1961 served to spark interest in various projects in the college, including conducting a survey of various undergraduate teacher education preparation programs and their curriculums throughout the country. Findings from this study provided "some comparative basis for consideration in modification of offerings in curriculum at the University of Georgia" (Wootton, 1969, p. 5).

In 1966, the Division of Instruction was reorganized to merge the separate departments of Science Education, Mathematics Education, English Education, and Social Studies Education. Undergraduate and graduate courses in curriculum along with certain responsibilities for supervising student teaching that had previously been housed in the separate departments were assigned to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, established on July 1, 1966. Dr. Lutian Wootton was appointed by the dean as chair of the new department.

In the fall of 1967, a new doctoral program in Curriculum and Teaching was approved, nine new faculty members were added, and the first doctoral students were admitted in the winter quarter of 1968. The next major change in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching was the moving of supervision from the Department of Administration and Supervision on July 1, 1968. The Department of Curriculum and Teaching became the Department of Curriculum and Supervision as a result of that move, and three faculty members and a series of supervision courses were added to the new department (Wootton, 1993, 1994).

To fully understand the development and changes in the life of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, one must look historically at the context of politics, policy, and educational changes in the nation, the state of Georgia, the University of Georgia, and the College of Education prior to and during the same time frame (1968-1991) that the department existed. In addition, understanding the parallel changing trends and issues in supervision during the same time period served to inform analysis of faculty participants' perspectives of events leading to the development and existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

The trends and issues in supervision history described in Chapter 2 span the time period from the early inception of supervision as "inspection" in the 1600s through the development and use of clinical and other models of supervision into the early 1990s. Since this study was a history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and only spans the time frame of its existence (1968-1991), it was deemed necessary to capture events, trends, and issues before and during the existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. This study focused on the particular trends in supervision during that time frame to explain the context and perspectives of the departmental faculty participants in this study and how these trends might have been integrated into their work and the work of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

It is important to mention here that the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was eventually merged in 1991 with the Department of Administration to become the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia. Historically, however, there have always been tensions between the two fields of administration and supervision, and supervision has often become separated from the field of administration (Glanz, 1998; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Wiles & Bondi, 1996). Such tensions may have been the result of early conceptions of

supervision as inspection where the primary emphasis was administrative and in many early works, supervision was referred to as “administrative supervision” (Glanz, 1998).

The field of instructional supervision has sought to establish itself as a profession; however, supervision “in schools has a history of being misunderstood and devalued, having been beset by problems of definition and purpose” (Hazi & Glanz, 1997, p. 3). Many educators in the field of supervision have debated definitions of the profession, and many have maintained that supervision was concerned with instruction, not administration (Daresh, 1989; Dull, 1981; Lucio & McNeil, 1969). In fact, the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction (DSDI), the national professional organization of supervisors, merged with The Society for Curriculum Study (SCS), the national professional curriculum organization in 1943. This merger was an organizational effort to align supervision with instruction. The merged organization became the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development (DSCD), and three years later the name was changed to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) (Davis, Jr., 1978; Glanz, 1998).

This historical study of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia served to illustrate trends and issues in supervision in one state, Georgia. The issues and trends were defined by the context of historical events, politics, and policy issues in the state and nation.

The historical events, politics, and polices examined in this study were described and documented using historical documents and interview data. A major focus of the study was the development of a program for the training of supervisors established at South Georgia Teachers College in 1937 under the direction of Dr. Marvin Pittman and Jane Franseth and moved to the University of Georgia in 1939. This program became the central focus of the Department of

Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia in 1968. This supervision program was a key factor in the Department's rise to national prominence and the recognition of its faculty as trail blazers in the field of supervision.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and document the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia spanning the years 1968 to 1991. The study was designed to review a variety of historical and legal documents to obtain important information about the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and its eventual merger with the Department of Educational Administration. Also important in data collection were interviews with four key educational professors who were on faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the time of its development and existence prior to its merger with the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Georgia.

Of interest were each participant's perspectives of political, social, and conceptual shifts in instructional supervision at the University of Georgia as the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was formed in 1968 and was merged in 1991 with the Department of Educational Administration (Wootton, 1994). The perspectives of the participants were also compared to national focal points and trends in supervision obtained through a review of the literature and professional supervision organizational activities and documents during this 24 year period.

The study's focus and research design was influenced by:

1. The suggestions by Lutian Wootton, first department chair, that interested parties expand on his preliminary work by providing perspectives on the history of the

Department of Curriculum and Supervision from the time of formation in 1968 until the merger with the Department of Educational Administration in 1991.

2. The importance of documenting a history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision for the College of Education at the University of Georgia.
3. The researcher's own experience and interests in the field of supervision.

### Methods and Procedures

Historical and qualitative methods of research were employed in this study.

According to Kaestle (1988), "There is no single, definable method of inquiry [in historical research], and important historical generalizations are rarely beyond dispute. Rather they are the result of an interaction between fragmentary evidence and the values and experiences of the historian" (p. 61). This study attempted to follow historical research trends in the history of American education to "see education as broader than schooling" and "in the context of social and economic development" (Kaestle, 1988, p. 71). Documents and artifacts that reflected educational, social, policy, and political issues and trends in the state of Georgia and the United States prior to and during the existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1968-1991) were selected for review in this study.

Reviews of intentional and unpremeditated documents, oral, and written records, were considered appropriate for the design of this study (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Gall et al. stated:

1. Oral records include the spoken word that preserves a record of events for posterity.

Some historians conduct oral interviews of individuals who witnessed or participated in events of potential historical significance. These interviews typically are recorded on audiotape and then transcribed to provide a written record. (pp. 353-354)

2. Intentional documents, such as memoirs are intentionally written to serve as a record of the past. Unpremeditated documents, such as memos are prepared to serve an immediate purpose, with no expectation that they might be used as a historical record at a later time.  
(p. 653)

Data collection procedures for artifacts and documents were designed to explore the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1968-1991).

1. Artifacts considered of historical value and important in providing insights into social, policy, and political contexts surrounding the professional activities of the department and faculty were collected and reviewed. Artifacts included Wootton's (1969, 1977, 1993, 1994) unpublished papers, selected yearbooks published by the Association for Curriculum and Staff Development (ASCD), selected programs from annual meetings of professional organizations in supervision such as ASCD, the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS), and the Georgia Association for Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS), the text of a speech delivered by Johnnye V. Cox (1972) at the annual meeting of GACIS with personal notes by Dr. Ray E. Bruce, and bulletins from the Georgia Department of Education.

Documents considered of historical value in explaining events in the national and state educational contexts and in the field of supervision prior to and during the time period of the existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were collected and reviewed.

Documents included histories of the state of Georgia, histories of the University of Georgia, histories of the College of Education at the University of Georgia, a history of Instructional Supervision in Georgia, a history of Jeanes Supervisors, Georgia Legislative documents, periodic yearbooks in administration and supervision with chapters on issues by experts in each field, text

books written by experts in the field of supervision, articles in professional journals written in the field of supervision, papers delivered at meetings of professional organizations such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Counsel of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS), and Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS).

Data collection in addition to artifact and document review, included semi-structured interviews with four former members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. These former members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision included Dr. Ray E. Bruce, Dr. Gerald R. Firth, Dr. Edith E. Grimsley, and Dr. Virginia M. Macagnoni.

Procedures for selection, data collection, and analysis are outlined as follows.

1. Purposeful, within case sampling (Kuzel, 1992; Patton, 1990) was chosen for the study as this type of sampling allowed for deliberate selection of individuals who participated in activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, the College of Education at the University of Georgia, and in the state of Georgia and nationally in the field of supervision. This type of sampling also allowed for choices of artifacts, documents, informants, conditions, and interactions to be based on conceptual questions, not representativeness (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Given that this is a historical study, “the primary concern is with the conditions under which the concept operates, not with the generalizations of the findings to other settings” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 29).
2. The participant faculty members’ accounts in this study were considered important primary sources. Semi-structured interviews of the participants in this study were analyzed using the constant comparison approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), though

grounded theory was not developed. The participants were tenure track professors in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia during the time period of 1968-1991. The participants were selected because they were considered “trailblazers” in the field of supervision at the national and state levels during the period of time of this study.

3. Each study participant was interviewed on two or three occasions. A semi-structured interview protocol was used to guide sets of interviews. The protocols for the first interviews were guided by 1) events and issues found in Wootton’s documents that might be better defined and explained, and 2) beliefs, events, trends, and policy issues in the field of supervision at the national and state levels. For subsequent interviews, protocols were developed from the analysis of the first set of interviews and further research on supervision.

Cautions about analysis and interpretations of data in historical research put forth by Kaestle (1988) and Marius and Page (2005) were considered in all phases (artifact review, document review, and interviews) of this study. Data included historical documents, artifacts, and interviews with the four participants. The researcher attempted to corroborate findings among all data sources. The researcher was careful not to confuse correlations and causes, but rather to define key concepts and terms in view of the situations in which they occurred (Marius & Page, 2005).

#### Policy Analysis: Interpretive Framework

The Kingdon Multiple Streams Model (Kingdon, 1984) was used to analyze and to interpret the changing contexts of educational policy in Georgia and its effects on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. This model was



selected because it provided the researcher a systematic design to organize historical events, politics, and policies for analysis and interpretation by time periods of educational reforms in Georgia from 1777 to 1991. The Kingdon Model

focuses on the flow and timing of policy action rather than on its component parts (and) is extremely useful in understanding the complexities of policy-making. In this model attention is focused on three streams, the problem stream, the political stream, and the policy stream which move independently through the policy system. It aims to explain why some issues and problems become prominent in the policy agenda and are eventually translated into concrete policies while others never do so. The model contradicts the rational approach to decision-making claiming that policies are not the product of rational actions, because policy actors rarely evaluate many alternatives for action and because they do not compare them systematically. (Kingdon, 2003, p. 1)

The model illustrates three complementary, but distinct streams or processes flowing through the system of policy agenda setting. It is the coupling of these streams in an opportune context and at an appropriate time, an open window, which allows for a particular issue to be translated into policy. Each process stream is mostly independent of each other and each develops according to its own dynamics and rules. But at some critical juncture the three streams are joined, and the greatest policy changes grow out of that coupling of problems, policy proposals, and politics (Kingdon, 2003).

The researcher used historical educational policy data (1777-1991) and, beginning with policy during the years of 1968-1991, personal accounts of four major professors in this study to illustrate contextual trends and major actors in Georgia education prior to and during the life of

the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Data were categorized across the various problem, process, and political streams for each time period examined.

The merging of issues, major events, and key actors leading to open windows which allowed the passage of various educational policies is described in a series of tables in Chapter 7. Of interest was the identification of precursor policy and enabling factors leading to the high visibility of involvement of department faculty members in development and implementation of supervision programs, in providing service to national and state professional organizations in supervision (e.g., COPIS, ASCD, GACIS), and in service to organizations in local school, national, and international arenas. Also of interest was the identification of precursor policy and enabling factors leading to the merger in 1991 of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to become the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia.

#### Significance of the Study

This study was significant in responding to Lutian R. Wootton's (1993) call for interested persons involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia to provide information to complete a picture of the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia (Appendix A). The study was also timely in an effort to obtain primary source data from the four department professors retired from the University of Georgia.

The study was significant to the University of Georgia and the College of Education's continued development, particularly in view of changes in the Program in Educational Leadership and in the newly formed Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy. In addition, this study was significant to the field of supervision in that it used four primary sources of data, retired professors who were considered trailblazers in the field, not only

at the University of Georgia, but at the local, state, and national levels as well. Thus, documenting a history of this revered effort at the University of Georgia would provide a rich national archive for those doing research in the field of instructional supervision.

#### Assumptions of the Study

The historical papers of Dr. Lutian Wootton (1969, 1977, 1993, 1994), the primary artifacts and genesis for this historical study, were assumed to be reasonably accurate in terms of events and dates related to the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. It is recognized that the content of these papers might have been affected by Dr. Wootton's perspectives, biases, and motivations as he recorded narratives of the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, its surrounding environment in the College of Education at the University of Georgia, and its merger in 1991 with the Department of Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership.

The researcher conducting this study held the following assumptions relative to the interviews conducted with the four former faculty members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

1. The social, political, and conceptual perspectives of participants represented their honest opinions and recollections concerning events preceding and following the merging of the Departments of Curriculum and Supervision and Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership.
2. The perspectives of participants were freely given.
3. The participants were able to communicate honestly with the researcher, as he was a student of supervision and worked and studied with each participant during the time prior to and following the merger of the two departments.

4. The collective experiences of the participants in this study are important to document the history of changes in these two departments for the University of Georgia.
5. The collective experiences of the participants in this study are important to document especially the contributions of faculty and programs to the national focus on developments in the field of supervision.

### Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 includes background information and a rationale for conducting a historical study of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. The study is conceptualized in the larger national context of the field of supervision during the time period spanning the life of the department (1968-1991). Methods and procedures used in the historical and qualitative research design are presented and assumptions of the study are provided.

Chapter 2 includes a review of the research literature to include theoretical models, conceptual approaches, policies and procedures, and trends and issues in supervision during the time period 1966-1991. Chapter 3 includes a description of the research design, methods and procedures for data collection and analysis used in the study. Chapter 4 includes biographical information, both personal and professional, for the four subjects of the study, as well as excerpts from the first round of interviews conducted in the study. The interview information in this chapter provides insight into the views of each subject regarding the field of supervision and their experiences in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

Chapter 5 is a description of historical events and individuals that were instrumental in the formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia in 1968. The history is told in two parts. The first section describes events in Georgia that influenced the fields of teacher education and supervision from 1777 to 1932. The second section

describes events in Georgia from 1933 to 1968 that influenced teacher education and supervision as well as lead directly to the establishment of the first program for the training of supervisors at South Georgia Teachers College. That program was established by Dr. Marvin Pittman, who completed the nation's first supervision dissertation in 1921, and later served as the President of South Georgia Teachers College beginning in 1933. This program was moved to the University of Georgia in 1939 and eventually would become a key component in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

Chapter 6 is a description of the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia from the department's formation in 1968 to the department's merger with the Department of Educational Administration in 1991 to form the Department of Educational Leadership. The chapter also explains various events described in Dr. Lutian Wootton's original narratives along with educational legislation in Georgia that impacted the operations of the department. The interviews of the four former members of the department are used to give insight into the details of the various events described. Themes emerged in the text of interviews that guided the researcher's inquiry into the department's operations.

Chapter 7 includes a theoretical interpretive policy analysis of various Georgia education policies, events and key people and their interactions prior to and during the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision that directly or indirectly impacted the operations of the department. Kingdon's Multiple Streams Model (1984) is used as an interpretive framework for the policy analysis. The primary source data provided by the former faculty participants in the study was used to explain the impact of problems, policy and politics on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

**CHAPTER 2**  
**TRENDS, ISSUES, AND THEORY DEVELOPMENT**  
**IN SUPERVISION IN THE UNITED STATES**  
**(1600-1991)**

Introduction

This review of the evolution of supervision is presented chronologically and anchored conceptually in research and the practice aspired by noted theorists. Trends in supervision are outlined chronologically, followed by an examination of theoretical and conceptual models of supervision. Both sections serve to illustrate national, state, and local contextual factors that influenced the development, beliefs, and activities of key supervision faculty in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Trends indentified in this review were used to establish context in terms of problem, policy and political streams, as defined by Kingdon (2004), and used for the interpretive policy analysis described in Chapter 7.

Trends and Issues in Supervision

The history of supervision of teachers can be traced to the 1600s in American schools. In 1642, the first Massachusetts School Law “requiring parents to attend to their child’s ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the laws of the Commonwealth” (Duffy, 1998, p. 182). In 1647, the “Ye Olde Deluder Satan Law,” (Duffy, 1998) was enacted marking the beginning of the development of supervision which lasted until after the Civil War in 1865 (Daresh, 1989; Daresh & Plako, 1995; Zepeda, 2007).

### *Supervision and Teacher Inspection*

During the 1600s through early 1800s, teachers were generally viewed as lacking basic competency and in need of oversight (Wiles & Bondi, 1996). As the purview of education changed from religious to secular control, supervisors changed from ordained ministers or elders to committees of laymen at the county level not associated with any particular religious group. These supervisors were viewed as “friends of education” (Dwight, 1835, p. 21). Though supervision was viewed as “inspection,” the process involved visitation and careful examination to determine the merits of teachers and to provide some positive reinforcements directed toward improvement. In 1864, however, supervisors were no longer viewed as friends of education but, similar to the corporate world, as caretakers to guide behavior toward outcomes predictable in organizations (Wickerman, 1864; Wiles & Bondi, 1996).

One benchmark of notable influence on the formal supervision of teachers was the book *Chapters on School Supervision* (Payne, 1895). In Payne’s book, the Michigan School Superintendent stressed the need for the county to monitor and oversee curriculum. Particularly important during the late 19th and early 20th centuries was using objectivity in evaluating teacher performance and student achievement (Bolin, 1987; Pajak, 1993)

### *Supervision and Scientific Management*

During the early 20th century, ideas of industrial logic and the cult of efficiency began to dominate the workforce and began to affect education (Glanz, 1990; Pajak, 1993). Following the Civil War and World War I, supervisors in education were viewed as experts on the improvement of instruction and were expected to facilitate organizational efficiency, particularly as a result of the publishing of Taylor’s (1916) book, *Principles of Scientific Management*, for the corporate world. Principles borrowed from Taylor’s work and applied to education included

the 1) establishment and enforcement of one best way of accomplishing a task, 2) separation of planning from work, and 3) linking pay directly to performance (Daresh, 1989; Duffy, 1998). Thus, the theme of supervision in schools changed from that of “inspection” for maintaining quality to that of supervision as a “science” (Lucio & McNeil, 1969; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Though elements of inspection could be noted in the new theme, this scientific conception of supervision demanded a more behavioral approach based on the tenant that behaviors predicted outcomes in organizations. Once supervision was thought of as a science (1910-1930), it became an expert-based activity, although it was immersed in the bureaucratic structure of school systems (Dull, 1981; Harris, 1975; Wiles & Bondi, 1996).

In 1914, E. C. Eliot observed that “Supervisory control is concerned with what should be taught, when it should be taught, to whom, how, and to what purpose” (p. 23). Supervisors were responsible for planning the most efficient and cost-effective ways of achieving school organizational goals (Daresh, 1989; Harris, 1975). School districts began hiring both business managers and instructional supervisors. Prior to the decades of the 1920s and 1930s, school systems required that the supervisor’s duties include elements of both tasks. These two positions were at equal levels in the district’s organizational structure, and the combination increased organizational complexity. The position of superintendent of schools responsible for oversight of both business and instruction began to appear in many large school districts (Daresh, 1989; Duffy, 1998; Wiles & Bondi, 1996).

### *Supervision and Instruction*

By the 1920s, the period of specialization in supervision had begun, and the term “Instructional Supervision” began to appear in education (Harris, 1975). Practices of top down control were fading, and supervision was rapidly being viewed as separate from administration



(Glanz & Neville, 1997; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Instructional supervision was viewed as an area of expertise that was decentralized and cooperative and seen as a democratic function of education, whereas administration was concerned with efficiency and centralization of administrative power (Harris, 1975; Pajak, 1993). For example, Bruce and Grimsley (1987) indicated:

Most writers in the field of supervision agree that the primary focus in educational supervision is – and should be – the improvement of teaching and learning. The term instructional supervision is widely used in the literature to embody efforts to those ends. (p. 129)

Also emerging during this time was the recognition of supervision as a theory –based discipline, separate from administration. Concepts forming the nature of supervision were derived from a wide range of theoretical bases developed through research in teaching and learning and in other areas such as psychology and sociology (Oliva, 1984). Other conceptual bases for views of supervision were derived from practice and research in studies of organizational behavior (Glickman, 1990; Hoy & Miskel, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1984). Thus, theories of supervision in schools were developed from a combination of theoretical constructs across multiple disciplines that had evolved from both research and practice (Wiles & Bondi, 1980). One example of this process is Hertzberg’s (1966) expansion of Maslow’s (1954) Theory of Human Motivation. Hertzberg applied the basic constructs of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs to explain human behavior in organizations. Similarly, Glickman (1990) applied elements of both Maslow’s and Hertzberg’s prior work to construct a teacher-centered developmental model of supervision.

### *Supervision and Human Relations Ideology*

Since supervisors were considered experts and they worked with teachers, it became evident that expertise beyond simple content knowledge and knowledge of pedagogy was required to make the supervisor/teacher relationship more meaningful (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Thus, the view of supervision grounded in “human relations” emerged as a trend. Instructional supervisors were expected to stimulate and to encourage teachers with instructional effectiveness as an expected outcome. Commensurate with the human relations ideology, in 1930, the National Education Association (NEA) stated its philosophy of supervision in this way:

Supervision is a creative enterprise. It has for its objective the development of a group of professional workers who attack their problems scientifically, free from control of tradition and actuated by the spirit of inquiry. Supervision seeks to improve an environment in which men and women of high professional ideals may live a vigorous, intelligent, creative life. (p. 47)

This new philosophy reflected an emphasis on democratic processes in school organizations, rather than on top down management or power and control issues present in the earlier scientific management orientation to instructional supervision.

### *Supervision and Democratic Processes*

With the advent of John Dewey’s (1910, 1929) ideas of combining democracy with scientific thinking and reflective inquiry to guide practices in education, the field of supervision began to change considerably from the prior framing influence of scientific management. Conscious reasoning and cooperative problem-solving became the guiding principles of supervision (Glanz, 1992). A benchmark text, *Supervision* (Barr, Burton & Brueckner, 1938), was published with the intent of replacing the old concept of supervisor as “inspector” with the

new concept of the supervisor as a responsible leader who used scientific reasoning and experimentation for enlightenment and direction. Thus, a new notion of democratic supervision began to emerge. Pajak (1993) reported, “Democratic supervision recognized the worth of individuals, emphasized flexibility in organization, free participation by all, and pursuit of the common good” (p. 4).

### *Supervision and Curriculum*

During the 1930s, the field of supervision began to align itself with curriculum development. The NEA formed a Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction. Many of the publications of the department emphasized involvement of teachers in decisions related to instruction, group deliberations, and experimentation for solving problems. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) was formed from the NEA Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction in 1943.

During the 1940s through the 1960s, human relations supervision combined with the democratic approach dominated the field of supervision (Duffy, 1998; Wiles, 1967; Wiles & Bondi, 1996). Leaders promoted cooperative problem solving and personal development of those they led. The purpose of supervision was to promote democracy among students and teachers. Pajak (1993) stated that “Democracy is action oriented with individuals joining their energies in pursuit of intelligent solutions through problem-centered groups” (p. 4). In the 1950s and 1960s, the trends in supervision reflected the beliefs that all individuals and groups in the school and community have leadership potential and that all should work toward common goals of making schools, homes, and communities, better places to live.

### *Supervision and Group Processes*

During the 1950s and 1960s, ASCD's (1951, 1960) definition of leadership included the concept that leadership emerged from within the group to meet challenges and that supervision was a process that facilitated the emergence of leadership in others. Based on studies by Bales (1953), the organization concluded that collegial adult groups have been shown to produce higher performance outcomes than individuals. The two dimensions of group behavior identified by Bales, the task dimension and the personal dimension, seemed particularly applicable to groups in school organizations. Tasks included the purpose for the group meeting, for example, selecting new textbooks, setting up schedules, deciding on dress codes, and so on. The personal dimension included the interpersonal processes and the satisfaction that group members felt from working with each other. Both dimensions may be facilitated by the supervisor and were deemed necessary for the group to be productive (Glickman, 1990; Little, 1990). Group production was seen as an effective way to enhance teacher professionalism, learning, and change in school organizations. Little (1990) noted that in successful schools "teachers engage in frequent, continuous, and increasingly concrete and precise talk about teaching practice, creating a shared language that is characteristic of the profession" (p.31).

Group processes in schools were seen to be facilitated by a leader or supervisor, and both the personal and task dimensions of such processes needed to be functional for the school to be successful. Interpersonal dimensions of the process were relatively stable, though the tasks of professional groups in schools became increasingly more complex as the era of educational reform began with *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). In response to public concern about education, policymakers at the state and national levels passed multiple, comprehensive legislation aimed at

improving education. Implementation of these well-meaning policies began to influence school environments and shaped research in education, particularly stakeholder involvement in school improvement (Bickel & Artz, 1987; Glattorn & Newberg, 1984).

### *Supervision and Change Agency*

The period between the mid-1950s through the 1970s was characterized as a period of change and reform in schools and thus views of supervision as “change agency” and supervisors as the “change agents” in schools developed (Zepeda, 2003). As a result of the 1957 launch of the Soviet Sputnik, changes in views of education as an instrument of social policy and as a means of gaining superiority in technology began to emerge. The federal government’s appropriation of federal money to education to fund projects such as Operation Head Start and Vocational Education and policies such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the War on Poverty, and laws affecting racial integration of schools served collectively to increase federal involvement in schools (Wiles & Bondi, 1996). Innovations such as the new math, team teaching, the use of audiovisual equipment, bilingual education, and open classrooms characterized school environments in the late 1960s and 1970s (Daresh, 1989; Pajak, 1993).

Along with increasing size and complexity of schools came the expectation for supervisors to devote more time to organizational goals, long-range planning, and change strategies (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1981). In addition, collective bargaining for teachers in many states usurped supervisors’ traditional tools of group planning and problem solving as promoted in the earlier democratic trend. Teachers’ job-related duties were negotiated and outlined in contracts. All other activities beyond those in such contracts could not be legally required by supervisors. Decisions regarding curriculum and instruction were also redefined as

conditions of employment and limited the scope of change in schools (Pajak, 1993; Pajak & Arrington, 2004).

Supervisors as “change agents,” rather than encouraging prior valued democratic processes, were more concerned with convincing others that a new course of action was better than existing conditions (McCoy, 1961). Supervisors were expected to clarify their positions and share objectives with teachers only after the supervisors themselves had identified problems. Supervisors then established priorities and decided where and how interventions or innovations would be introduced into the classroom for the teacher (Cunningham, 1963). Teachers were not seen as sources of creative ideas and solutions, but as problems of resistance that had to be overcome (Toepfer, 1973). The supervisor’s duty was to keep teachers informed so that they understood the rationale for the change and how implementation would occur. This trend changed views of the instructional nature of supervision to include a more organizational rather than an individual (teacher) focus. In an attempt to adjust the focus back to the individual and instruction, many researchers in the field of supervision began to develop models for supervision that captured nationwide attention.

### *Clinical Models of Supervision*

During the 1960s through the early 1990s, four families of clinical supervision emerged to help preserve traditional values of supervision in the new educational environment created by widespread reforms and federal involvement in education (Table 2.1). Clinical supervision models refocused supervision’s legacy of democracy, cooperative planning, problem solving, and action research on classroom events and processes (Oliva, 1984; Pajak, 1993; Pajak & Arrington, 2004; Wiles & Bondi, 1996; Zepeda, 2003, 2007).

Table 2.1

*Models of Supervision in Schools*

<b>Model/Family</b>	<b>Year(s) Developed</b>	<b>Theorist(s)</b>	<b>Overview</b>
Original Clinical Supervision Models	1960's 1970s	Cogan Goldhammer Mosier & Purpel	<u>Purpose:</u> Collegiality, Mutual Discovery of Learning <u>Processes:</u> 6 Stages Clarify, Plan, Observe, Analyze, Conference, & Evaluate
Humanistic and Artistic Models	Mid 1970s- Early 1980s	Blumberg Eisner	<u>Purpose:</u> Positive, Productive Interpersonal Relationships <u>Processes:</u> Holistic Understanding of Classroom Events
Prescriptive and Behavioral Models (Continued)		Hunter Joyce & Showers	<u>Processes:</u> Emphasis on Effective Teaching Behaviors Supervision and Teaching Linked to Organization  <u>Purpose:</u> Teacher Cognitive Development, Introspection, Context- Specific Principles of Practice <u>Processes:</u> Peer Coaching, Reflection, Developmental and Differentiated Learning Processes
Developmental and Differentiated Supervision Models	Mid 1980s- Early 1990s	Bowers & Flinders Costa & Garmston Garman Glatthorn Glickman Pajak Nolan & Francis Schön Sergiovanni & Starratt Smyth Wiles & Bondi Zepeda	

Clinical supervision processes were developed by Morris Cogan at Harvard in the mid-1950s for supervising student teachers (Pajak, 1993; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). The original clinical supervision models were built on psychological theory and field tested. The early processes of clinical supervision involved a six-phase process; (1) Clarifying the supervisory relationship, (2) Planning, (3) Observing, (4) Analyzing, (5) Conferencing, and (6) Evaluating (Zepeda, 2003). A classroom observation was accompanied by a pre-observation and a post observation conference. The emergence of the clinical processes marked a departure from prior models of supervision as inspection and single classroom observations to multi-processes in which supervisors could work with teachers in cycles throughout an extended period (Zepeda, 2003).

The original clinical models (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969; Mosher & Purpel, 1972) emerged in the field of supervision from the 1960s to the early 1970s. Their focus was on promoting collegiality and mutual discovery of learning. Humanistic and artistic models, emerging in the mid-70s to early 1980s, were based on positive and productive interpersonal relationships between supervisors and teachers (Blumberg, 1980; Eisner, 1984). The focus of supervision in these models was the holistic understanding of classroom events and the teacher's work in the classroom environment.

Prescriptive and behavioral models (Acheson & Gall, 1987, 2003; Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1981; Hunter 1986; Joyce & Showers, 1982) emerged in the early to mid-1980s, in response to the national reform in education reports such as *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), research in teaching and resulting prescriptions for teacher behaviors and effectiveness, and comprehensive educational reform endeavors such as the retooling of math and science curricula funded by the



National Science Foundation (Wiles & Bondi, 1996). The prescriptive and behavioral models of supervision emphasized effective teaching strategies and techniques, and these models tied supervision and teaching to organizational expectations and effectiveness (Pajak, 1993).

Parallel to the development of technical and didactic models of supervision were state policies such as the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG) (1974) and the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) (1984), also in Georgia, whose purposes were to regulate school effectiveness largely through the supervision and evaluation of all teachers. Large scale teacher evaluation programs, greatly affecting the role of supervisors and the supervision process in schools, began to appear as a response to similar state omnibus education policies in many states, particularly in the southeastern United States (Loup, Garland, Ellett, & Rugut, 1996).

From the mid-1980s and early 1990s, the focus of teaching changed to accommodate new innovations such as creating constructivist learning environments for students, emphasizing the use of multiple intelligences in classroom teaching and learning, and using authentic assessment and reflective processes rather than traditional testing as a means to assess learning more closely (Nolan & Francis, 1992; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). Similarly, clinical models of supervision during this time focused on teacher cognitive development, introspection, differentiation, and discovery of context-specific principles of practice (Bowers & Flinders, 1991; Costa & Garmston, 1985; Garman, 1986; Glatthorn, 1984; Glickman, 1985, 1990, 1988; Smyth, 1988). Within this context, supervisory practices reflected the importance of teacher involvement in processes such as peer coaching, differentiated supervision, and developmental supervision, (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998; Joyce & Showers, 1982; Pajak, 1993, Pajak & Arrington, 2004; Wiles & Bondi, 1996; Zepeda, 2003, 2007).

The trends and issues in supervision history described in the preceding section span the time period from the early inception of supervision as “inspection” in the 1600s through the development and use of clinical and other models of supervision into the early 1990s. In the next section, theory development in the field of supervision was discussed separately but should be recognized as having been parallel to trends and issues during the same time periods.

### Theory Development in Supervision

Supervision theory in educational organizations has been derived from epistemological bases such as relativism and behaviorism in perceptive psychology which were used to explain human behavior in society. Multiple fields of study concerned with human behavior in organizations began to emerge with production studies in factories. Explanations and models of individual and group behavior in school organizations emerged from the scientific management paradigm used in factories and have expanded it to include communications theory, change theory, human relations theory, learning theory, leadership theory, and organizational theory.

*Wiles and Bondi (1980)*

Wiles and Bondi (1980) believed that as philosophies of supervision began to emerge in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, more effective supervisors had fully examined and arranged their assumptions about the process of supervision in schools, and they arranged them into a coherent series of generalizations which formed the beginnings of a theory of educational supervision. The process of theory development included compilation of collective ideas, experiences, feelings, and perceptions of each individual supervisor to form a core of assumptions that first served as a guide for supervisory behaviors. When these assumptions were formally stated as generalizations, theory began to emerge. According to Wiles and Bondi (1980), “Theories of educational supervision were based on at least four kinds of assumptions about (1) the nature of

people, (2) the relationship between people and organizations, (3) the uniqueness of school organizations, and (4) what schools can become because of people” (pp. 257-258).

Wiles and Bondi (1980), in addition to examining approaches to supervision in education during this time period, proposed that three supervisory approaches were beginning to emerge. The three approaches were based on different assumptions about the nature of people, the relationship of people to the school organization, and the uniqueness of contexts and outcomes of school organizations. The three approaches (Table 2.2) provide a framework that is helpful in examining theories of educational supervision by incorporating views of human interactions in school settings and effective use of human resources. The three approaches, Type I: Designer/Manager, Type II: Linker/Coordinator, and Type III: Helper/Therapist, can be placed on a continuum from high organizational emphasis (Type I) to high individual emphasis (Type III). Basic descriptions of each type differ in supervisory focus, tools, techniques, and strategies. For example, the designer/manager’s (Type I) supervisory focus is on organizational planning and execution, whereas the linker/coordinator’s (Type II) focus is on integrating people and resources. Type II helper/therapist’s supervisory focus is fixed on assisting the person in individual growth and development within the organization. Similarly, supervisory tools used in each approach vary according to each focus from short and long-term planning, budget control, and performance evaluation used in Type I to need hierarchies, motivation theories, and development profiles used in Type III. Techniques and strategies vary from the use of Program Evaluation and Review Techniques (PERT) charts and systems management tools for Type I to the use of diagnostic, assessment and transformation tools to refine organizational processes through inquiry and involvement for Type II, and manipulating climates, counseling, and an emphasis on upgrading of individuals (parts) to improve the school (whole) for Type III. Such

attempts at comparisons of perspectives of supervision in school organizations led to development of competing definitions and much research and inquiry, both practically and theoretically grounded, into the functions of schools as organizations (Wiles & Bondi, 1980, 1996).

Table 2.2

*Frameworks for Examining Theories of Educational Supervision Based on Human Interactions and Utilization of Human Resources*

<b>Approach to Supervision</b>	<b>Supervisory Focus</b>	<b>Supervisory Tools</b>	<b>Techniques/ Strategies Used</b>	<b>Organizational/ Individual Emphasis</b>
Type I Designer/Manager	Organizational Planning and Execution	Short and Long Term Planning  Budget Control  Performance Evaluation	Systems Management  PERT Charts  Control of Resources & Plans	High Organizational Emphasis
Type II Linker/Coordinator	Integrating People and Resources	Assessment of Organizational Processes	Organization Development  Diagnosis, Assessment & Transformation of Organizational Processes	Organizational and Individual Shared Emphasis
Type III Helper/Therapist	Assisting the Person in Individual Growth Within the Organization	Need Hierarchies  Motivation Theories  Development Profiles	Structuring Perceptions, Manipulating Climates, Counseling  Upgrading of Parts Contributes to Improvement of Whole	High Individual Emphasis

Adapted from *Supervision* (Wiles & Bondi, 1980)

### *Organizational Theory and Supervision in Schools*

Lucio and McNeil's (1969) research on schools was considered one of the broadest bases of interpretation of organizational theory and supervision in educational environments during that decade. The researchers contended that supervision was clearly an organizational process and a "distributive function which holders of various positions discharge in different ways" (p. 46).

Positions involved in supervisory activities in schools included, teachers, principals, consultants, coordinators, directors, and superintendents. The three common functions of all positions were to; (1) propose desirable ends or results to be attained, (2) develop programs and procedures that promise to produce the results desired, and (3) assess whether the desired results actually are obtained from the procedures followed. Thus, for Lucio and McNeil (1969), the common dimension of supervision found in all positions of leadership was the "ability to perceive desired objectives, to help others contribute to this vision, and to act in accordance with this vision" (Lucio & McNeil, 1969, p. 21).

Within the organization, certain supervisory positions responsible for articulation and designated by the system were charged with being able to bring the distributed supervisory tasks together so that intelligent decision making by those in higher administration was possible. Through the use of these positions in supervisory functions, a two-way communication link with teachers could be created. Lucio and McNeil (1969) maintained that central office consultants most often performed these articulation functions.

Lucio and McNeil's (1969) work on supervision was predicated on the assumption that schools were becoming more increasingly complex organizations and on the belief that the growth of school organizations required more supervision. The authors believed that "defining

the relations among supervisors was more important than searching for a common supervisory role.” (p. 37)

Three beliefs about the nature of supervision permeated the research of Lucio and McNeil (1969). First, supervision required a super-vision which was a superior perspective attained by special preparation and position. A prerequisite to supervision was the possession of a methodology which respected the learner, the disciplined approaches to knowledge, and social conditions. For Lucio and McNeil, supervisors functioned as statesmen, and they “were able to give direction beyond merely ministering to the organization’s equilibrium.” (p. vi)

Second, supervision by objectives was a way of holding those responsible for behavior change in learners accountable. Supervision by objectives was integral to school organizations as the perspective involved a statement of what schools should strive for, the determination of the capabilities needed for attaining the objectives, and planning for the implementation of such objectives. Therefore, supervision was a process of discovering what values are worthwhile and proper for instructional objectives. Instructional practices should be observed for both immediate and long-term consequences to assist supervisors and teachers in the discovery of what is worthwhile. Supervisors need access to data and propositions from a number of disciplines to be used as instruments for defining situations, suggesting promising avenues for experimentation, and for making more intelligent and informed educational decisions.

Third, supervision should include methods of reason and practical intelligence (Lucio & McNeil, 1969). Methods of reason included the formulation of school purposes and the direction and dedication of all concerned to those purposes. The method of practical intelligence invites judgments by all involved in these purposes. The purposes, however, should not be allowed to become idols limiting freedom. The purposes should also be interpreted through the judgment of

supervisors and the consequences on those whom they affect. Of necessity was enabling those who were expected to invest their energies in the purposes to be committed to them and to conduct themselves appropriately (Lucio & McNeil, 1969).

Similarly, Lewis and Miel (1972) proposed that those in the field of supervision begin to realize that supervision has an organizational monitoring function that at its roots was concerned with enhancing the quality of the educational process. These authors viewed supervision as one of the six key functions of a school system. The remaining five functions include administration, curricular decision-making, the creation of environments, teaching and guidance. Although supervision was focused on enhancing the quality of instruction, in its generic sense supervision could be applied to other operations in the school system. Supervisory function was capable of enhancing the quality of instruction “through intelligent cooperation among teachers and supervisory officials in ways that enlarge vision and open doors to higher achievement” (Lewis & Miel, 1972, p. 43).

According to Lewis and Miel’s (1972) supervisory model, five activities were central to the function of instructional supervision. The instructional supervisory function of a school system was responsible for:

1. overseeing planning and operations so that group and individual decisions about opportunities for engagement (i.e., what the learner meets face to face) were carried out through monitoring and maintaining limits,
2. gathering and evaluating evidence of the quality of opportunities actually provided and the outcomes realized (i.e., auditing),
3. serving as a critic of teaching,
4. serving as a critic of the instructional environment, and

5. sizing up instructional situations, deciding what kind of help is needed, and furnishing or arranging for such help. (Lewis & Miel, 1972, p. 44)

This model introduced a new supervisory role, that of a “critic” of teaching and of the instructional environment. The critic model required some explanation as models and theories in the field of supervision during the late 60s and early 70s focused much more on supervision as a collaborative process. Lewis and Miel’s (1972) beliefs regarding supervision were misunderstood by many in the field simply on the basis of their use of the word critic. The researchers actually were attempting to propose a model to enhance the quality of instruction without resorting to the authoritarian supervisory process. For example, Lewis and Miel (1972) state:

The essence of criticism is systematic and discriminating study, an examination in terms of a conceptual framework. In criticism every aspect gets treated – the craft is explicated, the artistry is examined, underlying assumptions and values are disclosed, and the cultural context is considered. Finally, criticism makes the whole intelligible, and it provides an improved vision of what might be. Involved in the process are describing, analyzing, synthesizing, valuing, and imagining. (Lewis & Miel, 1972, p. 228)

During the 1960s and 1970s, curriculum was seen as constructed elsewhere and curricular plans were tailored by the individual teacher to meet the needs of his/her unique classroom learning environment. Thus, supervisory leadership was seen as crucial for maintaining the fidelity of implementation of the curriculum in schools. Lewis and Miel (1972) wanted to curtail such processes by interjecting the idea of critic of teaching into the supervisory processes in schools. They tried, however, to maintain the collaborative nature of the profession by stating that enhancing instructional quality need not be assigned to a functionary known as a



supervisor (an authoritarian role). Instead, improving instruction could be seen as a shared responsibility with parents. Thus, power was widely distributed beyond the use of functionaries to include sharing of responsibility among organizational interests for assessing the quality of what is occurring in schools, uncovering unmet needs, and helping to find the means to meet needs.

Supervisors were seen as “visionaries” in Lewis and Miel’s (1972) model. As visionaries, supervisors had the responsibilities to help people look ahead, to serve as catalysts for action, to coordinate people and resources, and to create group opportunities for continuing in-service teacher education. The most direct contribution of supervisors to the enhancement of instructional quality was in consultations with individual teachers during which cooperative evaluation, planning, and criticism occurred. Desired results were seen as changes in teaching style and instructional management.

Harris (1975) also assumed a more organizational focus on supervision in schools. He defined supervision of instruction as “what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching processes employed to promote pupil learning” (pp. 10-11). Supervision, according to Harris, was one of the five central functions of school operations. These five central functions were teaching, supervisory service, special pupil services, management services, and administrative services. Since the most important role of schools is instruction and pupil learning, these five functions were ranked by Harris (1975) according to the level of instruction-relatedness and pupil-relatedness. Ratings for the five central functions of schools are as follows:

1. Teaching: High on instruction and pupil-relatedness
2. Supervisory Services: High on instruction-relatedness only

3. Special Pupil Services: High on pupil-relatedness only
4. Management Services: Low instruction and pupil-relatedness
5. Administrative Services: Mid-range instruction and pupil-relatedness. (p. 24)

Since supervision was rated high only on instructional-relatedness, Harris (1975) placed supervision second in the order of school functions. He contended that supervision was not a job, task, or methodology, but a function of the school operation directed toward maintaining and improving the teaching processes of the school. Such a complex function for Harris involved multiple tasks that are preliminary, operational, and developmental according to the order in which they were most frequently used to facilitate teaching. Preliminary tasks such as developing curriculum, providing facilities, and providing staff, must occur prior to instructional activities.

Operational tasks such as organizing for instruction, orienting staff members, providing materials, relating special pupil services, and developing public relations, comprised the ongoing operation of programs in schools. Developmental tasks such as arranging for in-service education and evaluating instruction provided inputs for modifying or changing the instructional program but were not essential for the operation of the school. Harris argued that all three types of tasks were appropriate to include in the supervisory function because they shared common characteristics of being highly instructional related. Some of the broader tasks such as developing public relations, however, were not exclusively supervisory tasks. Evaluation, curriculum development, in-service education, material development, and staffing were considered by Harris to be the core of a program of supervisory services.

Harris (1975) defined supervisors as “those professional personnel responsible for maintaining a full array of supervisory endeavors, attending to all tasks of supervision, and giving special emphasis to dynamic supervision (i.e., supervision directed at changing

instructional practices)” (p. 25). Thus, for Harris, supervision of instruction was a responsibility of all professional personnel including administrators and teachers.

### *Human Resources Theory and Supervision in Schools*

Wiles (1967) believed that theory was the most practical instrument any professional had because it guided practice and inquiry and allowed engagement in a continuous process of self-education. Wiles’ theory of supervision was derived largely from human resources theory with some influence of organizational theory apparent particularly in his six underlying assumptions:

1. Supervision exists to produce change in the curriculum and instruction in schools.
2. The difference between supervisor and teacher is more one of function than education and experience.
3. Teachers are professionals with a code of ethics, specialized education, and a desire to be self-directing.
4. Supervisors are employed to provide leadership and competency in the process of developing an organization and a working environment that facilitates the constant improvement of instruction.
5. The most valuable sources of concepts to be used in the development of an organization and a strategy for change are the behavioral sciences, psychology, social psychology, sociology, and communication.
6. Concepts from each field that seem to have relevance to the formation of a strategy of change should be selected and utilized as the basis for the formulation of a theory of supervision. (p. ix)

Wiles (1967) further developed his theory of supervision by borrowing concepts from the behavioral science fields of mental health, learning, group development, leadership, human

relations, communication, and political science, and he used many aspects of these concepts as criteria for evaluation of projected actions of supervisors in schools. The designated purpose of supervision formed the overall basis for the criteria used in the evaluation process. The domain of supervision included all activities related to instructional improvement, morale, improving human relations, in-service education, and curriculum development. From this domain, Wiles (1967) formulated the following eight assumptions about supervision:

1. Supervision is the name given to the activities that contribute to the improvement of the instruction and program of a school system.
2. Supervision is a function of the organization.
3. Many people contribute to the function of improvement – some have official responsibility for contribution to improved instruction, and others contribute by their actions.
4. Supervision operates in an organizational structure.
5. Qualities of the organization that affect the supervisory function are; rigidity, norms, goals, role perceptions, patterns, communication, use of authority, morale, and cohesiveness.
6. The effectiveness of supervision is increased when:
  - a. The organizational structure includes a change inducing agent and is flexible enough to accommodate experimentation and innovation;
  - b. The norms permit innovation, experimentation, acceptance of diversity and change;

- c. The role of perceptions enables each to value the other, to expect to obtain help from the others, to see authority used to hold the group together to make decisions, and to implement those decisions made;
  - d. Communication channels are opened horizontally and vertically, upward as well as downward, and for formulating and evaluating as well as implementing and rating.
7. The persons officially responsible for the function of improvement of instruction, superintendents, assistant superintendents, directors, consultants, helping teachers, or principals, have the task of creating within the organizational structure and intellectual and emotional environment which provides:
- acceptance and support so satisfying that each teacher feels he belongs and is encouraged to develop his unique potentialities,
  - many stimuli from which each teacher will choose those that have the greatest meaning and motive,
  - opportunities for each teacher to grow at his or her own rate and stage of readiness,
  - curriculum development programs and in-service education that permit each teacher to work in terms of his or her purposes and state of development,
  - a procedure for selecting and distributing materials of instruction that enables teachers to devote full energy to improving the instructional process,
  - evaluation conducted in such a manner that evidence is collected concerning the attainment of goals, and each individual involved becomes more self-directing and establishes higher goals for himself,

- a means of communication where each feels free to reveal individual needs, concerns, value, wants to discover the purposes and perceptions of others, and has access to the data that will enable him or her to make increasingly intelligent decisions.
8. Other staff members, teachers, librarians, secretaries, or custodians, affect the improvement of instruction by their attitude, method of operation, interaction patterns and decisions. (pp. xiii – xiv)

Wiles (1967) believed that the process of supervision should release human potentialities and that in doing so a more competent staff would emerge. Wiles believed that to apply this theory, one would choose any of the assumptions generated and assess how aspects of the assumption might be applied to his or her own position as a supervisor.

Wiles' (1967) theory suggested a definition of supervision that focuses on human relations. According to Wiles:

Supervisors are expeditors. They help establish communication. They help people hear each other. They serve as liaisons to get persons into contact with others who have similar problems or with resource people who can help. They stimulate staff members to look at the extent to which ideas and resources are being shared, and the degree to which people are encouraged and supported as they try new things. They make it easier to carry out the agreements that emerge from evaluation sessions. They listen to individuals discuss their problems and recommend other resources that may help in the search for solutions. They bring to individual teachers, whose confidence they possess, appropriate suggestions and materials. They sense, as far as they are able, the feelings that teachers

have about the system and its policies, and they recommend that the administration examine irritations among staff members. (Wiles, 1967, p. 10)

Similarly, Wiles and Bondi (1980) promoted a human relations perspective in their views of supervision in schools. The authors believed that “supervisors must attempt to remove themselves from the orbits of administration, curriculum, and teaching, and define supervision as a unique leadership role” (p. 11). Later, Wiles and Bondi (1996) refined and promoted in their definition to state that supervision was a function of leadership that bridged administration, curriculum, and teaching. Supervision coordinated these school functions to accomplish the greater concern, which is learning.

#### *Social Systems Theory and Supervision in Schools*

Blumberg (1980), in an earlier time period during the 1980s, believed that the application of organizational theoretical premises regarding supervision was incorrect. The relationships suggested were often altered by the basic organization of schools and district bureaucracies. Blumberg asserted that what occurred in the name of supervision (i.e., the interactions between teachers and supervisors) was often seen as an administrative oversight function, rather than a leadership bridge as Wiles and Bondi (1989) in a later time period noted. Blumberg viewed supervision from a practical perspective as a waste of time for teachers. Blumberg (1980) described the collective relationship between teachers and supervisors as a “cold war” in which the link to student and teacher learning was absent. Blumberg (1980) states:

Neither side trusts the other and each side is convinced of the correctness of its position. Supervisors seem to be saying, ‘If they would just listen to us, things would really get better. Teachers seem to be saying, ‘What they give us doesn’t help. It would be better if they left us alone.’ (p. 6)

Blumberg quickly pointed out that although he considered the quality of interpersonal exchanges between teacher and supervisor as the key to effective supervision, it was also critical to consider the ways in which the norms and values of schools as social systems affected the exchange between teachers and supervisors.

Blumberg (1980) asserted that since the early implementation of supervision in schools, supervisory practices had fallen short of expectations and were composed of little but organizationally ritualistic and position-justifying activities. Blumberg envisioned a different type of supervision that would make supervisory activities more tasks productive. A supervisory focus on instructional improvement that would necessitate changing the organizational function of supervision was proposed by Blumberg (1980). The approach to supervision called for the re-conceptualization of the essential function of the school. For Blumberg, schools should be places where everyone, including pupils, teachers, supervisors, counselors and administrators, had the responsibility to learn. This perspective was similar to what Barr, Burton, and Bruecker (1938) proposed in their “modern” definition of supervision.

Blumberg (1980) supported his proposal for re-conceptualizing the role and function of schools and the organizational function of supervision by developing the following assertions about the practice of supervision from data collected in schools:

- There is little evidence that supervision as it is currently concerned has had any appreciable effect on the nature of the overall processes of teaching and learning in the schools.
- The present system is doomed to failure unless our interests go beyond the individual teacher to include the nature of the system.
- Supervisors are engaged in essentially organizationally ritualistic activities. (p. 242)



Blumberg further argued that the necessity for re-conceptualizing the nature of schools depended on “whether we are interested in the systematic improvement of instruction and in making schools centers of inquiry into teaching. In such a case, the role of the supervisor would become part of collaborative house of inquiry” (p. 242).

The supervisory orientation proposed by Blumberg (1980) was one that focused on supervisors who were part of a system that supported inquiry to help all members to learn. Thus, the organizational role of the supervisor might be that of a manager or director borrowing from approaches to supervision as defined by metaphors such as the stage (classroom, school) and actors (teachers, students) used in the dramatic arts. However, for Blumberg, there was an individual social role for a supervisor that was defined by views of supervision as interpersonal intervention. The role of supervisor as interpersonal interventionist was borrowed from practices in the fields of psychology and counseling which included concepts and practices that Blumberg (1980) believed could be used in the social context of public education.

The organizational conditions suggested by Blumberg (1980) as necessary for supervisors to become interpersonal interventionists included:

1. An appropriate focus of at least some part of the supervisor-teacher transaction should be on those elements of the classroom situation that tend to induce anxiety in the teacher and the ways in which the teacher deals with that anxiety,
2. So long as the thrust of supervision is on curricular and methodological matters is the neglect of behavioral matters – those of teachers in the classroom and of the teachers and supervisors in their interaction with each other – the outcome of supervision will fall short of its potential,

3. To the extent that the focus on supervision remains solely on the behavior of students as the source of the teacher's problems, the supervisor's role will be that of didactic teacher. As long as problems of teaching exclude the teacher as a person, the better are the chances that supervision will be a prescriptive practice with slight chance for growth for either the teacher or supervisor,
4. In order for supervisor-teacher relationships to be growth producing, they need to be seen as significant human relationships, not ritualistic ones,
5. At some time in the supervisor-teacher relationship, attention needs to be given to the personal and professional growth problems of the teacher. (Blumberg, 1980, p. 194)

According to Blumberg (1980) a supervisor in this model would cease to function as an experienced curricular and methodological technician and assume another function, that of a competent pedagogical technological technician. Supervisory training would require a different set of skills and knowledge base – one more concerned with the necessary skills and understandings for assisting others with personal, interpersonal, and group problems.

Blumberg, similar to Champagne and Hogan (1981), used Argyris's concepts of intervention and the roles of the interventionist to develop supervision theory. Intervention theory was useful in the interpretation of supervisory roles because the processes generated valid information associated with selected problems. The processes also maintained the client's autonomy that was necessary for free, informed choice about teaching and learning in the classroom. Interventionists were concerned with the development of the client's internal commitment to the choices being made. If commitment was low, the chances of lasting learning and change resulting from the intervention was minimal. A supervisor who functioned as an interventionist, in Blumberg's (1980) view, believed that "adults, when confronted with

appropriate data about themselves and the situation in which they are working and where their adulthood is acknowledged and accepted, will make decisions for themselves which are appropriate for them” (p. 195).

Blumberg’s views supported an action research view of supervision where the supervisor merely served as a guide for gathering information and working cooperatively with the teacher to solve a problem. Such a view of supervision was not commonly held during the early 1980s and was challenged by those who were concerned with increased emphasis on accountability in schools. Competing definitions and theoretical views of supervision had, however, always characterized the profession throughout the decades.

#### *Multiple Theoretical Bases and Supervision in Schools*

Alfonso et al. (1981) proposed a competing view of supervision than that of Blumberg (1980). Supervision was connected to defined behavior in schools and multiple theoretical bases in studies of organizations, leadership, communication, decision making, and change. Their definition of supervision specified that supervision is “behavior officially designated by the organization that directly affects teacher behavior in such a way as to facilitate pupil learning and achieve the goals of the organization” (Alfonso et al., 1981, p. 43). Three key elements guided this definition. First, the behavior exhibited was “officially designated,” not a random, casually determined activity. Supervisory behavior bore the stamp of organizational request and formal authority. Second, supervisory behavior directly influenced teacher behavior. Such a view eliminated from the definition of supervision the multitude of tasks performed by supervisors that, while important to the organization, were not supervision. Third, the definition specified an ultimate outcome tied directly to the reason for the existence of schools, to facilitate student learning. Thus, the sources of supervisory behavior were derived from the goals of the

organization and the instructional needs of teachers. The product of instructional supervisory behavior was improved student learning.

Building on their definition of instructional supervisory behavior, Alfonso et al. (1981) developed a research-based theory of supervision based on five theoretical fields: (1) organizational theory, (2) communication theory, (3) leadership theory, (4) decision theory, and (5) change theory. One-hundred-thirty-three propositions were generated from research in the five fields. The propositions were considered generally applicable to supervision, and they examined for their implications for instructional supervisory behavior in schools. Alfonso et al. (1981), grouped propositions through a process of coding, categorizing and clustering. The procedures were referred to as interfacing or a “mix box.”

The analysis resulted in three critical components of instructional supervisory behavior; (1) interpersonal components, (2) milieu components, and (3) intervention components. These three critical components and their individual sub-elements formed the basis of a matrix of instructional supervisory behavior. Intervention was defined by planning, strategy, participation, modification, and support components. Interpersonal components included reference, esteem, and status. Milieu was defined by expectations, suitability, and perception components. For Alfonso et al. (1981), effective supervisory behavior was a product of the supervisor’s personal properties, interactions with other members of the organization, and the environmental characteristics and conditions of that particular organization.

Sergiovanni and Starratt’s (1983) theory of human resources supervision was concerned with the human and professional growth of people in schools, a view which indirectly affected organizational outcomes. Research from the fields of organization and management served as a basis for the authors’ beliefs that an understanding of the differences between human relations

and human resources supervision was critical. Both types of supervision were concerned with teacher satisfaction. Similar to views of supervision espoused by Alfonso et al. (1981) in which pupils' learning was the ultimate end, human relations supervision viewed teacher satisfaction as a means to an end. The end was a smooth-running and effective school. Human resources supervision, however, was more concerned with teacher satisfaction. From the human resources view, satisfaction resulted from successful accomplishment of meaningful and important work. Accomplishment from work was the key component of school effectiveness.

Conceptual distinctions inherent in Sergiovanni and Starratt's (1981) human resources supervision theory that are important to emphasize were as follows:

1. Understanding supervision as a process is more meaningful than viewing supervision as a role;
2. Supervision is a process used by those in schools who have responsibility for aspects of the schools' goals and depend upon others to help them achieve those goals;
3. Understanding behavior is critical for understanding the supervisory process and analysis of behavior is a focus of human resources supervision;
4. Differences between administrative (organization oriented) and supervisory (people oriented) behavior relate to either positional authority and dependence on others to achieve school goals, and primarily functional authority conferred as a result of knowledge and personal leadership behavior. (pp. 183-184)

Glickman (1985) viewed supervision as a function, not a role or a behavior. Like Alfonso et al. (1981), Glickman borrowed from theory in the behavioral sciences to formulate his developmental supervision framework. Glickman defined his approach as "collaborative experimentalism striving toward non-directive existentialism within a developmental

framework” (p. 86). The core concept of Glickman’s developmental approach to supervision was his belief that for supervision to be effective, it must respond to the developmental stages of teachers in such a way as to increase teacher self-control. He believed that as teachers gained more control over decisions for instructional improvement, they became collectively purposeful and more committed to a cause beyond them. The role of the supervisor, after having assessed the developmental level of the teacher, was to choose the most appropriate supervisory approach for that developmental level. Approaches were directive, collaborative, or non-directive.

In his model, Glickman (1985) supported the clinical supervision cycle with appropriate variations in supervisory approaches for the developmental level of the teacher. Three prerequisite skills for supervisors who used this model were; (1) a subject matter and pedagogical knowledge base, (2) an interpersonal skills base, and (3) a supervisory knowledge base which included technical skills in observing, planning, assessing, and evaluating instructional improvement. When applied to supervisory tasks, these three prerequisite skills had an impact on teacher development through direct assistance, curriculum development, in-service education, group development, and action research. Glickman posited that a supervisor who effectively brought together organizational goals and teacher needs and used the five supervisory tasks in a developmental way promoted powerful instruction and improved student learning.

The selected theoretical orientations for supervision in schools examined in this study suggested similar and different implications for the implementation of supervisory practices in schools. The remaining question that resonates is: How has supervision theory influenced practice in schools?

## Supervision of Instruction: Theory into Practice

Neagley and Evans (1980) in their *Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction* implied that effectiveness of supervision lay in the recognition of the inherent value of individuals so that each might reach full potential. Neagley and Evans took the position that “any service rendered to teachers that eventually resulted in the improvement of instruction, learning, and the curriculum could be considered a form of supervision” (Neagley and Evans, 1980, p. 2).

Neagley and Evans (1980) offered four types of supervision that were not mutually exclusive, but had emerged from the field. The first type, general supervision, included all activities performed by supervisory personnel that are not administrative in nature and occur outside of the classroom. The second type, instructional supervision, included all activities related to either general or clinical supervision. The term was used to distinguish supervisory activities related to the improvement of instruction, learning, and the curriculum from those concerned with the supervision of building, grounds, transportation, and so on. The third type, clinical supervision, included activities that occurred in the classroom. Clinical supervision was concerned with instructional improvement and the improvement of learning through direct classroom observation of teachers and students. Supervisory conferences played a major role in clinical supervision. The fourth type, supervision by competency-based objectives, was related to the use of instructional objectives by teachers. The supervisor and teacher compared the goals and objectives of the school district with those of the teacher and an attempt is made to reconcile any differences.

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) found that more reflective, theoretical analysis was needed in supervisory practice not only to solve the immediate problems of teachers, but also to assist teachers to engage in long-term critical inquiry into teaching and learning. Supervision of

instruction according to Hoy and Forsyth was a collaborative effort among colleagues aimed at improving the teaching-learning process and not aimed at judging teachers' competence or assessing their effectiveness as in teacher evaluation.

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) proposed a differentiated model of supervision in which the roles of the principal and supervisor were seen as distinct and separate. The model, much like that of Glatthorn (1984), was developed using the principles found in role theory. Although the roles of the supervisor and principal were relatively distinct, they were also complementary even though there was an inherent tension between the two. Supervisors in this model were seen as master teachers holding staff positions, and administrators were seen as line personnel. Thus, the positions were qualitatively different in their purposes and authority relations.

Hoy and Forsyth (1986) believed that in schools where the administrator was the supervisor, supervision was different because of the two conflicting roles. However, many state and national policies have mandated ultimate responsibilities of school principals to evaluate teachers. Such policies appeared to be at odds with what was considered in this model to be the pivotal role of the principal in the supervisory process. The role of the principal was that of creating an organizational climate conducive to the systematic study and improvement of instruction by teachers and supervisors working collaboratively in a non-threatening environment. However, in practice implementation of mandates served to create an evaluation climate that was often perceived as threatening.

Looking forward from the time period 1968-1991, in their text *Curriculum Leadership*, Glatthorn, Boschee, and Whitehead (2006) placed supervision within the realm of curriculum. In this book they state, "Supervision is a part of the taught curriculum and the supported curriculum" (p. 229). Placement of supervision in the realm of curriculum enabled questioning



some of the current approaches, issues and problems, major roles, motivational perspectives, theoretical orientations, and importance of inclusion of curriculum in the supervision process (Glatthorn al. 2006).

### Chapter Summary

Since this study was a history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and only spans the time frame of its existence (1968-1991), it was deemed necessary to capture events, trends, and issues in supervision before and during the existence of that Department at the University of Georgia. This study focused on the particular trends, issues and theory development during that time frame to assist in interpretation of the context and perspectives of the departmental faculty participants in this study.

This review also served to illustrate how faculty participants might have been influenced by trends, issues, and theoretical perspectives during the time period and how they might have integrated certain perspectives into their work and the work of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Extensions and new perspectives presented in this chapter and Chapter 7 served as illustrations of how politics and policy in education have often served to shape historical trends, issues, and theoretical perspectives in supervision as they have evolved over time. What seemed important to note was that policy implementation had served to define situational contexts that existed in schools over time. Policy also had influenced those who were attempting to change school environments. However, despite shifts in school contexts and educational policies, practitioners as well as theorists in the fields of supervision and curriculum continued to connect and reinforce the importance of support mechanisms for both teaching and learning in schools.

Chapter 3 includes a description of the research design of the study and the methods and procedures used in data collection and data analysis. Interview processes are described along with procedures used for developing themes and categorizing data. A table of historical documents, which includes out of print books and personal papers obtained by the researcher from the participants in this study, is also provided.

Chapter 4 presents the partial results of the first semi-structured interviews with the four key study participants. Profiles of each key participant are provided. The completed results of the semi-structured interviews are presented in Chapters 5 and 6 using the researcher's narrative, participant quotes with select video clip hyperlinks to illustrate individual responses to key interview questions, and the presentation of common themes emerging from the interviews.

Chapter 7 includes an interpretive policy analysis of educational legislation in Georgia and the United States during the period from 1777 to 1991. This analysis is presented using the Kingdon's Multiple Streams Model (1984) as an interpretive framework. The primary source data provided by the former faculty participants in the study was used to explain the impact of problems, policy, and politics on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

#### Introduction

This study of the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia was designed based on several important factors. One of the key factors in the inception of this study was that Professor Lutian Wootton, former department chair, left notes on his preliminary work on the department's history with the College of Education and suggested that interested parties expand on the effort. The researcher sought to answer this call by providing perspectives on the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from the time of its formation in 1968 until the department's merger with the Department of Educational Administration in 1991. This study was considered an important entry, particularly from the supervision perspective, in the historical documentation of the College of Education at the University of Georgia.

This chapter is organized in eleven sections. They are as follows; 1) purpose of the study, 2) research questions, 3) role of the researcher, 4) theoretical and methodological perspectives, 5) data collection procedures, 6) data analysis, 7) policy analysis, 8) validity and reliability, 9) assumptions of the study, 10) limitations of the study, and 11) chapter summary.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe and document a history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia spanning the years 1968 to 1991. The study was designed to review a variety of historical and legal

documents to obtain important information about the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and its eventual merger with the Department of Educational Administration. Of interest were key faculty members' perspectives of political, social, and conceptual shifts in instructional supervision at the University of Georgia as the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was formed in 1968 and was merged in 1991 with the Department of Educational Administration (Wootton, 1994). Participants' perspectives were also compared to national and state focal points in supervision obtained through a review of the literature and trends in the field obtained through reviews of issues prominent in professional supervision, organizational activities and documents during this time period.

### Research Questions

The researcher sought to respond to Dr. Lutian Wootton's call (Appendix A) by using historical and qualitative interview and policy analysis methods to examine three research questions:

1. What events and actors led to the creation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1968?
2. What operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision placed its faculty in national and state prominence in the field of supervision?
3. What events and actors led to the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in 1991?

The study was designed in three interactive stages to answer the research questions. First, documenting various events that led to the creation and merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from historical, supervisory, and policy perspectives was deemed important to

define the context in which the department was formed and operated. Second, documenting the operations and events leading to the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was a primary focus of the qualitative interviews with study participants. Third, placing events and operations within the unique context of educational policy and politics of reform during the time period of the department's existence was important in interpretation of outcomes and in developing conclusions in this study.

#### Role of the Researcher

The researcher's own experience as a graduate assistant and doctoral student for three of the professors in the department during the time period chronicled in this study provided a unique contextual perspective that enhanced the interpretation and analysis of data. The researcher's previous relationship with the participants aided in creating collegial and candid interview interactions. Research has shown that a collegial rapport helps to enhance the quality of the interviewee's recollections in interviews (Dunaway & Baum, 1996; Perks & Thomson, 1998).

The researcher was also knowledgeable and interested in the field of supervision in schools having studied in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and having served as an instructional supervisor during this study. His preexisting experiences could create personal bias which required the researcher to maintain caution in the interview process. Personal bias has been shown to negatively influence the interview process by creating descriptions of events that may be either inflated or deflated (Dunaway & Baum, 1996). The researcher maintained a neutral, non-conversational interview procedure, except when clarification was needed, in the interviews of participants in this study.

Because of the researcher's affiliation with the department and the participants, certain safeguards were taken to guard against bias and subjectivity. Throughout the study, the researcher's major professor reviewed the data interpretations to check for personal bias and to ensure that objectivity was maintained. The researcher also enlisted the assistance of an external auditor who reviewed the transcripts and segments of the video-tapes of the interviews. The external auditor then reviewed the analysis offered by the researcher. Although there is always the possibility for bias in research, these safeguards were taken to reduce the likelihood for bias.

### Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives

Historical and qualitative methods of research were employed in this study. Throughout the duration of the study, the researcher checked personal bias by maintaining an awareness of the potential conflict that personal bias can create in interpreting the data. Moreover the researcher was continually monitored by his major professor to insure subjectivity and biases were reduced. And finally, an external auditor reviewed transcript, field notes, and the drafts of Chapters 4 through Chapters 6, the presentation of the data and its' analysis.

#### *Historical Methods*

The researcher followed recent historical research trends in the history of American education to "see education as broader than schooling and in the context of social and economic development" (Kaestle, 1988). According to Kaestle (1988):

There is no single, definable method of inquiry [in historical research], and important historical generalizations are rarely beyond dispute. Rather they are the result of an interaction between fragmentary evidence and the values and experiences of the historian.  
(p. 61)

To capture a comprehensive story of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia, the researcher included “multiple voices supported by many different kinds of evidence, told in different ways in different times and in different places” (Marius & Page, 2005, p. 29). Denzin and Lincoln (2000) noted that people often have widely varying perspectives of the same phenomenon and their perspectives often change over time. They caution that researchers should consider all interpretations of data to be “unfinished, provisional and incomplete” (p. 34). Also, Mead (1930) in her study of children in New Guinea discovered that researchers must modify their hypotheses, theories, and interpretations to reflect whatever is discovered in the field.

Document and artifact reviews were conducted to define the educational context prior to and including the years of the existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1968-1991). Interviews with a purposeful sample of four retired professors from within the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were conducted. The transcripts and video taped footage were analyzed to provide a more comprehensive picture of the operations of the department from the perspectives of these influential people in the field of supervision. The participants in this study included four retired professors from within the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Reviews of intentional and unpremeditated documents, oral, and written records, were considered appropriate for the design of this study (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Gall et al. stated:

1. Oral records include the spoken word that preserves a record of events for posterity.

Some historians conduct oral interviews of individuals who witnessed or participated in events of potential historical significance. These interviews typically are recorded on audiotape and then transcribed to provide a written record. (pp. 353-354)

2. Intentional documents, such as memoirs are intentionally written to serve as a record of the past. Unpremeditated documents, such as memos are prepared to serve an immediate purpose, with no expectation that they might be used as a historical record at a later time. (p. 653)

Given that this study was historical, “the primary concern is with the conditions under which the concepts operates, not with the generalizations of the findings to other settings” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 29). Cautions about analysis and interpretations of data in historical research put forth by Kaestle (1988) and Marius and Page (2005) were considered in all phases (artifact reviews, document reviews, policy reviews, and interviews) of this study. The researcher attempted to compare and to verify findings among all data sources. The researcher was careful not to confuse correlations and causes, but rather to define key concepts and terms in view of the situations in which they occurred (Marius & Page, 2005).

### *Qualitative Methods*

The researcher was concerned with documenting the perspectives of four former faculty members in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision regarding the formation, operation, and demise of that department. A qualitative study was appropriate because the data were derived from the personal experiences of the study participants (Langenbach, Vaughn, & Aargard, 1994). Qualitative research recognizes the individual’s experience as a valid source of data in interpreting events (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). Multiple interviews, focused on common personal experiences of the individuals involved, create common points in which the interviews intersect (Glesne, 1999). These intersections, along with additional research, were important in documenting this history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.



Data collection, in addition to artifact and document reviews, included semi-structured interviews with four former members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Purposeful, within case sampling (Kuzel, 1992; Patton, 1990) was chosen for the study as this type of sampling allowed for deliberate selection of individuals who participated in the activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia, in supervision activities in the state of Georgia, and in the broader national efforts in the field of supervision. These individuals were considered trailblazers in the field of supervision. This type of sampling also allowed for choices of artifacts, documents, informants, conditions, and interactions to be based on conceptual questions, not representativeness (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

#### Data Collection

This study focused on examination of the unique and common experiences of each study participant in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia (1968-1991). In order to set the context for interpretation of individual and collective perspectives, the researcher also examined historical documents related to departmental activities, reviewed the literature describing the history of education in the United States and Georgia, particularly the history of supervision in schools of which the participants in this study were major actors. In addition, the researcher conducted an analysis of the various policy contexts that influenced the changing series of policy and political events regarding education in Georgia from 1937 to 1994. The analysis was predicated on selected events in education, in the nation, and in Georgia that set the stage for the formation and affected the subsequent operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.

#### *Historical Document Reviews*

The researcher was given access to personal papers, official documents, and rare out of print publications belonging to the participants and Dr. Lutian Wootton. The resources included copies of departmental and college of education documents created from 1937 to 1994 which were relevant to events in the development and operation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Other documents used in this study included copies of state and national education legislation and the administrative procedures and regulations for implementation of these laws.

Table 3.1 lists the various documents and artifacts and the researcher’s sources that were reviewed in the study.

Table 3.1

*Historical Documents and Artifacts*

<b>Documents</b>	<b>Sources</b>
The Organization and Conduct of Teacher Study Groups “Blue Book” (1937)	Dr. Ray Bruce’s personal collection
GA Program for the Improvement of Instruction “Red Book” (1942)	Dr. Ray Bruce’s personal collection
<i>A History of Education in Georgia</i> (Orr, 1950)	Researcher’s personal collection
Georgia Minimum Foundations Program for Education Act (1974)	Dr. Ray Bruce’s personal collection
Curriculum Framework (GA) (1967)	Dr. Ray Bruce’s personal collection
Spowles Committee Report (UGA, 1968)	Dr. Virginia Macagnoni’s personal collection
Core Curriculum for Administration/Supervision (UGA, 1968)	Dr. Virginia Macagnoni’s personal collection
<i>Instructional Supervision in Georgia</i> (1974)	Dr. Ray Bruce’s personal collection
<i>Readings in Educational Supervision</i> (ASCD, 1 <sup>st</sup> & 2 <sup>nd</sup> Editions)	Researcher’s personal collection

Table 3.1 (Continued)

*Historical Documents and Artifacts*

<b>Documents</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<i>Jeanes Supervision in Georgia Schools</i> (1975)	Researcher's personal collection
<i>A History of Education in Georgia</i> (1979)	Researcher's personal collection
ECS 700 Course description and requirements (UGA, 1984)	Dr. Ray Bruce's personal collection
GA QBE Act (1985)	Researcher's personal collection
Georgia Basic Curriculum Content (1985)	Dr. Ray Bruce's personal collection
Georgia Public School Standards (1987)	Dr. Ray Bruce's personal collection
Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program Trainer's Manual (1987)	Researcher's personal collection
Restructuring GA Schools (1991)	Dr. Ray Bruce's personal collection
A History of the GA School Superintendents Association (1991)	Dr. Ray Bruce's personal collection
Dr. Wootton's Histories and Chronology of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1969; 1977; 1993; 1994)	Dr. Lutian Wootton's papers in Department of Lifelong Education, Administration and Policy

*Interview Data Collection*

Data collection, in addition to artifact and document reviews, included conducting semi-structured interviews with four former members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Procedures for selection, data collection, and analysis for the interviews were as follows.

Purposive, within case sampling (Kuzel, 1992; Patton, 1990) was chosen for use in this study. This type of sampling allowed for deliberate selecting of individuals in this historical study who were faculty members and participated in activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. These individuals also actively participated in professional and scholarly activities, in service to school systems, and in state and national organizational activities in the field of supervision. This type of sampling also allowed for choices of artifacts, documents, informants, conditions, and interactions to be based on conceptual questions, not representativeness (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

The program for the training of supervisors in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision created a unique situation. Supervision is traditionally a program of study, as it was at the University of Georgia before 1968 and after 1991, housed in an administration department. This study is a description of the conditions surrounding this unique situation in time and location. Miles and Huberman note: “The primary concern is with the conditions under which the concept operates, not with the generalizations of the findings to other settings” (1994, p. 29).

The participant faculty members’ accounts in this study were considered important primary sources. Semi-structured interviews of participants in this study were analyzed using the constant comparison approach (Glaser & Strauss, 1970). The participants were tenure track professors in the Department of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision during the time period of 1968-1991 in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The participants were selected because they were considered “trailblazers” in the field of supervision at the national and state levels during the period of time of this study.

Each study participant was interviewed on two or three occasions. A semi-structured interview protocol was used to guide the first and second set of interviews (Appendix D). The

protocol was guided by 1) events and issues found in Wootton’s documents that might be better defined and explained, and 2) beliefs, events, trends, and policy issues in the field of supervision at the national and state level.

The use of interviews to collect data from individuals involved in events described in a written history is supported by qualitative research scholars (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Kvale, 1996). The purpose of the interview process in this type of research is to explain how individuals understand and express their experiences (Kvale, 1996). The interview is a valid method to construct knowledge from personal insights (Kvale, 1996).

Open-ended questions used in the interview process encourage the participant’s involvement in the research by providing the opportunity to relay personal experiences and perspectives (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

Table 3.2 gives some examples of open ended questions and the follow-up probing questions in the participant’s interviews.

Table 3.2

*Examples of Interview Questions*

Open Ended Questions	Probing Questions
What is your definition of Instructional Supervision?	How do you define the role of an instructional supervisor?
What were the circumstances surrounding Dr. Bruce introducing the telephone conference calls to the College of Education?	Describe its’ use in classes in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.
Describe the circumstances surrounding your appointment as the Interim Dean of the College of Education.	How did this appointment impact the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision?
Describe the circumstances surrounding your [Dr. Firth] election to position of President of ASCD.	How did this election impact the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision?

Bogdan and Biklen also stress the need to ask probing questions to gain greater detail to responses to open-ended questions. Probing questions are important in, not only generating details, verifying the researcher's understanding of participant responses (Yin, 2003).

The use of semi-structured open-ended questions in addition to probing questions in the interview phase of this study provided the researcher with a means of verifying information from all participants and seeking greater detail from individuals (Merriam, 1998). A key task of the researcher in this type of interview process is to try to understand how the participant "thinks" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p.98).

### Data Analysis

Major sources of data for this study were the interviews of the four study participants who were former member of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and colleagues of Dr. Lutian Wootton. The questions for the first round of interviews were derived from Dr. Wootton's papers and the researcher's pre-interview document reviews. Subsequent interview questions were derived from Dr. Wootton's papers, continuing document reviews and emergent themes from each interview.

The researcher conducted a total of seven interviews between June 2005 and October 2007 with four former faculty members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Each participant was interviewed twice and additional interviews were done with three participants. Each interview was videotaped using a standard 8mm camcorder. In order to import the taped interview into a computer, the tapes were played and reviewed by the researcher the evening of each interview. Digital video files were created using a video production program [InterVideo WinDVD Creator]. The researcher monitored this process in order to make notes and index time locations for the various responses of the participants. The resulting digital video files allowed

the researcher the ability to index specific quotes from all interviews. The resulting files were duplicated and stored in four storage drives to safeguard against loss.

The interview digital video files were played within 48 hours of each interview to produce an audio cassette tape. These audiotapes were transcribed by an independent transcriber to produce interview transcripts. The transcripts were completed using a standard computer word processing program. The researcher monitored the audio recording process and enhanced volume levels during the cassette recordings to aid the transcriber with the accuracy of the transcripts.

The audio file created also allowed for the production of an audio compact disc of each interview. The resulting audio and video digital files provided the researcher with multiple formats [CD, DVD, iPod (audio and video), TV, and computer] to review and analyze the data.

The researcher initially viewed each video interview three times prior to receiving the transcriptions from the independent transcriber. The researcher made notes regarding emergent themes during each viewing. When the researcher received the transcriptions, they were checked for accuracy using the audio file and then the video file. The transcripts were reviewed simultaneously with the interview video files on a wide screen monitor to cross-check accuracy. Corrections were made (names, spelling, punctuation, and inaudible moments) to the transcript document files when needed. Participants were asked for clarification when the researcher was not confident with the transcribed interpretation. Emergent themes derived from the videotapes were verified with the transcriptions and cross-referenced by transcript line number and video time index.

Text relating to each theme was assigned a text color using the font color function tool of the word processing program. Key words and phrases identified from each interview review were located within each transcript using the search and find tool of the word processing

program. This process helped to further identify comments and quotes that could be classified under each of six themes. Themes identified from the interviews included the following:

1. Beliefs and influences regarding the nature of supervision [blue]
2. Events instrumental in the establishment and operation of the Department [red]
3. Individuals instrumental in the establishment and operation of the Department [orange]
4. Professional activities of faculty members in the Department [plum]
5. Policy impacts on the establishment and operations of the Department [green]
6. Relationship between supervision and administration [gray]

The researcher established a system of digital folders that contained audio files, video files, and transcriptions from the interviews. The first set of folders contained the video file for each full interview and the full transcriptions. The second set of folders contained video clips and transcriptions organized by questions. The third set of folders contained video clips and transcriptions organized by themes.

The folder sets facilitated the organization of themes into a chronology that followed the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The video clips were used to create digital links within the text of the study. Select video quotes that best illustrated these four themes were included in the body of Chapters 4 through 7.

### *The First Round of Interviews*

The first interview conducted with each participant in this study consisted of semi-structured interview questions exploring personal beliefs regarding the field of supervision. The questions were designed to build rapport and seek information regarding key events and individuals that the researcher deemed important from pre-interview document reviews and research. The bases for the pre-interview research were the narratives of Dr. Lutian Wootton, a



review of the literature on supervision, and a review of the literature on the history of education in Georgia and the United States.

The researcher conducted interviews with each participant individually during the summer of 2005. Each participant was asked the same set of questions. These questions (Appendix D) began with the participants beliefs about supervision, how each became interested in the field of supervision, and what factors brought each of them to the University of Georgia. Questions seeking information on events, individuals, and policies that occurred during the development and life of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were also included in the first interviews. These questions were derived from the pre-interview document reviews as well as from personal recollections of the researcher as a graduate student in the department. The researcher was attempting to gain the participant's perspectives, experience and knowledge to verify information obtained from pre-interview research and to discover new information not obtained from the pre-interview research.

The following is a compilation of the interview results for the first round of interviews:

- The human relations model was the predominant philosophical orientation regarding supervision held by the participants. (Theme 1)
- Dr. Johnnye V. Cox was a key individual in each participant's decision to come to the University of Georgia. (Theme 3)
- Dr. Johnnye V. Cox was a key individual leader in the establishment and operation of the program for the training of supervisors at the University of Georgia. (Theme 3)
- The participants reported that salary differentials created tensions between administrators and supervisors in Georgia's public schools. (Theme 7)

- The participants had no knowledge of why the program for the training of supervisors was moved to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to create the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1968. (Theme 2)
- The Participants who were at the University of Georgia when the Department was established all named Dean Joe Williams as the key decision maker in moving the program for the training of supervisors to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to create the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. (Theme 3)
- Implementation provisions of APEG (1973) were key policy elements in expanding supervisory positions in Georgia and increasing enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. (Theme 6)
- Cooperative Educational Service Associations and Regional Educational Service Associations were key policy outcomes that aided in expanding supervisory positions in Georgia and increasing enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. (Theme 6)
- Implementation of the provisions of the QBE (1984) broadened the salary gap between administrators and supervisors in Georgia's public schools. (Theme 7)
- Implementation of provisions of the QBE were key policy outcomes that resulted in decreasing supervisory positions in Georgia and decreasing enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. (Theme 6)

### *The Second Round of Interviews*

The second round of interviews conducted with each participant in this study consisted of questions to seek information regarding events and individuals that were derived from previous interviews and further document reviews. Each participant was asked the same set of questions

(Appendix D). Dr. Lutian Wootton's narratives and continuing reviews of literature prompted by data from the first round of interviews, on supervision and the history of education in Georgia and the United States, particularly in the educational policy arena, were also used in formulating questions for the second round of interviews.

The researcher conducted the second set of interviews with each participant during the winter of 2006. The interviews consisted of semi-structured questions designed to probe for more information derived from the first interviews. Individuals, programs of study and the impact of specific policies on the development, operation and demise of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were examined in depth.

The following is a compilation of the interview results for the second round of interviews:

- The supervision internship in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was originally a part of the program for the training of supervisors established by Marvin Pittman at South Georgia Teachers College in 1933. (Theme 2)
- The Instructional Lead Teacher position in Georgia public schools was developed by two faculty members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. (Theme 4)
- Dr. Johnnye V. Cox and the program for the training of supervisors was the exclusive program for the certification of supervisors in Georgia when the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was established in 1968. (Theme 4)

### *The Third Round of Interviews*

The third set of interviews was conducted with three of the four participants in this study. One participant was unavailable for a third interview. These interviews consisted of questions developed by the researcher to seek additional information regarding specific events, activities

and individuals derived from previous interviews and further document reviews. Dr. Lutian Wootton's chronology from 1994 and continuing reviews of the literature on supervision and the literature on the history of education in Georgia and the United States, particularly in the policy arena, were also used in formulating questions for these interviews.

The first of the third round of interviews was conducted with two participants, Dr. Ray Bruce and Dr. Edith Grimsley. Questions (Appendix D) focused on specific activities of the department within which the participants were directly involved. This interview was conducted in Dr. Ray Bruce's Athens Home on October 6, 2007. The results of this interview are highlighted as follows:

- Dr. Bruce was the first professor to use the conference call as a classroom resource in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. (Theme 4)
- The Department of Curriculum and Supervision was the first to use the conference call to allow a student from another country to defend his dissertation before his committee. (Theme 4)
- The faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were key individuals in the development of Operation CD (curriculum directors) as a continuing in-service educational program for curriculum and supervisory personnel in Georgia's public schools. (Theme 4)
- The ASCD publications *Readings in Educational Leadership* (Bruce & Grimsley, 1987) were produced to offer a source of professional literature for off campus students enrolled in supervision classes in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. (Theme 4)

The second and final of the third round interviews was conducted with Dr. Gerald Firth. Questions (Appendix D) focused on specific activities, in which he was directly involved. This

interview was conducted in the conference room of the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration and Policy at the University of Georgia on October 23, 2007. Dr. Firth's interview results are highlighted as follows:

- Dr. Firth was instrumental in the Allied Health Careers program of study becoming a component of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. (Theme 4)
- Dr. Firth's appointment as interim Dean was the result of budget cuts in the College of Education which led to the resignation of Dean Kathryn Blake. (Theme 3)
- Dr. Firth credits the prestige of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia and his position as Department Head with his election as president of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (Theme 4)

The results of all interviews conducted in this study were used to construct Chapters 4, 5, and 6. Information derived from the first round of interviews regarding the participants' beliefs about supervision, how each became interested in the field of supervision, and what factors brought each of them to the University of Georgia is included in the participant biographical profiles found in Chapter 4. The remaining interview results were incorporated in chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 5 recounts the historical foundations of the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Chapter 6 recounts the operation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1968 to 1991.

#### Policy Analysis: Interpretive Framework

The Kingdon Multiple Streams Model (Kingdon, 1984) was used to analyze the changing contexts of educational policy in Georgia. This model was selected because it;

focused on the flow and timing of policy action rather than on its component parts (and) is extremely useful in understanding the complexities of policy-making. In this model attention is focused on three streams, the problem stream, the political stream, and the policy stream which move independently through the policy system. It aims to explain why some issues and problems become prominent in the policy agenda and are eventually translated into concrete policies while others never do so. The model contradicts the rational approach to decision-making claiming that policies are not the product of rational actions, because policy actors rarely evaluate many alternatives for action and because they do not compare them systematically. (Kingdon, 2003, p. 1)

The model illustrates three complementary, but distinct streams or process flowing through the system of policy agenda setting. It is the coupling of these streams in an opportune context and at an appropriate time, an open window, which allows for a particular issue to be translated into policy. Each process stream is mostly independent of each other and each develops according to its own dynamics and rules. “But at some critical juncture the three streams are joined, and the greatest policy changes grow out of that coupling of problems, policy proposals, and politics” (Kingdon, 2003, p. 88).

The researcher used historical educational policy data (1777-1991) and, beginning with policy during the years of 1968-1991, personal accounts of four major professors in this study to illustrate contextual trends and major actors in Georgia education prior to and during the life of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Data were categorized across the various problem, process, and political streams for each time period examined.

The merging of issues, major events, and key actors leading to open windows which allowed the passage of various educational policies are described in a series of tables in Chapter

7. Of interest was the identification of precursor policy and enabling factors leading to the high visibility of involvement of department faculty members in development and implementation of supervision programs, in providing service to national and state professional organizations in supervision (e.g., COPIS, ASCD, GACIS), and in service to organizations in local school, national, and international arenas. Also of interest was the identification of precursor policy and enabling factors leading to the merger in 1991 of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to become the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia.

The analysis of selected educational policy in Georgia focused on three common themes which enabled passage and implementation of policy initiatives:

- Historical Support for Education
- Professionalization and Quality of Teaching and Supervision
- Centralization of Educational Processes

The common themes illustrated the evolution of policy trends which influenced both the development and later dissolution of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Other findings of interest were the effects of policy implementation on faculty professional activities and student enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

#### Validity and Reliability

Trustworthiness according to Lincoln and Guba (1985) is achieved when the researcher convinces the audience that the findings of a study are worthwhile. The researcher in this study has contributed to the history of the College of Education at the University of Georgia by answering Dr. Lutian Wootton's call (Appendix A) for expanding on his beginning history of the

Department of Curriculum and Supervision. In addition, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest establishing trustworthiness by strengthening study findings through establishing credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of methods and procedures used in the study.

### *Credibility and Confirmability*

Gathering and comparing information from more than one source of data increases the credibility or validity of study findings (Bogdan & Biklin, 2003). The researcher gathered and reviewed from multiple sources in each phase of the study. These sources included:

1. Historical documents and artifacts from primary and secondary sources,
2. Videotaped interviews with each of the faculty participants in the study,
3. Transcriptions of all interviews each the four study participants,
4. The researcher's field notes from the interviews,
5. Other artifacts such as participants' vitae, personal notes and copies of reports and speeches, and policy artifacts such as legislative copies of educational bills, state implementation guides, and training manuals for supervisors.

Data from all phases in this study were corroborated and in some instances triangulated to shed light on themes and to enhance the internal validity of the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). For example, transcriptions of interviews were compared with the interview videotapes to judge the accuracy of participant responses. The memories of the participants were considered rich sources of data and the researcher carefully examined the interview data to determine the most relevant and important information to include in a history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (Dunnaway & Baum 1996; Sommer & Quinlin, 2002).

The researcher analyzed the information derived from the interviews with an awareness of the influence time may have had on each participant's interpretation of events described.



Sixteen years have passed since the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was merged with the Department of Educational Administration. For this reason the data collected from each interview was cross checked with other interviews conducted and the review of historical documents. Follow-up or probing questions were developed from interview analysis and document review to conduct the second and third round of interviews.

Cautions about analysis and interpretations of data in historical research put forth by Kaestle (1988) and Marius and Page (2005) were considered in all phases (document and artifact review, interviews, and policy analysis) of this study. The researcher was careful not to confuse correlations and causes, to define key concepts and terms in view of the situations in which they were defined and are conditioned by those situations (not present understandings) (Marius & Page, 2005), and to “keep in mind distinctions between evidence of ideas of how people should behave, and evidence of how ordinary people *in fact* behaved” (Kaestle, 1988, pp. 69-70).

### *Transferability*

The researcher provided descriptions of the national and state historical education, policy, and supervision contexts from within which the Department of Curriculum and Supervision emerged and operated until its merger with the Department of Educational Administration. The descriptions allow the reader an opportunity to make decisions to determine transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1983; Merriam, 1988). Chapters 1 and 2 of this study included historical events in the nation and in Georgia from 1977 through 1991, and the review of the literature in the field of supervision. Chapter 4 includes a description of study participants, their research and teaching activities, and their beliefs about supervision. Chapter 7 describes an analysis of state educational policy and its effects and intended and unintended consequences on the department’s operations at the University of Georgia. “With detailed description, the researcher enables

readers to transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred because of shared characteristics” (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993, p. 32).

### *Dependability and Neutrality*

The researcher used persistent observation (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988) in the field to build rapport with the participants and to check for information or misinformation gathered through document reviews and conversation with other participants. Through use of the constant comparison method in the interview process, the researcher was able to continually interpret and analyze emergent themes and meanings (Glaser & Strauss, 1987). Though the purpose of this study was not to develop grounded theory, the method did allow for persistent review of interview videotapes and transcripts for developing further lines of inquiry for subsequent interviews.

The researcher clarified his bias (Merriam, 1988) from the beginning of the study in Chapters 1 and 3. He was committed to a role of “ethical, fair and unbiased reporting in all circumstances” (Stake 1995, p. 103) and maintained a neutral focus on the purpose of the study throughout data collection and analysis.

The researcher used a majority of primary sources (Marius & Page, 2005) for the document review and in some instances actual documents obtained from the personal libraries of the participants. Before conducting the study, the researcher gained permission from the participants for videotaped interviews. Participants agreed to allow inclusion of video clips in the completed study.

### Assumptions of the Study

The researcher held the following assumptions:

1. The social, political, and conceptual perspectives of participants represented their honest opinions and recollections concerning events during their tenure in the Departments of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.
2. The perspectives of participants were freely given.
3. The participants were able to communicate honestly with the researcher, as he was a student of each participant and served as a graduate assistant in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision 1985 to 1987.
4. The collective experiences of the participants in this study are important to help document the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.
5. The collective experiences of the participants in this study are important to document contributions of faculty and programs to the national focus on developments in the field of supervision

### Limitations of the Study

The study is limited by the participants who included four former faculty members noted as trailblazers in the field supervision in the state of Georgia and in the United States during the existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The accuracy of the participants' accounts of events relating to the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision is reliant on each participant's unique individual experiences.

The scope of the study was limited to the experiences of the participants in a single department in the College of Education at the University of Georgia which was unique in its' organizational composition. Furthermore the study primarily focused on the program for the training of supervisors which was the primary focus of the department.

### Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 included a description of the research design of the study and the methods and procedures used in data collection and data analysis. Interview processes are described along with procedures used for developing themes and categorizing data. A table of historical documents, which includes out of print books and personal papers obtained by the researcher from the participants in this study, is also provided.

Chapter 4 presents the partial results of the first semi-structured interviews with the four key study participants. Profiles of each key participant are provided. The completed results of the semi-structured interviews are presented in Chapters 5 and 6 using the researcher's narrative, participant quotes with select video clip hyperlinks to illustrate individual responses to key interview questions, and the presentation of common themes emerging from the interviews.

Chapter 7 includes an interpretive policy analysis of educational legislation in Georgia and the United States during the period from 1777 to 1991. This analysis is presented using the Kingdon's Multiple Streams Model (1984) as an interpretive framework. The primary source data provided by the former faculty participants in the study was used to explain the impact of problems, policy and politics on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY**

#### **Introduction**

The researcher, in order to obtain personal insights into the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at The University of Georgia, selected four prior members of the Department as primary sources for this study. These participants were selected based on their longevity and their involvement in the department during the period from 1968 to 1991. These faculty members were considered key figures in the establishment and operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

Dr. Ray Bruce was a member of the original Department of Curriculum and Teaching at the University of Georgia in 1968. Dr. Virginia Macagnoni was a member of the Supervision Program in the University of Georgia's Bureau of Educational Field Services in 1967. The Supervision Program was moved to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to form the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia in the summer of 1968.

Dr. Edith Grimsley came to the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1968 and remained there until 1990. Dr. Gerald Firth came to the Department in 1972 as the head of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. He remained in the Department through the merger with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Georgia in 1991. Dr. Firth retired from that department in 2000.

The remainder of this chapter is an examination of biographical information about each of the four participants. Each participant's section includes the information regarding their educational and professional experiences along with their professional publications. Responses to specific interview questions from the participants are also included. The questions and responses were taken from the first set of interviews conducted in the summer of 2005. The interviews explored how each participant came to the University of Georgia, became interested in the field of supervision, and their definition of supervision along with the role of the supervisor. Individuals in the field of supervision that influenced each participant's views on the nature of supervision were also discussed.

The information for this chapter was provided by the participants to the researcher from their interviews and personal vita. All quotes were drawn from the interviews with each of the participants. Each interview was video taped. Video clips of selected quotes can be viewed by clicking on the [HYPERLINK](#) at the end of the quote.

#### Dr. Ray E. Bruce

Dr. Ray E. Bruce received his Bachelor of Arts degree in 1950 from Hendrix College in Conway, Arkansas where he majored in Classical Languages. In 1955, he received his Master's Degree in Educational Administration from Memphis State University in Memphis, Tennessee. He earned an Educational Doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction in 1966 from George Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee.

Dr. Bruce began his career in education at Osceola High School in Osceola, Arkansas where he taught biology, chemistry, mathematics, and Latin. He remained there from 1950 to 1952. He entered the United States Army where he was an instructor of radio theory from 1952 until 1954. After leaving the Army, Dr. Bruce returned to Pine Bluff, Arkansas to continue his

career in education. There he served as a teacher of chemistry and physics, chairman of the Science Department and assistant principal at Pine Bluff High School from 1945 to 1960.

In 1960, Dr. Bruce left the classroom to work for the Pine Bluff School System until 1968. During those eight years, he served as a coordinator of curriculum, an assistant superintendent for instruction, and deputy superintendent. He also spent the summer of 1967 as a visiting professor of curriculum and personnel at the College of Southern Utah in Cedar City, Utah.

Dr. Bruce came to Athens, Georgia, in January of 1968 to join the faculty of the newly formed Department of Curriculum and Teaching in the School of Education at the University of Georgia as an associate professor. That department would become the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the summer of 1968. He remained there through the department's merger with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in 1991. Dr. Bruce retired in 1993 and was named Professor Emeritus.

Dr. Bruce was well known for his expertise in the field of supervision before coming to the University of Georgia. He worked with his colleagues at UGA to improve schools through a number of efforts. His publications included two well-known journal articles coauthored with Dr. Carl Glickman that addressed the changing face of public education in America. The first article, "Altering the Role of Public Education," was published in *Kappa Delta Pi Record* (1982) and the other, "Public Schools under Siege: A Dream Threatened," was published in *Educational Forum* (1983). Dr. Bruce and Dr. Edith Grimsley compiled two books of *Readings in Educational Supervision* (Volume I, 1982 and Volume II, 1987) which were published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). These two publications were compilations of the readings used in their courses at the University of Georgia.

Dr. Bruce was heavily involved in the national, international, and regional activities of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). He developed “Time-line for Responsibilities for Consultants in the Southern Association Self-Study Process” for SACS in 1982. He, along with coauthors Gerald Firth and John Newfield, published an article in *The Journal of Experimental Education* (1983) that captured experiences of helping staff examine curriculum design during a school self-study.

Dr. Bruce served as president of SACS for the years 1987-1988. His “Report of the President” was published in SACS proceedings (1988), and he wrote an informative article for the SACS newsletter in Georgia (1988) on “Selecting the Visiting Committee for Evaluation for Initial Accreditation and Ten Year Reaccreditation.” Dr. Bruce also served as a SACS evaluator and consultant for K-2 schools in Latin America, Columbia, Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, Venezuela, Chile, Peru, Brazil, Ecuador, Costa Rica, Curacao, and Jamaica.

Dr. Bruce has been immersed in the activities of professional associations, particularly the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) during his career. He served as chairman for program planning for the annual meeting of the group in 1979. Oliva

Among his many state and regional activities, Dr. Bruce is well-known for his development of “Seminars for Principals,” a year-long program for school leaders. The program was implemented in the 13 school systems served by the Northeast Georgia Cooperative Educational Service Agency in 1979 and 1982.

In the first of three interviews with Dr. Ray Bruce conducted on June 14, 2005 in his home in Athens, Georgia, the researcher asked; What were the circumstances that brought you to the University of Georgia? Dr. Bruce explained that Dr. Lutian Wootton and his former colleague from Peabody, Gilbert Shearron, were instrumental in his initial consideration to come



to the University of Georgia. Dr. Bruce also received a recommendation to come to the University of Georgia from his major professor, William Alexander.

Dr. Bruce described how he initially met members of the supervision program at the University of Georgia at an ASCD national conference and later interviewed with Dr. Wootton. Dr. Bruce was not initially enthused by the opportunity to come to the University of Georgia, despite being pursued by both the curriculum and the supervision programs. Ironically these two programs would become one: The Department of Curriculum and Supervision was established in 1968. Dr. Bruce shared his interview experience as follows:

I was invited here and interviewed and initially was not particularly impressed with the opportunities. I had an earlier invitation from the supervision department, wing, committee, if you will, because it was not a department at all. There were three people, down [stairs] in administration, who were handling the supervision. They had invited me for an interview which was conducted at an ASCD national meeting. (June, 2005)

After multiple visits to the University of Georgia, Dr. Bruce was convinced that he would remain in Pine Bluff. His family and his position in Arkansas offered financial security, but his final decision would be based on the University's increased offer and circumstances in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Dr. Bruce described himself as "the point man" in the desegregation process of his home town's public schools and the stress he and his family were experiencing was one factor that influenced his final decision.

Dr. Bruce eventually decided to come to the University of Georgia. His decision was prompted by an increase in contracted services and an agreement that would allow him to remain in Pine Bluff until January of 1968. Dr. Bruce felt he should provide his former employer a period of notice which would allow for him to help with the opening of school.

Although Dr. Bruce was originally employed as a curriculum specialist, he focused primarily on supervision while in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. He taught classes in supervision and conducted supervision internships in various Georgia school systems.

When asked how he became interested in the field of supervision, Dr. Bruce described arriving for his first day as a high school teacher with a four course load: chemistry, Latin, math, and physics. He explained how that first day impacted his life-long dedication to teacher support and finding a “better way.” A young Ray Bruce arrived at school and reported to the principal’s office. Dr. Bruce recalled his experience that day in the principal’s office:

She had a neat stack of books for me and handed me those and a key to my classroom, which was a lab on the second floor, and very tersely said, “I’ll see you at Thanksgiving.”

That was my induction to teaching, and I thought ‘hum’ surely there’s a better way, and that gnawed at me over the years. (June, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

Dr. Bruce’s overall philosophy of the purpose of education was the central focus of his beliefs about the role of the supervisor. He described his beliefs and how they influenced his focus on the field of supervision like this:

[I was] Always convinced the only reason we had schools was to have interaction between teachers and students. Whatever facilitated that would be supervision. So then that interest has grown and with that [interest] same focus endured across the years. (June, 2005)

Dr. Bruce’s focus on having his students define supervision was a key component of the classes he taught in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. He explains that the focus on examining the definitions of supervision was a key element of his relationship with his students and colleagues. In fact, when he was asked what he was most

proud of during his career, he referred to his attempts to engage his students in thinking and dialogue about supervision. He said “I was never hesitant in telling them what mine was,” but he wanted them to develop their own definition based on ideas expressed in the literature and those in the field. Dr. Bruce described one of his many approaches:

I made a very conscious effort to introduce them to the views as broadly as possible, to the point that I had telephone conversations with authors of all the books that we had. Interactions in the classroom by telephone with these purveyors of truth or non-truth as it might have been, gave them a chance to interact with all those people who had views quite different from their own. (June, 2005)

The varying definitions of supervision were present among colleagues within the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Dr. Bruce expressed his belief that the variety of definitions was a valuable contribution to the education of the students taking courses in the department. Dr. Bruce explained how views about supervision were often “pitted against” the prevailing theories of his contemporaries:

Within our own department, we had span of views about what supervision is. My very dear friend Gerry Firth and I were at constant loggerheads about that. He had quite a different view [as did] his colleagues Neville and Alfonso with whom he wrote. We pitted these against those of Oliva, Wiles, Sergiovanni, and Anderson. (June, 2005)

The researcher had been a student of Dr. Bruce’s in 1985 and 1986 and recalled the various definitions of supervision posed in the educational literature of that time as well as the class discussions on the topic. Defining supervision was central to the trends and issues we studied in our supervision classes. Now that 20 years have passed since those class sessions, the researcher was interested in asking Dr. Bruce about how he now defined supervision. His reply

reflected an emphasis on a supportive relationship of the supervisor to those with whom they work. This was consistent with the researcher's earlier understanding of Dr. Bruce's beliefs as to the nature of supervision. Dr. Bruce went on to explain:

I've been a member of the organization called COPIS, the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision, and [at] every one of the sessions, by in large we met twice a year, they've always argued the definition of instructional supervision. But for me however you precisely define it, it includes and is focused on those activities that are intended to release the potential of those around you. (June, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

The role of the supervisor was also a major focus during those classes in 1985 and 1986. Ben Harris (1985) wrote that the role of a supervisor included a series of tasks. Alfonzo, Firth, and Neville (1981) described the role as a "behavioral system" employed under certain circumstances. Dr. Bruce in 2005 defined the role in 23 words. "One who submerges himself always for the good of the teachers in the classroom and does whatever is necessary to facilitate their activities." Dr. Bruce again stressed the importance of a supportive relationship.

Dr. Bruce exposed his students to a wide variety of authors in the field of supervision. In preparation for each class, he required his students to read articles about the trends and issues in supervision. The students were to write an abstract for each article on a three by five inch index card including a bibliographical citation in accordance with the APA style of the date. These assignments served as a basis for class discussions and modeled a technique that could be employed when the students began their own research. The researcher asked Dr. Bruce which individual in the field of supervision had the most influence on his views. His earliest and most enduring influence was Kimball Wiles. Dr. Bruce explained:

My earliest impact and it remains extremely strong is the work of Kimball Wiles. He's always been my mentor. In fact, in my teaching years, I always urged students to read the copy [of his book] and I garnered it wherever I could get copies of his book on supervision. (June, 2005)

Dr. Bruce recognized the importance of some of his contemporaries including Dr. Carl Glickman who had served in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision during a partial period of his tenure at the University of Georgia. Dr. Bruce referred to Carl Glickman as a "brother in believing that the importance of the classroom teacher should be emphasized always." Dr. Bruce further elaborated about the professionals who influenced his thinking regarding instructional supervision. He talked of Thomas Sergiovanni as a "banner carrier" for him, but he preferred his earlier works.

Dr. Bruce has continued to respect Peter Oliva's and Thomas Sergiovanni's writings over the years, but prefers their earlier writings. Despite the evolving works of these contemporaries, Dr. Bruce continued to relate most closely to the work of Kimball Wiles, who died an untimely death in a car accident in 1967. Dr. Bruce described how this "crystallized" Kimball Wiles' views.

The writer that I have most closely identified with, again, [is] Kimball Wiles. He died the spring that I came to this University in an automobile accident returning from a teaching responsibility in another part of Florida. His views might have changed over time, so I have him crystallized in time and those views are the ones that I adhere to most directly and occasionally go back, even now, and read some of those pages that resonate for me. (June, 2005)

Dr. Bruce was an instrumental force in the development of the school based supervisor in Georgia known as the “Instructional Lead Teacher.” His human relations emphasis in supervision has been reflected in many of those teachers with whom he worked. The Northeast Georgia Regional Education Service Association in Winterville, Georgia named the staff development building in his honor. The Ray Bruce Professional Learning Center continues to house programs for educating educators, and its “Rising Star” leadership program offers leadership training with an emphasis on mentoring and on-the-job experiences.

Dr. Bruce established the Ray E. Bruce Academic Support Award. This annual scholarship is presented to individuals who demonstrate distinction in the study and practice of supervision theory in schools and school system. He was the first recipient of the Johnnye V. Cox Award presented by the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Georgia in 1996.

#### Dr. Gerald Firth

Dr. Gerald Firth received his B.A. degree in Science Education from the State University of New York at Albany in 1952. He completed his M.A. in Secondary Educational Administration from Teachers College, Columbia University in 1953. Dr. Firth also earned his Ed.D. at Teachers College under the direction of Dr. E. Edmund Rutter in 1959. His dissertation was entitled *The Professional Self-Discipline of Public School Personnel*.

Dr. Firth began his educational career as a teacher and assistant principal at Battle Hill Junior High School in White Pains, New York, where he served from 1953 to 1956. He served as an associate professor at the State University College of Education in New Paltz, New York, from 1956 to 1957. He moved to Oneonta, New York, in 1957 to serve as Director of the Caskill Area Project in Small School Design, funded by the Advancement of Education of the Ford

Foundation. In 1959, Dr. Firth went to the State University of New York in Buffalo where he served as an associate professor. In 1960, he was employed by the Utica Public School District in New York where for the next four years he served as Director of Secondary Education, Assistant Superintendent, and Superintendent.

Dr. Firth returned to higher education in 1964 at the University of Minnesota where he served as a professor and department chair until 1967. He also served as professor and department chair at the University of Alabama from 1967 to 1971, when he came to the University of Georgia. In that year, he assumed the chair of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. In 1989, Dr. Firth took a leave from the University of Georgia to serve in the Egypt National Curriculum Development Center Project with the U.S. Agency for International Development, Ministry of Education in Cairo. He returned to the University of Georgia in 1991 where he remained until 2000 when he retired and was named Professor Emeritus of Educational Leadership.

Dr. Firth was well known across the nation and internationally for his expertise in both the fields of curriculum and supervision. He published several chapters in edited books and coauthored a book related to various issues in the study of curriculum. The chapters included; “Youth Education: A Curricular Perspective” in the 1968 ASCD Yearbook, and “Curriculum Development and Selection” with J.W. Newfield in *Skills for Effective Supervision* in 1984. Dr. Firth coauthored a textbook with R. D. Kimpston in 1973 entitled *The Curriculum Continuum in Perspective*.

The study of supervision in schools from an organizational perspective began to claim his interest as he published four edited books and several chapters in yearbooks and handbooks on the subject. Dr. Firth’s writing included key chapters in books edited by such notable scholars as

Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Jeffrey Glanz, and Richard Neville. In 1998, Dr. Firth served as lead editor with Ed Pajak for *The Handbook of Research on School Supervision* in 1998. He served as coeditor along with colleagues R.J. Alfonso, and R.F. Neville for the 1981 and 1985 editions of *Instructional Supervision: A Behavior System* and for the 1986 textbook *Instructional Supervision*.

Dr. Firth published numerous articles in national professional journals, most notably the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* and *Educational Leadership*. He and coauthors Alfonso and Neville published articles on supervisory skills in these two journals (1984, 1990). He also published a series of articles in 1976-1977 volumes of *Educational Leadership* on leadership theory, new conceptions of supervision, and staff development. Collectively Dr. Firth's publications illustrate his expertise in curriculum development and supervision from an organizational perspective.

Dr. Firth's interests in international educational reform efforts were reflected in his papers presented at various conferences and symposiums overseas for organizations on global education. In 1992, he addressed, (1) "Common Concerns of Global Curricula" at the annual conference of the International Network for Global Education in Denmark, (2) served as a member of a panel presentation on "Education Response to Cultural Diversity" for the annual conference of the Center for International Studies, Wales, United Kingdom, and (3) presented a paper on "Egyptian Education from an American Perspective" at the fifth triennial conference of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction in Cairo, Egypt.

In 1994, Dr. Firth presented papers on (1) "International Institutional Collaboration" at the conference of the International Network for Global Education in Russia, (2) "Wanted: Partner Institutions for Democratic Leadership Programs" at the fifth annual conference of the Alliance



of Universities for Democracy in Prague, The Czech Republic, and (3) “The Illusion of Local Control in Governing America’s Public Schools” at the invitational symposium hosted by the Hungarian Institute for Educational Research in Budapest, Republic of Hungary.

Dr. Firth was noted for his involvement in the governance and activities of national professional organizations, especially the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) and the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS). He served as president of ASCD and was a founder and president of COPIS. During the period from 1990-1997, Dr. Firth presented seven papers on topics of professionalism and professional self-discipline, higher education’s place in curriculum and supervision, diversity and reform in American educational practices, critical issues in supervision, and international collaboration for annual meetings of the ASCD. He also authored and presented six papers at annual meetings of the COPIS. Topics of the COPIS papers centered on national standards in the preparation of supervisors, standards of the National Education Policy Board, issues related to accreditation, certification and enforcement, supervision scholarship and praxis and research in supervision.

Dr. Firth met with the researcher for the first of three interviews in a conference room in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy at the University of Georgia on July 13, 2005. The first question he was asked was: What were the circumstances that brought you to the University of Georgia? Dr. Firth said, “I think I was destined to come here.” Dr. Firth recounts his first encounter with Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, Dr. Reba Burnham, and Dr. Virginia Macagnoni from the University of Georgia while they were conducting a workshop at an ASCD meeting in California. Dr. Firth described how he had to confront a young man who was in attendance at the ladies’ workshop and was “heckling” them. Dr. Firth called the young man aside and suggested that he should not return the next day if he could not “appreciate what these

three people had done.” The young man did return and Dr. Firth recounted the result of his intervention as follows:

He came back the next day and was very quiet, but I think I earned the praises and friendship of these three ladies, and someone even said that I acted liked a southern gentleman. For a guy from Minnesota, they thought that was pretty good, particularly a guy who started out from New York. (July, 2005)

In that same interview, Dr. Firth was asked how he became interested in the field of supervision. He described the transition from his focus on curriculum to supervision and the influence Dr. Ray Bruce had on that transition. Dr. Firth shared:

Well if you talk to Ray Bruce you’ll find out I think he converted me. Mostly people have forgotten that Ray Bruce proved to be one of the nation’s best curriculum persons, and I tried to employ him as a curriculum person at the University of Minnesota. As a matter of fact my first book was in curriculum. (July, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

Dr. Firth arrived at the University in 1971 to assume the position of Department Head in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. He was identified as a supervision specialist because of his latest publications. Dr. Firth was asked for his definition of supervision and he explained that his definition was formulated from his research for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). That research would eventually produce the book *Instructional Supervision: A Behavioral System* (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1975; 1981; 1986). He explained how this definition was based on research, unlike most other definitions, which were often based on philosophical views:

Dr. Firth explained that *Instructional Supervision: A Behavioral System* was originally intended to be an ASCD research project, but due to financial difficulties resulting from

attendance problems at their national conference in San Francisco, the association was unable to continue the research funding. ASCD gave the authors permission to publish their research as a textbook. Publisher Allyn & Bacon agreed to publish this groundbreaking work and the second edition (1975; 1881).

Dr. Firth described his beliefs, based on the research for the book, that supervision was a series of behaviors that might be carried out by any one of many people in the school organization. Dr. Firth elaborated:

It doesn't make any difference what the title of the person is, it [supervision] is the kind of behavior which is demonstrated within an organization and in this case a school, to act upon the teaching system in such a way that it either improves student learning or improves the learning situation itself. (July, 2005)

Consistent with his definition of supervision, Dr. Firth explained that the role of the supervisor was to carry out supervisory behaviors within the organization. He expressed the belief that these individuals, supervisors, were generally not administrators. However, in some cases, supervisory behaviors could be carried out by an administrator. Dr. Firth described the problem in role identification for supervisors as one with funding for distinct supervisory positions in some public schools in Georgia. These supervisory positions were often given administrative titles to secure support for funding, and those titles could convey a somewhat different meaning from that traditionally ascribed to supervisors. Dr. Firth described this funding dilemma:

Clearly the supervisor is someone who acts in that behavior system whatever their title. My title was assistant superintendent for instruction. I guess a lot of people in the south were called instructional supervisors by definition. In the old days in New York the

principal was supposed to be the supervisor and the title supervising principal still exists.  
(July, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

Dr. Firth recalled a diagram he used in his classes to explain the role of a supervisor in schools. He compared the role of the supervisor and the relationship to the teacher to the role of the counselor and the relationship to the student. Both of these positions are focused on the needs of people and may not always be in line with the overall goals of the administration.

Dr. Firth used an analogy from an old movie to describe his view on the role of the supervisor and the “leadership behavior” they must demonstrate in the operation of the organization. A key element of this leadership behavior is to be capable of effectively performing the activity expected from those being supervised. The film, *An American Romance*, contains a scene where the foreman of the blast crew is temporarily blinded by steam and the main character provides the leadership behavior Dr. Firth described as supervision. He further elaborated:

....everyone stops working and he steps forward, picks up the shovel, and throws the stuff [coal] into the furnace and says, “let’s make steel.” Of course he becomes the next foreman because he had shown that kind of leadership [needed] in that situation. That’s exactly what I expect a supervisor to be able to do. (July, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

The belief that the supervisor should be able to perform the activities of those they supervise, became a frustration for Dr. Firth when he served as an administrator in the College of Education. He believed he could administer programs, but he also believed that could not offer supervision to many of his colleagues. He relates:

One of my frustrations toward the end of my career was that I was in an administrative role, but I could not do [specific tasks] as well what the people that I supervised could do.

I suggested that it was an appropriate assignment for me because I was the administrator, but I could never be their supervisor. By definition a supervisor has to be proficient in the thing that the people who are supervised are doing.

Dr. Firth served as Head of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision for a total of 22 years He took two leaves of absence to serve as acting Dean of the College of Education and direct an educational reform movement in Egypt. These activities are discussed in chapter five along with a description of his tenure as Department Head.

#### Dr. Edith Ellington Grimsley

Dr. Edith E. Grimsley received her Bachelor of Science degree in 1952 from Georgia State College for Women where she majored in Elementary Education. In 1959, she received her Master's degree in curriculum and teaching from Teachers College, Columbia. She earned an Educational Doctorate in Supervision and Curriculum development in 1968 from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dr. Grimsley began her career in education as a teacher in Putnam County, Georgia. She remained there from 1948 to 1949. She then went to Twiggs County, Georgia, where she taught from 1949 to 1954. In 1954, she began teaching for the Bibb County School System in Georgia and served in that position until 1963 when she assumed the position of Curriculum Director for Bibb County. Dr. Grimsley remained in that position until 1967 when she assumed the position of Bibb County Coordinator of Elementary Education. During the summers of 1965 and 1966, Dr. Grimsley also served as an instructor at Mercer University in Macon, Georgia.

Dr. Grimsley came to Athens, Georgia, in the summer of 1968 to join the faculty of the newly formed Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the School of Education at the University of Georgia as an assistant professor and in 1973 she became an associate professor in

that department. Dr. Grimsley assumed full professorship in the department in 1983 where she remained until her retirement in 1990 and was awarded Professor Emeritus of Supervision at the University of Georgia.

Dr. Grimsley has served as a co-author for a number of mathematics textbooks (Levels 1-6) and accompanying practice pads published by the Silver Burdett Corporation throughout her career in higher education. Along with a group of her mathematics colleagues, Dr. Grimsley formed an on-going professional partnership with the textbook company and was involved in periodic textbook revisions and development of supporting materials (1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1981, 1985, & 1987). These texts were widely used in elementary schools across the country and thus she and her colleagues gained nationwide visibility as experts in the field of mathematics education.

In 1973, Dr. Grimsley authored a chapter entitled “A Staff Development Planning Format for Individualized Instruction” in *Improving Supervisory Competencies*, published by the Georgia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (GASCD) and the Center for Curriculum Improvement and Staff Development at the University of Georgia (UGA). In 1974, she and her colleagues Johnnye V. Cox, Reba B. Burnham, and others co-authored *Instructional Supervision in Georgia* published by the Georgia Association for Curriculum and Instructional Supervision at UGA. These activities with professional association endorsement largely contributed to the University of Georgia’s prominence for faculty expertise in the field of supervision. The latter publication contributed to changing views of supervision as human relations to a more central job-related focus on improving instruction in schools. In 1982, Dr. Grimsley and Dr. Ray Bruce compiled a book: *Readings in Educational Supervision* which was published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), again

taking the lead in the distribution of knowledge through professional organizations in the field of supervision.

Dr. Grimsley and colleagues published several articles related to educational reform, supervision, and the Lead Teacher Program. The Lead Teacher Program was developed through the Department of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision at UGA in partnership with the Georgia Department of Education and a large school district in Georgia as a model of instructional supervision for schools in Georgia. Such articles appeared during the period of 1970-1982 in *Educational Leadership*, *The Educational Forum*, and *Theory Into Practice* and served to encourage thinking about educational reforms and the link to new, more creative ways to organize schools to enhance instructional supervisory activities.

Dr. Grimsley's mathematics consultancies for school districts, counties and textbook adoption commissions spanned a number of states including Georgia. She served as an elementary mathematics consultant in Georgia and Illinois (1973-1974), Alabama, Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Georgia (1974-1975), Texas and Georgia (1975-1976), Tennessee and Georgia (1976-1977), South Carolina and Georgia (1977, 1978, 1987, 1988), New York and Georgia (1978-1979), Indiana and Georgia (1979-1980), Virginia, New Jersey, California, Tennessee, and South Carolina (1980-1981), and Arizona, Tennessee, and Georgia (1981-1982). In addition, Dr. Grimsley served on and chaired Southern Association for Collages and Schools (SACS) visiting accreditation review committees for schools throughout the state of Georgia during her career. She was heavily involved in staff development for teachers in schools in Georgia and was sought out nationwide for her expertise in consultancies for lead teacher orientations, workshops for school principals, school district curriculum and improvement committees, and statewide assessment.

Dr. Grimsley's interests and research in schools, reform, curriculum, supervision and adult learning were exemplified in her varied presentations at meetings of national professional organizations during her career. She spoke on the reform movement in secondary education and implications for the middle school at the National Middle School Conference in Atlanta, GA (1975). She served as a panel member for a presentation entitled *The Domains and Competencies of Instructional Supervision* at the annual meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) in San Francisco (1978). She spoke at ASCD annual meetings in 1980, 1985, 1987, and 1988 on the Lead Teacher Program, Alternative Models of Supervision, Supervisory Effectiveness, Instructional Supervision, and in 1991, she was the Johnnye V. Cox Distinguished Speaker for the ASCD conference. Her address was entitled, Supervision in Georgia: Our Unique Legacy.

Along with her keen interest in supervision in schools, Dr. Grimsley advocated for a strong link between administrators and curriculum innovations in schools and spoke about how to implement such a model at the 1982 Pacific Administrators Conference in the Philippine Islands. She also conducted seminars for SACS for the directors of Latin American Schools regarding administration and educational reforms and teacher evaluation in 1974 and 1975. During 1980 and 1981, Dr. Grimsley served as mathematics consultant for the Department of Defense Dependent Schools in the Republic of the Philippines, Okinawa, Korea, and Japan. Thus, her own professional expertise in mathematics, curriculum, and instructional supervision for staff development was internationally recognized.

Dr. Grimsley's service to regional and state professional organizations included speaking and serving on panels for the Georgia Association of Educators (GAE), the Georgia Department of Education, Georgia Media Supervisors, the Georgia School Food Service Association, and the



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. She spoke at meetings of other state councils such as the Peninsula Council of Mathematics of Virginia, the Tidewater Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the Virginia Council of Teachers of Mathematics during the time period 1974-1991.

Dr. Grimsley describes the circumstances that brought her to the University of Georgia in her first interview with the researcher conducted at her home in Athens, Georgia, on June 23, 2005. She explained, “There was a demand for people at the district level to work with teachers in implementing programs. There was funding for these people.” She was invited by Dr. Johnnye V. Cox and Dr. Reba Burnham to interview for a possible vacancy in the program for the training of supervisors.

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision had not been officially formed at the time Dr. Grimsley first came to the University to discuss a possible position, yet her experiences in that initial visit might well have indicated that the movement of the program for the training of supervisors was being moved to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. The need for her to interview with Dr. Lutian Wootton was an unexpected surprise. Dr. Grimsley had intended to interview with Dr. Cox and Dr. Burnham and no one else. After interviewing with Dr. Cox, Dr. Burnham, and Dean Joe Williams she was informed that she was to interview with Dr. Lutian Wootton, who would become the new department’s head. However, a fire that day in her school system had left teachers in need of her assistance, so she left without actually seeing Dr. Wootton. In hindsight, she believes that she was fortunate that her actions did not cost her the position. Dr. Grimsley described that visit:

I talked to everybody and his brother and I had no intention of talking to anybody but Reba, and Johnnye, and Joe Williams. I got a call saying that one of our schools had a

fire and I said that I would go home. I thought that I'd spent the day talking to these people at the University and there was a building of youngsters and teachers who needed books, and they needed other help, and they needed support and encouragement! So thank you. If you want to talk to me anymore, I will be home. I was surprised that I even got the job at all, but Joe Williams did call and said, Edith, you need to get yourself back up here. (June, 2005)

Dr. Grimsley credits her interest in the field of supervision to Dr. Johnnye V. Cox and Dr. Reba Burnham. They were at the University of Georgia in the Bureau of Educational Field Services working in the field of supervision when Dr. Grimsley first became aware of their work. Instructional supervisors were somewhat rare at that time. She explains:

There were very few systems in the state of Georgia who had people who were instructional supervisors. These people were usually system based and not school based, and were usually just one person. They were all people who had been trained by Johnnye Cox and Reba Burnham. (June, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

Dr. Grimsley described the exclusive nature of the program for the training of supervisors at the University of Georgia in 1968. She explained that becoming a supervisor in Georgia was dependent upon the support of your local school system. Dr. Grimsley elaborated:

You didn't decide that you wanted to be a supervisor. You made that decision personally. You might want to for a hundred years, but unless somebody in your school district believed that you had demonstrated the qualities that they, whatever their mind set was, believed would make such a person [supervisor]. (June, 2005)

Dr. Grimsley also explained that in 1968 you had to be invited to participate in the program for the training of supervisors at the University of Georgia. She recalled the honor of

being asked to be a participant in the program. She explained, "...in those days Johnnye and Reba were the department, but it was never called a department. You were recommended by the school district, interviewed by them [Johnnye and Reba], and then received a formal invitation to study. So it was quite an honor." (June, 2005)

After Dr. Grimsley had decided she wanted to become a supervisor, she would need to gain the support of her superintendent as well as Dr. Cox and Dr. Burnham. She explained that the only place she could achieve her goal was at the University of Georgia. This was the only program that was accepted by Georgia for the certification of supervisors. She had received the encouragement of her superintendent and proceeded to interview for admission to the program. Dr. Grimsley described the exclusive nature of the program and the importance of Dr. Cox to state certification:

The interesting thing was not only was Johnnye the leader of that program, but she was also in charge of the certification of supervisors, so there was no way you went around [her]. When Johnnye said somebody was certified, the state department said yes. (June, 2005)

Dr. Grimsley explained how she came to the University of Georgia to work with the internship for new supervisors in local school systems. She explained how the increased number of supervisory positions in Georgia's schools required an increase in positions at the University to train these new students:

Now if you can imagine as the need for supervision and supervisors is expanded and there are two people doing this [at U.G.A.], then you can see that they were thinking ahead and they would have to have other people. So I talked with them about coming to the University. (June, 2005)

When asked how she defined supervision and the role of the supervisor, Dr. Grimsley described the functions of supervision and the nature of school based supervisors and work with individual teachers. These lead teachers were a major focus of her work at the University of Georgia. Dr. Grimsley explained:

I think that educational supervision is a school function. It is distributed across the school district, that is to say there are places and people at central office level who carry out the tasks that I will refer to. There are people at the school level and, in many places, Ray Bruce and I trained a number of them. There are people who work one on one with teachers and are called lead teachers, and that's still I would say a part of that supervisory leadership function. (June, 2005)

Dr. Grimsley defined various functions of school personnel. She described the role of the supervisor as focused on three basic functions: instructional improvement, staff development, and curriculum development. She acknowledged other functions such as building maintenance and transportation as important to the overall operations of schools, but these were not supervisory functions. For her, the supervisor's role is dedicated to improving the functional relationship between teacher and student in the learning process. She outlined how these three functions enable teachers to improve their "teaching art" through introspection.

The support of teachers in their professional growth is central to Dr. Grimsley's beliefs as to the nature of supervision. Dr. Grimsley continued this discussion with an explanation on how the supervisor utilizes these three functions in working with teachers:

Helping teachers look at how they use curriculum, how they themselves improve through self development, gaining skills, knowledge, whatever, understanding, and that they then apply those to improve what goes on in the teaching art. (June, 2005)

The researcher followed the discussion of the role of the supervisor, with the question: Who in the field of supervision were you most influenced by? Like her colleague, Dr. Ray Bruce, she first mentioned Kimball Wiles. Her connection with his emphasis on the importance of human relations and a focus on the practical application of supervision in schools are at the heart of her philosophy of supervision. Dr. Grimsley described her connection to Dr. Wiles:

I think that the first time that I read Kimball Wiles it was as though I knew and understood that *he* knew what happened in schools and how supervision could make a difference. It was not a book of theory; it was a very practical point of view. (June, 2005)

In our discussion about her influences, Dr. Grimsley attributed her basic beliefs about the nature of supervision and the role of the supervisor to her early mentors, Johnnye V. Cox and Reba Burnham. They had been the earliest, most important influences in shaping Dr. Grimsley's beliefs regarding supervision. Dr. Grimsley explained:

I'd have to say in that growth evolving process Reba Burnham and Johnnye Cox had a great deal of impact. My position was pretty much theirs and it was not because they were the only people with whom I was having a dialogue about supervision. It was that they too had worked with some of the people that I had worked with at Columbia. (June, 2005)

Dr. Grimsley concluded her discussion regarding her personal influences in the field of supervision by reiterating her comment about the importance of the school based supervisor. She explained how Dr. Ray Bruce was a colleague with whom she felt the strongest connection in beliefs regarding the nature of supervision. The importance of the school based supervisor had been a central focus of Dr. Bruce and Dr. Grimsley in their work in the Department of

Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. With humorous poignancy, Dr. Grimsley recounts:

I'd have to say that all the years of working with Ray Bruce probably means that if I start a sentence he finishes it or if he starts it I do. It is because we were like-minded about supervision. I think it was the appreciation of the practitioner's point of view and understanding schools as well as understanding supervision. It was a mutual respect for the profession and for those people who were out there in the trenches. Rarely did we quarrel about what supervision was or what supervisors are about (June, 2005)

Dr. Grimsley retired from the University of Georgia in 1989, but remained active in state and national professional organizations. She was a protégé of Dr. Johnnye V. Cox and is recognized by many Georgia educators for her contributions in the field of supervision. Dr. Grimsley has remained active in her efforts to support the professional development of educators as a contributing member of the George H. Reavis, Bronze Society of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation and the Kappa Delta Pi Educational Foundation.

#### Dr. Virginia Macagnoni

Dr. Virginia Macagnoni received a Bachelor of Fine Arts in interior design from the School of Art, Newcomb College at Tulane University in 1949. She received a Master of Arts in elementary education from Florida State University in 1952 with her thesis, *The Moral Values of the McGuffey Readers as Compared with The Moral Values of Three Current State-Adopted Reading Series*. Dr. Macagnoni also earned her Ph.D. from Florida State University in 1959 under her major professor, Dr. Mildred Sarenger. Her Dissertation was entitled, *Teacher and Community Perception of the Good School with Implications for Supervision*.

Dr. Macagnoni began her career in education in 1952. She taught seventh and eighth grades in New Orleans, where she was born. During her graduate studies, she taught in Kinard, Florida, in a one room high school and in Panama City, Florida, in a self-contained fourth grade classroom. Dr. Macagnoni assumed the position of instructional supervisor in Panama City in 1955 where she remained until 1961. During that time, she also served as a graduate assistant at Florida State University while she completed her doctoral studies.

Dr. Macagnoni spent the summer of 1960 as a visiting professor in the department of elementary education in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, at the University of Alabama, where in 1961 she became an associate professor in the Department of Administration and Curriculum Study. She left the University of Alabama to join the faculty at the University of Georgia in 1967. She began her stay at the University of Georgia as a member of the Bureau of Educational Field Services in the College of Education where she taught supervision. In the summer of 1968, she moved with the supervision faculty to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to form the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Dr. Macagnoni retired from the University of Georgia in 1987.

Dr. Virginia Macagnoni's research interests were three-fold: (1) a synergistic approach to learning and supervision, (2) community and curriculum study, and (3) the spiritual dimension or theology as a source of theory. She has published a number of book chapters, professional journal articles, monographs, and proceedings of her papers in national and international society conferences.

In 1955, Dr. Macagnoni actually began her work in the area of supervision. She published a monograph for the Florida State Department of Education entitled *When a Supervisor Begins* (1955) and completed a report to the Metropolitan School Study Council of Teachers College, Columbia University on *Community and Teacher Perception of the Good*

*School with Implications for Supervision* (1959). Along with two of her colleagues, Dr. Macagnoni coauthored an article on teacher personality change under the supervision of cooperating teachers which was published in the *Journal of Teacher Education* in 1966. She authored a book chapter on supervision and democratic planning processes in *Improving Supervisory Competencies*, edited by L. J. Bishop and published in 1977 by ASCD. Her most recent publication related to supervision was published in 1986 in the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*. She and two colleagues constructed a series of abstracts of selected doctoral dissertations in supervision. Most of Dr. Macagnoni's remaining work has been in the areas of curriculum and lifelong learning. She is well-known both nationally and internationally for her expertise in curriculum theory.

In the first of two interviews conducted by the researcher on July 14, 2005 in her home in Athens, Georgia, Dr. Macagnoni described the circumstances that brought her to the University of Georgia. Dr. Macagnoni gave credit to Dr. Johnnye Cox for inviting her to interview for a position in the program for the training of supervisors at Georgia. She had been involved with curriculum at the University of Georgia and was strongly influenced by the works of James McDonald and Dwayne Huebner. She described her excitement about the possibilities at the University as follows:

I was really excited and was looking forward to a sabbatical. Johnnye said that I could continue here. Then I realized through my work that I could just shift my focus a little. Their laboratory work in the field would give me a chance for more hands-on work with supervisors and teachers and this would be good, it would be very good. And that was why I came.



Dr. Macagnoni described her interest in the research being done at the University of Georgia in the field of supervision as a primary factor in her decision to come to Georgia. She explained that at the time she came to Athens, the University of Georgia was the leading institution with a supervision research focus. She explained, “One of the major reasons that I came here was that I knew that Georgia was the only place that had research, substantial research, in supervision and I was very interested in that.” (July, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))

Dr. Macagnoni continued by explaining how she became interested in the field of instructional supervision and her belief in the close relationship between curriculum and supervision when working with teachers in the classroom. She was an elementary school teacher in Bay County, Florida, and incorporated art as a major component in her teaching. She had been noticed locally for her instructional use of art and was employed by the county to become an art supervisor. She described her job:

My job was to integrate the curriculum. My job as given to me was to bring art experiences and music to the extent that I could, into the teaching of social studies and into the teaching of science, reading, or whatever it happened to be. (July, 2005)

Dr. Macagnoni referred to her comprehensive finals and how she defined supervision then when asked: What is your definition of supervision? Her response was grounded in human relations and her personal theological beliefs. “I define supervision as a love orientation, being strongly influenced by Eric From in the *Art of Loving*. I mean a caring kind of thing.” (July, 2005)

Dr. Macagnoni, in her discussion of her definition of supervision and authors in the field that influenced her, expressed her belief that supervision is continually evolving and supervision comes in many forms.

William Burton's book on supervision illustrates that supervision has been an evolving concept. It has evolved and it will always evolve. Hopefully, it will always evolve. The concept moves from definitions about educational supervision, which is broader, to instructional supervision, which is more specific and as its come to be. (July, 2005)

The researcher followed the previous response with the question: Who in the field of supervision were you most influenced by?

I'm of a synergistic perspective. I like Tom Sergiovanni very much. I haven't looked recently. I believe in building community. I believe Carl Glickman works with this in beautiful ways. I guess synergy; I just think that multiple perspectives are important. Jerry Starratt has done some interesting work. (July, 2005)

Dr. Macagnoni retired in 1987 from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. She has remained active in various professional organizations. In 2005 Dr. Macagnoni pledged \$25,000 to endow an academic fund to honor her mother. The Mary Sartalamacchia Macagnoni Academic Fund was established to promote research and inquiry among University of Georgia faculty and students. The library in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy at the University of Georgia was named in her honor when she donated her collection of professional publications in 2008.

### Chapter Summary

The four participants in this study were all colleagues of Dr. Lutian Wootton and worked together in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The participants were trailblazers in the field of and supervision and they helped to shape and frame the growth of the field of supervision during the years 1968 and 1991. These participants were selected because they met the criteria of Dr. Wootton's 1993 call for the

hope that "... persons of similar interests and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture [of the department] as possible." (Appendix A)

Chapter 4 included a description of the professional experiences of the four participants in this study. Also examined, was how each participant came to the University of Georgia, how each participant became interested in the field of supervision, and their definition of supervision along with the role of the supervisor. The chapter also includes authors the participants viewed as instrumental in the development of their own beliefs regarding supervision.

Chapter 5 provides a description of events in Georgia from 1777 to 1968 that were instrumental to the eventual establishment of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Key individuals involved in these events are also discussed. The participants of the study provided insights into the years 1967 and 1968 regarding events and circumstances associated with the establishment of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

Chapter 6 describes various events that preceded the formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia in 1968. The chapter also contains descriptions of selected activities in the department and of the four participants in this study. The events and activities were drawn from Dr. Lutian Wootton's earlier written histories and from themes that emerged in interviews and document reviews.

Chapter 7 includes an interpretive policy analysis of educational legislation in Georgia and the United States during the period from 1777 to 1991. This analysis is presented using the Kingdon's Multiple Streams Model (1984) as an interpretive framework.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND SUPERVISION**

#### Introduction

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia was established on July 1, 1968 when three faculty members from the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services, who had a focus in educational supervision, were transferred by the College of Education's Dean Joe Williams to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. This event was recalled by Dr. Ray Bruce:

It was a Monday morning, and we came to our office which was in the upstairs, the attic of Baldwin Hall, and I saw Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, Dr. Reba Burnham, and Dr. Virginia Macagnoni moving their materials from what had been the administration office all the way in the basement of that building. In the position and the announcements was that we were now the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. That ends my knowledge of how the transition occurred. It was an action by Joe Williams, the dean. What background there was for that, if he ever shared it with anybody, it certainly was not with me. (June, 2005)

One of those faculty members, Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, had been involved in the field of teacher supervision for 30 years prior to her assignment to the newly established Department of Curriculum and Supervision. She was trained as a supervisor at South Georgia Teacher College from 1937 to 1938. This program was responsible for the first certified educational supervisors

as established by Georgia legislation in 1937. Dr. Cox's contribution as a leader in supervision in Georgia is discussed in Chapter Six by the four faculty members interviewed in this study.

This chapter is a description of individuals and events that preceded the new department's development and their relationship to the establishment of The Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Since supervision of teachers has been an important element of Georgia's efforts over time to improve the public school systems of the state, it was important to review events, individuals and policy initiatives that affected the changing evolution of the concept. This chapter is divided into two sections in which educational events in Georgia are outlined: (a) Background of Education in Georgia: 1777 to 1932 and (b) Background of Education in Georgia: 1933 to 1968. The earlier section examines events, policy, and values and beliefs that influenced education in Georgia from before and after the Civil War. The latter section sets the more immediate background context for the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

#### Background of Education in Georgia: 1777 to 1932

The people of Georgia have demonstrated a commitment to the education of their children from the first state constitution adopted in 1777 which provided for the building of schools in every county. These schools were to be supported even as early as that time under the direction of the legislature with state funds (Evans, 1913; Orr, 1950).

#### *Legislative Funding for Education*

Despite the efforts of the Georgia Legislature, many counties continued to place little importance in developing public schools. In an attempt to encourage these counties, the Georgia Legislature of 1817 enacted The Poor School Fund and set apart a fund of \$250,000 for the establishment of Free Schools throughout the state. These schools were established to educate

needy children (Orr, 1950; Joiner et al., 1979). Most families in Georgia were too proud to send their children to these schools and instead many, who could afford a small tuition, sent their children to old Field Schools located on old abandoned fields where the soil was exhausted (Klein & Pascoe, 2005). These schools were not operated by the state and only operated for a few months each year when children were not needed in the fields. The curriculum of the Field Schools focused on minimum basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Selection and supervision of teachers in these schools remained the responsibility of the local community.

#### *Poor Schools and Common Schools*

The second free school movement in Georgia began with the election of Governor Joseph Emerson Brown, a pro-education politician, in 1857. Governor Brown advocated for a free education for all white children, and declared, “Let it be a Common School system not a Poor School system” (Orr, 1950, p. 171). Brown’s educational advocacy helped to establish the need for educating teachers in the normal school setting.

Governor Brown, in an attempt to increase enrollment of the Poor Schools in Georgia, worked with the Georgia General Assembly and in 1857, they passed legislation for the purpose of providing financial and oversight plans for the improvement of Georgia’s Poor Schools (1 GA Stat. 1 Ann. §§1-001 – 1-010). The Academies and Free School Act of 1857 provided state compensation for teachers of poor children for the first time. It also provided a replacement for the previous tax system used to identify poor children between the ages of 6 and 18 in each county. Responsibilities for the identification of these poor children were assigned to a county Ordinary or Justice of the Peace. The Ordinary was given the title of Commissioner of Poor Children (Orr, 1950; Joiner et al., 1979).

### *Teacher Certification*

In 1858 as an attempt to centralize the control of education at the state level, an act of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia made the Governor the President of the Board of Trustees of Franklin College (GA Stat. 106 Ann. §§1-109 -1-112). In addition, an important benchmark in education in Georgia was established by law. All teachers who taught in schools that received state funds were required to have a certificate. The county board of examiners issued teaching certificates that attested to capability and good moral character of the teacher. The responsibility of the local schools to evaluate the quality of instruction provided by teachers was formalized in this act (Dyer, 1985; Orr, 1950).

### *The University of Georgia's Role in Education*

The University of Georgia became the first public state institution of higher education chartered in the United States. Governor Lyman Hall, a Yale graduate, who had supported the legislature of 1783 and their commitment to public education, obtained a land grant of 40,000 acres from the Georgia legislature to support a state university (Dyer, 1985; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949). Abraham Baldwin, another Yale graduate, and Hall, with the aid of Yale president Ezra Styles, developed a charter for this state college. This charter was based on the belief that an educated citizenry was imperative to a free government, and it asserted that the government must assume the responsibility of educating all citizens regardless of their social position. The University of Georgia's charter was approved on January 27, 1785 (Dyer, 1985; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

Concurrent with these activities, in 1784, the Senatus Academicus of the University of Georgia was established as the governing body for regulation of the literature of the state (Dyer, 1985; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949). According to the charter of the University of Georgia, this body

consisted of two groups; (1) the Board of Visitors, consisting of the governor, the judges of the Supreme Court, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate, and (2) the Board of Trustees who were appointed and elected from faculty members of the university community. Supervision of schools became an activity of the state university and was conducted by visiting committees or groups formed from the Board of Visitors and the Board of Trustees of the Senatus Academicus. These committee visits replaced inspection by ministers as the mode of supervision in Georgia's schools. These groups would also evaluate the competence of a school's teachers; however, knowing little about instructional methods, their approach to instructional improvement was to fire incompetent teachers and to hire new ones (Georgia Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974).

#### *The Civil War's Effect on Education*

During the Civil War, the entire educational system of Georgia including the University of Georgia was shut down. Young white males, who made up the student bodies in the universities, were engaged in battle. The government of Georgia was occupied with the war, and all available funds went to the war effort (Evans, 1913; Klein & Pascoe, 2005; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

After the Civil War ended, the focus on education in Georgia began again with renewed intensity. The war resulted in a redirection of the state's economic base and placed new emphasis on the importance of education. The movement toward increased industrialization and urbanization required changes in school curriculums and resulted in new requirements in teacher preparation (Jerrolds, 1989; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).



### *The Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution*

Georgia had no provisions for the education of African Americans prior to the Civil War. In fact, it was illegal to teach slaves to read or to write. After the war, the need to offer education to former slaves became a necessity when the United States Congress passed the Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution in 1870 which guaranteed all male citizens the right to vote regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Georgia ratified the amendment on July 15, 1870 and quickly developed The Public Education Act of 1870 (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

### *The Public Education Act of 1870*

Many philanthropic efforts to improve education in the South appeared during the years following the Civil War. George Peabody, an educational philanthropist, established a grant to examine the needs of education in Georgia in 1867 and as a result, a study of Georgia's existing educational systems was conducted by the Georgia Teacher's Association. This study called for a state system of education and as a result, on October 13, 1870 these recommendations were adopted into law by the Georgia legislature in the form of *The Public Education Act of 1870* (Joiner et al., 1979). On that same day, Governor Rufus Bullock appointed the first state school commissioner, John Randolph Lewis.

The abolishment of slavery created a new student population in Georgia. The *Public Education Act of 1870* established a state system of education, provided for the education of former slave children, and mandated a system of supervision for all public schools in Georgia. Section 32 of this act stated:

And be it further enacted: that it shall be the duty of the trustees, in their respective districts, to make all necessary arrangements for the instruction of the white and colored

youth of the district in separate schools. They shall provide the same facilities for each, both as regards schoolhouses and fixtures, and the attainment and abilities of teacher, length of term-time, etc.: but the children of the white and colored races shall not be taught together in any sub district of the state. (Georgia Acts and Resolutions, 1870)

*The Public Education Act of 1870* not only established a racially segregated dual school system, but also established county boards of education whose members would represent the various districts in each county. The board had the responsibility to establish a three member Trustee Board to supervise all phases and operations of the schools in their district. The trustees were required to visit each school in their district at least twice during each term to examine the quality of instruction. The Public Education Act of 1870 represented a step in professionalizing supervision in the public schools.

#### *Professionalization of Teaching in Georgia*

Efforts to professionalize teaching in Georgia did not begin until 1831 when a group of educators established the Teachers Society and The Board of Education of the State of Georgia. Members of these groups would later found the Georgia Teachers Association (GTA). The Georgia Teacher's Association was established in 1867 by 25 educators from various colleges and private schools in Georgia. The association's name was changed to the Georgia Educational Association (GEA) in 1900 and back to the Georgia Teachers' Association in 1922. Members of the GTA focused their efforts on increasing the quality of teaching in Georgia (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

#### *Teacher Education and the Morrill Act*

Gustavus J. Orr became the State School Commissioner in 1872. He advocated for a state school to train teachers and supported the education of African Americans. Vocational education

was also promoted by Orr. High Schools were the responsibility of city and local governments, not a function of the state, and as a result, most of these schools received little or no funding (Klein & Pascoe, 2005; Orr, 1950).

The University of Georgia was designated a land-grant institution and expanded its curriculum to include the agricultural and mechanical arts under the *Morrill Act* in 1862 (Jerrolds, 1989; Orr, 1950)). *The Morrill Act* and later companion laws formalized the university's public service mission including the education of Georgia's teachers (Dyer, 1985; Jerrolds, 1989).

The General Assembly of the State of Georgia established a Normal Department in the North Georgia Agricultural College at Dahlonega in 1877 and authorized the faculty of this college to issue certificates of proficiency and licenses to teach in the common schools of the state (GA Stat. CXX Ann.§§ 1-2-117 – 1-7-118). The Normal Department at Dahlonega marked the first college program in Georgia to be established for the purpose of educating teachers. The faculty's responsibility for issuing certificates required them to observe and to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers and thus established a supervisory role for college faculty members (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950)

Teacher education became a function of the University of Georgia in 1891 when the Georgia Legislature established the State Normal Schools including one in Athens. The purpose of these schools was to educate and to train teachers for Georgia's Common Schools. The schools began operations in the summer of 1892. The programs of the Normal School operated during the summer months and offered a curriculum that included general education and specific professional training in pedagogy (Jerrolds, 1989). The first instructor at the Normal School in Athens was Lawton Bryan Evans, and he "superintended" the program during the 1891-1893

sessions. After leaving the Normal School, Evans became the superintendent of the Richmond County School System and authored *Lectures in School Supervision* in 1905 (Jerrolds, 1989; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

### *Teacher Education and Philanthropic Efforts*

During the 1890s, the emphasis on the education of former slave children became the aim of several philanthropic individuals and groups which would continue in one form or another for the next 100 years (Georgia Association of Jeanes Curriculum Directors & Southern Education Foundation, 1975). The General Assembly of the State of Georgia passed legislation in 1890, charging the university system to establish a school for African Americans as a branch of the state university and to provide appropriations for the same (GA Stat. 2 Ann. §§20-099-108). The General Assembly also amended the school laws of October 27, 1887. Included in the amendments were requirements for (1) teacher examinations administered by County Boards of Education, (2) establishment of County Institutes for the gathering and instructing the common school teachers of each county in the state for two weeks between June and July and one Saturday each month during the school year, (3) establishment of the Board of Visitors to attend to the examinations at Georgia Normal and Industrial College and to report on the condition and management of said institution as well as the progress of the students, and (4) provision of local taxation by counties for the support of the common schools.

Since Georgia's racially segregated dual school system was reinforced in 1896 with the *Plessey v. Ferguson* U.S. Supreme Court decision that established "separate but equal" facilities as constitutional, there was a movement toward the education of African American teachers. Thus, in 1902 John D. Rockefeller established the General Education Board to promote the establishment of normal schools for African American teachers along with public schools for

African American children. Funds for African American education were made available to hire a state agent for African American schools who would serve as a representative for foundations (Sessoms et al., 1975).

Dr. James H. Dillard, former Dean at Tulane University in New Orleans, LA, became the supervisor of the County African American Schools in 1907, and he became the first president and director of the “Negro Rural School Fund,” commonly known as the Jeanes Fund (Sessoms et al., 1975; Orr, 1950).

### *Supervision of Teachers in Georgia*

Two northern philanthropists played a major role in improving education in Georgia. Miss Anna T. Jeanes and Julius Rosenwald established funds to promote the improvement of education for African American students in the south. Miss Jeanes provided funds to train supervising teachers for Georgia’s segregated African American schools. Mr. Rosenwald began providing funds for vocational education teachers and school construction for African American students and expanded his support to the training of supervisors in 1932 (Sessoms et al., 1975; GACIS, 1974).

Miss Anna T. Jeanes, a Quaker woman from Philadelphia who wished to aid “little Negro schools,” established the Jeanes fund to assist in the development of the rural African American schools (Georgia Association of Jeanes Curriculum Directors & Southern Education Foundation, 1975, p. 7). Her first grant in Georgia was to the Fort Valley Normal and Industrial School of Fort Valley, Georgia. Among members of a board of 17 to which administration of these funds was entrusted were David C. Barrow, Andrew Carnegie, James H. Dillard, George F. Peabody, William H. Taft, and Booker T. Washington (Orr, 1950; Georgia Association of Jeanes Curriculum Directors & Southern Education Foundation, 1975; Joiner et al., 1979).

A Jeanes teacher was an African American who was an employee of the county school system and served on a county-wide basis to help improve the work of the schools and community life of African Americans in the state. Modeled after the work of America's first Jeanes teacher, Virginia Randolph, in the state of Virginia, the role of Georgia's Jeanes teachers was to strengthen elementary schools and their teachers and to promote the development of African American high schools. Thus, some of the Jeanes teachers' work included the training of African American teachers in teaching content and pedagogy and eventually they became known as Jeanes Supervisors (Sessoms et al., 1975; Orr, 1950). Georgia counties began to employ Jeanes Supervisors in 1908, and in 1911, the Rosenwald Fund was established to improve African American education in the rural South. (Sessoms et al., 1975)

Julius Rosenwald, a partner and vice president of Sears, Roebuck and Co., helped Booker T. Washington build African American schools in the south by supplementing contributions of land, labor, and materials of the county and through individuals in the communities. In 1930 and 1931, he contributed \$44,798 toward various projects in Georgia (Joiner et al., 1979). Many of the early Georgia Jeanes Supervisors helped to build Rosenwald Schools in their counties.

The financial support provided to African American students in Georgia by Anna T. Jeanes and Julius Rosenwald helped to offset the inequities of segregation in the early 1900s. In fact, the support for supervisory training established the foundation for Georgia's tradition of teacher support through supervision.

#### *Educational Reorganization in Georgia*

In 1911, the Georgia Legislature established a New State Board of Education. Georgia passed a constitutional amendment in 1912 to include high schools in state funding (Joiner et al., 1979). The Compulsory School Attendance and Child Labor Laws were enacted in 1916. This

collection of laws paved the way for expansion of Georgia's elementary and secondary educational system (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950). Women were admitted to the state university as regular students in 1918. The State Normal School in Athens established a four year curriculum in 1922 for granting Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Degrees in education (Jerrolds, 1989; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949). Teacher certification became a state function in 1924 when the State Division of Certification was created (Joiner et al., 1979).

The first district Agricultural and Mechanical School in Statesboro was renamed Georgia Normal School when it added a teacher training program and achieved accreditation as a junior college program from the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1924. In 1929, the Normal School was renamed South Georgia Teacher College (Orr, 1950; Grimsley et al., 1974). The University System of Georgia was created in 1932 and brought the state's 25 other public colleges together under the centralized administrative control of the Board of Regents. South Georgia Teacher College was merged with the University of Georgia (Joiner et al., 1979).

#### Background of Education in Georgia: 1933 to 1968

This section describes and documents events and circumstances surrounding the establishment of the program for the training of supervisors at South Georgia Teachers College in 1937 and traces the program's movement to the University of Georgia. This program and the individuals involved became a key component in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1968. The events and circumstances surrounding the development of the program for the training of supervisors is discussed in the context of educational legislation during the time 1933 to 1968.

### *The Georgia Program for Improvement of Instruction*

The Program for Improvement of Instruction, an initiative to improve Georgia's public school curriculum, was undertaken by the Georgia Department of Education in 1933. The Program for Improvement of Instruction with the backing of the Georgia Association of Educators was viewed as "a cooperative undertaking on the part of teachers to improve the quality of teaching" (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 1, 1935, 1937, p. 11). The committee was charged with developing a plan for constructing a curriculum to meet the needs of Georgia's children. The Georgia Program for Improvement of Instruction included three phases:

1. Grounding the teachers of this state in the fundamentals of the curriculum,
2. Developing a statement of social and educational goals and a program for realization in the lives of individuals,
3. Induction of these principles into classroom procedure through an expanded and improved program of supervision. (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 1, 1935, 1937, p. 12)

### *The Blue Book and the Red Book*

*Organization and Conduct of Teacher Study Groups*, commonly called the "Blue Book," (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 1) was published in 1935 and later revised in 1937. The book was a result of the work of a committee comprised of teachers, principals, superintendents, and state education personnel. This state funded initiative served to emphasize and to fund a new role for supervision in Georgia's schools. The "Blue Book" presented eighteen topics that could serve as the focus for the study groups. Those topics were as follows:

1. The Need of a Changed Education (p. 23)



2. The New Meaning of the Curriculum (p. 26)
3. A Democratic Education Program (p. 28)
4. Individual Differences in Pupils (p. 31)
5. The Effect of Mental Discipline on the Schools (p. 33)
6. College Entrance Requirements and the Public Schools (p. 35)
7. Education in Progressive Schools (p. 38)
8. Psychological Foundation of Education (p. 41)
9. Learning in the Modern School (p. 46)
10. The Place of Subject Matter in Education (p. 48)
11. Methods of Learning and Teaching (p. 50)
12. The Active Program (p. 52)
13. The Integrated School Program (p. 54)
14. An Educational Program for Adults (p. 56)
15. Aims and Objectives in Education (p. 57)
16. Curriculum Improvement (p. 59)
17. The Learning Experience (p. 62)
18. Planning a Learning Experience (p. 64)

Each of these topics was accompanied with questions and a bibliography of resources to be used by the study groups. The “Blue Book” was followed with a companion publication entitled *Georgia Program for the Improvement of Instruction*, commonly known as the “Red Book” (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 2, 1938, 1942).

The “Red Book” was a curriculum improvement guide for use by the teacher study groups. This publication identified seven “problems” that would serve as objectives to be

addressed by the curriculum being developed by the study groups. These problems were the basis for the Scope Chart included in the “Red Book” (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 2, 1938, 1942, p. 38a). The Scope Chart had three functions:

First, the chart organizes and simplifies the classification of the problems a teacher discovers in his pupils. Second, it defines the area in which any teacher’s work should largely be confined. The third use is a standard by which subject matter can be chosen. (p. 39)

The seven “persistent problems or basic aspects of living” defined in the Scope Chart were as follows:

1. Maintaining physical, mental and emotional health,
2. Earning a living,
3. Performing the responsibilities of citizenship,
4. Utilizing and controlling the natural environment for individual and social needs,
5. Receiving and transmitting ideas and transporting persons and commodities,
6. Expressing aesthetic and spiritual impulses,
7. Utilizing education as a means of acquiring and transmitting the social heritage, and as an agency for conserving and improving human and material resources.

(Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 2, 1938, 1942, p. 38a)

Teaching objectives for these seven problems were organized according to six levels of schooling:

1. Preschool,
2. Early Elementary,
3. Later Elementary Grades 4, 5, 6, and 7,

4. Lower Secondary Grades 7, 8, and 9,
5. Upper Secondary Grades 10, 11, 12, Junior College,
6. Adult Education. (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 2, 1938, 1942, p. 38a)

The “Blue Book” and the “Red Book” were written as the result of the work of various committees under the direction of the Georgia Program for the Improvement of Instruction. These publications became widely used by supervisors in their work with teachers through out the state of Georgia.

#### *Training and Certification of School Supervisors*

South Georgia Teacher College at Statesboro established the state’s first college program for the training and certification of school supervisors in 1937. This program brought together certain individuals who would become instrumental in the supervision program of study at the University of Georgia that would merge with the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to become the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1968. Those individuals were Marvin Summers Pittman, Jane Franseth, Kate Houx, and Johnnye V. Cox. The model used to train supervisors at South Georgia Teacher College was call the “Zone Plan” and was developed by Marvin Pittman during his studies at Columbia University (Grimsley et al., 1974).

Marvin Pittman was a proponent of improving the quality of rural schools prior to his appointment as president of South Georgia Teacher College in 1934. He developed a systematic approach to “helping teachers” which he used as the focus of his doctoral dissertation, *The Value of School Supervision Demonstrated with the Zone Plan in Rural Schools*, completed at Columbia University in 1921. This approach was called the zone plan (Pittman, 1921).

The “Zone Plan” was so called because the supervisory process was organized around three specific zones of a school system. These zones should be based on “topographical, social and educational conditions” (Pittman, 1921 p. 115). The first zone would be visited by the supervisor during the first week of the month. Supervisors would conduct classroom visitations and then meet together with the teachers of those schools on that Saturday to discuss their experiences and plan for the visits to the next zone during the following week. The same process would be used in zones two and three. The supervisor would plan for the next round of visits to the three zones during the fourth week. This process was repeated every four weeks (Pittman, 1921).

The population of Georgia in 1934, when Marvin Pittman came to South Georgia Teacher College, was predominately rural communities inhabited by people who made their living from small farms. The schools in these areas, unlike those in the larger cities, had not evolved dramatically from the old field schools of the early 1800s. The teachers in these communities, although educated, were given little to no continuing education and supervisory support (Orr, 1950).

#### *School Funding, Teacher Certification, and Teachers’ Salaries*

State School Superintendent M. D. Collins was an advocate of equalization of educational opportunity for all the states public school students with state funds. The Georgia legislature proposed a three bill education package on January 15<sup>th</sup> of 1937 known as *The Seven Months School Law* and *The Equalization of Educational Opportunity Law*. The bills passed and Governor E. D. Rivers signed them into law. House Bill No. 123 mandated a seven month school term for all state schools. House Bill No. 125 established an elected state lay board of education and House Bill N. 141 provided for free textbooks. Other provisions of the package provide for

equalization of funds to pay teachers based on a formula involving average daily attendance of each district's students and provided for the equalization of funds for counties and cities. This education package also provided state support for student transportation services, minimum courses of study and revision of the state's curriculum (Joiner et al., 1979).

The newly adopted salary schedule for teachers prompted the State Board of Education to adopt new certification requirements. The new salary schedule differentiated teacher pay based on level of education and years of experience. Special certification was also established for administrative and supervisory personnel. This certification set the stage for the establishment of a supervision program at South Georgia Teacher College (Joiner et al., 1979). The Board of Regents at South Georgia Teacher College employed Jane Franseth, who had worked with Marvin Pittman in Michigan, to serve as a demonstration supervisor to train local supervisors in 1935. Her work over the next two years was the foundation of the supervision program of study at that institution (Grimsley et al., 1974).

Rosenwald Scholarships were established for the training of individuals who could offer direct assistance to classroom teachers in rural schools in the south. These scholarships became the foundation for the program for the training of supervisors at South Georgia Teacher College that would eventually be moved to the University of Georgia (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The Julius Rosenwald Foundation of Chicago terminated its funding for school buildings in 1932; however, President Franklin D. Roosevelt managed to secure Rosenwald funding to help finance the construction of the Eleanor Roosevelt School in Warm Springs, Georgia. The Rosenwald Foundation also supplied a grant to South Georgia Teacher College in Statesboro in 1937 for the purpose of training white supervisors. Marvin Pittman obtained this \$25,000 grant to offer 30 experienced Georgia teachers a two year scholarship for training to become

supervisors in rural elementary schools. The scholarships would award the recipients \$250 a year for two years (Grimsley et al., 1974; Joiner et al., 1979).

Recruitment began to fill the 30 scholarships for the 1937 to 1938 class. Pittman wrote letters to the superintendents of rural school systems throughout the state of Georgia seeking applicants for these scholarships. Pittman received more than one hundred applications from which 80 were invited to Statesboro for the final selection process. The first group to enter the program consisted of 30 Georgia Educators. One of these supervisors in training was Johnnye V. Cox who would eventually direct the graduate program of study in supervision at the University of Georgia. (Grimsley et al., 1974)

The 80 applicants arrived on the campus of South Georgia Teacher College on Friday, June 4, 1937. They attended dinner and a reception that evening and a luncheon the next day. During these three social events, faculty and community members informally evaluated the suitability of each applicant. Jane Franseth organized the formal interviews and comprehensive testing of the applicants conducted that Saturday afternoon. The Committee for Rosenwald Scholarships reviewed the formal and informal data and selected the 30 scholarship recipients (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The South Georgia Teacher College program for the Rosenwald scholars consisted of field studies and activities as well as campus studies and activities. The field studies and activities were directed by Jane Franseth. Kate Houx, who had worked with Pittman and Franseth in Michigan, was recruited to direct the campus studies and activities (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The 30 Rosenwald scholarship recipients along with Jane Franseth and Kate Houx organized a club to plan additional activities to foster their professional growth. The members

became known as “Rosies” and they produced a quarterly publication entitled “The Helping Teacher.” This publication explored various issues in education and the field of supervision. Johnnye V. Cox became the club’s first president. Habersham County Superintendent Claude Purcell employed Miss Cox at the end of the first year and she remained there until she came to the University of Georgia in 1946 (Grimsley et al., 1974).

During the period that South Georgia Teacher College was establishing the Rosenwald supported supervision program, the University of Georgia hired a new Dean of Education. Walter Dewey Cocking assumed that position in September of 1937. Dean Cocking and Marvin Pittman would become linked together in an action by Georgia Governor, Eugene Talmadge, which would result in the loss of accreditation of 10 Georgia colleges by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Dyer, 1985; Jerrolds, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

The directors of the Rosenwald Board, pleased with the results of the program at South Georgia Teacher College, wished to expand the program to the graduate level at the end of the first two years. Since South Georgia Teacher College was an undergraduate institution, the supervision program was moved to the University of Georgia at the beginning of the fall term in 1939. Dean Cocking secured a two year agreement with the Rosenwald Board that would offer scholarships of four hundred dollars for the pursuit of a master’s degree in supervision. The Rosenwald Board withdrew their support for the program in 1941 due to the actions of Governor Eugene Talmadge (Dyer, 1985; Grimsley et al., 1974; Jerrolds, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

### *Integration of Teacher Preparation Programs*

The Georgia Advisory Committee on Teacher Education joined with New York and Michigan in a three year program sponsored by the National Commission on Teacher Education of The American Council on Education to study the improvement of teacher education in 1940. Georgia received a \$36,000 grant and began a state-wide study. Two Georgia education councils were involved in this endeavor; The Georgia Council on Teacher Education, which was focused on white educators, and the Georgia Committee on Cooperation in Teacher Education for African-Americans (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

The possible racial integration of teacher preparation programs in Georgia received state wide attention in 1941, when the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, S. V. Sanford, recommended the retention and renewal of all heads of units of the University System. Governor Eugene Talmadge spoke to the Board of Regents of which he was chairman of the Education-Finance committee, and asked that President Marvin S. Pittman of the Georgia Teachers College in Statesboro not be renewed to his post. He also recommended that Walter D. Cocking, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Georgia not be renewed. The two were attacked by the Governor for their interest in the education of African-American teachers, their involvement with the Rosenwald Foundation and Dean Cocking for allegedly suggesting to his faculty that they might integrate the University of Georgia's College of Education (Dyer, 1985; Jerrolds, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

The Board of Regents complied with the Governor's recommendation and as a result, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools charged the Governor with undue political interference with the operation of the state's colleges. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools withdrew accreditation of 10 Georgia colleges including South



Georgia Teacher College and the University of Georgia on September 1, 1942 (Dyer, 1985; Jerrolds, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949). Because of this political controversy, progressive Attorney General, Ellis G. Arnold was elected to the Governor's office in November 1942. He persuaded the general assembly to dissolve the Board of Regents and to then allow him to appoint a new Board. The new Board of Regents restored Pittman and Cocking to their respective positions. Arnold went on to reform the University System. Governor Arnold's progressive views on race issues, however, cost him the election in 1946. Eugene Talmadge regained the Governor's office that year (Dyer, 1985; Jerrolds 1989; & Reed, 1949).

A new program for the preparation of supervisors was established at the University of Georgia in 1943. This program was sponsored by the Georgia Council on Teacher Education. Jane Franseth was named director of the Program for the Education of Supervisors. West Georgia College and Georgia State College for Women served as learning centers for the program. The loss of the Rosenwald Board's financial support had an effect on the scope of this new program. The council provided funds for only eight scholarships. These funds were only available for the next two years (Grimsley et al., 1974).

#### *The University of Georgia's Role in Educational Reform*

The need to improve Georgia's public school system was made obvious during World War II when it was discovered that the state's young men demonstrated a much higher rate of illiteracy than those from other states. The Georgia Education Association established The Georgia Educational Panel, under the direction of Dean O. C. Aderhold. In 1947, this panel developed a plan to create a 12-year school program. The panel, remaining under the direction of Dean Aderhold, became The Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services as a function of

the College of Education at the University of Georgia in January of 1947 (Jerrols, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979).

The following year Johnnye V. Cox came to the University of Georgia as the director of the Georgia Program for the Education of Supervisors which was a division of the Bureau. She was assisted by Reba Burnham. O. C. Aderhold became the President of the University of Georgia in 1951. He appointed John A. Dotson to the position of Dean of Education that same year (Jerrols, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979).

The Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services was established in January 1947 to conduct research on problems in Georgia's schools and offer assistance to local school systems in address these problems. The Bureau conducted an extensive study of the operations of Georgia's common schools. This study produced a report entitled "A Survey of Public Education of Less Than College Grade in Georgia", which would eventually lead to one of the states largest school reform acts, The Minimum Foundations Program of Education for Georgia Act of 1949 was enacted in 1951 (Jerrols, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979). Joseph A. Williams and Johnnye V. Cox were members of the research team. The Act was revised in 1964 (Joiner et al., 1979). Dr. Grimsley recalled the impact of the Act:

That's funding and there had been the Minimum Foundation, which I think Joe Williams who was the Dean, wrote that or did the research as a part of that. [It] had to do with his dissertation, but it was funding. It set up more than just funding. The force was that money was to be appropriated to fund certain kinds of things in schools. So, it really was a vision for schools. (July, 2005)

Dr. Gerald Firth explained how the funding under the Minimum Foundations Program of Education for Georgia was rather unique in comparison to other states in the United States at that time. Dr. Firth explained further:

I think there were leadership roles created in Georgia that were hard to find elsewhere because they all had to be raised or you had to give up a teaching assignment in the local school system to create that, and the difference between whatever the salary was for the teacher and that administrator role had to be raised locally. In my experience prior to coming to Georgia was that most states where the money had to be raised out of local taxation and that's a hard battle to fight. Here where a great deal, if not all the money is from elsewhere, notably the state, an act of the state has a tremendous effect what a small system particularly can do. (July, 2005)

Dr. Ray Bruce described the impact that the Act had on the development of training and employment of supervisors in Georgia. Dr. Bruce shared:

That one [Minimum Foundations Program of Education for Georgia ] was very important in terms of the underwriting initiated and subsequently broadened to for the then cooperative education service agencies, and there was across the state with all the federal grants that were emerging too at that time, the need to have people who were identified as supervisors and a minimum preparation program for people with masters degrees emerged with, you could really get qualified as an I.S. [Instructional Supervisor] certificate with substantively three courses. (June, 2005)

*The University of Georgia, College of Education Re-organization Efforts*

Lutian Wootton in series of histories he wrote regarding the Department of Curriculum and Teaching and the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, indicated he was attracted to

the University of Georgia as a result of meeting Johnnye V. Cox and Reba Burnham and learning about the program of supervision (Wootton 1994). The reputation of Johnnye V. Cox and Reba Burnham along with the supervision program was described by Edith Grimsley:

Johnnye and Reba simply called it the program for training educational supervisors. I don't think they even used the term instructional supervisor. It was the training of supervisors because I think that goes all the way back to Pittman. But because these women were the face of that program in Georgia, the only place you received the program that would certify you in the State of Georgia was at the University of Georgia. The interesting thing was not only was Johnnye the leader of that program, but she was also in charge of the certification of supervisors, so there was no way you went around [her]. So when Johnnye said somebody was certified, the state department said yes!

(June, 2005)

Dr. Ray Bruce described his awareness of the reputation that Johnnye V. Cox and Reba Burnham as well as the Georgia Program for the Education of Supervisors had when he was working in Pine Bluff Arkansas prior to coming to Georgia:

I knew about the Georgia Supervision Program long before I ever met Johnnye Cox and Reba Burnham. It was known to us in Arkansas, where I was in public schools, and we were very desirous of having such people doing such jobs. (June, 2005)

Wootton began his work at the University of Georgia in the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. In 1960, he approached Dean Dotson with a request to study the possibility of expanding the offering in curriculum study at the undergraduate and graduate levels. A committee was established and organized by Dean Dotson and chaired by Doyne Smith (Wootton 1993). The Committee held meetings over a period from September, 1960 to May,

1961. Despite the work of the Committee, no changes to the curriculum were made at that time (Wootton, 1969).

Although the 1960 committee to study curriculum offerings produced no additional offerings, Wootton continued to express concerns. In 1964, he was granted one third workload research time to study the curriculum and instruction in teacher preparation programs in institution of higher education through the nation (Wootton, 1993). That summer the course “Curriculum Trends” became a third course added to the sequence beginning with undergraduate “Curriculum Planning” and graduate level “Curriculum Planning” (Wootton, 1969).

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education was reorganized in 1966. The new organization consisted of five departments; (1) Curriculum and Teaching, (2) Language Education, (3) Mathematics Education, (4) Science Education, and (5) Social Science Education (Wootton, 1993). Lutian Wootton became the Chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching on July 1, 1966 (Wootton, 1969).

A doctoral program in Curriculum and Teaching was established in 1968 and that summer eight students enrolled in the program. New faculty members were employed including Dr. Ray Bruce. The undergraduate course “Curriculum Planning” was revised into three new courses entitled “Basic Curriculum – Early Childhood,” “Basic Curriculum – Elementary,” and “Basic Curriculum – Secondary.” A new sequence of graduate level curriculum courses was developed. The new sequence was established as follows: ““Fundamentals of Curriculum,” “Curriculum Trends,” “Comparative International Curricula,” “Technology in Curriculum and Teaching,” “Curriculum Planning – Elementary,” “Curriculum Planning – Secondary,” and “Curriculum Planning – Higher Education” (Wootton, 1969, 1977, 1993, 1994).

Three new members came to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching on July 1, 1968 from the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services. Johnnye V. Cox, Reba Burnham, and Virginia Macagnoni were transferred to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching along with the Georgia Program for the Education of Supervisors. The move created the new Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The move was a surprise to many. Edith Grimsley, who was interested in working with Johnnye V. Cox and Reba Burnham, expressed her surprise:

I came to the University thinking that because these women were the supervision training program, not a department, but a part of the bureau of field services which housed the training program for people who were going to be school administrators. So I came thinking that I was going to interview with Johnnye and Reba and when I arrived I was told that I was to interview with Lutian Wootton. I wasn't certain what this was about, but I learned that these groups had been brought together with curriculum and that he was the new department head and that was kind of a shock. (June, 2005)

Dr. Virginia Macagnoni also expressed her initial surprise regarding the new department: ...next thing I knew Joe Williams said...we found out and I don't think any of us knew this, [that] supervision and elementary education along with curriculum were put together in one department on the fourth floor. (July, 2005)

The researcher could not find any documented rationale for the movement of the Georgia Program for the Education of Supervisors to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. However, the next chapter provides descriptions of events and activities in the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services as well as the Department of Curriculum and Teaching that may have had an influence on Dean William's decision. The newly established Department

of Curriculum and Supervision became a leading force in the fields of curriculum and supervision at the state and national levels in subsequent years.

### Chapter Summary

Chapter 5 provided a description of events in Georgia from 1777 to 1968 that were instrumental to the eventual establishment of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. Key individuals involved in these events were also discussed. The participants of the study provided insights into the years 1967 and 1968 regarding events and circumstances associated with the establishment of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

Looking forward, Chapter 6 describes various events that preceded the formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia in 1968. The chapter also contains descriptions of selected activities in the department and of the four participants in this study. The events and activities were drawn from Dr. Lutian Wootton's earlier written histories and from themes that emerged in interviews and document reviews. In this chapter the researcher attempted to respond to Dr. Wootton's call:

It is hoped that persons of similar interest and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture as possible. (Wootton, 1994)

The participants in this study, through their insights into the years 1967 through 1968 regarding events and circumstances associated with the establishment of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, also responded to Dr. Wootton's call as they were "those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia."

Chapter 7 includes an interpretive policy analysis of educational legislation in Georgia and the United States during the period from 1777 to 1991. This analysis is presented using the Kingdon's Multiple Streams Model (1984) as an interpretive framework. The primary source data provided by the former faculty participants in the study was used to explain the impact of problems, policy and politics on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.



**CHAPTER 6**  
**FORMATION AND OPERATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM**  
**AND SUPERVISION**

**1968 to 1991**

Introduction

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia was established on July 1, 1968. It began when three members of the Program for the Training of Supervisors in the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services were reassigned by Dean Joe Williams to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. Those three members were Dr. Reba Burnham, Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, and Dr. Virginia Macagnoni. This personnel reassignment created a separation between the training of educational administrators and the training of educational supervisors in Georgia. This separation resulted in both programs establishing an identity based on the unique perspectives of their academic focus.

This chapter describes and explains some of the major activities conducted by various members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision during the years 1968 to 1991, the time span of the existence of the department. The chapter also examines some effects that this department had on the role of school supervisors in Georgia as well as the department's impact on the field of supervision. This chapter is by no means inclusive of all the department's activities and influences, but it does focus on major activities and influences as revealed by the collected data from the selected four former members from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

The chapter is organized using a general chronology based on two previous histories (1969, 1977) written by Dr. Lutian Wootton, the first chair of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, and events described by four former department members in their three interviews conducted between June 2005 and October 2007. Educational policies in Georgia were also examined in respect to their impact on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1968 to 1991.

### The Formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision

The program for the training of supervisors, that began in 1937 at South Georgia Teachers College in Statesboro and moved to the University of Georgia in 1938, had been affiliated with the training of administrators for 30 years when it was moved to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. The separation of educational supervision and educational administration at the University of Georgia was unique from most universities in 1968. Dr. Gerald Firth described his previous experiences prior to coming to the University of Georgia:

In all of the other institutions, when I came here, the person in charge of the administration program was also responsible for whatever parts of the supervision program. As a matter of fact that was their official title; they were chairman of the departments of educational administration and supervision. (July, 2005)

Although the researcher, as established in the last chapter, could not find any documented rationale for the movement of the supervision program from the administration program to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, two documents provided some insight into the combination of the supervision and administration programs that was being examined at that time: (1) the Spowles Committee Report and Recommendations presented on January 5, 1968, and (2) an outline for a “Core Program” for Administration/Supervision presented on February 5,

1968. Both reports were presented to the members of the Bureau of Educational Field Services. The contents of both documents focused on differences between the study of supervision and the study of administration.

*The Sprowles Committee Report*

The Sprowles Committee was established by Dean Williams to consider the “development” and “organizational arrangements” for the Division of Administration/Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The committee met on December 13, 1967 at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education. The Report and Recommendations of the Sprowles Committee was issued on January 5, 1968. The report included a listing of four core beliefs on which the committee made ten recommendations for the Division of Administration/Supervision. The committee expressed a belief in separate rationales for supervision and administration as unique disciplines. Dr. Lucius Linton Deck wrote in that report:

Within the Department of School Administration and Supervision, we believe the following: That supervision and administration are unique disciplines, for which concepts can be defined and formulated into separate rationales. (Deck, 1968, p. 2)

In spite of the committee’s view that supervision and administration were not the same function of leadership personnel, the committee went on to propose that the study of supervision and administration could and should remain the focus of a common department. The report contained the following statement:

We do believe that both disciplines, school administration and supervision, can be addressed to goals of a common program of a Department of School Administration and Supervision. (Deck, 1968, p. 2)

Along with the core beliefs and organizational recommendations, the Sprowles committee provided 11 instructional goals for each program of study as they related to the respective fields of supervision and administration. The committee called for the admission of sixth year<sup>1</sup> and doctoral students only after 1970 and also made recommendations for a two year residency requirement for doctoral students.

The first year of the program would be a common base program and the second year would be based on one of three general career goals. Those career goals would be in the areas of (a) the active practice of administration/supervision, (b) the professorship in administration/supervision and (c) research in administration/supervision. (Deck, 1968, p. 12)

With the Sprowles Report was a proposal to change the administrative structures to provide leadership to the common goals of each program and three co-directors to oversee the three separate career goal (practice, teaching, and research) of the three programs. The report ended with a call for an immediate “definite decision” to be made as to procedures for the development and implementation of the recommendations with the caution that “...the cohesiveness and momentum of the two groups must not be lost” (Deck, 1968; p. 16).

Dr. Johnnye V. Cox and Dr. L. Linton Deck were assigned the task of drafting a core program for Administration and Supervision after the Sprowles Committee report was issued. They distributed their proposed program draft to the members of the faculty of the Division of Administration/Supervision following month.

The “Core Program” for Administration/Supervision was presented to the faculty of the Division of Administration and Supervision on February 5, 1968 by Dr. Linton Deck, who had been the recorder for the Sprowles Report and Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, the director of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The sixth year program is equivalent to a Specialist in Education Degree.

Supervision Program. This document proposed course descriptions for the first year of study proposed by the Sprowles Report. The “Core Program” was predicated on the following assumption about the purpose of administrators and supervisors. The assumption is explained in that document as follows:

One assumption on which the “core-program” shown below is based is that administrators and supervisors have, in part, a common role expectation; i.e., both roles exist in order to facilitate the accomplishment of the basic mission (goal) of the school. This assumption applies to a broad range of administrative roles (superintendent, principal, directors of various ancillary or auxiliary services, et al.) and to various supervisory positions (subject area coordinators, curriculum directors, supervisors, assistant superintendents for instruction, etc.). It seems logical to extend this premise by assuming that the generally accepted “descriptors” of the administrative process also describe—in large measure—the process utilized by supervisory role occupants to accomplish their work of facilitation. Understanding these assumptions may help to expose other assumptions which caused us to include the kinds of experiences we have outlined in the proposed program. (Cox & Deck, 1968, p. 1)

Despite the efforts of the Sprowles Committee and Dr. Cox and Dr. Deck, Dean Williams chose not to follow the recommendations of the committees. He moved the Supervision Program to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to establish the Department of Curriculum and Supervision on July 1, 1968. Dr. Bruce shared his perspective as to some possible factors that might have influenced Dr. William’s decision.

My sense, and you know you gather these reactions over time, was that there was tension between the personnel of the supervision program and the personnel of the bureau. Now

there was no department, no official department of the administration at that time. They had the Bureau of Field Services and everybody there functioned rather independently.

(June, 2005)

Dr. Bruce continued his interpretation of the situation in the Bureau of Field Services, which housed the Division of Administration and Supervision, during the time the Sprowles Committee was formulating the “Core Program.” He described the possible source of the tension as he recalled:

Now this team of people in instructional supervision had a rather well-defined purpose as they saw it. That was a source of some difference of opinion at least. So the judgment was, I’m assuming, that Dean Williams believed that they would function more effectively if they were in the department of Curriculum and Supervision as it came to be.

(June, 2005)

Dean Williams, in reorganizing the Division of Administration/Supervision and the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to create the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, had established a program in the College of Education at the University of Georgia that became known as a leader in the field of supervision. This department had a major impact on supervisory services offered to Georgia’s teachers and became nationally known for their activities in curriculum and supervision.

*The Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1968)*

When the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was formed it had a total staff of 37 members including faculty and graduate assistants (Wootton, 1977; Bruce, 2005). The former Department of Curriculum and Teaching consisted of faculty members who served in elementary education, middle grades education, secondary education and curriculum studies. With the

addition of the supervision program the department was one of the largest in the College of Education. With such a large number of members, the dean and faculty would require an examination of its organization and operation (Wootton, 1977). A planning committee was established during the summer of 1969 to examine how best the department could function as a large and diverse group. The planning committee grouped issues facing the department into nine areas: (1) Improvement of instruction, (2) department identity, (3) research, (4) service, (5) undergraduate programs, (6) graduate programs, (7) new and more appropriate courses and experiences, (8) administration and organization of the department and (9) advisory committee (Macagnoni, 2006; Wootton, 1977).

The planning committee also proposed the development of five working committees to study the nine issues that had been identified facing the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The five committees would include all faculty members and graduate assistants. These five committees included: (1) early childhood education, (2) elementary education, (3) middle grades and secondary education, (4) supervision, and (5) curriculum. These committees represented the diversity of the department and this diversity was a major factor in the need for a department identity. Each committee was comprised of faculty members in the five areas they represented. Their charge was to examine the nine issues identified by the planning committee from the respective background and professional focus of each group. The recommendations of these committees were brought to the entire department for the development of a consensus on what actions to take (Jerrolds, 1989; Wootton, 1993).

The planning committee had stressed to the department the need for department “identity” to be a “first priority” to pursue (Wootton, 1977). A working definition for the department was adopted to address the need for an identity. The definition adopted by the

committee stated: “We view the field of curriculum and supervision as the study of the processes and personnel related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of functional educational programs” (Macagnoni, 2006; Wootton, 1977).

### *Changes in the College of Education*

On July 1, 1969 the Division of Elementary Education was formed from members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision resulting in the transfer of courses and faculty to this new division. Gilbert F. Shearron was named chairman of the new division. Dr. Bruce described how Dr. Shearron had been instrumental in bringing him to the University of Georgia:

I had a dear friend, Gilbert Shearron, who had been a colleague at Peabody. We were in the doctoral program together. He had come a year earlier into that department and felt that I would be happy here. (June, 2005)

Gilbert Shearron, who had previously been chair of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, was replaced as chair by Martin A. McCullough on September 1, 1969. The Department was transferred from the Division of Instruction to the Division of Administration and Services four months later on January 1, 1970. That same year, the College of Education was moved from Baldwin Hall to newly opened Aderhold Hall on the South Campus. Following that move, Dr. Paul Halverson was named acting chair of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision on July 1 1971 (Bruce, 2005; Wootton, 1004).

Dr. David A Payne, a specialist in evaluation, filled a position created to be shared by the Department of Educational Psychology and the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the reorganization of the College of Education on July 1, 1969. Dr. Payne taught a new course, ECS 806, Curriculum Evaluation, which had been developed and approved by school administration (Wootton, 1972).



Dr. Johnnye V. Cox retired from the University of Georgia on July 1, 1971 and was granted the title Professor Emeritus. That year she was instrumental in the establishment of The Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS), which was the result of a merger between the Jeanes supervisors' organization and the Georgia Department of Instructional Supervision. (Grimsley et al., 1974)

Dr. Gerald Firth came to the University of Georgia just as the Georgia General Assembly was preparing to enact the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG) in 1971. The Department of Curriculum and Supervision rose to national prominence during Dr. Firth's tenure as department chair. During that time, the department continued to be a major educator of supervisors in Georgia schools as well as developed a program of study for individuals in several Georgia medical schools. The department was highly active in numerous state and national professional organizations. These activities are the focus of the following sections of this chapter.

The 21 years that passed from Dr. Cox's retirement to the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership were years of growth in the field of supervision in the state of Georgia. The Department of Curriculum and Supervision gained national prominence during this period due to the activities of the department members both at the state and national levels. What follows are some of those activities as described by the subjects of this study.

#### Select Activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision

The following section describes and documents select activities described in Dr. Lutian Wootton's 1969, 1977, 1993 and 1994 historical narratives of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The activities selected were chosen because they directly involved the participants

in this study. These participants were all “personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia.” Their story is an attempt to answer Dr. Wootton’s Call. Wootton (1993) wrote:

It is hoped that persons of similar interest and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture as possible. (Appendix A)

The following covers activities that span the life of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1968 to 1991.

*Dr. Ray Bruce brings the conference call to the College of Education*

Dr. Ray Bruce was responsible for bringing the conference call to classes in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision as well as the College of Education at the University of Georgia (Wootton, 1993). In a 2006 interview, Dr. Bruce confirmed this contribution, “Within our department, within the college I’m sure that’s true.” He described the value this activity brought to the students’ learning experiences in the curriculum and supervision programs. Dr. Bruce shared:

We would actually encourage the students to read widely and then we would talk to the authors of those pieces so they could be challenged and then you’d know that they had feet of clay. We would then produce students who would be wise challengers of what they read. (October, 2007)

In that same interview, Dr. Grimsley described the benefits that the conference call brought to her students in on and off campus classes, as they studied the major writers in supervision. The equipment was portable and could be used in any facility that had a phone connection. Ben Harris or Peter Oliva could be in their home and discuss their views with a group of teachers in a middle school in South Georgia. (October, 2007)

The researcher recalled, as a student, having telephone conferences with certain authors in classes in the department of Curriculum and Supervision. Dr. Grimsley remembered some of the authors and expressed regret at not having the opportunity to conduct such a conference call with one author that had been a major influence on many members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, Dr. Kimball Wiles. Dr. Wiles died in an automobile accident in the fall of 1967, just prior to coming to the University of Georgia. Dr. Grimsley stated:

Anybody who was anybody, Ben Harris, Tom Sergiovanni, I don't think we did Kim [Kimball] Wiles, oh dear. We would conference with anybody who wrote a supervision book and if we were studying that, especially when we did trends and issues, (ECS 721) where we looked at the position of various authors on issues that were identified in supervision. (October, 2007)

Dr. Bruce discussed the conference call as it was specifically used to challenge the students in the development of their own definition of supervision. This was accomplished by the student reading authors in the field and then being able to question these authors regarding their sometime evolving views. The conference call was a major contribution to the learning experience of curriculum and supervision students. Dr. Bruce explained how students were able to here the most recent views of the authors they were studying. Dr. Bruce elaborated:

Tom Sergiovanni is a classic case. Frequently he had a new opinion and this was always interesting to the students that they would write something and then three years later have quite a different view. It was an interesting experience. It is an interacting experience. (October, 2007)

The conference call became another first for the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1981 when it was used for a doctoral student from Australia to defend his

dissertation (Wootton, 1994). The student, Ian Kerr, had been a graduate assistant in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision during his course work and comprehensive finals and returned to Australia. Dr. Bruce described the circumstances surround obtaining permission and the success of this use for the conference call.

Ian Kerr was the first student at the University of Georgia in any department to defend his dissertation by telephone. His home is Perth, Australia. He had come and done all his work on campus and the dissertation time, the defense time was at hand and I argued that it make no sense for someone to have to come from Perth, Australia for a one hour defense at our institution if it could be accomplished another way. (October, 2007)

Dr. Bruce expressed his appreciation for the support he received from Dr. Gerald Firth who was the newly-appointed chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. With Dr. Firth's support, Dr. Bruce was able to have the first dissertation defense by conference call at the University of Georgia.

The use of the conference call brought new opportunities to the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. From having key figures in the field of curriculum and supervision as guests in classes to be questioned by students, to extending the reach of the department to international students, the conference was a major contribution to the Department.

#### *Operation Boot Strap and Operation Curriculum Directors (CD)*

The Georgia Department of Education and the University of Georgia were involved in two informational programs both prior to the formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and continuing throughout the department's operation. These two programs were Operation Boot Strap and Operation CD (Curriculum Directors). Both of these programs were provided by the University of Georgia with support from the Georgia Department of Education

to inform local school system leadership officials about new regulations, programs and issues facing education in Georgia.

Operation Boot Strap was an annual meeting for superintendents conducted at the Future Farmers of America and the Future Homemakers of America camp site at Lake Jackson. The meeting served to offer professional development for Georgia school superintendents and allowed them to earn college credits toward degree programs at the University Georgia. Operation Boot Strap was developed by Dr. Doyne Muncy Smith who served as a professor of educational administration and a director of field services at the University of Georgia and Georgia State School Superintendent Dr. Claude Purcell (Joiner et al., 1979). Dr. Edith Grimsley recalled those meetings:

I would like to just say as I recall, operation boot strap was pretty much an information session from the state, with Doyne Smith presiding. There was no question about it. The state school superintendent was always there to help them know what was going on at the state level. (October, 2007)

Dr. Ray Bruce described the exclusivity of the participants at Operation Bootstrap. He also illustrates the division between administrative and supervisory personnel in Georgia school systems during that time.

Operation Boot Strap was not one for us [curriculum directors]. It was for superintendents and it was very closely monitored group by them. They had the meetings at the FFA [Future Farmers of America], FHA [Future Homemakers of America] camp that was at Lake Jackson. They [public school superintends] looked forward to it because that was their social time, but when they went into session no one else was there except

by specific invitation. They would have programs with people presenting who were not superintendents but it was a meeting for superintendents. (October, 2007)

Although members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were sometimes involved in making presentations to the state's school superintendents, they were responsible for planning and conducting the corresponding meeting of the state's curriculum directors.

Operation CD (Curriculum Directors) was a meeting for individuals in the public schools of Georgia who were responsible for supervising the curriculum programs in their schools. These meetings were a function of The Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision.

After Dr. Johnnye V. Cox retired from the University of Georgia on July 1, 1971, she was instrumental in establishing the Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS), which was the result of a merger between the Jeanes Supervisors' organization and the Georgia Department of Instructional Supervision. The new organization, GACIS, began annual meetings each fall to examine issues in supervision. GACIS also conducted two day meetings twice a year in cooperation with the College of Education at the University of Georgia. These meetings known as Operation CD (Curriculum Directors) were held at the Future Farmers of America and the Future Homemakers of America camp at Jackson Lake (Grimsley et al., 1974).

Operation CD came into existence to provide similar services as those for Operation Bootstrap for the Curriculum Directors of the local school systems in Georgia. These meetings were also conducted at Lake Jackson. The members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision were heavily involved in the development of the programs for these meetings. Dr. Grimsley explained the meeting's purpose:

Operation CD was modeled very much after that [Operation Bootstrap]. It met at a different time. I guess what now takes its place or what serves a similar purpose is the curriculum directors' meeting that is held in conjunction with the GASIS conference in the fall. (October, 2007)

Dr. Bruce explained that during the 1960s and 1970s the individuals in the local school systems who "sat in the chair for the supervision curriculum development responsibility" were commonly titled Curriculum Director. These individuals in many cases were in school systems with elected superintendents. Dr. Bruce described conditions that made these individuals a stable and "guiding lights" to local school's instructional program development and why this made Operation CD important. He explained:

Whereas superintendents might come and go, and had interests, other than the instructional program I'm sorry to say, the CD's, these Curriculum Directors, were very significant and it was important that they come together and had some central focus.

That's why Operation CD was as vibrant as it was. (October, 2007)

The objective of Operation CD was to bring together curriculum and supervisory personnel from around the state of Georgia to examine and discuss state and national issues facing the field of supervision. In 1972, GACIS established the Johnnye V. Cox Lecture Series to be a regular event at Operation CD. Dr. Cox delivered the first lecture in the series at the September 1972 meeting at Jackson Lake. Her lecture, "Supervision Today, Yesterday, and Tomorrow," became well known as part of Georgia folklore in the field of instructional supervision (Appendix B).

In recognition of Dr. Cox's contributions to the field of supervision at the state and national levels, the Georgia Division of Instructional Supervisors established an award in her

name, The Johnnye V. Cox Award, to recognize distinguished supervisors each year at this annual GACIS meeting. Dr. Cox had established funding for this award through the year 1990 at which point the award became known as the GACIS Distinguished Service Award for Supervision of Instruction. This award is presented at the GACIS Fall Conference to a Georgia public school supervisor for significant contributions to the field.

*The Publication: Instructional Supervision in Georgia (1974)*

In 1974, the Georgia Association for Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS) published the book, *Instructional Supervision in Georgia*. This book was written by a committee that included Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, Dr. Reba Burnham, and Dr. Edith Grimsley. The book details the development of school supervision in Georgia from the first school in Savannah through the merger of the Jeanes Supervisors' Organization and the Georgia Department of Instructional Supervision to create GACIS. It was a first-hand account of the actual experiences of Georgia's earliest school and system based supervisors as well as a historical perspective of school supervision in Georgia's schools from 1637 to 1972. The book was funded by the Georgia ASCD and was distributed in limited quantities. Dr. Grimsley describes the scope of the book:

You've seen the book and you know that it starts with the earliest of supervision in this state and then follows it through chronologically and does speak to the developments with the sixth year certification and of course every thing that had happened to that point in time. (October, 2007)

Dr. Grimsley described some of the content of this book as having been drawn from the actual diaries of the interns supervised by Dr. Cox and Dr. Burnham. These diaries were an integral component of the intern program. The diaries were composed of the reflections of the interns as they conducted their on the job experiences. These diaries were read by college



supervisors and then the intern would receive a personalized response from his/her respective professor. Dr. Grimsley explained how these diaries were saved and used in the (GACIS) published book, *The Instructional Supervision in Georgia*:

So they had kept their copies and they were very sure that there was information in those diaries that would be useful and so they were happy about this. Reba and Johnnye were going to do that and they ultimately did. That was to look back through the diaries to get examples of how supervision was carried out in local schools. (Oct, 2007)

This publication was printed in a small quantity and is no longer available for purchase. Copies of the book are housed in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy at the University of Georgia. The year before the book was published, Dr. Cox retired from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia, and Georgia began a period of educational reform precipitated by the election of a new reform-minded governor, Jimmy Carter. Governor Carter became the driving force behind Georgia's Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG).

APEG made it possible for Georgia's public schools to provide increased supervisory services to the classroom teacher. The funding provided by this legislation allowed for increased supervisory personnel as well. The increase in services and personnel lead to increased enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and helped to make the department a leader in the field of supervision. One position that can be traced to that period of time and the department was the Instructional Lead Teacher.

#### *The Development of the Instructional Lead Teacher Role*

In January of 1971, an event that would have far reaching effects on Georgia's public schools and colleges occurred. Jimmy Carter was sworn in as Governor of Georgia on January

12, 1971. Jimmy Carter had made educational reform and government reorganization key themes in his campaign for the office. Two years earlier, Carter addressed a governor's conference and referred to Georgia's public education as "an abysmally poor academic program" (Atlanta Constitution, October 10, 1969, p. 1C). Governor Carter addressed the need to reform the school systems in 1973, after he had completely restructured the state's government (Joiner et al., 1979).

The Georgia General Assembly authorized a Blue Ribbon Committee in 1973 to study and to make suggestions for the improvement of the state's schools. Governor Carter chaired the subcommittee dealing with instructional services. This committee named for Georgia's previous education law, The Minimum Foundation Program of Education Study Committee, published their report, "Adequate Program for Education in Georgia: A Summary," in December of 1973. The committee called for increased supervisory services to improve the effectiveness of Georgia's schools. The report also stressed the role of the Cooperative Educational Services Agencies:

The supervision required for a smoothly functioning school or system has increased dramatically over the last few years as our educational program has grown in complexity. The superintendent is the administrative leader of the school system. The instructional supervisor is needed for the direct development of staff and individual instruction. In addition, specialized technical assistance is needed at the school system or CESA level to provide the necessary services for the efficient management of the entire system

*(Adequate Program for Education in Georgia: A Summary, 1973, p. 27).*

*The Adequate Program for Education in Georgia: A Summary*, also included addressing the need for increased school level supervisory services to be provided to principals so they could insure the quality of the education provided to Georgia students:

Traditionally the school principal is responsible for all phases of the local school program including instruction, guidance services, health services and food services. It is important that a sufficient number of supervisory personnel be provided in order to ensure that a quality educational program is available to the student. (p. 27)

The 1973 Blue Ribbon Committee's report became the basis for the 1974 Senate Bill No. 672 which became the *Adequate Program for Education in Georgia Act (APEG)* (Law Number: 1242). The act's full name outlines the provisions. Among those provisions were increased supervisory services at the school and system level:

...to provide for instructional services; to provide for supportive services; to provide for cooperative education service agencies; to provide for grants to local units of administration for the operation of educational programs. (Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1974, p. 1045)

These provisions had a direct effect on supervisory services in Georgia school systems. Governor Jimmy Carter's The Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG) was the most extensive educational reform act in Georgia's history (Joiner et al., 1979).

The Adequate Program for Education in Georgia had a direct impact on the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in its' program for the training of supervisors. Section 21 of APEG entitled Administrative and Supervisory Services, provided funding for leadership personnel in Georgia public school systems based on student attendance. Subsections (a) and (b) of Section 21 stated:

(a) The State Board of Education shall annually allot administrative and supervisory personnel to local units of administration, except as provided for in this section, on the basis of one per 190 pupils in average daily attendance in the local unit of administration

adjusted as provided for in sections 37 and 42. Administrative and supervisory personnel positions provided by this allotment shall include, but not be limited to, principals, assistant principals, librarians, curriculum specialists, directors of curriculum and community school coordinators.

(b) The State Board of Education shall further allot professional central administrative personnel to all local units of administration on the basis of one per 3,300 pupils in average daily attendance in the local unit of administration, adjusted as provided for in sections 37 and 42. The administrative positions provided by this allotment shall include, but not be limited to, plant operations and maintenance, transportation, food service, instructional supervision, finance and business services, planning and evaluation and direction of community school programs. For those local units of administration which do not earn sufficient central administration personnel, the State Board of Education is authorized to prescribe uniform requirements and procedures to allow a local unit of administration to utilize all or any part of its central administration personnel allotments in conjunction with one or more local units of administration or with a Cooperative Education Service Agency; provided, however, personnel allotments earned under the provisions of this section may not be assigned for use as classroom teachers, or other personnel designated in subsection (a) of this section (APEG, p.1059).

The funding provided for supervisory personnel and curriculum directors and thus increased the student enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision as systems sought to employ qualified individuals to fill these positions. Dr. Grimsley recalled the impact Johnnye Cox and Reba Burnham had on Section 21 of APEG and the resulting effect on the department's enrollment. In her 2005 interview, Dr. Grimsley recalled:

Adequate Foundation provided for a curriculum director in every county above a certain number of students. There were years in which they [Johnnye V. Cox and Reba Burnham] would have 8, 10, 12 students, and then we had classes of 100 students which blew our minds. We team taught and did all kinds of things when those came along. Those effected [the department] in terms of numbers. (June, 2006)

The Georgia Education Association, the State Department of Education and the University System of Georgia had backed the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG). This act also funded the development of regional cooperatives between school systems to provide services that were too costly for many local school systems to offer independently. A Cooperative Educational Service Association (CESA) was funded with state funds and funds from the cooperative's member school systems. The organization addressed the needs of their members. The cooperatives began mostly in rural areas of the state. As more money became available through state and federal funds, these organizations began to serve schools in every region of Georgia. The name of these service centers was subsequently changed to Regional Educational Services Associations (RESA) to reflect service in regional areas of Georgia.

Dr. Bruce discussed the development of the Cooperative Educational Service Association (CESA) and later the Regional Educational Service Association (RESA) as a result of the educational reform act, APEG. He also discussed the impact the education act had on the role of supervisors in the school systems of Georgia. Dr. Bruce explained:

I said that one of the out growths [of APEG] was the CESAs and later the RESAs and that gave a tremendous need across the state. It spawned a need for people who had the supervision function at heart and what emerged was strong and pervasive until it began to get wrapped up in accountability. (February, 2006)

The accountability to which Dr. Bruce referred would eventually influence the nature of supervision in Georgia schools and the people who performed supervisory services in them. Accountability and its' influence on supervision was evident in the rise and decline of the school based supervisor in Georgia during the period from 1968 to 1991. Georgia's next major educational reform act, *The Quality Basic Education Act* (QBE) of 1985 under the leadership of Lt. Gov. Roy Barnes, would mark the rise of the accountability trend that Br. Bruce believed changed supervision functions in Georgia schools. *The Quality Basic Education Act* will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

The training of school based supervisors became a major focus of the program of supervision in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision since the passage of APEG. The supervision program's internship was a key component that existed since the program was established at South Georgia Teachers College in 1937. The concept of in-service training had been a key component of Marvin Pittman's original "Zone Plan" detailed in his doctoral dissertation (Pittman, 1921). The internship continued to be a central activity of the program when it was brought to the University of Georgia and continued when the original program under the Bureau of Field Services was merged into the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. Dr. Grimsley discussed the internship's beginning in her second interview:

There had always been an internship. For as long as there was a program here there was an internship and so I guess I would have to say when Reba Burnham and Johnnye Cox became a part of the department they brought the program with them. Not just that program [the internship], but the entire supervision program. It was a given that that the internship was a part of it, and not only that, but that it was a year long activity. (March, 2006)

The number of students enrolled in the supervision program began to increase steadily when the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was established in 1968. During that period, Georgia counties began to add school based supervisory positions called Instructional Lead Teachers (Guerke, 1991; Kahrs, 1991; Williams, 1990). These positions were often staffed with individuals who obtained the Instructional Supervisor (I.S.) endorsement added to their teaching certificate. This endorsement required 15 quarter hours and resulted in a pay supplement for positions that involved supervision of teachers (Williams, 1990).

The position of Instructional Lead Teacher (ILT) began to emerge as a school based instructional supervisory position in various public school systems in Georgia during the early operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia (Kahrs, 1991; Williams, 1990). Two Department members who were closely associated with the implementation of these positions in Georgia were Dr. Ray Bruce and Dr. Edith Grimsley.

The training of Instructional Lead Teachers became the focus of cooperative programs between local Georgia school systems and the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Among the original systems involved were Americus City, Dekalb County, Gwinnett County, Houston County, and Richmond County (Kahrs, 1991; Williams, 1990). The two faculty members who were the most active in these systems were Dr. Ray Bruce and Dr. Edith Grimsley. Dr. Bruce discussed those programs:

Now Edith Grimsley and I made much of the Instructional Lead Teacher and we had programs in Houston County and over in Augusta in Richmond County and with that we encouraged the schools to put people in leadership positions. We had great cooperation from those and great success with the teachers. The teachers who received the [supervisory] service were well pleased. (February, 2006)

The satisfaction of those teachers involved in the program was documented in a 1991 study of participants in Gwinnett County (Kahrs, 1991). In the study's data analysis, Kahrs concluded:

Within the research-generated category of internship the themes of mentoring, instructional supervision, and site selection emerged from the directors and the participants. The internship was the highlight of the experience from the point of view of all participants. Most of them were engaged in a wide variety of experiences during this full-time internship experience (Kahrs, 1991, p.60).

Many of these Instructional Lead Teachers enrolled at the University of Georgia in the three courses required for the I.S. endorsement. Those three courses were; Introduction to Supervision (ECS 721); Supervision of Instruction (ECS 722); and Internship in Supervision (ECS 970).

*The Publication: Readings in Educational Supervision Volumes I and II*

Introduction to Supervision, ECS 721, focused on trends and issues in the field of supervision. Two publications, *Readings in Educational Supervision Volumes I and II*, were compiled by Dr. Ray Bruce and Dr. Edith Grimsley and published by ASCD. These publications were comprised of selected readings from *Educational Leadership*, which was another ASCD publication. The readings were used to examine trends and issues in Dr. Bruce's and Dr. Grimsley's ECS 721 classes. Dr. Grimsley, in an interview conducted in 2005, describes how the publications addressed the needs of the off-campus students:

Ray and I had developed a syllabus for 721, and we needed to because the students were in the field working. In a great many counties, students did not have access to a lot of professional literature; they weren't on campus students. (October, 2007)



ASCD came to publish these two editions with the support of Ron Brandt, the Editor of *Educational Leadership*. In an interview on October 6, 2007 conducted at Dr. Bruce's home in Athens, Dr. Bruce and Dr. Grimsley discussed the contents of the two editions. Dr. Bruce began:

Well each of us over the preceding years had drawn readings that we felt were important for our students and [we had] copied them [the readings] and handed them out. These [readings] were facades of the instructional supervision program and we decided that it would be efficient to have them all together and have each section preceded by our position with reference. So that's what the book was; it was a series of patterns of instructional supervision. (October 6, 2007)

Dr. Grimsley described their surprise at the success of these two editions and their widespread use. She also asked Dr. Bruce to recount how the order of the authors listed for the publications varied from the first to the second editions. Dr. Grimsley said:

I don't think we anticipated that there would be the interest that there was because across the country a lot of people used the publication. So many that we were asked to do the second volume. [Dr. Grimsley speaking to Dr. Bruce] You need to tell the story about the names, our names, and how they came to be placed on that [*Readings in Educational Supervision*]. (October, 2007)

The first edition of *Readings in Educational Supervision* listed the authors as Edith Grimsley and Ray Bruce while the second edition reversed the listing to Ray Bruce and Edith Grimsley. Dr. Bruce explained how he recalled the change in the authorship, which reflected their respectful and collegial relationship. Dr. Bruce elaborated:

I'm not sure I remember all that happened, but the first one gave the authorship as Edith Grimsley and Ray Bruce and in the second one, Edith insisted the names be reversed. I

was a candidate for promotion along about that time so she was trying to give me every boost she could and that's really the reason that happened. (October, 2007)

Dr. Grimsley and Dr. Bruce worked closely over their years of service at the University of Georgia and the circumstances regarding the authorship of *Readings in Educational Supervision* reflected their cooperative relationship.

Other UGA courses for which these readings were used were ECS 722, Supervision of Instruction, and ECS 970, Internship in Supervision. The ECS 722 course focused on techniques for supervising classroom teachers. Specific techniques like clinical supervision, conferencing, collaborative planning, and the use of observation instruments in the classroom were presented in this course. The students in 722 conducted classroom observations and conferences with classroom teachers to experience the application of the techniques studied in the course.

#### *The ECS 970, Internship in Supervision*

The ECS 970, Internship in Supervision, was originally a year long, on-the-job, supervised internship. The student was to be mentored by the building administrator with regularly scheduled visits by a department faculty member to whom the student was assigned. Dr. Ray Bruce explained how calling the year long in the field experience an internship was somewhat misleading:

To call it an internship is to misname it. Internships normally imply that you go and you work with someone who is experienced in the role. You watch them and you pursue what they do and then you do a little of it and perhaps you take over a similar job. In our case we had no other name for it so we called it an internship. (February, 2006)

Dr. Grimsley explained how students` became interns with the Department of Curriculum and Supervision:

Basically you had to be first year on the job and you had to have had Introduction to Supervision (ECS 721) and Supervision of Instruction (ECS 722), or be taking them concurrently. (March, 2006)

Student criteria for admission to ECS 970 were listed in the official course description:

To be accepted into the internship the student must:

1. Be employed full time in a leadership role and work under the direction and guidance of a superintendent or another designated administrator.
2. Earn during the year of the internship, or already hold, credit in two other supervision courses. If the participant has not earlier had ECS 721 and ECS 722, during the period of the internship, he must enroll concurrently in ECS 721 and must commit to ECS 722 or an alternate course approved by the internship advisors.
3. Secure written approval for participation in the internship program from the superintendent (or administrator to whom he/she is responsible).
4. Be granted released time for internship meetings. There will be a one-day total group meeting at the beginning of the school year and subgroup meetings on two other occasions during the year.

The interns would meet at the beginning of the school year as a group. This meeting was a general orientation to the internship and a chance for interns to network with other interns in their first year in a leadership role in various Georgia school systems. Dr. Grimsley explained the rationale foundation of the internship from it's beginning at Georgia Southern Teacher's College under the direction of Marvin Pittman:

It goes back to the whole notion that Johnnye [Johnnye V. Cox] and Pittman [Marvin Pittman] and Franseth [Jane Franseth] had at Georgia State Teacher's College, that at the

time you are getting theory in the classroom, you are getting practical experience with support and learning to look at what one does in practice, so it's this whole notion of a balance between theory and practice. (March, 2006)

Each intern maintained a weekly journal of their on-the-job experiences which was to be the focus for the supervising professor's on-the-job visits. The supervising professor would make a minimum of three onsite visits with the intern. The visits required a great deal of travel as enrollment increased and began to be difficult to staff. Dr. Edith Grimsley recalls that growth:

[growth in enrollment] was unusual because we went from classes, Johnnye and Reba went from classes of 10-15, to classes of 25-30, and one quarter the three of us taught about 100 people. (March, 2006)

The increased student enrollment changed the internship from a year long activity to a one quarter activity because of the lack of departmental personnel available to supervise student for an entire year. Dr. Grimsley explained the change that was necessary because of increased enrollment:

It became a quarter's activity when we were preparing people for RESA [Regional Education Service Association] and CESA [Cooperative Educational Service Association] for jobs that the state had declared that they must have IS certification. Then it was impossible to have enough people to work year long with all of these [interns] because that involved a great deal of time and expense. You couldn't really do justice of having people report weekly on their activities, turn around and you give them feedback, [and] go to visit with them on the job. (March, 2006)

Dr. Ray Bruce described the increased enrollment in the field based internship during the period and the decline in enrollment prior to the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration in 1991. He stated:

I had interns up until I retired in 1993. The number of those diminished, but I've had as many as 30 in a year which constitutes almost a full responsibility. It was a full responsibility because of the requirements of the internship, both for the client and for the professor. (February, 2006)

The field based internship and the development of the school based supervisor known as the Instructional Lead Teacher (ILT) were major focuses of Dr. Bruce and Dr. Grimsley in their careers at the University of Georgia. Both agree that the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG) made the growth in the programs possible. The Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) replaced APEG and was viewed by Dr. Bruce and Dr. Grimsley as a cause for decreased enrollment in both programs.

Prior to the enactment of QBE, the Department of Curriculum and Supervision established a new program of study. Students from Georgia's medical colleges began to enroll in this new graduate studies program.

#### *Health Occupations and the Department of Curriculum and Supervision*

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision extended its' program of study to health occupations students in 1981. Dr. Gerald Firth was instrumental in the inclusion of these individuals in the department's program of study. Dr. Firth's first trip to Georgia from the University of Alabama was to the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta. He went there to serve as a consultant. The faculty at the Medical College was interested in applying Dr. Firth's research in supervision and curriculum improvement to their educational program. Dr. Firth's

early interest in health occupations and his awareness of the needs in many medical schools prompted his support for the University of Georgia's efforts to offer a program of study to the students of several medical colleges in Georgia. (Firth, 2007; Wootton, 1993)

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision, under the guidance of Dr. Firth, began to develop programs of study for those teaching and supervising individuals in the health occupations. Dr. Firth explained how Dr. Mary Louise McBee, from the central administration approached College of Education Dean Katherine Blake to ask for the college's involvement in the development of this program of study. The Dean asked Dr. Firth, the head of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and Dr. Carvin Brown, the head of the Department of Educational Administration to consider their involvement in the operations of a doctorate program for individuals in the faculties of the medical, dental, and nursing programs. The administration department felt that this would be a drain on their resources and not in keeping with their basic mission. Dr. Firth said, he believed that "it might be more appropriate for us" (Firth, 2007). Dr. David Payne and Dr. Murray Tillman offered to undertake the program and other members soon followed. (Firth, 2007; Wootton, 1993)

The programs in Allied Health and Nursing were developed. The enrollment of student from the health occupations in courses taught by members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision continued to grow. By mid-1985, enrollment had grown to a level that the department sent faculty members to hospitals to provide on site programs. Dr. Firth recalled that the growth of the program included the Medical College of Georgia in Augusta, Armstrong State College in Savannah, the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Dublin, Piedmont Hospital in Atlanta, Northeast Georgia Medical Center in Gainesville, West Georgia College in Carrolton,

Georgia Southern College in Statesboro, and North Georgia College in Dahlonega. (Firth, 2007; Wootton, 1993)

*Dr. Firth assumes new leadership roles outside the Department*

Dr. Firth assumed the role of Interim Dean of the College of Education at the University of Georgia in 1983, a period of tight state school budgets. He explains how his predecessor Dean Blake had been a victim of these budget cuts that required the University of Georgia to return 10% of its' original allocation. Dean Blake had made salary and other financial commitments that she felt were "a manner of honor." Dean Blake resigned, and Dr. Firth was chosen among the faculty members (Firth, 2007).

Dr. Firth remained in that position for 18 months and had to focus on reducing the budget while maintaining the quality of the programs of study offered by the College of Education. Dr. Alphonse Buccino was appointed Dean of the College of Education in 1984. At the end of his tenure as Interim Dean, Dr. Firth returned to the Department of Curriculum and Supervision for a brief period.

Dr. Firth was elected President of ASCD and Department Head two years after he returned to the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The office required a three year term of service that included the first year as President-Elect. The office required him to spend extended periods away from the University. He expressed his appreciation for the support of the department members. He shared the following:

I was being made President-Elect of ASCD, a position which I coveted very much so I went back to the department and they were gracious enough to allow me to serve over a three year period going and spending my time in Washington in ASCD. (October, 2007)

The involvement of members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development had always been strong. Dr. Firth described this strong connection during the period of his presidency and the positive impact it had on the Department. Dr. Firth shared:

Most people were members of ASCD. The faculty was the only one I am aware where we had closed down our shop to go to the conferences because not only did our doctoral students go but [also] the faculty drew straws to see who had to stay home and run the shop while we were gone. And in effect, it was a victory for everybody. (October, 2007)

The unique nature of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision among leadership programs in colleges of education is credited by Dr. Firth for the dedication and leadership of the faculty in state and national organization.

The department was an unusual one to begin with and I think their uniqueness came to the floor in terms of their support, not only in the state organizations that dealt with curriculum and supervision, but also in the national organizations as well, particularly ASCD. (October, 2007)

When asked about the influence that his position at the University might have played in his selection as president of ASCD, Dr. Firth discussed the change in the orientation of ASCD. The Association was moving from a “college orientation” to a “public school orientation” as Dr. Firth described the change. He said he was very much against this change in orientation and his election was “somewhat of a minor miracle”. Dr. Firth credited the Department for his selection. He acknowledged:



I was the chair of the department that was committed to curriculum and supervision [and that] made that possible. It's not likely that would have occurred if I had been sitting in any other unit that I can even think of. (October, 2007)

### The Merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and the Department of Educational Administration

The following account of events and circumstances that surrounded the seven years from the 1985 Quality Basic Education Act of 1985 (QBE) in Georgia to the 1991 merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The possible impact of QBE on the operation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision is a central focus of the following section.

#### *The Quality Basic Education Act of 1985*

*The Quality Basic Education Act* (QBE) was passed by Georgia's General Assembly in 1985. It followed the release of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) and contained many regulations holding schools accountable to numerous "standards." One of those standards that had an effect on the role of supervisors in the state of Georgia was the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP). The GTEP required all teachers to have a minimum of three classroom observations using an observation instrument called the Georgia Teacher Observation Instrument (GTOI). These observations were used to compile a teacher's annual summative evaluation. Many school based supervisors, such as the Instructional Lead Teacher were called upon to conduct classroom observations using the GTEP processes. In reality they were both supervising and evaluating teachers.

Dr. Bruce expressed his view of how QBE influenced what was taught in classes and how the act changed the nature of supervision in Georgia this way:

So we had the obligation of making the people who were preparing for leadership aware of the conditions and the need to respond to and be in coordination with state mandates. That's not to say they were good, it was just a fact of life if you were going to survive you had to do certain things. (June, 2005)

Teacher evaluation had been seen by the members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision as an administration function and not a function of supervision. However, as school based supervisors such as Instructional Lead Teachers, were to conduct QBE required observations as part of the GTEP, they became more identified as administrators. As a result, many of these supervisors choose to move toward administrative positions and obtaining administrative endorsements to receive higher salaries for performing the same functions as those of the ILT lower-paying positions. Dr. Bruce describes this situation as follows:

The result of that [QBE] has been that a lot of people that were basically committed to instructional supervision as I am defining it saw the writing on the wall, and it's illustrated most specifically in the change of title. The change demanded [a shift in title] from instructional supervisor to assistant principal and was actually a salary step. It was a significant difference in the amount of money paid to those people who bore the title of assistant principal and those who bore the title of instructional supervisor. (June, 2005)

Georgia's *Quality Basic Education Act* also established examinations for all education certification fields held by newly entering teachers in the state as well as anyone seeking to add a field to existing certificates. The programs in Department of Curriculum and Supervision as well

as the Department of Educational Administration in the College of Education at the University of Georgia had to adopt changes to address these certification requirements.

On April 9, 1985 the draft of the new criteria for college programs in the leadership field was presented to the members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Dr. Ray Bruce was given anonymous written feedback from members of the department. What follows are some of those observations of the faculty regarding the criteria:

Competencies #1 and #2 have a strong administrative and managerial slant.

I don't see anything along the lines of supportive service.

No statement about expertise in instruction, isn't that what leadership of schools should be all about?

Why do instructional leaders need warehousing skills or facility maintenance?

Where are the support, facilitate statements? (Bruce, personal notes)

The changes that the new criteria for college programs in the leadership field required by the certification requirements of the Quality Basic Education Act were adopted and the program changes went into effect in 1987. QBE essentially established new leadership criteria for Georgia college and university programs. The IS certification is no longer issued in Georgia today.

Dr. Bruce described the effect that these changes had on the functions of supervisors in Georgia. He said: "The whole mood of supervision began to change." He added, "In my judgment we lost the real heart of supervision which is the openness that can exist between people with whom there is not reported accountability." Dr. Bruce lamented the impact of the changes on the tradition of supervision in Georgia: "Supervision, as it was conceived by Johnnye Cox, as it was fermented from her and pervaded the state, brought us to new heights, and made Georgia a leader, began to be diminished" (Bruce, 2006).

Dr. Bruce described the decline of the ILT supervisor position that he and Dr. Grimsley had been instrumental in developing. Dr. Bruce explained:

Now that changed when the state mandated that periodic evaluation and re-evaluation of teachers. Somebody had to do it. There was not enough time on the part of the principal and the assistant principal to get around to all the people as many times as they needed to be seen under the plan. So they brought in, they squeezed in, the instructional lead teachers. And having done that instructional lead teachers (especially in Gwinnett) said wait a minute, we ought to get the same recognition in standing and pay as the assistant principals. In fact we ought to be called assistant principals. (February, 2006)

Dr. Bruce's perception of the attitude of the Instructional Lead Teachers during this time was documented in a 1990 doctoral dissertation study in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision conducted by Debra Williams under the direction of Dr. Gerald Firth. In her study of five school systems that were the first in Georgia to establish the Instructional Lead Teacher position, she found that the position was viewed as a "stepping stone" position. Those individuals who held the position did not see the position as permanent. They aspired to go into an administration position because of the stability of such a position and the step on the state salary scale (Williams, 1990).

The decline of the Instructional Lead position in Georgia's public schools was reflected in the decline of supervisory interns as reflected by Dr. Bruce as he recalled the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in 1991.

I had interns up until I retired in 1993. The number of those diminished, but I've had as many as 30 in a year which constitute almost a full responsibility, full responsibility

because of the requirements of the internship, both for the client and for the professor.

(February, 2006)

The Instructional Lead Teacher (ILT) as originally viewed by local systems was described by Dr. Bruce who had worked with these systems as they implemented this school-based supervisory position. The relationship between the ILT and the teacher was the central focus. According to Dr. Bruce described that relationship as “to be someone who was excused from any evaluation responsibilities and was solely responsibility for facilitating the work of the teacher in the classroom.” (Bruce, 2006)

The increased demands of *Georgia’s Quality Basic Education Act* (QBE) on teacher evaluation in the form of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP) which mandated multiple classroom observations for teachers caused school systems to look closely at their personnel allocations. Dr. Bruce described the change in focus from supervisory support to evaluation:

After several years of rather remarkable success with the program that action didn’t eliminate the interest in and the support that it was given but it changed it’s nature totally and it became difficult for teachers to have as it has always been historically became difficult for teachers to have someone with whom they could relate without fear of evaluation. (February, 2006)

The 1986–1987 school year in Georgia was the first year that the QBE and its required standards that mandated the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program and its initial three classroom observations of all Georgia public school teachers was implemented. The results of these observations could support or deny a teacher the annual salary schedule pay raise. In addition, the need for leadership personnel to fulfill these observation requirements resulted in the use of

former supervisory people to conduct these summative evaluations. This period of increased accountability of local school systems to the state, and the resulting impact on administrative and supervisory functions, changed the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

The following year at the annual conference of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision (COPIS) held at Harvard University on March 10, 1988, the Department was honored for its achievements in the field of Instructional Supervision. Members of the Department conducted an invited session in which the history and the operations of the Department were discussed. Dr. Johnnye Cox was among the presenters. Despite the department's national standing in the field of supervision, within the next three years, the Department of Curriculum and Supervision would be merged with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The merger occurred largely as a result of unintended consequences of the QBE requirements that changed the course of supervisory positions in public schools in Georgia.

#### *Changes in Department Leadership*

Dr. Gerald Firth took a two year sabbatical from the University of Georgia in 1989 when he went to Egypt. Dr. Firth described the circumstances that took him to Egypt on behalf of the United States Agency for International Development. Dr. Firth was appointed to oversee the transition of the education system for elementary and secondary education in Egypt from the British model to the American model. Dr. Firth had originally intended to return to the University within one year, but he explained that after arriving in Egypt he wanted to oversee the project. Dr. Firth remained for two and a half years; the duration of the project. Dr. Firth would return to the University of Georgia, but to a "new" department.

Dr. Arch J. Phillips assumed the position of Head of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. On June 4, 1991 Dr. Phillips sent out letters to all students enrolled in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision informing them that The Department of Curriculum and Supervision would be merging with The Department of Educational Administration on July 1, 1991 to form the Department of Educational Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The following year, Dr. Ray Bruce retired, and Dr. Firth returned to the University where he remained until his retirement in 2002.

Dr. Cox, in her presentation, Supervision Today, Yesterday, and Tomorrow which was presented at Operation Curriculum Director in 1972 and was the inspiration for Johnnye Cox Lectures, a key event at the annual meetings of the Georgia Association for Curriculum and Instructional Supervision, calls for the continued promotion of supervision in Georgia's school systems. Dr. Ray Bruce reflected on the state of supervision in relationship to the vision that had been articulated in Dr. Cox's presentation. Dr. Bruce shared:

I'd say it's taken a significant hit, as I have observed, I haven't been in a classroom now since 1993 so you have to measure anything I say against that, but what I can read and what I believe because of the interaction with people in the school is that the demand to produce at the end scores on test has caused leadership to focus only on production and has squeezed out the concern of reacting to teacher needs. (October, 2007 [Hyperlink](#))

The funding of supervision programs in Georgia's school systems had been the "significant hit" to which Dr. Bruce referred. Here he expressed his belief that the emphasis on high stakes testing has displaced the traditional supervisor envisioned by Dr. Cox and her colleagues:

All the money has gone to one end and that is to test and see how students are doing, that's used up the time and used up the resources and in short the people we knew as instructional lead teachers for example are rare birds indeed. I wouldn't even know where to find one, and these people have risen to new heights, they are assistant principals in charge of monitoring performance of teachers rather than supporting them and their efforts. (October, 2007 [Hyperlink](#))

The researcher was only able to locate one school system in Georgia with the position of Instructional Lead Teacher. Meriwether County in Southwest Georgia still employs Instructional Lead Teachers at the middle school level. The era of supervision in Georgia, established by Marvin Pittman in 1937 and continued for 55 years. That era as recalled by the four subjects of this study, is now, in the words of University of Georgia graduate and author, Margaret Mitchell, *Gone with the Wind!*

The era of supervision (1937-1968) was characterized by a number of policy initiatives that influenced the growth in size and quality of Georgia's public schools. These policies were generated at the state, local, and university levels and their interrelationships throughout the schools of Georgia created the conditions that fostered both the advancement and decline of supervision as it was envisioned by the trailblazers in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.

When asked what gave them pride from their years of service at the University of Georgia and to the field of supervision, each participant described their interaction with colleagues and students at the core. These remarks are here linked to each participant. Dr. Bruce (June, 2005 [Hyperlink](#)); Dr. Firth (July, 2005 [Hyperlink](#)); Dr. Grimsley (June, 2005 [Hyperlink](#)); and Dr. Macagnoni ( July, 2005 [Hyperlink](#))



## Chapter Summary

Chapter 6 described the circumstances surrounding the transfer of the program for the training of supervisors from the Bureau of Educational Field Services to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to establish the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia in 1968. Chapter 6 also contains descriptions of selected activities in the Department involving the four participants in this study. The events and select activities were drawn from Dr. Lutian Wootton's earlier written histories and themes that emerged from the participant's interviews and the review of related documents. The chapter concludes with a description of events surrounding the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in 1991.

Chapter 7 includes a theoretical interpretive policy analysis of various Georgia education policies, events and key people and their interactions prior to and during the history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision that directly or indirectly impacted the operations of the department. Kingdon's Multiple Streams Model (1984) is used as a theoretical base for the policy analysis. The primary source data provided by the former faculty participants in the study was used to explain the impact of problems, policy and politics on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

## CHAPTER 7

### ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Introduction

The history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1968 to 1991, in the College of Education at the University of Georgia is nested in social and political movements that resulted in state and national legislation directed at the improvement of education. Primarily between 1968 and 1991 the improvement of teaching had been central in efforts to advance education in Georgia and its' programs for the training of supervisors. These efforts were key components in the work to improve the instructional skills of Georgia's teachers. The Department of Curriculum and Supervision was the leading program for the training of supervisors in the state and, in the view of the participants of this study, the nation as well.

Dr. Lutian R. Wootton (1916-1996) left a series of documents describing historical events, people, and activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia (Wootton, 1969, 1977, 1993, 1994). In a 1993 memorandum to the faculty accompanying working drafts of a history and chronology of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision, Wootton (1994) wrote:

It is hoped that persons of similar interests and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture as possible. (Appendix A)

The researcher in this study sought to document and to explain the events described by Dr. Wootton in the development and existence of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision

(1968-1991) within the context of national and state trends in educational policy and politics.

Additional contextual elements that were important included issues, philosophies, and trends in supervision that affected instruction, faculty views and activities, and program focus during 1968-1991.

This study was important because during the time period (1968-1991) the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia was one of the oldest and leading departments in the country in which the curriculum and activities were primarily focused on supervision (Bruce, 2005; Firth, 2006; Grimsley, 2006; Macagnoni, 2005; Wootton, 1994). In addition, this time period was characterized by sweeping educational reforms at the national and state levels, changing populations of students in public schools, and changes in the field of supervision.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis of the various unique policy contexts that influenced the changing series of policy and political events regarding education in Georgia. Particular emphasis is placed on events related to supervision in Georgia during the years 1937 to 1991. The analysis was completed using the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model (Kingdon, 1984). Following the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model, selected events in education in Georgia that set the stage for the formation and subsequent operation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia were analyzed.

Emphasis was placed on the intended and unintended consequences of implementation of major education initiatives and policies affecting the operations of public schools and higher education in Georgia. A guiding focus was on the effect of four major department faculty actors on the development of an ideology of supervision for teachers. The Human Relations ideology

permeated both the state and national research and practice agenda during the time of the existence of the department.

### The Kingdon Multiple Streams Model

The Kingdon Multiple Streams Model (Kingdon, 1984) was used to analyze the changing contexts of educational policy in Georgia. This model was selected because it

focuses on the flow and timing of policy action rather than on its component parts (and) is extremely useful in understanding the complexities of policy-making. In this model attention is focused on three streams, the problem stream, the political stream, and the policy stream which move independently through the policy system. It aims to explain why some issues and problems become prominent in the policy agenda and are eventually translated into concrete policies while others never do so. The model contradicts the rational approach to decision-making claiming that policies are not the product of rational actions, because policy actors rarely evaluate many alternatives for action and because they do not compare them systematically. (Kingdon, 2003, p. 1)

The model illustrates three complementary, but distinct streams or processes flowing through the system of policy agenda setting. It is the coupling of these streams in an opportune context and at an appropriate time, an open window, which allows for a particular issue to be translated into policy. Each process stream is mostly independent of each other and each develops according to its own dynamics and rules. But at some critical juncture the three streams are joined, and the greatest policy changes grow out of that coupling of problems, policy proposals, and politics (Kingdon, 2003).

### *Coupling and Merging Issues*

In Kingdon's model, three processes contribute to the governmental agenda: (1) political events, (2) generation of policy proposals, and (3) problem recognition. They can be either an impetus or a constraint on agenda setting. Political process such as swings of national values, a variety of public opinion, elections, changes of administration, turnover in Congress, and so on, have powerful effects on decision-making. In the policy process, the gradual accumulation of knowledge by specialists in a given policy area such as education or medicine might shape the generation of policy proposals. The problem recognition process is often affected by the march of problems pressuring the system. Kingdon (2003) further describes:

Problems are brought to the attention of people in and around government by systematic indicators, by focusing events like crises and disasters, or by feedback from the operation of current programs. People define conditions as problems by comparing current conditions with their values concerning more ideal states of affairs, by comparing their own performance with that of other countries [states], or by putting the subject into one category rather than another. (p. 10)

### *Policy Actors*

According to Kingdon (2003), actors in the policy formulation process include the visible cluster of elected governmental officials and their appointees. They are the single most important groups in setting the agenda in the policy formulation process. Hidden clusters, such as specialists in the bureaucracy and in professional communities, are also actors in the policy process but, have more of an effect on the specification of policy alternatives from which the governmental choices are made. Governmental staffs that lean towards promoting agenda and

special interest groups and mass media have more often had a blocking effect on policy proposals (Kingdon, 2003).

The researcher used historical educational policy data and personal accounts of several major professors in this study to illustrate contextual trends and major actors in Georgia education prior to and during the life of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (1968-1991). Data were categorized across the various problem, process, and political streams for each time period examined. The merging of issues, major events, and key actors leading to open windows which allowed the passage of various educational policies are described in the text for this analysis and in series of illustrative tables. Of interest was the identification of precursor policy actors and enabling factors leading to the high visibility of involvement of department faculty members in: (1) development and implementation of supervision programs, (2) in providing service to national and state professional organizations in supervision (e.g., COPIS, ASCD, GACIS), and (3) in service to organizations in local school, national, and international arenas. Also of interest was the identification of precursor policy and enabling factors leading to the merger in 1968 of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration to become the Department of Educational Leadership at the University of Georgia.

### Policy Analysis

The policy analysis is organized in chronological order using major historical events to divide the policy development and implementation into five periods. Each period is characterized by major legislation at the state and national level influences as well as key figures and events in education that impacted Georgia's schools. The policy periods used to frame this study were

approximated through examination and analysis of key literature, policy documents, and interview data from the participants. The five periods analyzed in this chapter are:

1. First Free School Movement: 1777 to 1857
2. Second Free School Movement: 1857 to 1861
3. Post Civil War Reforms: 1865 to 1912
4. Instructional Improvement Reforms 1912 to 1945
5. School Improvement Reforms 1945-1991

The various streams identified in the analysis, in some cases, run from one period to the next. Each period is discussed in relation to the three elements of the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model (Kingdon, 1984) which include: (1) problem, political, and policy streams, (2) coupling elements which include merging issues, events, and open windows, and (3) resulting policy. Implementation activities are also included to illustrate policy outcomes. Tables for each period are also presented to illustrate the Kingdon analysis.

#### *The First Free School Movement: 1777 to 1857*

The first free school movement in Georgia began with the state's first Constitution of 1777 which established a county system for local governance and called for schools to be erected in each county. These schools were to be supported under the direction of the legislature with state funds (Evans, 1913). Legislation in 1783 provided land grants to establish Academies that charged tuition and Poor Schools that were free to all poor children. This legislation resulted in Academies in Richmond and Burke Counties and a Poor School in Wilkes County. Despite these efforts, public schools remained a low priority for many Georgia counties (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

There was also legislative support for establishment of the University of Georgia, the first public institution of higher education chartered in the United States. Influential actors in this process were the then Governor Lyman Hall, a Yale graduate, who had supported the legislature of 1783 and their commitment to public education. He was instrumental in obtaining a land grant of 40,000 acres from the Georgia legislature to support a state university (Dyer, 1985). Abraham Baldwin, another Yale graduate, and Lyman Hall, with the aid of Yale president Ezra Stiles, were key actors in the development of a charter for the first state college. This charter was based on the belief that an educated citizenry was imperative to a free government, and it asserted that the government must assume the responsibility of educating all citizens regardless of their social position. The University of Georgia's charter was approved on January 27, 1785 (Dyer, 1985; Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

With the establishment of the University of Georgia in 1785, the *Senatus Academicus* of the University of Georgia became the governing body for regulation of the literature of the state (Dyer, 1985; Reed, 1950). The body consisted of two groups: 1) the Board of Visitors, including the governor, the judges of the Supreme Court, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate, and 2) the Board of Trustees who were appointed and elected from the university community. Supervision of schools became an activity of the state university. School visits were conducted by visiting committees or groups formed from the Board of Visitors and the Board of Trustees of the *Senatus Academicus*. These groups also evaluated the competence of a school's teachers; however, most knew little about instructional methods. Although supervision was highly centralized, most committee approaches to instructional improvement was to fire incompetent teachers and to hire new ones (Grimsley et al., 1974).



The first free school movement in Georgia was not successful in creating a state-wide public school system due to the stigma associated with families having to legally declare their financial condition as “poor.” During this time, some communities established “field schools.” These schools were one-room schools constructed in old fields that had been abandoned after the soil had been rendered useless for crop cultivation. The field schools did not educate a large number of Georgia’s children.

The primary policy initiatives of the first free school movement in Georgia were the Georgia State Constitution of 1777, the University of Georgia Charter in 1785 and the Poor School Fund in 1817. The Constitution provided funds for building schools in all Georgia counties and Poor School Fund provided for free education to needy children. The University of Georgia Charter was the first in the United States and exemplified Georgia’s commitment to the education of the state’s citizens (Dyer, 1985; Reed, 1950).

Two key actors during this policy period were Abraham Baldwin and Lyman Hall. Governor Hall was instrumental in the establishment of Poor School Fund. He and Abraham Baldwin were the primary political forces behind the Charter of the University of Georgia. The University of Georgia would become a major force in the advancement of public education in the state for the second free school movement that began in 1857 with the election of Governor Joseph E. Brown (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

Table 7.1 presents an analysis of this policy period according to the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model. Two financial implementation outcomes from the policy initiatives during the first free school movement included funds for school construction and free public education. A political outcome of the period was an ongoing involvement of the university system in school supervision.

Table 7.1

*The First Free School Movement in Georgia 1777-1857*

<b>Streams</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
<p><b>Problem Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education of children in Georgia</li> <li>• Supervision of schools in GA</li> <li>• Professionalization of teaching</li> <li>• Supervision of teachers in GA schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Political Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment of Governor and people to GA education</li> <li>• Non- commitment of GA counties to establishment of poor schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education of needy children</li> </ul>	<p><b>Merging Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financing</li> <li>• Building</li> <li>• Support and governance</li> <li>• Education of all children regardless of social class</li> <li>• Poor School System</li> <li>• Concurrent operation of old Field Schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishment of the University of Georgia and governing boards</li> <li>• Precursor to GA Teachers Association formed (Teachers Society + Board of Education 1831)</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Windows</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative directed support</li> </ul>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State of GA Constitution (1777)</li> <li>• University of Georgia Charter (1785)</li> <li>• Poor School Fund (1817)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State funding for building schools in every county</li> <li>• Committee - directed supervision of schools</li> <li>• Supervision of schools became an activity of university faculty members of the Board of Trustees and members of the Board of Visitors</li> </ul>

Although the first free school movement in Georgia was not successful in reaching a majority of the state’s student age population, it did set the stage for the second free school movement in 1857. That year, the pro-education politician, Joseph E. Brown was elected Governor. Under the leadership of Governor Brown, the state legislature passed the Academies

and Free School Act of 1857 which not only funded a “common school system,” but also required teachers in those state funded schools to be certified.

*Second Free School Movement: 1857 to 1861*

The second free school movement in Georgia began with the election of a pro-education politician, Governor Joseph E. Brown. Governor Brown advocated for a free education for all white children, and declared, “Let it be a common school system not a Poor School system” (Orr, 1950, p. 171). Governor Brown replaced the old, ineffective Poor School System with a common school system.

Governor Brown, in an attempt to increase enrollment of the Poor Schools in Georgia, worked with the Georgia General Assembly and in 1857, they passed legislation for the purpose of providing financial and oversight plans for the improvement of Georgia’s Poor Schools (1 GA Stat. 1 Ann. §§1-001 – 1-010). The Academies and Free School Act of 1857 required state funding to compensate teachers in common schools in addition to providing for education of teachers in Normal School settings (Joiner et al., 1979).

In 1858, in an attempt to centralize the control of education at the state level, an act of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia made the Governor the President of the Board of Trustees of Franklin College (GA Stat. 106 Ann. §§1-109 -1-112). In addition, an important benchmark in education in Georgia was established by law. All teachers who taught in schools that received state funds were required to have a certificate. The county board of examiners issued teaching certificates that attested to capability and good moral character of the teacher. The responsibility of the local schools to evaluate the quality of instruction provided by teachers was formalized in this act (Dyer, 1985; Orr, 1950).

The primary policy initiatives of the second free school movement in Georgia were the Academies and Free School Act of 1857 and Georgia Statute 106 in 1858. These policies provided funds for teacher salaries, established teacher certification and provided for teacher education in the Normal School setting. Two key actors in this period were Governor Joseph E. Brown and Georgia Commissioner of Education, Gustavus Orr. Orr was instrumental in the establishment of state normal schools for the training of teachers. Governor Brown backed both legislative acts and was appointed president of the Board of Trustees of Franklin College, centralizing state control of teacher education Table 7.2 presents an analysis of this policy period according to the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model. Increasing educational opportunities for students and teachers were the major policy implementation outcomes.

Table 7.2

*The Second Free School Movement in Georgia 1857-1861*

<b>Streams</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
<p><b>Problem Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement of Poor School System</li> <li>• Education and Payment of Teachers</li> <li>• Faulty tax system for identifying poor children</li> </ul> <p><b>Political Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education and certification of teachers in common schools</li> </ul> <p><b>Policy Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State funded education for all children in GA</li> </ul>	<p><b>Merging Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common School System</li> <li>• Education of all children</li> </ul> <p><b>Events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Election of Governor Joseph E. Brown</li> </ul> <p><b>Open Windows</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gustavus Orr, Commissioner of Education advocated for state normal school</li> <li>• Governor made president of Board of Trustees of Franklin College</li> </ul>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Academies and Free School Act of 1857</li> <li>• GA Statute 106 1858</li> </ul>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State funding to compensate teachers in common schools</li> <li>• System eliminated for identification of poor children</li> <li>• Education of Teachers in Normal School Setting</li> <li>• First teacher certification</li> <li>• Teacher supervision responsibility of local systems</li> <li>• Centralization of state control of higher education</li> </ul>

The second free school movement was cut short by the Civil War. During the war years, colleges and school closed their doors due to the manpower needed for the war effort. The next policy period began during the post war period of Southern Reconstruction and was characterized by sweeping educational reform legislation and the education of the children of former slaves.

### *Post Civil War Reforms 1865-1912*

The period following the Civil War, known as Reconstruction, was a time in Georgia that political and social change had a profound influence on the public schools in the state. The Progressive Movement in Georgia politics was characterized by a shift from a primarily agricultural based economy to a more diversified economic base. Industrialization produced new jobs in manufacturing, transportation and construction, and required new schools and new curriculums to address the needs of the new work force.

The “New South” was a phrase used by *The Atlanta Journal* [now known as *The Atlanta Journal Constitution*] editor Henry W. Grady to describe the goal of the Progressive Movement. Along with a shift in economic focus, Georgia politicians began to focus on educational reform (Klein & Pascoe, 2005). The Public Education Act of 1870 provided funding for a racially segregated dual school system segregated by race. The segregation of public facilities became law in Georgia during the post Civil War Reconstruction (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

The same year as Georgia’s Public Education Act of 1870, the United States Congress passed the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution. This Amendment provided all male citizens with the right to vote regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude [slavery]. This new electorate was in need of educational services that had been denied them during their slavery period (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

The education of the children of former slaves became a cause for northern philanthropists to invest money and support. The racially segregated dual school system provided a social cause and Georgia provided opportunities for philanthropic activities directed toward African-Americans. Two of these types of activities not only advanced the cause of education for former slaves, but they also established the first formalized program for the training of supervisors. This formalized program of supervision would eventually be located at the University of Georgia and become a major component of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision (Grimsley et al., 1974; Sessoms et al., 1975).

Key philanthropic actors and organizations were instrumental in efforts to improve education in the south after the Civil War. George Peabody, an educational philanthropist, examined the needs of education in Georgia in 1867 and funded a study of Georgia's existing educational systems. The study was conducted by the Georgia Teacher's Association and called for a state system of education. Recommendations from the study, especially for schools in urban areas, were adopted into law by the Georgia legislature in the form of The Public Education Act of 1870 (Joiner et al., 1979). As a result, Governor Rufus Bullock appointed the first state school commissioner, John Randolph Lewis. The School Commissioner's position was key in the centralization of education in Georgia (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

During the 1890s, the emphasis on the education of former slave children became the aim of several philanthropic individuals and groups which would continue in one form or another for the next 100 years (Sessoms et al., 1975). For example, in 1902 John D. Rockefeller established the General Education Board to promote the establishment of normal schools for African American teachers along with public schools for African American children. Funds for African American education were made available to hire a state agent for African American schools who

would serve as a representative for foundations (Joiner et al., 1979; Sessoms et al., 1975; Orr, 1950).

The Public Education Act of 1870 also established county boards of education whose members would represent the various districts in each county. The Public Education Act of 1870 did not provide for local taxation; however, some heavily populated counties did obtain legislation to grant them the authority to levy school taxes. Those counties were Chatham, Bibb, Richmond, and Glynn. The passage of this act was the beginning of the local option school tax in Georgia (Joiner et al., 1979).

A key actor in centralization of training for teachers was Gustavus J. Orr who became the State School Commissioner in 1872. He advocated for a state school to train teachers and supported vocational education and the education of African Americans. High Schools in Georgia, however, still remained the responsibility of city and local governments, not a function of the state, and as a result, most of these schools received little or no funding (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

The General Assembly also amended the school laws of October 27, 1887. Included in the amendments were requirements for: (1) teacher examinations, (2) county directed teacher in-service, (3) establishment of the Board of Visitors to attend Normal Examinations and report on the condition and management of the institution and the progress of the students, and 4) local taxation by counties for the support of the common schools (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

The Peabody Fund in 1877 helped develop a system of in-service education for teachers to improve the instruction offered in the Common Schools. Weekly meetings on effective teaching and learning became known as Normal Classes and were held in many school systems

in Georgia. The in-service classes were conducted by the superintendent and represented a new approach in supervision in the state (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The General Assembly of the State of Georgia established a Normal Department in the North Georgia Agricultural College at Dahlonega in 1877 and authorized the faculty of this college to issue certificates of proficiency and licenses to teach in the common schools of the state (GA Stat. CXX Ann. §§ 1-2-117 – 1-7-118). The Normal Department at Dahlonega marked the first college program in Georgia to be established for the purpose of educating teachers. The faculty's responsibility for issuing certificates required them to observe and to evaluate the effectiveness of teachers and thus established a supervisory role for college faculty members

The General Assembly of the State of Georgia passed legislation in 1890, charging the university system to establish a school for African Americans as a branch of the state university and to provide appropriations for the same (GA Stat. 2 Ann. §§20-099-108). The General Assembly also amended the school laws of October 27, 1887. Included in the amendments were requirements for the establishment of (1) the teacher examinations administered by County Boards of Education, (2) County Institutes for the gathering and instructing the common school teachers of each county in the state for two weeks between June and July and one Saturday each month during the school year, (3) the Board of Visitors to attend to the examinations at Georgia Normal and Industrial College and report on the condition and management of said institution as well as the progress of the students, and (4) provisions of local taxation by counties for the support of the common schools (Joiner et al., 1979).

Teacher education became a function of the University of Georgia in 1891 when the Georgia Legislature established the State Normal Schools including one in Athens. The purpose of these schools was to educate and to train teachers for Georgia's common schools. The



University of Georgia was designated a land-grant institution and expanded its curriculum to include the agricultural and mechanical arts under the Morrill Act in 1896 (Jerrolds, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979).

Georgia's racially segregated dual school system was reinforced in 1896 with the *Plessey v. Ferguson* U.S. Supreme Court decision that established "separate but equal" facilities as constitutional. Thus, in 1902 John D. Rockefeller established the General Education Fund to promote the establishment of normal schools for African American teachers along with public schools for African American children. Funds for African American education were made available to hire a state agent for African American schools who would serve as a representative for foundations (Orr, 1950; Sessoms et al., 1975).

Dr. James H. Dillard, former Dean at Tulane University in New Orleans, LA, became the supervisor of the County African American Schools in 1907. He became the first president and director of the "Negro Rural School Fund," commonly known as the Jeanes Fund (Sessoms et al., 1975).

Georgia counties began to employ Jeanes Supervisors in 1908, and in 1911, the Rosenwald Fund was established to improve African American education in the rural south. Julius Rosenwald helped Booker T. Washington build African American schools in the south by supplementing contributions of land, labor, and materials of the county and individuals in the communities. Many of the early Georgia Jeanes Supervisors helped to build Rosenwald Schools in their counties. Also in 1911, the Georgia Legislature established a New State Board of Education (Sessoms et al., 1975).

Georgia passed a constitutional amendment in 1912 to include high schools in state funding. The Compulsory School Attendance and Child Labor Laws were enacted in 1916. This

collection of laws paved the way for expansion of Georgia's elementary and secondary educational system (Joiner et al., 1979). Women were admitted to the state university as regular students in 1918 (Jerrolds, 1989). The State Normal School in Athens established a four year curriculum in 1922 for granting Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Degrees in education. Teacher certification became a state function in 1924 when the State Division of Certification was created (Jerrolds, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979).

The Fifteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution set the stage for the Post Civil War Reforms period in Georgia. A primary policy initiative of that period in Georgia was The Public Education Act of 1870 which was amended in 1887. This legislation established a state-wide racially segregated dual school system and provided for local option sales taxes to fund local school operations. The state constitution was amended in 1912 to provide for funds for high schools and mandated compulsory school attendance. The 1912 constitutional amendments also provided child labor laws (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950).

Many of the key actors in this period were philanthropists who directed their activities toward the education of African-American students in the South. Jeanes Supervisors, the Peabody Fund, the Rockefeller Fund, and the Rosenwald Fund were instrumental in the advancement of African-American education in Georgia during this time. The activities of these philanthropic organizations provided the foundation for the program to train supervisors that would be established at South Georgia Teachers College in 1933 and eventually become a key component in the Department of Curriculum in the College of Education at the University of Georgia in 1968 (Grimsley et al., 1974; Sessoms et al., 1975).

Federal funding for education began to emerge with the Public Education Act of 1870, also known as the Morrill Act. The Morrill Act of 1870 and the second Morrill Act of 1890

provided federal involvement for funding a system of land-grant colleges and universities. Federal aid to schools for vocational education through the Smith-Hughes act of 1917 and the 1946 George-Barden Act for agricultural, industrial, and home economics training for high school students changed the face of schooling nationwide to include not only preparation for higher education, but preparation for life skills.

Table 7.3 presents an analysis of this policy period according to the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model. Major policy implementation outcomes of this period included increased educational opportunities for all students, increased supervisory services for teachers, and financial support for educational programs from philanthropic organizations.

Table 7.3

*Post Civil War Reforms 1865-1912*

<b>Streams</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
<b>Problem Streams</b>	<b>Merging Issues</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Georgia</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education for all children in Georgia</li> <li>• Education of teachers</li> <li>• Common curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate but equal education system</li> <li>• Education of Teachers in Normal Schools</li> <li>• Education of African American children</li> <li>• Education and supervision of African American Teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Education Act of 1870; 1890 (Morrill Acts)</li> <li>• 1887 Amended School Laws</li> <li>• 1912 Constitutional amendment for state funding of high schools</li> <li>• 1912 Compulsory School Attendance and Child Labor Laws</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Racially Segregated Dual School System</li> <li>• Local option sales tax</li> <li>• 1877 Normal Department at North GA College</li> <li>• Peabody fund education of teachers</li> <li>• Jeanes Supervisors funding to help African American teachers</li> <li>• Rockefeller fund for African American teachers and children</li> </ul>
<b>Political Streams</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment of Governor and General Assembly to GA education</li> <li>• Philanthropic support for education in GA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education and supervision of African American children</li> </ul>		
<b>Policy Streams</b>	<b>Events</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Progressive Movement</li> <li>• State funded education for all children in Georgia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Randolph Lewis appointed first State School Commissioner</li> <li>• Georgia Teachers Association formed</li> </ul>		

Table 7.3 (Continued)

<i>Post Civil War Reforms 1865-1912</i>			
<b>Streams</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
<b>Policy Streams</b>	<b>Events</b>		<b>Georgia</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State regulation of teacher examinations and in-service education</li> <li>• Separate but equal education for African Americans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• James H. Dillard president of the “Negro Rural School Fund”</li> <li>• <b>Open Windows</b></li> <li>• 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment</li> <li>• Peabody study of 1867</li> <li>• <i>Plessey v Ferguson</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1890 University Branch Schools for African Americans</li> <li>• 1891 State Normal Schools</li> <li>• Rosenwald fund to build African American school</li> <li>• UGA programs and BS for teacher education</li> </ul>

The activities of philanthropic organizations provided the foundation for many educational initiatives in Georgia during the post civil war period. Of interest in this study was the program to train supervisors modeled after the activities of the Jeanes Supervisors that was established at South Georgia Teachers College in 1933. This program was a key component in supervision in the Department of Curriculum in the College of Education at the University of Georgia in 1968.

*Instructional Improvement Reforms 1912-1945*

The Program for Improvement of Instruction, an initiative to improve Georgia’s public school curriculum, was undertaken by the Georgia Department of Education in 1933. The Program for Improvement of Instruction with the backing of the Georgia Association of Educators was viewed as “a cooperative undertaking on the part of teachers to improve the quality of teaching” (Georgia Department of Education, Bulletin No. 1, 1935, 1937, p. 11). The

committee was charged with developing a plan for constructing a curriculum to meet the needs of Georgia's children.

State School Superintendent M. D. Collins was a key actor as an advocate of equalization of educational opportunity for all the states public school students with state funds. The Georgia legislature proposed a three-bill education package on January 15<sup>th</sup> of 1937 known as the Seven Months School Law and the Equalization of Educational Opportunity Law. The bills passed and Governor E. D. Rivers signed them into law. House Bill No. 123 mandated a seven month school term for all state schools. House Bill No. 125 established an elected state lay board of education and House Bill No. 141 provided for free textbooks. Other provisions of interest in the package provided for equalization of funds to pay teachers based on a formula involving average daily attendance of each district's students and provided for the equalization of funds for counties and cities. This education package also provided state support for student transportation services, minimum courses of study, and revision of the state's curriculum (Joiner et al., 1979).

The newly adopted salary schedule for teachers prompted the State Board of Education to adopt new certification requirements. The new salary schedule differentiated teacher pay based on level of education and years of experience. This Special certification was also established for administrative and supervisory personnel certification set the stage for the establishment of a supervision program at South Georgia Teachers College (Joiner et al., 1979).

South Georgia Teachers College at Statesboro established the state's first college program for the training and certification of school supervisors in 1937. This program brought together certain individuals who would become instrumental in the supervision program of study at the University of Georgia. Those individuals were Marvin Summers Pittman, Jane Franseth, Kate Houx, and Johnnye V. Cox (Grimsley et al., 1974).

Marvin Pittman was a proponent of improving the quality of rural schools and the improvement of in-service education for teachers prior to his appointment as president of South Georgia Teachers College in 1934. He developed a systematic approach to “helping teachers” which he used as the focus of his doctoral dissertation, “The Value of School Supervision Demonstrated with the Zone Plan in Rural Schools,” completed at Columbia University in 1921. This approach was called the Zone Plan (Pittman, 1921).

The Board of Regents at South Georgia Teachers College employed Jane Franseth, who had worked with Marvin Pittman in Michigan, to serve as a demonstration supervisor to train local supervisors in 1935. Her work over the next two years was the foundation of the supervision program of study at that institution (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The Julius Rosenwald Foundation of Chicago was instrumental in providing some funding for school buildings in the early 1900s and also supplied a grant to South Georgia Teachers College in Statesboro in 1937 for the purpose of training white supervisors. Marvin Pittman obtained this \$25,000 grant to offer 30 experienced Georgia teachers a two year scholarship for training to become supervisors in rural elementary schools. One of these supervisors in training was Johnnye V. Cox, who would eventually direct the graduate program of study in supervision at the University of Georgia (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The 30 Rosenwald scholarship recipients along with Jane Franseth, director of field studies, and Kate Houx, director of campus studies, organized a club to plan additional activities to foster their professional growth. The members became known as “Rosies” and they produced a quarterly publication entitled *The Helping Teacher*. This publication explored various issues in education and the field of supervision and was indicative of the emergent philosophy of supervision as a helping peer process (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The directors of the Rosenwald Board, pleased with the results of the program at South Georgia Teachers College, wished to expand the program to the graduate level at the end of the first two years. Since South Georgia Teachers College was an undergraduate institution, the supervision program was moved to the University of Georgia at the beginning of the fall term in 1939. Dean Cocking secured a two year agreement with the Rosenwald Board that would offer scholarships of \$400 for the pursuit of a master's degree in supervision. The Rosenwald Board withdrew their support for the program in 1941 due to the actions of Governor Eugene Talmadge that would result in the loss of accreditation of 10 Georgia colleges by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Grimsley et al., 1974; Jerrolds, 1989; Reed, 1951).

A new program for the preparation of supervisors was established at the University of Georgia in 1943. This program was sponsored by the Georgia Council on Teacher Education. Jane Franseth was named director of the Program for the Education of Supervisors. West Georgia College and Georgia State College for Women served as learning centers for the program. However, the loss of the Rosenwald Board's financial support had an effect on the scope of this new program. The council provided funds for only eight scholarships. These funds were only available for the next two years (Grimsley et al., 1974).

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools withdrew accreditation of all Georgia colleges in 1941 (Dyer, 1985; Orr, 1959) because of the political controversy surrounding then Governor Eugene Talmadge, Walter Cocking, Dean of Education at UGA, and Marvin Pittman, President of South Georgia Teacher's College. Progressive Ellis G. Arnold was elected to the Governor's office in November 1942. Arnold persuaded the General Assembly to dissolve the Board of Regents and to then allow him to appoint a new board. Governor Arnold

went on to reform the University System. Arnold's progressive views on race issues, however, cost him the election in 1946. Eugene Talmadge regained the Governor's office that year.

The primary policy initiatives of the Instructional Improvement Reforms period in Georgia were the Program for the Improvement of Instruction in 1933, the Seven Months School Year Law of 1937, and the Equalization of Education Opportunity law of 1937. The establishment of a program for the training of supervisors for the University System of Georgia also was established by policy during this period (Joiner et al., 1979; Orr, 1950; Reed, 1949).

Key actors during the Instructional Improvement Reform period were Governor Eugene Talmadge, Walter Cocking, Marvin Pittman, Ellis G. Arnold, Julius Rosenwald, Kate Houx, Jane Franseth, and Johnnye V. Cox. These individuals were instrumental in the establishment and expansion of the program for the training of supervisors in the state of Georgia.

World War II led to expansion of Federal Support for education. In 1944, the GI Bill authorized postsecondary education federal assistance that would ultimately send nearly eight million World War II veterans to college. The impact of the GI Bill would be a major factor in the growth of both higher education and technical education in Georgia during the School Improvement period following this period.

Table 7.4 presents an analysis of this policy period according to the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model. This period of policy initiatives produced several major policy implementation outcomes. In the school personnel arena, certification requirements for administrators, supervisors and teachers, and a state salary schedule for teachers were all enacted. Instructional improvement and curriculum revision were major undertakings of the State Department of Education. The expansion of the program for the training of supervisors and a philosophy of supervision as a helping process emerged.



Table 7.4

*Instructional Improvement Reforms 1912-1945*

<b>Streams</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Coupling/Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
<p><b>Problem Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of the quality of teaching in GA schools</li> </ul>	<p><b>Merging Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Certification of teachers, supervisors, administrators</li> </ul>	<p><b>Open Windows</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1921 Marvin Pittman developed the Zone Plan</li> </ul>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GA DOE Program for Improvement of Instruction 1933</li> </ul>
<p><b>Problem Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding for payment of teachers</li> <li>Funding formulas for counties and cities</li> <li>Improving the quality of rural schools</li> </ul>	<p><b>Events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1937 South GA Teachers College established first program for training of supervisors</li> <li>Marvin Pittman, Johnnye V. Cox, Jane Franseth, Kate Houx faculty members in supervision at South Georgia Teachers College</li> </ul>	<p><b>Coupling</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rosenwald Scholarship funds for training of supervisors - Johnnye V. Cox Rosenwald Scholar</li> <li>“Rosies” published <i>The Helping Teacher</i></li> <li>Ellis Arnold elected governor and appointed a new Board of Regents</li> </ul>	<p><b>Georgia</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The <i>Blue Book and the Red Book</i> published by DOE</li> <li>Lay boards of education established</li> <li>Average Daily Attendance (ADA) formula for equalization of state funding</li> <li>State funding for transportation</li> <li>Revision of state curriculum</li> <li>Minimum courses of study</li> <li>State Salary Schedule for Teachers</li> <li>State teacher certification</li> <li>State certification for administrators and supervisors</li> <li>Zone Plan for in-service education implemented</li> <li>Supervision philosophy of helping process</li> </ul>
<p><b>Political Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment of Governor and General Assembly to GA education</li> <li>Education and certification of teachers in GA schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1939 South Georgia supervision program moved to UGA as graduate program</li> </ul>	<p><b>National Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smith-Hughes Act 1917</li> <li>GI Bill 1944</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Policy Streams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State regulation of teacher education and certification</li> <li>State equalization of funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GA colleges lose SACs accreditation because of Cocking Incident</li> <li>Rosenwald withdrew funding for Scholarships</li> </ul>	<p><b>GA Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1937 Seven Months School Law</li> <li>1937 Equalization of Educational Opportunity Law</li> </ul>	

School Improvement Reforms produced legislations that allowed the program for the training of supervisors to gain state and national prominence as a key component in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. Legislation during the period also led to the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Georgia and the eventual demise of the program for the training of supervisors.

#### *School Improvement Reforms 1945-1991*

The need to improve Georgia's public school system was made obvious during World War II when it was discovered that the state's young men demonstrated a much higher rate of illiteracy than those from other states. The Georgia Education Association established The Georgia Educational Panel under the direction of Dean O. C. Aderhold of the University of Georgia. In 1947, this panel developed a plan to create a 12 year school program. The panel, remaining under the direction of Dean Aderhold, became The Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services and was a function of the College of Education at the University of Georgia in January of 1947 (Jerrols, 1989).

The following year Johnnye V. Cox came to the University of Georgia as the director of the Georgia Program for the Education of Supervisors which was a division of the Bureau. She was assisted by Reba Burnham. O. C. Aderhold became the President of the University of Georgia in 1951. He appointed John A. Dotson to the position of Dean of the College of Education that same year (Jerrols, 1989; Joiner et al., 1979).

The Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services was established in January 1947 to conduct research on problems in Georgia's schools and offer assistance to local school systems in address these problems. The Bureau conducted an extensive study of the operations of

Georgia's common schools. This study produced a report entitled "A Survey of Public Education of Less Than College Grade in Georgia" which eventually led to The Minimum Foundations Program of Education for Georgia Act of 1949. It was enacted in 1951. Joseph A. Williams and Johnnye V. Cox were members of the research team. The Act was revised in 1964 (Joiner et al., 1979). The Minimum Foundation Program provided various options and funding for the training, education, and certification of supervisors in Georgia.

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia was established on July 1, 1968 when three members of the Program for the Training of Supervisors in the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services were reassigned by Dean Joseph Williams to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching. Those three members were Dr. Reba Burnham, Dr. Johnnye Cox, and Dr. Virginia Macagnoni. This personnel reassignment created a separation between the training of educational administrators and the training of educational supervisors at the University of Georgia. This separation resulted in both programs establishing an identity based on the unique perspective of their academic focus.

Some professional activities in supervision during the period after the passage of the Minimum Foundation Program included the establishment in 1971 of the Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS)<sup>2</sup>, the result of a merger between the Jeanes supervisors' organization and the Georgia Department of Instructional Supervision (Grimsley et al., 1974). *Instructional Supervision in Georgia* (Grimsley et al., 1974), a first-hand account of the actual experiences of Georgia's earliest school and system-based supervisors as well as a historical perspective of school supervision in Georgia's schools from 1637 to 1972, was published by GACIS.

---

<sup>2</sup> GACIS is now known as the Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervisors.

The unique nature of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision among leadership programs in schools of education and the professional activities of the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the national, state, and local levels elevated the faculty at the University of Georgia to a level of prominence in state and national arenas. Because of this reputation, the faculty was invited to present the various unique aspects of the program at the annual meeting of COPIS in 1991, a year before the program was merged with Educational Administration at the University of Georgia. Their efforts, however, led to the recognition of supervision as an important construct for teacher development in schools; and thus, these effects became a focus of state-sponsored legislation and training programs for teacher supervisors.

An analysis of the state Minimum Foundation Program resulted in The Blue Ribbon Committee report of 1973 which addressed the need for increased school level supervisory services to be provided to principals so they can insure the quality of the education provided to Georgia students. The Committee reported:

Traditionally the school principal is responsible for all phases of the local school program including instruction, guidance services, health services and food services. It is important that a sufficient number of supervisory personnel be provided in order to insure that a quality educational program is available to the student. (p. 27)

The 1973 Blue Ribbon Committee's report became the basis for the 1974 Senate Bill No. 672 which became the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia Act (APEG) (Law Number: 1242). Among the provisions of the act were increased supervisory services at the school and system level:

...to provide for instructional services; to provide for supportive services; to provide for cooperative education service agencies; to provide for grants to local units of

administration for the operation of educational programs;...(Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, 1974, p. 1045)

These provisions had a direct effect on supervisory services in Georgia school systems.

Governor Jimmy Carter's The Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG) was the most extensive educational reform act in Georgia's history (Joiner et al., 1979). The Adequate Program for Education in Georgia had a direct impact on the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in its' program for the training of supervisors. Section 21 of APEG entitled teachers to Administrative and Supervisory Services, and provided funding for leadership personnel in Georgia public school systems based on student attendance. The funding provided by this act for supervisory personnel and curriculum directors increased the enrollment in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision as systems sought to employ individuals to fill these positions.

The Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) passed by Georgia's General Assembly in 1985 replaced APEG and had a profound impact on the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. QBE also affected the supervisor positions in Georgia schools. was the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) which included regulations holding schools accountable to numerous "standards." One of those standards that had an effect on the role of supervisors in the state of Georgia was the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP). Many school based supervisors, such as the Instructional Lead Teachers were called upon to perform these administrative functions.

Teacher evaluation had been seen by the members of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision as an administration function and not a function of supervision. As school based supervisors, the Instructional Lead Teachers (ILT), were required to conduct QBE required

observations as part of the GTEP. The Instructional Lead Teacher (ILT) became more identified as an administrator.

The programs in Department of Curriculum and Supervision as well as the Department of Educational Administration in the College of Education at the University of Georgia had to adopt changes to address new certification requirements. The QBE Act served to abolish the IS certification and establish new leadership criteria for Georgia college and university programs.

Dr. Bruce describes the effect that the changing function of supervision had on the field in Georgia

The whole mood of supervision began to change with the intrusion, I will say, of the accountability claim that had been imposed on us. Particularly that did get to be an issue with those people, once they had these IS certificates, then they had laid on them the responsibility of teacher evaluation. If you will remember my definition of supervision, it did not include accountability for function. It included counseling with releasing potential of and leaving the determination of ongoing employment to the administration which was clearly a different function. When they began to be mixed in the latter days of these foundation programs and certainly with the current accountability thrust, in my judgment we lost the real heart of supervision which is the openness that can exist between people with whom there is not reported accountability. (Bruce, 2005)

The primary policy initiatives of the School Improvement Reforms period in Georgia were the Minimum Foundations of Education for Georgia of 1949, the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia on 1973, and the Quality Basic Education Act of 1985. These educational acts were key factors in the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the

University of Georgia and the ultimate merger of the Department with the Department of Educational Administration. The legislation also in this period helped establish supervisory services and the final legislation was responsible for the demise of those services. Key actors during the School Improvement Reform period were former Governor, President Jimmy Carter, O. C. Aderhold, Johnnye V. Cox, and Joseph A. Williams.

The period from the mid -1950s to the 1970s was characterized as a period of change and reform in schools. As a result of the 1958 launch of the Soviet satellite Sputnik, changes in views of education as an instrument of social policy and as a means of gaining superiority in technology began to emerge. The federal government's appropriation of federal money to education to fund projects such as Operation Head Start and the Vocational Education Act and policies such as the National Defense Act of 1958 which focused on funding for math and science, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (1965) which focused on school programs particularly Title I federal aid to disadvantaged children, and various initiatives of the War on Poverty in the 60s served collectively to increase federal involvement in schools (Wiles and Bondi, 1996). The Civil Rights Act of 1864, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 prohibited discrimination based on race, sex, and disability respectively. Enforcement of these acts in schools became a task for the United States Department of Education.

Table 7.5 presents an analysis of this policy period according to the Kingdon Multiple Streams Model. This period of policy initiatives produced the 12 Year School Program, the Quality Core Curriculum, and the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program (GTEP). These policy initiatives and their implementation outcomes were key influences on the operation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

Table 7.5

*School Improvement Reforms 1945-1991*

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Coupling/Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
<b>Problem Streams</b>	<b>Merging Issues</b>	<b>Open Windows</b>	<b>Georgia</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role of administrators in Schools</li> <li>• Role of supervisors in schools</li> <li>• Curriculum and instructional improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability and Supervision</li> <li>• Administrative salaries</li> <li>• Supervision salaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bureau published report which led to MFP passage</li> <li>• Department of Curriculum and Supervision - Dean Joseph Williams</li> <li>• Jimmy Carter elected GA Governor</li> <li>• Supervision merged with Administration in 1991 to form the Department of Educational Leadership at UGA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 year school program</li> <li>• Separation of Administration and Supervision as unique programs</li> <li>• IS Certification and Instructional Lead Teacher Positions (developed under APEG, eliminated under QBE)</li> <li>• Quality Core Curriculum</li> <li>• Principal as Instructional Leader</li> <li>• Teacher Evaluation and Professional Improvement GTEP</li> </ul>
<b>Political Streams</b>	<b>Events</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment of Governor and people to GA education</li> <li>• Statewide improvement of schools</li> <li>• Standards-based movements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1947 Bureau of Educational Field Services at UGA directed by O.C. Aderhold</li> <li>• 1948 Johnnye Cox director of Bureau UGA</li> <li>• Operation Bootstrap for Superintendents</li> <li>• Operation CD for Curriculum Directors</li> </ul>		
<b>Policy Streams</b>		<b>National Policy</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Supervisor Certificate</li> <li>• Administrative Certification</li> <li>• Supervision Degree Programs</li> <li>• Administration Degree Programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GACIS</li> <li>• <i>Instructional Supervision in Georgia</i> published</li> <li>• CSEA support service centers</li> <li>• COPIS</li> <li>• Firth – ASCD president</li> <li>• C&amp;S faculty professional activities</li> <li>• Soviet Satellite Sputnik 1958</li> <li>• Operation Head Start 1965</li> <li>• War on Poverty</li> <li>• <i>A Nation at Risk</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• George-Barden Act 1946</li> <li>• National Defense Act 1958</li> <li>• Vocational Education Act 1963</li> <li>• Civil Rights Act 1964</li> <li>• Economic Opportunity Act 1964</li> <li>• Social Security Act 1965</li> <li>• ESEA 1965</li> </ul>	



Table 7.5 (Continued)

*School Improvement Reforms 1945-1991*

<b>Problems</b>	<b>Coupling</b>	<b>Coupling/Policy</b>	<b>Implementation</b>
	<p><b>Events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>A Nation at Risk</i> report 1983</li> <li>• <i>Blue-Ribbon Commission Report</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Open Windows</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Title I 1965</li> <li>• Title IX Amendment 1972</li> <li>• Section 504 of Rehabilitation Act 1972</li> </ul> <p><b>GA Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Foundations of Education for Georgia (MFP) Act of 1949</li> <li>• Adequate Program for Education in GA APEG (1973)</li> <li>• Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) (1985)</li> </ul>	

The educational policies and reform legislations of the School Improvement Reforms Era were prompted by the social and political issues facing a rapidly growing population in Georgia and the South. This growth required rapid development of Georgia’s public schools and increased oversight by the State Department of Education. This era was a time of prominence and ultimate decline of the program for the training of supervisors and the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in the College of Education at the University of Georgia.

Policy Analysis Summary

In summary, the analysis of these selected educational policies in Georgia focused on common problem, political, and policy streams which enabled passage of policy initiatives. The analysis revealed three larger themes which merged at various points in time to provide open

windows for the passage of selected educational policy. The themes were: (1) Historical support for education, (2) Professionalism and quality of teaching and supervision, and (3) Centralization of educational processes.

One common theme in the ongoing educational agenda in Georgia was the collective historical support by key policymakers, influential educators, philanthropic organizations, and general cultural support for the education of children. For example, as early as 1777 in the development of the Constitution of the State of Georgia, there was cultural support for education of all children and the responsibility of the state for education was written into the document. In later years, a series of legislations provided state funding for building schools in every county and a system of committee-directed state supervision of schools. This cultural support greatly enabled state funding of various policy initiatives for educational improvement, particularly in program development and supervision activities in higher education (Orr, 1950).

A second common theme in the educational policy and political arena was the emphasis on areas of professionalism, certification, supervision, and pay for teachers. Members of the Georgia Teachers' Association (GTA) as early as 1831 focused their efforts on increasing the quality of teaching in Georgia and their support allowed for teacher partnering initiatives with the State Department of Education (GA Department of Education, 1972; Orr, 1950). Support and funding for quality teaching from the state General Assembly has historically been a part of Georgia educational policy initiatives and allowed the state government to prioritize and fund education to benefit Georgia citizens.

A third common theme identified in this analysis was the state's focus on centralization of control of education largely to assuage the public of concerns about the quality of teaching and learning in schools. The attempt by the state legislature in 1785 to compensate and require

certification of teachers, while appearing to be supportive of teaching as a profession, was also an attempt to control the quality of education in schools in Georgia. The attempts to control and centralize, however, also resulted in funding for corresponding activities and functions regarding education in K-12 schools and higher education programs for teachers, supervisors and administrators.

The common themes illustrated the evolution of policy trends which influenced both the development and later dissolution of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Georgia. Also of interest was the effect of policy initiatives and their implementation, particularly the *Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG)* 1973, and the *Quality Basic Education Act (QBE)* 1985, on the department's faculty activities and their involvement with state policymakers, the GA Department of Education, and local school systems.

Results of the policy analysis indicated that initiation of and changes in educational policy in Georgia were characterized by spillover effects. That is, they did not occur in stages and steps, but were rather a result of interactions of key political actors and a variety of ongoing merging issues, open and closed windows and national trends. The Kingdon model is one that emphasizes that policy agenda setting is an ongoing interactive process with overlapping rather than separate cause effect relationships (Kingdon, 2003).

Both of the largest reform policies enacted in Georgia in the School Improvement period, the *Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG)* 1973 and the *Quality Basic Education Act (QBE)* 1985, had profound effects on the activities and operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The APEG and the QBE enabled the activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision by providing legitimate supervisory roles in schools and funding for

educational supervision programs at one period in time. By the time QBE was passed, however, the focus on accountability and evaluation of teachers had limited the scope of implementation of philosophically-based supervisory programs designed to help teachers in schools.

### Conclusions and Implications

Moving from the analysis of state and national policies, what can be drawn from the study of the Department of Curriculum of Supervision from 1968-1991 and Dr. Lucian Wootton's call?

It is hoped that persons of similar interest and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture as possible. (Appendix A)

What implications can be drawn from this study? What insights can be gained to guide our actions in field of supervision today?

### *Conclusions*

Through the examination of local, state, and national policies, key legislation, and listening to the voices of the four participants of this study, the researcher concludes that the formation of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision was the outcome of multiple social and political variables that were unique to the state and the nation during the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. The combination of state and national policies, philanthropic activities, and key individuals created conditions that fostered and advanced the field of supervision in Georgia and subsequently in the United States.

Georgia's racially segregated dual school system established by the Education Act of 1870 opened a window of opportunity for philanthropic assistance to support the African-American schools in Georgia. Miss Annie T. Jeanes provided the opportunity for the training of

supervising teachers to focus on improving the instructional skills of the teachers in the African – American schools in Georgia. Julius Rosenwald contributed funds for the training of Jeanes Supervisors and also for construction of African-American schools in the south with concentrated efforts in Georgia. These programs were early antecedents to the program for the training of supervisors that Marvin Pittman established at South Georgia Teachers College in 1937.

Marvin Pittman came to Georgia with a commitment to teacher supervision rooted in his doctoral studies. Pittman worked with two women who became pivotal in the program for the training of supervisors when the program moved from South Georgia Teachers College to the University of Georgia in 1943. Jane Franseth served as the director of the supervision program at South Georgia Teachers College and served in the same capacity when the program first came to the University of Georgia in 1943. Johnnye V. Cox was a student in the first group trained in the supervision program at South Georgia Teachers College. Johnnye V. Cox was the next director of the program at the University of Georgia beginning in 1947.

Dr. Cox remained the Director of the supervision program for 25 years and was in that position when the program was moved to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to form the Department of Curriculum and Supervision in 1968. Dr. Edith Grimsley was a student of Dr. Cox and was selected by her and Dr. Reba Burnham to join the supervision program as a faculty member the year the new department was established at the University of Georgia.

The Department of Curriculum and Supervision rose to prominence during the implementation of the Adequate Program for Education in Georgia Act of 1972 (APEG). This legislation provided funds for supervisory personnel for local school systems as well as special certification for these supervisors. The Department became the leading program for the training

and certification of school supervisors in Georgia from 1968 to 1991 and especially during the life of the APEG legislation.

In 1985, the Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) was passed by the Georgia legislature. This act focused on accountability for school systems and their teachers. Accountability for teachers was exemplified through a state mandated teacher evaluation program. Because of the additional manpower needed to fulfill the formal classroom observations requirements of the Georgia Teacher Evaluation Program, school based supervisors began to assist administrators by conducting administrative observations and making evaluation decisions. However, the salary compensation for supervisors was generally considerably less than administrators. Thus, the new expectations of administrative duties and lower salaries for supervisors in 1985 precipitated a shift in enrollment from the Department of Curriculum and Supervision to the Department of Educational Administration.

The University of Georgia reorganized the educational leadership programs in 1991. The change in policy focus from supervision to administration affected other educational programs in supervision in higher education. Such was the fate of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia. The number of students enrolled in the supervision program decreased dramatically in favor of administration as policy deemed that area of study and degree most beneficial for compensation and legitimate personnel evaluation roles in schools. As a result, the department was merged with the Department of Educational Administration to form the Department of Educational Leadership in 1991.

Dr. Ray Bruce retired from the University of Georgia in 1993, the year after the departments were merged, and the original program for the training of supervisors came to an end in Georgia. Dr. Gerald Firth remained in the newly established department until it was

placed into receivership in 2000. Dr. Sally J. Zepeda, a professor in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration, and Policy and who came to the University of Georgia in 1999, is, at present, the only professor of supervision at the University of Georgia.

### *Implications*

The researcher contends that this study has implications for school-based supervision and for the study of supervision as a field. The participants in this study were instrumental in both endeavors. The Department of Curriculum and Supervision was a major force in training supervisors to work directly with classroom teachers during a period of major educational reforms. Georgia's classroom teachers are under increased pressure with new accountability requirements from current educational reforms. Supervisory support services could help assure the success of teachers as they comply with the Highly Qualified Teacher requirements of No Child Left Behind and a new Georgia teacher evaluation program being developed during the winter of 2008.

The training of educational leaders to become effective supervisors must be research based and that research should have a broad base to encompass practical and theoretical applications of both the roles and the tasks of supervisors. It is hoped that this study may help to document the value of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision and encourage the advancement of supervision in schools and in institutions of higher education.

The researcher retired at the conclusion of this study in July 2008 having spent the last 6 years of his career as a teacher and instructional supervisor. Prior to this study the researcher was a middle school principal for 12 years. These experiences and studying supervision in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision from 1987 to 1991 provided the researcher an

understanding of the importance of supervision in schools. Conducting this research study has reinforced his belief in the importance of supervision as a field of study.

It is hoped that in some way this study was able to preserve the voices and images of the participants who were considered trailblazers in the field of supervision. Their story should serve as a reminder of the state and national prominence attained by the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia from 1968 to 1991.

The history of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision is a history of teaching, service, and research. The participants of this study educated many of Georgia's school leadership personnel and assisted local school systems in numerous school improvement efforts during the Department's 25 years of operation. The participants were also involved in theoretical and practice-based research through their own work and their work with doctoral students in and out of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision. The contributions of the Department to Georgia's schools were a major asset for the College of Education at the University of Georgia from 1968 to 1991.

Dr. Johnnye V. Cox, in her 1972 lecture entitled, "Supervision Today, Yesterday, and Tomorrow" (Appendix B) cautioned her colleagues to prepare for change and remain diligent to advancing the study and practice of supervision. The lecture's last sentence was optimistic, "I predict tomorrow will be the best day supervision has had in the land of Georgia" (September 27, 1972). It is hoped she may still be right.



## REFERENCES

- Acheson, K.A., & Gall, M.D. (1987). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Acheson, K.A., & Gall, M.D. (2003). *Clinical supervision and teacher development: Preservice and inservice applications* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Adequate Program for Education in Georgia Act (APEG), 32 GA. Stat. 1242. Ann. §§ 20-601-672 (1974).
- Alfonso, R.J., Firth, G.R., & Neville, R.F. (1981). *Instructional supervision: A behavior system*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- An Act donating public lands to the several States and [Territories] which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the Mechanic arts [Morrill Act], (12 US Stat. 503) (1862).
- An Act to establish a Normal Department in the North Georgia Agricultural College at Dahlonega, and to more efficiently provide for the Military Department of the same, and for other purposes, 1- 120 GA Stat. CXX Ann. §§ 1-2-117 – 1-7-118 (1877).
- An Act to establish a school for colored persons as a branch of the State University, to appropriate money for the same, and for other purposes, 1 GA Stat. 2 Ann. §§ 20-099-108 (1890).
- An Act to establish a system of public instruction, (GA Stat. 53) (1870).
- An Act to make the Governor of the State, and in his absence the oldest member of the Board of Trustees of Franklin College, who may be present, President of said Board, 1-107 GA Stat. 106 Ann. §§1-109 -1-112.
- An Act to render certain the compensation of teachers of poor children of the respective counties of the State, and to secure to poor children the benefit of the poor school fund, 1 GA Stat. 1 Ann. §§1-001 – 1-010 (1857).
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1951). *Instructional supervision in small schools*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1960). *Leadership for improving instruction, 1960 yearbook*. Washington, DC: Author.

- Barr, A.S., Burton, W.H., & Bruecker, L.J. (1938). *Supervision: Principles and practices in the improvement of instruction*. NY: D. Appleton-Century.
- Bickel, W.E., & Artz, N.J. (1984). Improving instruction through focused team supervision. *Educational Leadership*, 41(April), 22-24.
- Blumberg, A. (1980). *Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 207
- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson education Group, Inc.
- Bolin, F. (1987). On defining supervision. *The Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2(4), 368-390.
- Bottorff, J. L. (1994). Using videotaped recordings in qualitative research. In J. M. Morse (Ed.), *Critical Issues on Qualitative Research Methods* (pp. 244-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bowers, C.A., & Flinders, D.J. (1991). *Culturally responsive teaching and supervision*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Bruce, R.E., & Grimsley, E.E. (1987) Topic E: The supervisor as facilitator in the improvement of teaching and learning. In R.E. Bruce & E.E. Grimsley (Eds), *Readings in educational supervision: Volume 2* (pp. 129-130). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Bruce, Ray E. and Edith E. Grimsley (Eds.) (1982 and 1987). *Readings in educational supervision*, Vol. 1 and 2. Reston VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp 509 – 535). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Charmaz, K. (2002). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J.Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research* (pp. 675-694). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc

- Champagne, D. & Hogan, R. (1981). *Consultant supervision: Theory and skill development*. Wheaton, IL: CH Publications
- Cogan, M.L. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Costa, A.L., & Garmston, R.J. (1985). Supervision for intelligent teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 42, 70-80.
- Cox, J.C. (1967). *A history of school supervision in Georgia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Florida State University: Tallahassee, FL.
- Cox, J.V. (1972, Sept.). *Supervision today, yesterday, and tomorrow*. The 1972 Johnnye V. Cox Lecture presented at the annual meeting of the Georgia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (GASCD). Athens, GA.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, L.L. (1963). Effecting change through leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 21(2), 75-79.
- Daresh, J.C. (1989). *Supervision as a proactive process*. NY: Longman.
- Daresh, J.C. & Plako, M.A. (1995). *Supervision as a proactive process: Concepts and cases*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Davis, O.L. Jr. (1978). Symbol of a shift from status to function: Formation of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. *Educational Leadership*, 35(2), 609-614.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). The methodological implications of symbolic interactionism for the study of deviance. In A. Wells (Ed.), *Contemporary Social Theories* (pp. 99-108), Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Denzin, N.K. (2001). *Interpretive interactionism* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.). (1994). *The handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Boston: DC: Heath.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. NY: Horace MacMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1929). *The sources of a science of education*. NY: Horace Liveright.

- Dull, L.W. (1981). *Supervision: School leadership handbook*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.
- Dunaway, D.K., & Baum, W.K. (Eds.). (1996). *Oral history: An interdisciplinary anthology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Duffy, F.M. (1998). The ideology of supervision. In G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 81-199). NY: Simon & Schuster McMillan.
- Dwight, T. (1835). *The school-master's friend of the committee-man's guide*. NY: Roe Lockwood.
- Dyer, T.G. (1985). *The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Eisner, E. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68, 447-452.
- Eliot, E.C. (1914). *City school supervision*. NY: World Book.
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 105-394 (1965).
- Erlanson, D.A., Harris, E.I., Skipper, B.L., & Allen, S.D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Evans, L.B. (1913). *First lessons in Georgia history*. NY: American Book Co.
- Gall, M.D., Borg, W.R., & Gall, J.P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Garman, N.B. (1986). Reflection, the heart of clinical supervision: A modern rationale for practice. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2(1), 1-24.
- Garmston, R. (1988, August). A call for collegial coaching. *The Developer*, 4-6. National Council of Staff Development. Pittsburg, PA.
- Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS) (1974). *Instructional supervision in Georgia*. Athens, GA: Author.
- Georgia Association of Jeanes Curriculum Directors (1975). *Jeanes supervision in Georgia schools: A guiding light in education*. GA: Author.
- Georgia State Department of Education (1935, 1937). *The organization and conduct of teacher study groups*. Bulletin No. 1. Atlanta, GA: Author.

- Georgia State Department of Education (1942). *Georgia program for the improvement of instruction*. Bulletin No. 2. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Georgia State Department of Education: Education Panel (1947). *School leaders manual*. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Glanz, J. (1990). Beyond bureaucracy: Notes on professionalization of school supervision in the early twentieth century. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5(2), 150-170.
- Glanz, J. (1992). Curriculum development and supervision: Antecedents for collaboration and future possibilities. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 7(3), 226-244.
- Glanz, J., & Neville, R. (1997). *Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues and controversies*. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon.
- Glanz, J. (1998). Histories, antecedents and legacies of school supervision. In G.R. Firth & E.F. Pajak (Eds.), *Handbook of research on school supervision* (pp. 39-79). NY: Simon & Schuster McMillan.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1999). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter
- Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). *Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman/Little Brown.
- Glatthorn, A.A. (1997). *Differentiated supervision* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Glatthorn, A., Boschee, F., & Whitehead, B. (2006). *Curriculum leadership: Development and Implementation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glatthorn, A., & Newberg, N. (1984). A team approach to instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 41(February), 60-63.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. New York: Longman
- Glickman, C.D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glickman, C.D. (1990). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Glickman, C.D., Gordon, S.P., & Ross-Gordon, J.M. (1998). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). *Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Grimsley, E.E., Burnham, R.M., Cox, J.V., Hussey, J.B., Singletary Jr., H.T., & Woodard, A. L. (1974) *Instructional supervision in Georgia*. Athens, GA: Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision (GACIS).
- Guerke, M.L. (1991). *The importance of twelve dimensions of effective supervisory practice derived from educational literature as perceived by selected lead teachers and team leaders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Harris, B.M. (1975). *Supervisory behavior in education* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hazi, H. M., & Glanz, J. (1997, April). *Supervision traveling incognito*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Hertzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World.
- Hoy, W., & Forsyth, P. (1986). *Effective supervision: Theory into practice*. New York: Random House.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1982). *Educational administration theory, research and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). New York: Random House.
- Hunter, M. (1986). Let's eliminate the pre-observation conference. *Educational Leadership*, 43(6), 69-70.
- Jackson, E., Stake, M., Hepburn, L., & Hepburn, M. (1999). *The Georgia studies book: Our state and the nation*. Athens, GA: Carl Vinson Institute of Government.
- Jerrolds, B.W. (1989). *The history of the college of education: The university of Georgia*. Athens, GA: College of Education, University of Georgia.
- Joiner, O.H., Bonner, J.C., Shearouse, H.S., & Smith, T.E. (Eds.) (1979). *A history of public education in Georgia 1734 – 1976*. State of Georgia: State Board of Education and Columbia, SC: R.L. Bryan Co.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 40(2), 4-10.

- Kaestle, C.F. (1988). Recent methodological developments in the history of American education. In R.M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 61-74). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Kahrs, J.R. (1991). *School/university partnership program for developing educational leaders: Assessment and implications*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Kingdon, J.W. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Little Brown.
- Kingdon, J.W. (2003). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Klein, P. & Pascoe, E. (2005). *Georgia in the American experience*. Evanston, IL: McDougall Littell, Inc.
- Kuzel, A.J. (1992). Sampling in qualitative inquiry. In B.F. Crabtree & W.L. Miller (Eds.), *Doing qualitative research* (pp. 31-44). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Langenbach, M., Vaughn, C. A., & Aagaard, L. (1994). *An introduction to educational research*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lewis, A.J., & Miel, A. (1972). *Supervision for improved instruction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Little, J.W. (1990, Summer). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in professional relations. *Teacher College Record* 91, 526-527.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Loup, K., Garland, J., Ellett, C., & Ragutt, J. (1996). Ten years later: Findings from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in the 100 largest school districts. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 10(3), 203-226.
- Lucio, W.H., & McNeil, J.D. (1969). *Supervision: A synthesis of thought and action*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Marius, R., & Page, M. (2005). *A short guide to writing about history*. NY: Longman.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- McCoy, R.F. (1961). *American school administration*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Mead, M. (1930). *Growing up in New Guinea: A comparative study of primitive education*. New York: William Morrow.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook: Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Minimum Foundation Program of Education Act 523. 20 GA Stat. Ann. §§ 32-601-32-661.
- Mosher, R.L., & Purpel, D.E. (1972). *Supervision: The reluctant profession*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Author.
- National Education Association, Department of the Superintendence. (1930). *The superintendent surveys supervision: Yearbook 8*. Washington, DC: National Education Association. Author.
- Neagley, R.L & Evans, N.D. (1980). *Handbook for effective supervision of instruction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice – Hall.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). 238
- Nolan, J., & Francis, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In C.D. Glickman (Ed.), *Supervision in transition* (pp. 44-60). 1992 Yearbook of the American Association for Supervision and Curriculum and Development. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Author.
- Orr, D. (1950). *A history of education in Georgia*. Greensboro, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Pajak, E.F. (1993). *Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Pajak, E.F., & Arrington, A. (2004). Empowering a profession: Rethinking the roles of administrative evaluation and instructional supervision in improving teacher quality. In M.A. Smylie & D. Miretzky (Eds.), *Developing the teacher workforce* (pp. 228-252). 103<sup>rd</sup> Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.



- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Payne, W.H. (1895). *Chapters on school supervision*. NY: Wilson & Hinkle.
- Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Perks, R., & Thompson, A. (1998). *The oral history reader*. London: Routledge.
- Pittman, M. S. (1925). *The value of school supervision*. Baltimore, MD: Warwick & York.
- Plessey v, Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).
- Quality Basic Education Act (QBE), Title 20, 2 GA Stat. Ann. §§20-2-130 – 20-2-331(1984).
- Reed, T.W. (1949). History of the University of Georgia. Athens, GA.:University of Georgia. Retrieved 10-11-2004 from <http://triton3.galib.uga.edu>.
- Schön, D.A. (1988). Coaching reflective teaching. In Peter P. Grimmett & Gaalen L. Erickson (Eds.). *Reflection in teacher education*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41(February), 4-13.
- Sergiovanni, T.J., & Sarratt, R.J. (1983; 1998). *Supervision: Human perspectives*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Sessoms, J.B., Tackwood, E.A., Davis, R.E., Dempsey, M.D., Knight, E.W., et al. (1975). *Jeanes supervision in Georgia schools: A guiding light in education*. Athens, GA: Georgia Association of Jeanes Supervisors and the Southern Education Foundation, Inc.
- Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Smyth, W.J. (1988). Developing a ‘critical’ practice of clinical supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 3(2), 1-15.
- Sommer, B. W., & Quinlan, M. K. (2002). *The oral history manual*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

- Suddeth, R., Osterhout, I., & Hutchen, G. (1966). *Empire builders of Georgia* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Austin, TX: Steck-Vaughn.
- Taylor, F.W. (1916). *The principles of scientific management*. Bulletin of the Taylor Society.
- Toepfer, C.F. (1973). The supervisor's responsibility for innovation. *Educational Leadership*, 30(8), 740-743.
- United States Department of Education, National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Wickerman, J.P. (1864). *School economy: A treatise on the preparation, organization, employments, government, and authorities of schools*. NY: Lippincott.
- Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1980). *Supervision: A guide to practice* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1996). *Supervision: A guide to practice*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wiles, K. (1967). *Supervision for better schools*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Williams, D.W. (1990). *An ethnographic study of school – based instructional supervisors: Their role and functions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Wootton, L.R. (1969). *1969 History of the curriculum and supervision department*. Unpublished manuscript, College of Education, University of Georgia.
- Wootton, L.R. (1977). *Curriculum and supervision department history*. Unpublished manuscript, College of Education, University of Georgia.
- Wootton, L.R. (1993). *Chronology of department of curriculum and supervision University of Georgia: Working draft*. Unpublished manuscript, College of Education, University of Georgia.
- Wootton, L.R. (1994). *1994 Working draft history of the curriculum and supervision department*. Unpublished manuscript, College of Education, University of Georgia.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zepeda, S. J. (2003). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education. 216

Zepeda, S. J. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts*. (2nd ed.).  
Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

1201 Rockinwood Drive  
Athens GA 30606  
September 1, 1993

Enclosed is a beginning effort to capture an overview of the development of curriculum and supervision in the College of Education of the University of Georgia.

The first section is focused primarily on the development of the department of curriculum and supervision.

The second section attempts to itemize certain activities, concepts and persons particularly associated from 1930 to 1992. This section is far from being complete.

I claim no holding or certainty as to the specifics delineated. These efforts are made as a matter of interests in reviewing areas of education that have been vital to me during the major portion of my career.

It is hoped that persons of similar interest and especially those who have been personally involved in supervision and curriculum in Georgia will share with us in presenting as complete a picture as possible.

You are personally requested to review this writing very critically and make copies and invite others to share with us. PLEASE USE THIS COPY TO WRITE IN YOUR REACTIONS. CORRECTIONS, DELETIONS AND ADDITIONS AND RETURN TO LUTIAN.

A REVISED COPY WILL BE SENT TO ALL WHO SHARE IN THE PROCESS AND DESIRE A COPY.

Copies are presently being sent to those who have already expressed interest in the project: Ray Bruce, Jerry Firth, Ed Pajak, Johnnye Cox and John Reynolds. Others desiring may have a copy of this first draft.

Cordially yours,

**Appendix B**

SUPERVISION TODAY, YESTERDAY, AND TOMORROW

THE JOHNNYE V. COX LECTURE

1972

Given By

Johnnye V. Cox

Sponsored by

Georgia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Sallye Bennett, President

THE 1972 JOHNNYE V. COX LECTURE  
SUPERVISION TODAY, YESTERDAY, AND TOMORROW  
GIVEN BY JOHNNYE V. COX

Dr. Howard Lane, when speaking to this group several years ago, said if people are really honest they don't have but one speech. Most of you have heard my speech so many times that you can probably give it even better than I. If you attended the retirement dinner given in my honor you will recall how well certain persons did just that.

This talk, or lecture, if you please, doesn't really have a title but it has three parts. Part I will take a look at supervision yesterday. Part II will take a look at supervision today. Part III will take a look at supervision tomorrow. Here, then, is my speech, organized for this occasion in three parts.

Part I: Once upon a time (almost forty years ago) there were many schools in the land of Georgia. They could be found in every small community in the rural areas and in the cities. The schools served as gathering places for the people for ice cream suppers, quilting parties, picnics, and for other social, religious, and political activities. There was much happiness in the land as people of all ages gathered for every occasion.

Because there were many schools most of them were small with one, three, or five or perhaps ten or fifteen teachers. A teacher in the elementary school taught all of the pupils all of the subjects in one, two, three or even seven grades. A teacher in the high school taught all of the pupils all of the mathematics, or all of the sciences, or all of the social studies, or all of the English or a combination of two or more of these subjects. Teachers were important in those

days and were so regarded by pupils and parents. Schools were happy places with teachers helping pupils with difficulties encountered in teaching and learning.

In each school a person was named to manage such matters as heat, light, water, sanitation, chalk, erasers, and busses. In the smaller school the management matters were usually attended to by a teacher. In some instances the teacher received a small supplement for tendering these services in addition to teaching one or more grades. In the larger schools a principal was employed to attend to the management matters, to coach athletic teams, to teach one or more subjects, and to help teachers know about school policies relating to dating, marriage, salaries and the like. To do these things just enumerated and to build and maintain a feeling of contentment and satisfaction among the community people and the school people indicated that the principal had met the expectations of the school board and it would appear that all was well in the land of Georgia.

Nevertheless, some teachers and principals about this time became somewhat restless. "After all," some were heard to say, "There may be more to good schooling than happiness, contentment and satisfaction." Some even raised such questions as, "What is the job of the school?" "Are we teaching the right subjects?" "How well are we teaching?" "Who can help us answer these questions?"

Now it did so happen that other persons in the land of Georgia were asking similar questions. Wise leaders assembled to discuss these disturbing questions. They called in wise persons from other lands and teachers and principals from the land of Georgia. First they produced the Blue Book. This book did suggest ways to find answers to the perplexing questions. Its message was, "Organize a study group of your own teachers, parents, and students and determine the answers for your own school." Many study groups were organized. Some

groups did find some answers to their questions, but many groups gave up because, as they said, “Planning with people is a new thing. It is not easy. We will wait for our answers.”

The wise leaders of the land of Georgia were not discouraged. They assembled still more wise people and produced the Red Book. Some study groups did use the Red Book and found some help in answering their questions. And, perhaps to their surprise, as a group did find answers they uncovered more questions, thus, there did come forth in some schools a plan for continuous study which does exist unto this day.

But the wise leaders were not content for only a few schools to be seeking answers to questions. As they looked t each school that continued to study its questions they discovered that there was always a leader who kept the group alive. This leader knew how to study a question and knew how to help members of the group to find ways of taking parting the study. He knew how to use the results of the study to change a situation. In some schools this leader was a principal. In some schools this leader was a teacher. In a few favored spots, maybe about ten in the whole land of Georgia, the leader was a supervisor or helping teacher.

Looking at the ongoing groups caused some conjecturing on the part of the wise leaders. “The supervisor,” said they, “is in a unique position to help teachers, principals, and parents to engage in the study and improvement of school conditions. The supervisor does not have management jobs nor does he have pupils to teach. He can help a teacher and/or a group of teachers looking at ways of teaching and at the results of teaching. He can assist a principal and/or group of principals in looking at school and community situations that help or hinder school improvement. Let us secure more supervisors!”

But alas, there were no supervisors to be found in the land of Georgia! But again the wise leaders would not be daunted. “We will send out to other lands and find persons who will come



to the land and teach persons to become supervisors.” This they did. The wise leaders then sent messengers throughout the land of Georgia to discover teachers and principals who wished to become supervisors. The candidates were tested, screened, and scrutinized. A goodly number appeared to be stout-hearted enough for the work ahead and were invited to take part in the supervision programs which were designed for them. Thus, the wise leaders moved forth again with another means of assisting with school improvement in the land of Georgia.

The candidates gathered at the colleges where they were to learn how to supervise. The supervisors who had come from other lands as well as some wise leaders from the land of Georgia directed their study. They learned from the wise college leaders about curriculum, supervision, methods of teaching, psychology, sociology, and other subject of their interest. They learned from the wise practicing supervisors just how these new knowledge could be used in improving schools. They practiced these new skills by helping teachers and pupils try some new and different ways of studying health, reading, science, mathematics and other persistent questions. They extended their practice to helping teachers and pupils to see what each had learned. The supervisors especially kept tab of their own learnings and skills. They found time and worked over-time to build confidence and know—how as they looked toward the time when they would be on their own as supervisors. Each candidate did prepare for himself a plan of action which he would take to the new job. In the plan of action he had stated what he believed about education and schools and how supervision could help to have better schools. He described how the supervisor could help a teacher set the goals to be accomplished and to know if the goals were achieved. He described a way of working with others so each would have a part in the studying, planning, doing, and evaluating. He prepared and practiced talks describing what he would do as a supervisor and how he would work. Little did the supervisor know how much he

would use this plan and these talks but the wise leaders who were teaching him to supervise did know that the plan would give him confidence and security and direction.

And so it was that supervisors went forth into the land of Georgia – into the hills, into the mountains, into the flatlands, and to the seashore, to small schools, and to large schools. In most situations one supervisor served as a teacher, as a resource person, as a leader, and as a coordinator as he helped teachers and others find ways to answer perplexing school questions.

Unfortunately in this period not all schools had the services of a supervisor whose primary functions were to assist in school improvement and staff development. Extending these services to more and more teachers and schools continued to be a task of the wise leaders in the land of Georgia throughout the period of yesterday. The task was not an easy one. Indeed it was really a three-fold task. It involved supporting programs for the education of supervisors, encouraging persons to prepare for supervisory positions which existed in only limited numbers, and providing funds for the employment of supervisors. And just at sundown of yesterday the wise leaders were rewarded for their efforts for there did come to pass the Minimum Foundation Program of Education. This law made provision for financing instructional supervision in the land of Georgia. The provision was limited but it was enough to cause rejoicing, especially among supervisors. The supervisors could now live through the budget making period each year without the threat of being “cut off” as an unnecessary item. And thus it was that the wise leaders moved from yesterday to today with a rich legacy. A legacy that included

- 1) an established need for instructional supervision in the schools in the land of Georgia (valid research studies had established this need),
- 2) an acceptance and understanding of the function of supervision on the part of teachers, principals, and others,

- 3) financial support for the supervision programs in small and large school systems,
- 4) programs for educating supervisors that were acclaimed throughout the land of Georgia and other lands,
- 5) supervisors whose major responsibility was to provide leadership in staff development, curriculum development and instructional improvement,
- 6) supervisors who demonstrated skill, competency and understanding in the performance of this responsibility.

There was much reason to feel happy, proud, and rewarded as yesterday came to an end in the land of Georgia about 10 or 15 years ago.

Part II: Supervision today had its beginning in the land of Georgia when the curtain was drawn on yesterday. As the sun rose on today a condition of affluency had already begun to move into the arena of education throughout the land of Georgia. This “new to education” condition came about largely from federal assistance programs such as the National Defense Education Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Civil Rights Act, and others. The condition was boosted further in the land of Georgia by a second Minimum Foundation Program for Education and by state—wide programs as special education, reading, and early childhood.

There was much rejoicing in the land of Georgia as these developments came to pass. “Our worries are over!” “We can now have all the books, materials, equipment and buildings we have always wanted.” “We can have persons to help us with all of our questions.” “What great times are ahead for us!”

And great times were ahead but not without many questions and concerns. Decisions had to be made concerning these fruits of affluency – which ones to select, where to place them, how to use them, and how to show that they would be used wisely.

Many supervisors were designated as management chiefs of these fruits of affluency. These jobs they did but each new management task meant less time for the supervisor to work with teachers and principals in studying and improving the curriculum and instruction in the schools. The people in the schools were asking, “Where is our supervisor?” “Why don’t we see him more often?” “What is he doing?”

The supervisors were perplexed. They asked the wise leaders, “Which comes first, the management tasks or the instructional tasks?” The wise leaders responded, “Both tasks are important. Both tasks must be done.” “We will study the question.” “There must be ways to accomplish both tasks.”

And so it came to pass that the wise leaders called together other wise leaders from the land of Georgia and wise leaders from other lands and they made a study of the tasks of instructional leaders in the land of Georgia.

The wise leaders did examine the treasures of supervision in the legacy which yesterday had left. They examined supervision in other lands. They developed many proposals which were discussed, debated and revised. Eventually a proposal, acceptable to the wise leaders, came forth and it did become a program of action for the land of Georgia.

This proposal did consider the questions and concerns and assets of the schools in the land of Georgia. “We need leaders to be ‘chiefs’ for instructional improvement.” “We need leaders to do specific jobs for instructional improvement.” And so it came to pass that there were many instructional leaders in the land of Georgia. There were chiefs to coordinate and direct the

activities of the other leaders who did come to be called by such names as curriculum directors, instructional specialists, instructional consultants, curriculum specialists, instructional supervisors, and many others. Each of these special leaders was directed to work with teachers and others in one special area, such as reading, mathematics, social studies, science, language, art, music, and other subjects or curriculum areas. And then there were special leaders to work with resources and media, with testing and evaluation. There were special leaders to work with the gifted children and the not-so gifted children, the emotionally disturbed, and the physically handicapped. It did appear that if a label could be found for a group of teachers or students that a special leader could be named for that group. The instructional leaders were indeed additional fruits of affluency in the land of Georgia.

But, indeed again, the task of the wise leaders was not completed when they did prepare and get approval for the proposal for more instructional leaders. Would-be instructional leaders had to be found and given assistance and preparation for their new responsibility. “Because there are different tasks to be achieved by the chiefs and the special instructional teachers they must learn some different skills and competencies.” “We will ask the colleges to develop different programs – one designed especially for the chiefs and one designed especially for the special leaders.”

Straightway this was accomplished but not without much study on the part of the wise leaders of the colleges and of the land. And so there have gone out many chiefs equipped to do the management tasks of school improvement as well as the coordinating and directing tasks of staff development, curriculum development, and instructional improvement. And also there have gone out many special leaders equipped to work closely with teachers and others to achieve the goals of staff development, curriculum development, and instructional improvement.

It can be observed that the supervisors of yesterday and the chiefs and special instructional leaders of today were working toward the same major goals. However, they worked at these tasks in terms of what was needed at the time. Many supervisors of yesterday worked with teachers to help them learn basic skills and competencies involved in teaching and learning. Many chiefs and special leaders of today work with teachers to provide for their continuing personal and professional development in terms of today's new developments and things to be selected for teaching and learning today.

And this is as it is as the curtain comes down on today—today with its large schools, today with its curriculum for all learners, today with its innovations in organization and teaching methods, today with materials and equipment little dreamed of on yesterday, today with its teachers better prepared than ever before, today with chiefs and instructional leaders to assist with all tasks of school improvement!

No doubt the wise leaders of the schools in the land of Georgia have helped to answer more disturbing questions today (this period of ten or fifteen years) than in the more than 200 years that the land of Georgia has existed as an institution of government and education. But, as the wise leaders of yesterday learned when they developed and introduced the Blue Book and the Red Book, new questions do continue to be raised by students, teachers, principals, supervisors, chiefs and instructional leaders. And this is what the wise leaders hope for. "It is only when we question," they say, "that we move ahead."

And, as in the period of yesterday, the wise leaders, the chiefs and the special leaders of today move ahead into tomorrow with a legacy – a legacy even richer than the legacy of yesterday – a legacy which includes

- 1) a firmly established need and provision for chiefs and instructional leaders,

- 2) chiefs and instructional leaders with clearly describable and distinguishable tasks and responsibilities,
- 3) school programs designed and provided for all learners,
- 4) adequate materials, equipment and buildings for providing learning opportunities for all learners in all programs,
- 5) programs for preparing leaders for their responsibilities – programs which include preservice and inservice assistance,
- 6) leaders engaging in activities to strengthen their own skill, competency, and understanding as needed in the performance of their responsibilities.

“How rich we are! What assets we have! What more is there to wish for? Can’t we rest on our laurels?”

Part III: The story of supervision yesterday and today has been presented largely as it was experienced by the narrator. It is a prologue to the next story. It has brought us where we are. Supervision tomorrow, as presented here, is somewhat visionary and “blue sky.” It will, as did yesterday and today, deal with the realities of the times and the dreams of its wise leaders. How we face these realities and dreams will depend on whether we accept the challenges they present or rest on the laurels of yesterday and today.

I see supervision dealing with at least three groups of tasks, functions, activities, endeavors. First, there are those activities for maintaining stability and continuity in the institutions of learning so that crises may be prevented or alleviated. Most educational leaders will continue to work diligently at these tasks which they often describe as putting out fires or applying band – aids. They will probably continue to use such means as school reorganization, technology, packages, performance contracting, and accountability measures to assist in these

endeavors. They will probably continue to give a major part of their time to these matters even though each stop to apply a band – aid or put out a fire means less time for other supervisory or leadership functions.

An observer might ask, “Are the leaders really seeking answers or are they mending fences and hoping the fence breaker or fire builder won’t come back?”

Another group of activities that most instructional leaders will be busy about tomorrow, with hands, feet, and tongue, are some constants which were here yesterday and today. Among these constants are curriculum development, instructional improvement, and staff development. Hopefully, only the titles will be constant.

There is an analogy here to the professor’s reply to his secretary when she reminded him that the test he was about to give to his class was the same test that he gave to a class ten years ago. “Yes, but the answers are different.” These arenas of activity are the same as in previous day but what will be happening within each arena will be different to the extent and degree that chiefs and instructional leaders help to make it different. The challenge for dealing with these tasks is to do something more than maintain the status quo in each area – to move away from fighting fires.

Something more in curriculum development means more than reshuffling the offerings in social studies so that American History now comes in the ninth grade and World History comes in the tenth grade. It means more than changing the emphasis in health classes from preventing and treating hookworm to preventing and treating drug use. It means more than moving long division from the fourth grade to the third or fifth grade. It means more than adding five or ten minutes worth of spelling to each subject area. It means more than creating curriculum guides which tend to stabilize where, when, and how all things should be taught. It means the fresh



approaches to designing learning opportunities that are now occurring in some places. It means complete revisions, deletions, additions, reorganizations in terms of purpose, time, content, sequence and other factors that learners would suggest if given the opportunity! It could even mean eliminating some curriculum areas!

Something more in instructional improvement means more than grouping of children with similar eating habits, similar hand grip, with teeth lost or retained, or in other obvious ways like the hares or tortoises. It means more than passing out packages – commercial or homemade – as students enter the classroom. It means more than providing books and other materials designed to correct any difficulty of the learner. It means more than placing children in small or large groups. It means more than placing learners in open schools. These are largely management measures and instruction is more than management. Instruction involves love, trust, faith, hope, respect for human dignity and other such attributes and these don't come in books, packages, or tape recorders. Something more in instruction means distinguishing between the tools of learning and the enhancements of learning and using both of them in appropriate balance and relationship in each learning opportunity that is provided.

Something more in staff development means more than setting aside Thursdays for thinking or occasional inservice, professional or work days. It means more than deciding that a school or school system will study mathematics or reading this year. It means more than helping a teacher get to a state or regional meeting to learn how to teach place geography. It means more than arranging for a teacher to visit another school to determine a method of rotation for sending children to the chalkboard, the lunchroom, the restroom or the principal's office. These experiences will, no doubt, contribute to the teacher's skills and competencies in curriculum planning, classroom management, or instructional improvement but is this all that staff

development can and should mean? Is there something more that can be provided for the personal development of staff? Ponder such questions as these. What will enhance the teacher and teaching? What will enrich the teacher and teaching? What will help to deepen the teacher's understanding of self and others? What will help teachers to feel needed? What will provide enjoyment in living and in teaching? What will provide enjoyment in living and in teaching? What will stimulate continuous self-renewal? What will aid in developing new interests, new hobbies, new friends? What new, unique and different experiences will contribute to self-renewal? To give special emphasis to these elements of staff development will change emphasis and activity from putting out fires to building fires of excitement!

A third group of activities in which many instructional leaders and management leaders will be involved tomorrow may be called new demands. Many of them aren't really new. They are new only because they are almost untouched. The ones that have been touched have only been stroked with the finger tips or the tip of the tongue. These new demands are those concepts and issues in education which will be giving direction to all areas of school development whether educators are in command of them or not. These concepts and issues will affect school policies, organization, curriculum, teaching procedures, supervision, the education of teachers and other school personnel, and all other basic components or elements of the school.

A listing of all of these concepts and issues is impossible but here is a baker's half dozen or so that may tantalize and frustrate you if you turn your good ear to them. They are

- the pendulum swing
- the unaffluency in education
- alternatives to schooling
- alternatives to supervision
- the new school community
- the new educational environment
- priorities for survival
- sociological and psychological behavior of

school personnel, students, and parents.

A two-faceted question looms up as some of these demands of tomorrow are verbalized. What can be done about them? How can they be dealt with? One answer is an easy one. Do you remember what some persons said yesterday when they organized school study groups as suggested by the Blue Book? “Planning is hard. We will wait for answers to our questions.” This, nevertheless, will be the way some chiefs and instructional leaders will deal with these concepts and issues. They will keep on putting out fires and applying band – aids for these issues will cause bigger fires and deeper scratches. I predict (and hope) that this number of leaders will be small.

Many leaders, on the other hand, will face these issues directly. They will see them as assets, as stimulation, motivation, and direction. They will use them as a means for fighting fires and rebuilding fences. They will use them as reflectors as they examine content and processes in all curriculum areas. They will study the implications and effects of these issues upon the treasures in the legacies of yesterday and today.

On the front row and center of those studying the new demands of tomorrow, as well as the legacies and laurels of yesterday and today, will be those wise leaders who plan and execute programs for the preparation of chiefs and instructional leaders. They will explode the myth of “plus three” and “plus five” and of such larger numbers as 55, 60, and 110. They will even examine the sacred elements of the programs they offer and perhaps, just perhaps, some elements may be eliminated and/or offered in smaller doses. The dosage of some elements may be increased. Some entirely new elements may be added. Some current programs for the education of instructional leaders may be merged – even two, three, or more programs! From all of this study and activity, there will emerge new programs – programs to give assistance in fire fighting,

in dealing with the constants and the new demands, and in areas of need not yet determined.

These programs will enable the leaders to provide “something more” in all areas of endeavor.

Tomorrow will bring confrontations of many kinds with many people. School purposes will be scrutinized and restated. School programs will be reorganized. School leaders will become quite visible and quite audible! There will be aggressive actions on the part of chiefs and instructional leaders! New responsibilities and new images will emerge!

Tomorrow will be a busy day – whether it lasts one year, ten years, or more. Tomorrow will demand that priorities be established as leaders work with firefighting, with the constants, with the new demands, or with unknowns at the present.

I predict tomorrow will be the best day supervision has had in the land of Georgia.

Johnnye V. Cox

September 27, 1972

Recreated from original manuscript housed in Dr. Ray Bruce’s personal library.

## Appendix C

### First Set of Interview Questions 2005

How did you become interested in the field of supervision?

What is your definition of Instructional Supervision?

How do you define the role of an instructional supervisor?

Whose views in the field of supervision are most closely aligned with yours?

Do you see a difference between the instructional supervision and educational administration? If so could you explain the difference?

Do you see any tensions between the fields of instructional supervision and educational administration? If so could you describe those tensions?

What were the circumstances that brought you to the University of Georgia?

Describe the events and circumstances leading to the development of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia.

Why was the supervision program moved from the Department of Administration and Supervision to the Department of Curriculum and Teaching to form the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia?

How did the following state initiatives impact the activities of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia?

Georgia Minimum Foundation Program in Education

Adequate Program for Education in Georgia (APEG)

The Quality Basic Education Act (QBE)

Describe the events leading to the merger in 1991 of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision with the Department of Administration at the University of Georgia.  
Who were key persons in the merger?

## Appendix D

### Second Set of Interview Questions 2006

What was the importance of the following individuals to the development of school supervision in Georgia and the program for study in Supervision at the University of Georgia?

South Georgia Teachers College

Marvin Pittman

Rosenwald Foundation

Jeanes Supervisors

How did the position of Instructional Lead Teacher come into existence?

What school systems were adopting the position of Instructional Lead Teacher?

How did the internship for Instructional Supervisors become a part of the Department of Curriculum and Instructional Supervision at UGA and who were the individuals primarily responsible?

Could you describe these elements of the internship program?

What were the requirements for admission to the program?

What were the required activities of the interns?

Which school systems were most involved?

Why did these school systems become involved?

Which department faculty members were directly involved?

How did you become involved in the intern program and how long were you involved?

Could you tell me about the following Organizations and their relationship to the development and operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision at the University of Georgia?  
ASCD – COPIS -- GACIS

Dr. Johnnye V. Cox has been mentioned by all those I have interviewed as a key figure in his development of school supervision in Georgia. What can you tell me about her role in this endeavor?

## Appendix E

### Third Set of Interview Questions

Dr. Bruce and Dr. Grimsley

Oct 6<sup>th</sup> 2007

How was the Department of Curriculum and Supervision involved in the publication of the two ASCD collections: *Readings in Educational Leadership*?

How did the Department of Curriculum and Supervision participate in Operation Bootstrap and Operation CD?

What were the circumstances surrounding Dr. Bruce introducing the telephone conference calls to the College of Education? Describe its' use in classes in the Department of Curriculum and Supervision classes.

How was the Department of Curriculum and Supervision involved in the publication of the 1974 book, *Instructional Supervision in Georgia*?

Given Dr. Cox's prediction in her keynote address, *Supervision Today, Yesterday, and Tomorrow*, how would you characterize the state of supervision in Georgia today?

## **Appendix F**

### Third Set of Interview Questions

Dr. Firth

Oct 23<sup>rd</sup> 2007

Could you describe the circumstances surround how the allied health careers program of study become a responsibility of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision?

Could you describe the circumstances surround your appointment as the Interim Dean of the College of Education.

How did this appointment impact this had on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision?

Could you describe the circumstances surround your appointment as a program director in Egypt and the impact this had on the operations of the Department of Curriculum and Supervision.