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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of practicing physical education instructional supervisors/coordinators regarding their job role and responsibilities. Participants for this study were six subject specialist district physical education supervisors who supervise instruction for one or two subject(s), which includes physical education. Using the interpretivist, particularly the symbolic interactionist framework (Blumer, 1986; Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), the researcher investigated meanings and understandings that underpin the participants’ views of their roles and responsibilities and how they impact the district’s physical education program. The study was conducted over a seven month span during the spring, summer, and fall of the 2004-2005 academic years. Data were collected through two 90-minute in-depth and semi-structured interviews, fieldnotes, and document artifacts. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. Data trustworthiness was established by using triangulation of methods (Guion, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mason, 1970), peer-debriefing (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), and member checks (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Codes, categories, themes and commonalities from the data and constant comparison guided the data analysis.

Findings from the data revealed pertinent information about the roles and responsibilities of the district physical education supervisors as well as aspects that are most and least important. The findings also contributed to the knowledge base regarding the function of the district physical education instructional supervisor and the impact this person has on the school based physical education program and training for future leaders in the physical education profession.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study examined physical education instructional supervisors’ perceptions of their role as district physical education supervisors/coordinators. The introduction includes five sections: background information, description of the study, significance of the study, limitations of the study, and glossary of terms.

Scholars in the field of physical education have examined many aspects that contribute to a quality school physical education program. These range from teacher preparation (Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 1998, 2000) to curriculum development (Graham, Holt-Hale, & Parker, 2004; Pangrazi & Dauer, 1992; Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000) to teachers and students themselves (Coelho, 2000; Doutis & Ward, 1999). However, few have investigated those who may have the most power to effect change in the teaching and conduct of quality physical education programs – the district physical education instructional supervisor.

Sallis, McKenzie, Bohdan, & Curtis (1996) stated that a worthy place to make changes in the quality of school based physical education programs was in “understanding the perceptions and motivation of people who make decisions that affect physical education” (p. 25). Arguably, the person who makes these decisions is the district physical education instructional supervisor or coordinator in charge of the physical education programs. Although the role of the supervisor at the district level is poorly defined in theory and practice (Olivia & Pawlas, 2001; Pajak, 1989a), the importance of the leadership of an
An instructional supervisor of physical education has been established (Evaul, 1995). Specifically, district physical education instructional supervisors possessed dual responsibilities: to help teachers develop teaching skills and curriculum and to be an advocate for the profession with the school board and community. Mohsen (1999b) further argued that a district physical education instructional supervisor should possess passion about the profession of physical education and his or her role in developing and maintaining a rich program and should transfer this passion to the physical education teachers under the supervisor’s tutelage.

In a quality physical education program, teachers must be provided with the skills and knowledge to implement a curriculum where students can learn how to be healthy, active learners for a lifetime (Graham, 1992, 2004; Metzler, 1990). While many teachers may possess the needed skills to develop a quality program, they also need the leadership and direction of a physical education instructional supervisor if they are to continue to grow, develop new skills, and stay abreast of trends in the field. Part of the responsibility of the district physical education instructional supervisor then is to assist teachers in their professional growth and to oversee the design and implementation of a quality physical education program.

Struggling to survive, physical education has often not been fully accepted as a legitimate discipline in schools resulting in a status of vulnerability (Ross, 2001). The most recent “Shape of the Nation Report” (NASPE, 2001) indicates that there are still two states (Colorado and South Dakota) that do not have a mandate for public school physical education. After recent changes in legislation, Georgia’s mandate now gives the power to the local school districts to determine the format and content guidelines for physical education in
middle schools (Georgia Legislature, 2000). The elementary physical education requirement remained the same. Unfortunately, in some districts this legislation has resulted in the removal of physical education as a requirement in the middle schools. Given these developments, the importance of the district physical education instructional supervisor’s role has now become even more pronounced. The supervisor must continually promote physical education and be an advocate for the physical education program, or this discipline risks extinction (Mohnsen, 1999a; Sallis, et al., 1996).

It would seem that if we are to produce healthy children through exemplary physical education programs, examining the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor would be vital. Data from the Surgeon General and Centers for Disease Control (CDC) indicated that American children were less fit and “more overweight than ever before, about double the numbers who were heavy in the late 1970’s” (CDC, 1996, p. 6). From this and all other evidence, children’s fitness levels and weight control are not improving and have now become a full-fledged health crisis. Unfit youth directly affect society, both socially and economically, resulting in young adults who do not have the necessary health to maintain a supporting role in the work force nor the stamina to raise healthy families. Many organizations (NASPE, 2001; CDC, 1996) noted that one important weapon in the fight to improve children’s health and fitness was a quality physical education program in which students were taught the skills that would enable them to be fit for a lifetime.

If we are to provide students with such programs, it will be necessary that we study the factors that will lead to the realization of this goal. One step toward doing this is to examine the perceptions of the district physical education instructional supervisor about his
or her role, responsibilities, and his or her impact on the design and implementation of physical education programs (Sallis, et al., 1996). Knowing how practicing district physical education instructional supervisors perceive their roles and responsibilities can help to (a) understand their beliefs regarding their role, (b) examine how this role relates to meeting the physical educational needs of the students and teachers, (c) define the role as it is practiced (i.e., what supervisors think they should be doing), and (d) furnish information for the development of future leaders in physical education.

It should be noted, however, that while “about three-quarters of all states and about half of all districts have a person responsible for directing or coordinating physical education” (Kolbe, Kann, Pateman, & Warren, 1995 p. 341) – statistics borne out in a survey by Pate, Small, Ross, Young, Flint, Warren (1995) – many of those instructional supervisors, especially in smaller school districts, did not have a background in physical education. Consequently, many supervisors with a number of content areas in their purview do not have enough time or professional knowledge to give adequate attention to the physical education program. Whether the supervisor is a specialist or a generalist may then have significant impact upon the development and promotion of a quality physical education program.

This study proposed to examine the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor through interviews with the district level physical education supervisor. The researcher sought to understand the supervisors’ perceptions of their role and responsibilities, to examine how they fulfill the role of a district physical education instructional supervisor, and to contribute to the knowledge base regarding the function of the district physical education instructional supervisors.
Purpose of the Study

In response to the importance of the district physical education instructional supervisors’ position and the lack of research on these people, the purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of practicing district physical education instructional supervisors/coordinators regarding their roles and responsibilities. It is hoped that these findings will provide insight into the role of the physical education supervisor and his/her impact on the total physical education program.

Research Questions

The research questions were developed as the research progressed from broad open-ended questions to more specific directive questions as is typical in grounded theory research. The following questions were the initial questions that guided the data collection and analysis of this study:

1. How does the district physical education instructional supervisor define his or her role as a district physical education instructional supervisor and how he or she perceives the responsibilities of his or her job?

2. What does the district physical education instructional supervisor indicate as being the most important and least important aspects of his or her job?

Participant Selection

District physical education instructional supervisors in the state of Georgia were used for this study. Theoretical sampling, a component of grounded theory methodology, guided the number and variation of the participants chosen. The grounded theory methodology permitted the researcher to add participants to the study as a means to expand and refine the concepts of developing the emerging theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), and/or derive
meanings and understandings from the symbolic interactions (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). The pool of participants was limited by the number of available physical education supervisors in the state of Georgia, but the criteria of gender and ethnicity were observed by acquiring three males and three female participants with as much diversity as possible. Two participants had athletic responsibilities, as well as health and physical education supervision responsibilities. Initially, six participants were chosen as Morse (1994) indicated that at least six participants need to be studied for understanding the essence of everyday life experiences.

Research Design

The perceptions of the district physical education instructional supervisors were the focus of this qualitative study. Symbolic interactionism and grounded theory guided the research process from the beginning proposal, to data collection, to writing and presentation of the findings (Glaser, 1978). Theory and meanings emerged during research “through continuous interplay between analysis and data collections” (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 273). Through constant comparison the researcher simultaneously collected and analyzed data in an ongoing process. This process dictated what future data should be collected and served to establish which similar incidents or codes could be grouped into categories. These categories give understanding and meaning to the perceptions of the physical education supervisors.

The specific data collection procedures included interviews, fieldnotes, and document collection. Line by line marking and coding of the transcribed interviews, fieldnotes, and documents contributed to the search for incidents that identified the role of the physical education supervisor. Through constant comparison analysis, the researcher compared “specific incidents in the data . . . [refined] these concepts, [identified] their properties,
[explored] their relationships to one another, and [integrated] them into coherent theory” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p. 137). Therefore, while data was collected, identifiable themes and categories were developed by comparing data to other data; collecting more data; and comparing data to other data to confirm, refine, or discard data where themes or concepts “build theory that fits the data” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998, p.137).

 Interviews

The qualitative interviews were the primary data source for this study. A qualitative interview is not an ordinary conversation because it is a “tool of research, an intentional way of learning about people’s feelings, thoughts, and experiences” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Kvale (1996) explained that the purpose of the qualitative interview was to understand the participants’ perspective as they share their daily lived experiences. Since this was the main purpose of this study, the interview appeared to be the best data collection method. By deriving themes from these experiences the participant was able to give meaning to what he or she did. The interviews were audiotaped and transcribed so that the transcription could be examined for meaning, themes, and patterns for interpretation.

 Fieldnotes

Fieldnotes about the social setting and the participants’ body language were collected as a source of data to support and verify what the participant said during the interview. Observations and note taking about the office space, interactions with other employees, and behaviors during the interview (the participants’ body gestures, voice inflections, and facial expressions) added depth to the study’s interpretation of the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor. The fieldnotes were a summary of the key dimensions of
the researcher’s initial impression of behaviors, events, observations, and comments (Bryman, 2001).

Documents

Documents such as job description, curriculum guides, staff development documents, and any other official documents produced by the county, state, or district were collected as a source of data. Merriam (1998) indicates that documents are communicated information—written, visually seen, or physically acquired—that supports the research. These documents added context and depth to the study.

Significance of the Study

Presently, very few studies have focused on the district level physical education instructional supervisor. Book studies by Humphrey, Love, & Irwin (1972) and Mohnsen, et al. (1999) provided a limited knowledge base to build upon. These studies focused on giving definition and meaning to the district physical education instructional supervisors’ role. Supportive studies included dissertations by Floyd (1986), Porter (1994), Smith (1990) that focused on supervision at the district level in general and specifically on the district music supervisor. Because of the limited amount of research on the perceptions of the district physical education instruction supervisors’ role, the results of this study have theoretical, practical and methodological significance.

Theoretical Significance

The results of this study significantly contributed to the knowledge base of the perceived role of the district physical education instructional supervisor. This study provided unique findings of in-depth focus in the state of Georgia concerning the role of the physical education instructional supervisor and its effects on instruction in physical education. This
study also provided a theoretical support to literature on the role of the physical education supervisor.

**Practical Significance**

The results of this study have significance for the school level, district level, and university level. The school and district level benefited from the results of this study because it provided insight into how district physical education instructional supervisors impacted the total physical education program. The district and/or school may use the information to make changes in the design and implementation of the physical education program. At the university level, the significance of this study was relevant to teacher preparation and leadership development in physical education. The faculty members may use the results to restructure the physical education teacher preparation course of study to integrate leadership as a part of the core curriculum.

**Methodological Significance**

This study had methodological significance in the use of qualitative research as opposed to quantitative research. The previous studies of district level supervision had used the quantitative survey or questionnaire methodology. By using the grounded theory qualitative methodology, this study resulted in theoretical concepts that explained the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor. Other researchers could use these theoretical concepts as a knowledge base upon which to build. The methodological procedures used in this study can give insight for other researchers interested in similar studies.
Limitation of Study

The main limitation of this study was the limited representation. The base of physical education supervisors in Georgia is limited. The demographics used in this study were not representative of the entire state of Georgia, nor of other states. Providing in-depth descriptions and taking a holistic look at the role of the district physical education supervisor minimized the limitations of this study. Using a large sample base would make it difficult to do a qualitative in-depth study with a comprehensive focus.

Glossary of Terms

**Subject Generalist District Supervisor (SGDS)**—the person at the district level who supervises instruction for several curricular areas; he or she may or may not have expertise or experience in these areas.

**Subject Specialist District Supervisor (SSDS)**—the person at the district level who supervises instruction for one or two subjects only; he or she has expertise and experience in this field(s).

**District Physical Education Instructional Supervisors (DPEIS)**—synonymous term used to identify the person at the district level who is responsible for physical education instruction for an entire school district.

**District Supervisor**—synonymous term used to identify the person at the district level who is responsible for instruction for an entire school system.

**Instructional Supervisor**—synonymous term used to identify the person at the district level, specialist or generalist, who is responsible for instruction for an entire school system.

**Professional Development**—a term for the advancement of teachers in knowledge, skill, and practice.
**Curricular Development** – the process of creating or organizing appropriate learning activities to benefit the students by informing them, heightening their interest, and increasing their skill performance (Pangrazi & Dauer, 1992).

**Staff Development** – a generally accepted responsibility of district supervisors that consists of providing thoughtfully designed classes of content, process, or context to meet the professional needs of the teachers within a school or district.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There are many levels of supervision within public education: the school level, the district level, the state level, and the national level. This study concerned supervision at the district level. Particularly, it focused on the district physical education instructional supervisor (DPEIS). The physical education program has traditionally been supervised at the district level by a curriculum specialist or curriculum generalist. The subject generalist district supervisor (SGDS)—also referred to as curriculum director, director of instruction or assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction—is responsible for several curriculum areas such as music, art, physical education, science, math, and language arts. Persons responsible for one or two subject areas and who have training in that subject are referred to as subject specialist district supervisors (SSDS) (Smith, 1990). As a district level supervisor, the DPEIS are responsible for overseeing several schools throughout the district (Oliva & Pawlas, 2001).

While the literature in supervision of student teachers in physical education is abundant, the literature on the supervision on practicing physical education teachers is scant. Searching to understand supervision in physical education and a possible conceptual framework, this chapter reviews the pertinent existing literature in the following areas: (a) supervision, and (b) leadership conceptual framework, ending with a summary.
Supervision

Existing research confirmed the importance of central (district) office supervisors in improving the effectiveness of the schools (Oliva, 1989; Wiles & Bondi, 2004; Wimpelberg, 1987). In reviewing the importance of the district supervisor, the researcher reviewed literature on dimensions of supervisory practice and definitions of supervision.

**Dimensions of Supervisory Practice**

Edward Pajak’s *Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice* (Appendix A) focused on practices and theories of studies about central office (district) supervisors in the state of Georgia. Unpublished dissertations (Floyd, 1986; Smith, 1990; Porter, 1994) that explored several different aspects regarding district level supervisors, were also reviewed.

Porter (1994), Smith (1990) and Floyd (1986) dealt directly with perceptions of district level supervisors about their roles and responsibilities. Porter’s study explored district level music supervisors while Smith’s (1990) study concentrated on all supervisors in the state of Georgia and Floyd’s (1986) study centered on four outstanding supervisors in one Southern state.

Porter (1994) examined the knowledge, attitudes, and skills of district music supervisors, as well as the perceived importance of Edward Pajak’s Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice as it related to the position of a district music supervisor. The findings from Porter’s study indicated that music supervisors perceived personal development as the most important dimension of supervisory practice according to the questionnaire data; but from interview data, problem solving and decision-making, community relations and service to teachers were deemed the most important dimensions. During the interview, participants were asked to relate to the dimensions as they actually occurred on the job. The participants
revealed data that were different from the survey data as they responded to perceptions of the actual job situation. This discrepancy could clarify the difference in the quantitative (survey) and qualitative (interview) findings.

Examining district supervisors in general, Smith (1990) investigated the subject specialist district supervisors and subject general district supervisors’ perspective concerning supervisory practices. Using Pajak’s Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice (Appendix A), it was determined that the dimensions of service to teachers and observation and conferencing were viewed as more important to subject specialist district supervisors, while planning and change, problem solving and decision-making, and research and program evaluation were of greater importance to the subject generalist district supervisors. Smith used the survey method of research to gather quantitative data about the way the supervisors perceived the importance of the dimensions.

After reviewing music supervisors and supervisors in general, attention was given to Floyd’s (1986) research. She studied four outstanding central office instructional supervisors searching for meanings that these outstanding central office instructional supervisors associated with their role. The methods used to acquire this knowledge were qualitative, in-depth, unstructured interviews. The themes that emerged from the data were “influence” over teachers, students and instruction, “credibility” as a supervisor, and “flexibility” in regard to job performance. Outstanding central office instructional supervisors defined their “influence” over teachers, students, and community as a responsibility to use their power in a way that would improve teaching and learning. The sub-themes of flexibility and credibility indicated that the supervisors had the capacity to adapt and to respond to aspects within their role as a supervisor and had to earn students’, teachers’, and administrators’ respect and trust.
by demonstrating professional skills, experience, and leadership. The coding and emergence of the themes in Floyd’s study supported inductive research and the development of dimensions of supervisory practice which the researcher used to investigate the roles and responsibilities of the district physical education instructional supervisor. Using Floyd’s, Smith’s, and Porter’s studies based on supervisory dimensions, the researcher sought a theoretical basis of dimensions of supervisory practice, as she investigated scholarship in general education (Glickman, 1990; Pajak, 1989b; Wiles & Bondi, 2004) and in physical education (Humphrey, Love, and Irwin, 1972; Mohnsen, 1999a) for commonalities of supervisory practice (Appendices A, B, C).

Blase and Blase (1998) referred to both Pajak’s and Glickman’s dimensions as “the responsibilities and activities of what we broadly refer to as instructional leadership” (p.10). After reviewing the literature and the work of these scholars, the researcher decided to apply Pajak’s (1989b) *Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice* and Mohnsen’s (1999a) Physical Education aspects of supervision to frame her study on physical education supervision. Pajak is mentioned both in Porter’s (1994) and Smith’s (1990) dissertations, and Pajak’s *dimensions* are broad enough to encompass the other scholars’ aspects of supervisory practice. Mohnsen’s (1999a) aspects of supervision are not as recognized as Pajak’s *dimensions*, but Mohnsen’s are the most current *dimensions* available in physical education.

*The Evolution and Definition of Physical Education Supervision*

If supervision as a field of study is to be developed beyond its historic purpose as an extension of administration (Wiles & Bondi, 2004), a need exists to define the “knowledge, attitudes, and skills that are unique to the central office supervisory role” (Smith, 1990, p.12). District level positions are strategic leadership positions (Alfonso, Firth & Neville,
1984; Metzler, 1990; Mohnsen, 1999a) and those who hold such positions are charged with a “sweeping array of tasks and responsibilities associated with improving instruction throughout the district” (Smith, 1990, p. 12).

The literature in physical education supervision and administration relates to supervision in the physical education teacher programs (PETE) (Bryant & Passmore, 2001; Metzler, 1990) more than in the supervision of physical education at the district level in public schools. The supervision in PETE involves the supervision of student teachers by the university professor and the placement supervising teacher during the student teacher’s practicum. The literature revealed the supervision qualities necessary to support the teacher preparation program.

In this review, the books on supervision (Bryant & Passmore, 2001; Metzler, 1990; Mohnsen, et al., 1999) provided the widest information with the least amount of information coming from journals (Coelho, 2000; Kolbe, et al., 1995; Metzler & Tjeerdsma, 1998, 2000; Pate, et al. , 1995; Sallis, McKenzie, Bohdan, & Curtis, 1996).

Kolbe, et al. (1995) provided background information gathered from a questionnaire about the status of state and district level supervision in 1995 with “three-quarters of all states and about half of all districts [having] a person responsible for directing or coordinating physical education” (p. 341). Similar information came from another questionnaire study by Pate, et al. (1995) which found that

Many (76.5%) states have a person responsible for directing or coordinating physical education. Four of five (84.6%) of these state physical education directors have other responsibilities in addition to directing physical education such as coordinating health education. . . . About half (51.4%) of all districts have
a person responsible for directing or coordinating physical education. Many (85.9%) district physical education directors have other responsibilities in addition to physical education (p. 313).

The purpose of the present study was to determine the perceptions of practicing physical education instructional supervisors/coordinators regarding their job role and responsibilities. This study could be compared to Sallis’ et al. (1996) survey of district physical education administrators in the state of California where authors examined administrator’s perceptions and how that related to the performance of one’s job, willingness to change, and readiness to adopt new and better programs. Where as Sallis et al. used a survey, I have used in-depth interviews, fieldnotes, and document artifacts to articulate the DPEIS’s perceptions and how those perceptions relate to their jobs. Sallis et al. (1996) examined perceptions of physical education administrators and found that “assessing the perceptions of decision-makers can lead to strategies for improving physical education for our children” (p. 28).

Perception as an “insight, intuition, or knowledge gained by perceiving” (American Heritage Dictionary, 1978 p.973) was used in the research design by Sallis et al. and supported the researcher’s decision to use the same research concept. The supervisors’ perceptions were the way they understood their role and become, in turn, the accepted way to perform their job. The findings revealed how the supervisors perceived and possibly performed their jobs.

As a seminal work in the supervision of physical education, Humphrey, Love, & Irwin (1972) historically defined supervision as being “supervision centered upon the idea that the purpose of supervision should be the improvement of instruction” (p. 2), and
indicated that “the meaning that an individual attaches to the term ‘supervision’ is likely to be predicated upon his concept of the subject” (p. 3). More recently Blase and Blase (1998) placed emphasis and meaning on supervision and instructional leadership as being a collaborative experience for supervisors and teachers alike. This collaboration occurred when the supervisor saw teachers as leaders with valuable input into teaching and student learning. Supervision has gone from a theme of control, with more of an administrative perspective, to a collaboration theme in which the supervisor encourages reflection, instructional conferencing, and staff development on the part of the teacher (Blase & Blase, 1998). Mohsen, (1999b) shared this same concept in physical education supervision, encouraging teachers and supervisors to work together for quality physical education.

Supervision in general education altered during the second half of the nineteenth century. The development of supervision as a specialist activity started in the later part of the 1800s when “special” subjects were introduced into the curriculum to support instruction and teachers. Since school officials were ill prepared to support these special subjects, a need existed for supervisors in these special-subject areas. From the beginning, physical education has been considered one of these special-subjects.

The first physical education supervisor was hired in Kansas City when the first city-school system employed “a person to train personnel in-service when it procured the services of Carl Betz as Director of Physical Training in 1885” (Humphrey et al., 1972, p. 5). Betz instructed principals on Saturday and the principals, in turn, presented the information to the classroom teachers on Monday. Thus the origin of physical education supervision had its start as a way of training principals and teachers on the job. After Kansas City, other school systems hired Directors of Physical Training (Humphrey et al., 1972).
Only about 16% of all the counties in the nation in the 1950’s had a supervisor who was responsible solely for health, physical education and recreation. The percentage increased in 1999 to 75% of the states having a person at the state level responsible for the physical education program (Sartorius, 1999). In 2001, the *Shape of the Nation Report* indicated that at the state level 50% of the states had a physical education specialist, 18% of the states had health specialists, and 32% had a general coordinator supervising the physical education program.

In 1972, the following circumstances determined whether or not a school district had a DPEIS: population, number of teachers serviced and number of administrators, number of schools in the district, training of the supervisor, training of the staff in the schools, and the funds that were available for the program (Humphrey et al., 1972). Mohsen (1999a) provided a similar list for the present day, but added that the district coordinator might have to be in charge of several areas besides physical education. The larger the school population for a district the more likely the district will have a supervisor for individual subjects or special areas. The smaller the district, the more likely that a generalist will supervise the physical education program (Mohsen, et al., 1999). The factors influencing the organization of supervision at the district level are the philosophy of the school district and the administration, the size of the community, and the training and experience of the supervisor (Humphrey et al., 1972). This is relevant to the state of Georgia because the larger a school district the more likely it is to have SSDS, while the smaller school districts tend to have SGDS. Bradshaw (1970) found in his research of supervisors in the state of Georgia that out of 324 supervisors there were only 11 supervisors of physical education. In
conducting a participant search for this study, the researcher found that there are only 10 physical education specialist supervisors in Georgia.

Supporting Models and Studies of Supervision

The researcher examined literature comparing general education models and physical education models. There are general models of supervision designed for all teaching levels and areas, as well as content area (Acheson & Gall, 1987; Boyan & Copeland, 1978; Glickman, 1990; Goldhammer, 1969; Hoy & Forsyth, 1986; Pajak 1989b; Willis & Bondi, 2004). These models were more for the classroom and were not suited for supervision in physical education (Metzler, 1990). The physical education teacher often has had unique circumstances - restrictive environment, large class size, and inadequate equipment (Griffin & Locke, 1986; Lambdin, 1986). Metzler (1990) indicated that “the unique contextual features of most physical education instruction require similarly unique approaches for supervision. If effective teaching is highly context-specific, it stands to reason that effective supervision must be too” (p. 24).

The field of physical education has been described as unique in regard to other areas of curriculum in that the supervision includes facilities, activity areas, time allotment, class size, and climatic conditions. However, as in other content areas, supervision should be based on sound educational practices and should relate to the overall general educational philosophy.

Humphrey, et. al. (1972) indicated that in professional development, the DPEIS should have an understanding of curriculum, teaching methods, evaluation of teaching results, techniques in supervision, methods of research, and public relations as they relate to physical education. A main emphasis for the DPEIS was to build relationships with
teachers and work to improve student learning. Instructional supervision was a systematic, intentional, context specific process that developed and maintained effective teaching skills (Metzler, 1990). Metzler (1990) attested that the supervisor in charge of physical education should be subject specific by stating that there is

Ample evidence to support the notion that good teaching is context specific. While it is possible to apply generalizations from classroom teaching to some physical education supervisory functions, subject matter and contextual differences between the classroom and the gymnasium require that many supervisory practices be developed exclusively for physical education teachers (p.14).

Metzler (1990) was adamant that the person responsible for the physical education program be specifically trained for the position of the supervisor of physical education. Training in physical education, as well as experience in teaching physical education, was necessary for the supervisor of physical education (Humphrey, et al, 1972; Metzler, 1990). Metzler (1990) had grave concern for the development of the physical education supervisor because “much of the supervision practiced in physical education today is based solely on individual knowledge and preference, lacking formal training in both teacher analysis and supervisory process” (p.23). Therefore, this study could increase the knowledge base DPEIS and help to shape the future training of leaders in physical education.

Leadership Conceptual Framework

Historically, it has been difficult to define leadership but Barge (1994) pointed out that Arthur Jargo (1982) narrowed the defining factors down to the assumptions of explanatory devices and whether the view of leadership was universal or situational. The
explanatory devices accepted by most leadership theorists were traits or behavior. Were leaders born with innate ability to lead or are there outside factors influencing the leader? The universal perspective assumed that leadership remains constant across situations, or content areas (Zepeda & Mayers, 2004), while the situational theory indicated that leaders adapted their behavior for different situations.

Two well-known and respected leadership conceptual frameworks are leadership within a learning organization (Leithwood, Leonard, & Sharret, 1998; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998); and leadership as a relationship paradigm (Popper, 2002; Ropo, Parvianen, & Koivunen, 2002). The studies defined leadership in terms of social influence in a learning organization and in relationships.

**Learning Organization**

In Nahapiet and Ghoshal’s (1998) study of organizational learning, leaders used social capital, human capital, and intellectual capital to create learning organizations, build professional communities, and facilitate improved instruction. The social capital referred to the resources received from the network of relationships within a social unit or with individuals. The interpersonal skills, personality, and dispositions constituted the human capital; and the intellectual capital was the past knowledge, present knowledge, and future knowledge of the individuals or the collective body of the social unit. Leithwood, Leonard, & Sharret’s (1998) study on organizational learning schools indicated that leadership influence was affected by individual support, school culture, school structure, vision and goals, performance expectations, and intellectual stimulation.

Looking at this concept one had to ask whether the influence of leadership was transformational or transactional (Bass, 1985), whether it was formal or informal leadership
(Barge, 1994) and whether it took the rationalistic approach or a humanistic approach to leadership (Belasen, 2000)

Transformational leadership, an alternative perspective with emphasis on leaders who adapt to a situation and shape the members’ beliefs, values, and attitudes and develop options for present and future goals, was compared to transactional leadership where leaders relied on performance and rewards where the vision began and ended with performance and results. The transactional leadership was multilayered, bureaucratic and lacking in innovation and breakthrough in best practices. The transformational leader was expected to develop future leaders by transferring some leadership activities to the followers or empowering them through delegation, formal training, and lateral movement or through emergent leadership of inclusion and nurturing (Belasen, 2000). An emergent leader study conducted by Sabatini (2002) indicated that teachers who were empowered to lead sought out emergent leaders to assist in instructional improvement; were more collaborative with collective ownership in the visions and goals; and felt trusted, valued, and validated. From Blase and Blase (1998) studies, the leaders’ trust in their followers (teachers) encouraged them to be proactive and inspired them to improve their instruction.

The formal and informal perspective discussed by Barge (1994) announced that some roles are formal-imbedded in organizational hierarchy—formal obligations and responsibilities—while other roles are informal-developed through interactions within the organization. With the formal perspective, the leadership is more defined and top down, while the informal is more collaborative, seeking input from the members of the organization.
For the past three decades, management philosophy has vacillated between two broad schools of thought: a rationalistic school based on top down management with bureaucratic control and the humanistic school based on an interactive system with concerns for the social needs of the individuals within an organization (Belasen, 2000). Empowering teachers to be leaders supported the humanistic or human resource perspective of leadership. Belasen took the position that a rationalistic approach was viewed as being a well running machine where the organization was “highly efficient, yet inflexible and anti-innovative. Its strict hierarchy and unchallenged authority is aimed at achieving obedience, facilitating administrative innovations, and exchanging good performance and compliance with rewards, while sanctioning poor performance and undesirable behavior” (p. 22). Belasen further stressed that humanistic approach was centered on

Individual well-being, employees’ work conditions, job satisfaction, training, and Communication. . . .This approach calls for giving employees greater opportunities for involvement in decision making over work processes. . . [which] can lead to high commitment and morale—employees would regain trust and confidence in their managers and ultimately would become accountable for the results of their work (p.22).

Belasen, Benke, DiPadova, & Fortunato’s (1996) roles for leadership included “producer role, director role, coordinator role, monitor role, mentor role, facilitator role, innovator role, and broker role” (p. 107). The producer (the performer) motivated others and set high expectations and the director (the visionary) set the objectives to accomplish these goals or expectations. Providing resources was key to a coordinator’s (the organizer)
role while the monitor (the expert) disseminated information and the mentor (the
counselor) encouraged professional development and preserved an open, approachable
attitude toward all employees. The facilitator (the coach) oversaw small and large meetings
courage cohesiveness among workers. The opportunist who created ideas for improving
procedures and/or processes for the organization, promoted creativity among employees,
and assisted in adjustments to change was the innovator (the entrepreneur). The broker (the
networker) established a network among peers, cultivated contacts with persons outside the
organization, and represented the organization to others while applying lateral and upward
influence in the organization (Belasen, 2000).

The transformational leader supported the notion of horizontal management which
Kanter (1989) proclaimed involved four important changes or transformations:

(a) There are greater number and variety of channels for taking action and exerting
influence. (b) Relationships of influence shift from the vertical to the horizontal,
from chain of command to peer networks. (c) The distinction between nonmangers
and managers blurs, especially in terms of information, control over assignments,
and access to external relationships. (d) External relationships become increasingly
more important as sources of internal power, influence, and even career
development (p. 140).

Horizontal organizations were value based and stressed high-performance as the
leader developed a vision and provided the necessary resources to implement the vision.
The leader within a horizontal organization was a social architect “realigning its value
chain, and creating an organizational climate conducive to learning” (Belasen, 2000, p.1).
Belasen (2000) indicated that the members of a horizontal organization developed adaptive efficiency by:

(a) Temporizing structural arrangements, (b) delayering the chain of command, (c) creating boundaryless structures, (d) forming empowered teams staffed by cross-trained individuals, (e) using more flexible and informal forms of coordination, (f) enhancing organizational and individual communication capabilities, (g) focusing on customer [students] needs, (h) implementing quality improvement, (i) reengineering work processes, (j) investing in information technology, (k) establishing partnerships with suppliers (p. 2).

_Leadership as a Relationship Paradigm_

Regarding the leader as a relationship paradigm, the literature supported social influence of leadership occurring in organizations where the influence came from internalization of values (Burns, 1978), motivating people through vision, values, or beliefs (Bass, 1985), and/or building trust (Bass, 1999; Lapidot & Shamir, 2001).

Summary

From literature, it was found that Pajak’s (1989b) _Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice_ and Mohnsen’s (1999a) physical education supervisory practices were relevant knowledge bases that could support a study of perceptions of DPEIS’s roles by comparing Pajak’s Dimensions, Mohnsen’s supervisory practices and the findings of this study. Porter (1994), Smith (1990), and Floyd (1986), using Pajak’s _Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice_, gave meaning to the way district music supervisors, district supervisors of general education and exemplary district supervisors performed their job and the relative importance of these dimensions: problem solving, decision making, community relations, and service to
teachers. Smith’s (1990) study explored deeper into the difference and similarities between supervisors in general education who supervise several content areas and subject specialist who are trained and have experience in a specific content area. Smith found that subject specialist supervisors were more involved with the teachers under their supervision by providing service to teachers, observation of teachers, and conferencing with teachers. Pajak (1989b), Glickman (1990), and Wiles & Bondi (2004) provided a knowledge base for supervision in general education while Humphrey et al. (1972) and Mohnsen (1999a) gave meaning and a base of knowledge for physical education supervision. The difference between SSDS and subject SGDS emerged as a subject meriting study. The researcher discovered through the literature and history that there was a grave need for more research on the topic of the role of the supervisor of physical education. The data and findings gleaned from the researcher’s study presented views/perceptions about supervision from practicing district physical education supervisors in physical education. As described in the introduction this information was important because it helped to define the role of the person in charge of the physical education teachers in a district, to improve the physical education program, and to provide information for future leaders in physical education.

Consideration of the conceptual leadership framework helped the researcher understand the leadership styles that the district physical education supervisors indicated were their styles of leadership. When a DPEIS indicated that he was a “hands-on” leader seeking advice from the physical education teachers, the researcher could understand and search for more meaning by referring to the literature and the conceptual leadership framework. By using the symbolic interactionist theory, the researcher sought to reveal
meanings and definitions that the participants in the study gave to their actions and words as they performed their jobs as a DPEIS.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Responding to the importance of the DPEIS and the lack of research that existed in regard to this position, the purpose of this study was to determine how practicing physical education supervisors/coordinators in the state of Georgia perceived their role and responsibilities.

This chapter describes the methods and procedures selected for this study. These methods and procedures are presented in the following order: (a) role of the researcher, (b) conceptual framework, (c) participants, (d) data gathering procedures, (e) trustworthiness, (f) pilot testing, (g) data analysis techniques, (h) limitations of the study, and (i) proposed audience.

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher for this study was to provide the framework through which data collecting and processing occurred. The researcher developed a broad interview question that evoked rich information from the participants about their perceptions of the role of the DPEIS. The role of the researcher was magnified in qualitative interview research because “the interviewer him- or herself is the main instrument for obtaining knowledge” (Kvale, 1996 p. 117). Therefore, the researcher was responsible for insuring that the participants were allowed to talk freely, giving knowledge about their role as a physical education supervisor.
The relationships between the researcher and the DPEIS was one of professional interaction. Two of the supervisors were known by the researcher because of her work with the Georgia Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (GAHPERD). The researcher was teaching physical education in a school district that had a DPEIS who would have been used as a participant in the study if there were not enough physical education SSDSs in Georgia willing to participate in this study. Except for brief on-the-job interaction with this supervisor, precautions were taken by the researcher to avoid social contact with the participants, to limit personal conversations, and to closely monitor any contact or conversation with participants to assure that the researcher remained professional, focused, and unbiased.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework guiding this study was symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionists place importance on the social meanings that people assign to the world around them and the nature of social interactions (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Blumer (1969) defined symbolic interactionism as an “activity in which humans interpret each other’s gestures and act on the basis of meaning yielded by interpretation” (pp. 65-66). This section will discuss the background of symbolic interactionism and how symbolic interactionism relates to this study.

Background of Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interaction is rooted in the principles and theories of George Herbert Mead, Charles Darwin, John Dewey, Herbert Blumer, and others. Blumer (1986) was responsible for compiling the major explication of the symbolic interactionist’s perspective that can be summed up in these three premises: (a) people act toward others and things according to the meaning placed on them by these people, (b) as social beings one derives shared meanings
from objects and people as he/she interacts with the objects or people, (c) as social beings, one attaches meaning to things and others as a process of interpretation.

These premises were influenced by Mead’s philosophy of pragmatism and Darwin’s philosophy of symbols. Mead (1934) indicated that humans create reality when they are involved in interpreting things within their environment by defining and giving meaning to the world around them. Mead believed that humans’ perspectives, ideas, facts, and definitions, were based on the usefulness of knowledge that had been tested and judged applicable to the person. Both physically observable actions and thinking actions defined who a person is. Therefore, Mead indicated that humans should be examined by what they do and what they think (Mead, 1934). Charon (1995) indicated symbolic interactionism includes the way one interacts within one’s self, as well as the way one interacts with others and with objects. Influence for Blumer’s three premises also came from Charles Darwin’s belief that humans use symbols and are capable of reasoning, which processes enable them to control forces in nature by their understanding of the forces working in nature. Darwin’s belief that all things in nature are continually in a state of flux and change gave influence to the premise that the way one interprets one’s world is a process of being active and not passive (Charon, 1995).

The meaning gained from an experience is fundamental to understanding behavior—behavior that is developed as participants are actively engaged in creating their environment or world, as they seek understanding through interaction with others, and as they develop common definitions of their experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). These definitions or meanings developed through interaction or symbolic interaction are shared with others in the environment as these other persons partake in the experiences, problems, and background.
Consensus of the definitions is neither automatic nor inevitable because each person sees things differently. The development of these definitions is always evolving as the participants themselves change. “How such definitions develop is the subject matter for investigation” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982 p. 33) and will support the framework for this study.

The development of these definitions occurs through interpretation. Social scientists use factors such as “internal drives”, “personality traits”, “unconscious motives”, “needs”, “socioeconomic status”, “role obligations”, “cultural prescriptions”, and “social control mechanisms” to explain and predict a person’s behavior; but in this study of leadership in physical education, symbolic interaction was employed as the conceptual paradigm.

*Symbolic Interactionism’s Relationship to This Study*

In this study symbolic interaction gave a deeper meaning and understanding to the process of role developing by discovering definitions that were common to the participants when used in specific situations in being a physical education supervisor. The DPEIS use rules, regulations, norms, job descriptions etc. to define their role. These definitions determined how, what, and when the physical education supervisors performed their responsibilities within certain fixed meanings. However, the extent to which they altered or created this meaning is what was investigated (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

In developing these definitions, the symbolic interaction theory considers the “self” as an ego with personal needs, motives, and internal values, but puts the emphasis on “the definition people create (through interaction with others) of who they are. In constructing or defining self, people attempt to see themselves as others see them by interpreting gestures and actions directed toward them and by placing themselves in the role of the other person” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982 p. 35). The self can be seen as a social construct with people
presenting themselves and then creating definitions through the process of interaction that allows a person to grow and change.

Meaning was constructed from the inductively generated data that was collected and interpreted from each participant. The researcher sought to understand the covert meaning beneath the overt one and to understand the nature of the life expressed by the supervisor of physical education (Bleicher, 1980; Blumer, 1986; Crotty, 1998). Social meanings and perceptions of the DPEIS were used to search for understanding of the role of a supervisor of physical education and to support “the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experiences from the point of view” (Schwandt, 1994 p. 118) of these supervisors.

Examining the supervisors’ perceptions of their everyday lives as a supervisor, the researcher utilized social interaction or symbolic interaction to connect meaning to interpersonal relationships (Silverman, 2000). Kvale (1996) indicates that “knowledge is waiting in the subject’s interior to be uncovered, uncontaminated by the miner (researcher)”, where this knowledge is created through the interaction between the partners involved in the conversation (p. 3). The six philosophical foundations concerning symbolic interaction that guided this study were: (a) people have the ability to reason and use symbols; (b) people experience being human through interaction; (c) people are reflective and are capable of shaping their own behavior; (d) people respond to situations in response to others’ reactions, actions and interactions; (e) society is defined by people employing symbolic interaction; and (f) understanding of one’s social world is made when people act in response to the meanings they attach to things in their world (Sandstrom, Mantin, & Fine, 2001). What follows is a brief explanation of each assumption and how it related to this study.
Assumption One: People are unique in the use of symbols.

Realities come from social construction as it relates to a person using symbols. People have the capacity to reason whereas other animals act instinctively. Meaning comes from the use of language and interaction with others through communication. This use of symbols and language is what makes a person so unique. The researcher looked for the realities of the DPEIS as meaning was derived from the interaction with the participants.

Assumption Two: People show their humanness through their interaction.

Associations with others help people to have the behaviors and qualities of being human as they use language or symbols to communicate. People also develop the sense of self as they make plans, interact, take on roles and reflect on the language and symbols used by others and themselves. Therefore, the participants reveal their interaction, plans, and role definitions to establish symbolic interaction and meaning.

Assumption Three: People mold their own behavior by being self-reflective.

Spontaneous behavior is constructed from the things in the environment that directly affect the person and the meaning they give an object or stimulus. The participant has the ability to give meaning and definition to objects and stimuli as he/she reflects on the definitions that enables his/her behavior to be more automatic.

Assumption Four: People are active participants in their actions.

People act toward situations because of the meaning that a person attributes to the definition of that situation through the interaction with other people. Action is taken from the meaning given to a situation by “taking account of the unfolding intentions, actions, and expressions of others” (Sandstorm, et al. 2001, p. 219). Therefore, in the interpretation of the
participants’ actions, the researcher gained understanding and meaning from the participants as they gave meaning to their actions.

Assumption Five: Society consists of people enlisting symbolic interaction.

In social interaction, each person has the ability to assume another’s viewpoint, to adjust in organizing their actions, and to communicate through interpreting these actions. Symbolic interactionists believe that one’s identities and behaviors are developed when one makes plans, sets goals, or interacts with others in a specific situation. However, society produces humans that are rooted in the joint acts of engagement with other people (Sandstorm, et al., 2001) as the participants in this study shared their viewpoints and interactions.

Assumption Six: Understanding comes from detecting meaning from a person’s actions.

Seeking to understand the participants’ actions, the researcher searched in an unobtrusive way for the meanings the participants placed on their actions and the things in their world. By studying these meanings the researcher benefited from seeing how the participants in society define, construct, and act in their everyday worlds (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Participants

This study examined the role of the DPEIS through interviewing six SSDS in physical education in the state of Georgia to understand their perceptions of their roles and responsibilities. More participants could have been added if there had not been a theoretical saturation which was allowed by the grounded theory methodology. A SSDS in physical education is a person at the district level who has been trained in physical education and supervises quality instruction for one or two subjects only (e.g., science and physical
education or just physical education). There are a limited number (10 in the state of Georgia) of SSDS in physical education because of budget restrictions, population of districts, and philosophy of administrators responsible for determining the need for subject specialists. There are more SGDS in physical education, people at the district level that do not have training in physical education but have the responsibility for assuring quality instruction in the physical education program as well as several other curricular areas. This study concentrated on investigating only the SSDS in physical education and left the importance of investigating the SGDS in physical education to a later study.

State registries, professional directories, district directories, personal knowledge of district supervisors, and web sites were used to find the participants. Once the participants were identified, the researcher sent a letter of introduction so that when participants were contacted by telephone they would already have some details about the study and be aware that the researcher would be calling so as not to “surprise” the potential participant. The researcher called to see if they would be interested in participating in the study, and an appointment for an interview was set.

Risk was minimal for the participants as a pseudonym was used whenever necessary. The participants’ responses remained confidential and they were able to drop out of the project at any time if they felt uncomfortable about any part of the research. The participants were allowed to call the researcher or her advisor at any time during the study. The University of Georgia’s Instructional Review Board (IRB) approved the research project.

Data Gathering Procedures

The following data collection procedures were used in this study: (a) qualitative in-depth interview, (b) research notebook (d) documents, and (e) Q-sort (structured interview).
Qualitative In-depth Interview

An average 60 minute qualitative in-depth interview with the participants was the primary data source for this study (Appendices D & E). This interview gave an insight into what the supervisor felt best described his/her role. The interview took place in the DPEIS’ office, which was in deference to time restrictions, familiarity, and comfort. The rationale behind this decision was that since the supervisors were permitting the researcher to use them in research and to use their valuable time, the researcher would accommodate their schedule, their comfort level, and their time frame.

Permission to audiotape the interviews was obtained so as to preserve the participants’ words, thus allowing the researcher access for later review and reflection (Merriam, 1998). The interview began with informal dialogue with each participant to assure comfort and ease for both the researcher and participant.

The in-depth interview was unstructured, using only the command of “Please define the role of the district physical education supervisor?” The participant was encouraged to respond openly by the researcher’s engagement with eye contact and nodding of the head. Little encouragement was needed as the participants revealed relevant information about the role of the district physical education supervisor. Lincoln & Guba (1985) indicate that the interviewer can acquire more information from the interviewee if he or she is allowed to expand on the topic that is familiar to the participant. Follow-up questions derived from the responses from the open-ended questions guided the second part of the interview. For example, in her opening response, Francis Martin indicated that the role of the physical education supervisor meant she could give support in two directions: “support teacher…and being able to support here in the administrative center.” The researcher probed further by
asking for examples of support of teachers and how Ms. Martin gave support in the administrative center. With the response the researcher could visualize Ms. Martin providing supplies, securing funds, providing staff development and workshops, and providing research articles to the teachers so that they could provide quality instruction in physical education. Ms. Martin’s support of the administrative center was defined as securing funds, arranging staff development, and having people “buy into our program”. Her voice as an advocate for the physical education program was demonstrated at the administrative center. Some participants were hesitant at first to respond to such a broad question; but once they collected their thoughts they were able to share pertinent, relevant information.

As the interviews progressed, the researcher used the participant’s responses and became more comfortable in giving prompts that supported the discussion started by the participant, thus gleaning more detailed, descriptive information. The researcher was slow to respond when there was silence during the interview; this pause allowed the participants to collect their own thoughts and add more information. The questioning became more specific, narrow, and structured as the interview moved through the first phase (in-depth one question), to the second phase (creating questions from the participants responses to the in-depth question), and to the third phase (when the researcher returned for the follow-up interview) and finally to the fourth phase (the follow-up telephone interview if needed for clarification).

The narrowing of the questions allowed the participant to give details, clarify, expand on a thought, or give new information. For example, several participants mentioned “securing funds.” Since this became a relevant category, future interviews included specific questions about how the physical education supervisor secured funds.
The third phase of the interview process was a structured interview that was used at
the follow-up interview for each participant as a means of broadening categories and as a
member check. By using the structured interview during the third phase, the researcher could
elaborate on information that was known or partially known but needed to be clarified or
explored (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Additional information was gleaned by allowing the
participant to verify the relevancy of the categories that emerged from the analysis of the
data. The interviews did not last longer than 60 minutes and were also recorded for
transcription to preserve accuracy and validity.

After the first and second phase of the interviewing, the researcher analyzed the data
where categories emerged from the line by line coding of the data. Specific questions arose
to be used for the follow-up interviews. The researcher presented these questions to the
participant to clarify, elaborate, and provide rich examples or descriptions. The participant
was allowed to comment on each of the categories that emerged from the first and second
phase of the interviewing.

Following each interview the researcher made field notes about the experience. The
notes added depth about the setting, mood of the participants, voice expressions, the
behaviors of participants and the researcher’s initial thoughts. The field note process helped
the researcher begin the reflection and analysis. The field notes were kept in the research
notebook.

Research Notebook

A research notebook was carefully kept during the entire research process. The
research notebook included research log, fieldnotes, methodological notes, and research
memos. The research notebook kept things organized, accessible, and meaningful as data was gathered and analyzed.

Research Log

Bogdan & Biklen (1992) indicated that a research log contains any information pertinent to the progression of the study. The research log contained accurate records of mailings, telephone conversations, interviews, and any other information concerning contact with participants. The log, which included a calendar and journal, assisted the researcher in reaching the goals set for the study.

Fieldnotes

The researcher took fieldnotes about the social setting and the participants’ body language to support and verify what the participant was saying in the interview. Observations and note taking about the office space, interactions with other employees, and behaviors during the interview (the participant’s body gestures, voice inflections, and facial expressions) added depth to the study’s interpretation of the role of the DPEIS. The fieldnotes were a summary of the key dimensions of the researcher’s initial impression of behaviors, events, observations, and comments (Bryman, 2001). The researcher took care to be accurate by taking notes quickly during the interview, writing up full field notes immediately after the interview, and including pertinent information such as date and location (Bryman, 2001). It was essential to be unwavering and detailed with note taking so as to eliminate confusion during subsequent analysis of the data.

Keeping the research questions in mind, focus was placed on how each DPEIS performed his or her job while allowing the element of flexibility to assure rich and accurate data about the role of the DPEIS (Bryman, 2001). Fieldnotes remained an “authoritative
“chronicle” without being contaminated by the researcher’s own presence and experience (Bryman, 2001 p. 306). Therefore, the researcher let the participant control the interview at his or her own pace and did not allow personal experiences to color the interview and fieldnote data.

**Methodological Notes**

This section of the research notebook included methodological notes and descriptive procedures to assure accurate participant selection, data gathering methods, and correct data analyses.

**Research Memos**

Analytic memos were used to organize and scrutinize emerging themes as the research study progressed and to maintain descriptive write-ups of the research activities (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). Since these notes were kept continuously throughout the research process, a running record of analyses and interpretations proved to assist in the course of data collection and the final understanding and write-up of the findings. During the research process, the researcher wrote, classified, and arranged the memos for developing grounded theories (Charmaz, 1983). Therefore, as the researcher coded the transcripts and documents, memos were written to reflect the insights and ideas gained during the coding process. This assisted the researcher in answering questions, reflecting, sorting relevant and irrelevant data, and consolidating data from each individual and across all the participants’ views. Asking the questions—what is this a study of, and how does it relate to the district physical education supervisors’ role?—kept the researcher focused on the research questions. The memos took many forms during the research process—from sketchy notes, to questions and
reflections after each interview, to critical analysis of the researcher’s thought process. The research memo proved to be a valuable tool for this qualitative research study.

Documents

Documents were collected to provide background information about the participants’ role as a DPEIS. Merriam (1998) indicates that documents; which are any form of written or physical material that provides information, can support the context of an investigation. These documents can include any written information provided by the school district (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992).

Official documents such as the job description, curriculum guides, staff development documents, and any other official documents produced by the county, state, or the district were collected (Appendix F). Job descriptions for each participant, obtained from the school district’s personnel office, were collected and analyzed to determine each district’s policy. The rationale behind using the job description was that the researcher, knowing what the stated responsibilities of the job were, had the information to support the analysis.

If document artifacts were not available, the researcher focused on the interviews and fieldnotes for analysis and interpretation; but no source of information was left unexplored.

Q-sort

Q-Sort or Q methodology is referred to as a qualitative method of research because of the subjectivity feature in which a participant is asked to rank-order statements from “agree” to “disagree” or from “most important” to “least important.” Brown (1986) refers to the Q-methodology as a science of subjectivity where commentary, discourse, and conversation are an everyday life experience.
As part of the interview, a Q-sort technique (Kerlinger, 2000) was used to collect data in which the participant took thirteen cards, each containing a dimension of supervisory practice (Pajak, 1989b), and ranked the cards from least important to most important, supporting the research question concerning what the participants see as being the most important and least important aspects of their job (Appendix G). Following the ranking, the researcher asked semi-structured questions about the rankings, deriving an explanation about the order. Q-sort technique has been used to study knowledge acquisition of expert teachers (Schempp, Templeton, & Clark, 1998). Q-sorting is a way of systematically studying subjectivity and the participants’ points of views or opinion. While the factor analysis analyzes the segments, the Q-methodology is interested in the nature of these segments and the scope of similarity.

Trustworthiness

Establishing the trustworthiness of the data is a major concern in any qualitative research study. Therefore, a focus was placed on dependability, confirmability, and credibility of the data. The well known procedures of using a peer debriefer (Guba & Lincoln, 1994), methodological triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mason, 1970; Padgett, 1998; Silverman, 2000), and member checking (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) were used to ensure that the collected data were trustworthy.

The confirmability and dependability of the study—that is, did the researcher act in good faith to collect and report data?—was an ongoing topic of discussion with the researcher’s peer-debriefer (dissertation committee advisor) who strove to make sure that the researcher reported the findings without being swayed by her own agenda, values, or theoretical inclinations. The peer-debriefer acted as an auditor for the study (Guba &
Lincoln, 1994), making sure the researcher kept complete and accurate records of all phases of the research process. The records were kept accessible so that the peer-debriefer could review them at any time. The degree to which the theoretical conclusions were derived were actively surveyed by the peer-debriefer to assure that the theoretical assumptions supported the dependability of the study.

Credibility was established by the researcher’s use of multiple methods of research (qualitative interviewing, fieldnotes, document analysis, and the Q-sort) to achieve a methodological triangulation (Mason, 1970). Silverman (2000) points out that the purpose of triangulation is to “have a cumulative view of data drawn from different contexts, [so] we may, as in trigonometry, be able to triangulate the ‘true’ state of affairs by examining where the different data intersect” (p. 98). The use of methodological triangulation improved the validity of the study because it used multiple qualitative methods where similar conclusions were drawn from each method (Guion, 2002). Triangulation supported the trustworthiness of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and made it more rigorous (Padgett, 1998). By examining, coding, analyzing interviews, job descriptions, and documents the researcher could interpret the commonalities and differences to establish a more significant interpretation.

Member checking allowed the participants an opportunity to dispute or retract any of the data received and analyzed (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). The researcher reinterviewed each participant so that the participant could reveal discrepancies or make adjustments to the data. The participant indicated whether the researcher interpreted his/her responses correctly and if the researcher’s interpretations were congruent with his or her views. The researcher discovered areas of lack of correspondence between her findings and the participants and the reasons for any lack of congruity.
For example, Ann Oliver and Barbara Everett felt that the role of an athletic director and the role of the physical education supervisor should be combined into one role. The other participants felt strongly that this was not supportive of quality instruction in physical education. Most of the participants felt that the physical education supervisor gained credibility and respect for the physical education program because of the physical education program and not because they were related or connected to athletics. Ms. Oliver and Ms. Everett indicated that in their experience being the athletic director gave credibility to the health and physical education program.

Pilot Test

A pilot test was conducted in March 2003 on two participants, one participant from Alabama and one from Georgia, to determine if the data collection techniques were appropriate and whether the questions for the semi-structured interviews elicited the desired depth of data. The participants were chosen so as not to contaminate the pool of participants available in Georgia for the proposed study. Findings from the pilot study revealed: (a) prior knowledge of the job description could help the researcher with added information; (b) the interview needed to be more open-ended, and (c) the use of fieldnotes would enrich the study of the role of the district level physical education supervisor.

The researcher found a need to have preliminary questions answered by the personnel department at each of the school districts concerning the position of the district physical education instructional supervisor. After arranging the interview and securing the participant’s agreement to participate in the study, the researcher addressed these questions with the district personnel offices or with the participants: (a) title of the district physical education instructional supervisor, (b) background information-subject specialist supervisor...
or subject generalist supervisor, (c) length of time this person has held this position, (d) description of district’s policy for this person’s job responsibilities, (e) number of high schools in the district (must have at least two), (f) size of district student population, (g) number of certified physical education teachers in the district, and (h) number of physical education teachers at the elementary level, middle school level, and high school level. By having this knowledge the researcher was better able to understand the context in which the participants work, interpret the participants’ responses and ask richer, more probing questions about the role of the physical education supervisor.

The questions for the interview needed to be more open ended and the researcher discovered that a Q sort would better answer the question about ranking the importance of the job aspects. The researcher searched the literature for conceptual understanding of Q sorting so that the concept could be used in the present study. Edward Pajak’s (1989b) Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice from the “identification of supervisory proficiencies project” sponsored by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) was used for sorting.

The concepts of fieldnotes and calendar journaling were adjusted as a result of the pilot study. Fieldnotes included what the participant said, as well as a description of the environment, in order to study the whole person as meaning was made from conversation, environment, and interaction with others. Since the researcher did not use fieldnotes during the pilot test, she decided that fieldnotes could add depth to the study by describing the environment as well as the conversation. It was decided that a calendar journal would not be used because of the time commitment required by the participants.
The pilot test provided the necessary information to carry out a full-scale study of the role of the district level physical education supervisor. The findings revealed that the research instruments were not adequate (adjustments were made in the interview, Q sorting, and taking fieldnotes); the feasibility of a full scale study was determined to be advantageous; the design of the protocol, even though it was workable and realistic, needed some adjustments (adjusted interview questions, prior information and the use of Q sort); and the proposed recruitment approaches were satisfactory (University of Surrey, 2001).

Data Analysis Procedures

Grounded Theory

Grounded theory method was specifically chosen to investigate the district physical education supervisors’ role. Since there is not a significant amount of research in this area, the grounded theory was appropriate as Stern (1994) states “the strongest case for the use of grounded theory is in investigation of relatively uncharted waters” (p. 116). Strauss & Corbin (1998) define grounded theory as: “theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process. In this method, data collection, analysis and eventual theory stand in close relationship to one another” (p. 12). The main aspects of grounded theory are that the theory is developed out of the data and that analysis and data collections happen simultaneously and are repeatedly referred back and forth to each other through constant comparison (Bryman, 2001). Bryman (2001) indicates that grounded theory is the most widely used framework for analyzing qualitative data referenced in The Discovery of Grounded Theory Strategies for Qualitative Research by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss (1967).
A notable phase of analysis in grounded theory is constant comparison in which the researcher consistently compared the data analyzed with new data that was collected (Glaser, 1978; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). After the initial coding and establishing concepts (labels given to phenomena within the data), categories (grouped together concepts), and properties (aspects of a category), the researcher developed new questions for subsequent interviews. These questions aided the participants elaborating, clarifying, and supporting the findings. The results were then compared within and across categories to discover relationships so that a hypothesis could be generated (Merriam, 1998). The incidents were chunked together and were “chosen for their relevance to the theoretical domain designated for study. During the early phase of data collection and analysis, these chunks [were] chosen for similarity. During later phases they [were chosen] to highlight differences” (Le Compte & Priessle, 1993).

The data analysis procedure will be discussed more fully by a close look at the four phases of constant comparative analysis and the components of comparative analysis.

**Phases of Constant Comparative Analysis**

To generate a theory of the DPEIS' role, the researcher used four phases of constant comparative analysis for this study. By employing the four stages of constant comparative analysis—“comparing incidents, integrating categories and properties, delimiting the theory, and writing the theory” (Sabatini, 2002 p. 74)—the researcher was able to synthesize the data to produce theoretical ideas that were grounded in the data.

**Phase One: Comparing Incidents**

Using the grounded theory, a descriptive inductive analysis of the data was conducted. Explanation of the perceptions of practicing DPEIS regarding their role was investigated as the text was reduced to incidents and categories. As the data were collected,
each of the data sets was analyzed individually by marking the text, identifying emerging themes, and building categories and dimensions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The researcher used a hard copy of the transcribed interview to underline, mark, and highlight the data line-by-line, searching for relevant incidents. Glaser & Strauss (1967) referred to incidents as small bits of data that reflect what is occurring in the research setting. Le Compte and Priessle (1993) indicate that researchers should read and reread the data while picking words, phrases, patterns of behavior, ways of thinking, and repeated events that stand out and have meaning as incidents. Incidents were then grouped together to create categories.

Following the constant comparative procedure, the researcher compared incidents to previous incidents within the same category and in different categories, continually refining throughout data collection and analysis. Indicating that an incident worked and was relevant the researcher had to fit each incident into the appropriate category without forcing it.

The researcher kept a codebook and memos of incidents with their meanings and definitions. Memo writing assisted in moving from the focus of coding to conceptualizing the data as the researcher’s reflective writing helped to crystallize ideas. Analytically looking at the codes and systematically identifying the categories, the researcher defined the properties and conditions by which each category originated while changes, consequences, and relationships were analyzed and interpreted (Charmaz, 2002). Therefore, memos became part of the data to be investigated (Charmaz, 1994).

*Phase Two: Integrating Categories and Their Properties*

From the first phase, the researcher grouped categories that arose from the data and were identified through similar characteristics (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) to establish properties. This was continuous throughout the coding and analysis process. It was during
this phase that the researcher used the Inspiration (1997) software program to display
visually blocks of data from different categories that emanated from the subsets of codes
(Appendix H).

Phase Three: Delimiting the Theory

Delimiting served to limit the theory, which was developed from the clear concise
concepts that defined the categories. At first many incidents fit under several categories, and
categories overlapped, but during the third phase the researcher refined the categories so that
the relevance of each incident and category became more evident. If categories did not fit the
developing theory, they were withdrawn or modified (Glaser, 1994). The fit between
indicators and concepts cannot be forced and must fit within the parameters set for the
categories. Relationships of categories were investigated when a hypothesis arose from the
connections between the categories. With further data collection, analysis until theoretical
saturation (discussed later), and testing of the hypothesis, a theory was created. Glaser &
Strauss (1967) indicate that saturation occurs when no new ideas or concepts are added to the
categories.

Once theoretical saturation occurred, the researcher was confident about the theories
that emerged from the data. At this point, the researcher did the follow-up telephone
interviews to confirm the theories. The participants confirmed that the theories and findings
were accurate and that the emerging theories represented the role of the district physical
education supervisor. Participants’ suggestions indicated further connections between the
relationships of the categories. Further refinement and adjustments of the emerging theory
were needed after these interviews. The analysis process was rigorous where “encountering a
single case that [was] inconsistent with a hypothesis [was] sufficient to necessitate further data collection or a reformation of the hypothesis (Bryman, 2001 p. 389).

**Phase Four: Writing the Theory**

Using the available data-coded data, memos, individual categories and the emerging theory, the researcher continued the process of constant comparison to confirm the data. The memos were organized in each category to crystallize ideas and to create the analytic framework. The researcher confirmed and validated the theory (Glaser, 1994) by using the participants’ voices as quotes which were then used in the write-up.

**Components of Constant Comparative Analysis**

**Theoretical Sensitivity**

Theoretical sensitivity is the researcher’s personal ability to code, analyze, and give meaning to the data. Since the data has no inherent meaning, the researcher must be creative, sensitive, and interpretive to flesh out meaning from the raw data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). In testing the emergent understanding of the theory, the researcher determined “how useful the data was in illuminating the questions being explored and how they are central to the story that is unfolding” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999 p. 157).

The researcher reflected on personal experiences and professional experiences to analyze and interpret the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). With this personal experience, heightened awareness and understanding of the literature, the researcher was able to identify incidents and to place them within categories while constantly comparing the data to extract meaning from that information. Even though the researcher reflected on personal and professional experience and the literature, the most valuable tool for analyzing and generating a hypothesis was the data itself (Glaser, 1978).
Theoretical Sampling

Theoretical sampling is an ongoing process in which the researcher jointly collects, codes, and analyzes data and “decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop his theory as it emerges. The process of data collection is controlled by the emerging theory” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Theoretical sampling is a “defining property of grounded theory and is concerned with the refinement of ideas, rather than boosting sample size” (Charmaz, 2000 p. 519).

While collecting and coding the first data, the researcher found similar concepts and incidents that were grouped into categories. The researcher selected additional participants to clarify and establish significance of these concepts and to add additional insights to be investigated. Therefore, the researcher’s use of new participants was controlled by how that participant would add to the relevancy and meaning of the emerging theory.

Theoretical Saturation

Theoretical sampling continued until theoretical saturation had occurred. The principles that governed the point of saturation were: “(a) no new or relevant data [seemed] to be emerging regarding a category, (b) the category [was] well developed in terms of its properties and dimensions demonstrating variation, and (c) the relationships among categories [were] well established and validated (Strauss & Corbin, 1998 p. 212). Theoretical saturation occurred when the last two interviews were not adding any new data to the categories. Therefore, I knew I had reached a point of saturation and interviewed the last two participants for confirmation of data.
Theoretical Pacing

Theoretical pacing relates to the pace at which the study was conducted. Since grounded theory is a tedious process not to be forced or rushed, the researcher scheduled two to four hours a day for inputting data. Glaser (1978) indicates there are two phases of theoretical pacing: input (data collecting, analyzing data, and writing memos) and saturation (no new insight) (Sabatini, 2002).

Theoretical pacing needed to be followed in order to create a balance between data collecting and data analysis. Since the data collection and data analysis occurred simultaneously, the researcher kept a check and balance system so as not to let one process outweigh the other. Data was collected and then analyzed so that theoretical sampling could occur.

Limitations of the Study

To ensure that the study was of high quality, the limitations of the study, audience engagement, and the researcher’s subjectivity were addressed. One of the limitations of the study was gaining the trust of the participants. Since the interviews took place at two different times, trust-building was difficult because of the short amount of time allowed to get acquainted. The researcher was not aware of any political or ethical issues that occurred; but if they did, she would have responded to that situation in an ethical and professional manner by discussing the issues openly with the participant. The audience interest was valuable to the researcher because it made the information relevant and important to society. The researcher used her doctoral committee, peer debriefers, and consultants in leadership to address any limitations of the study.
Proposed Audience

The audience for this study is the supervisors of physical education, superintendents, school boards, physical education teachers, members of professional organizations and district leaders who would like to know more about supervisors of physical education for possible employment of a subject (physical education) specialist supervisor. The researcher’s dissertation is not for a select group but could be used for understanding by anyone seeking more knowledge about supervisors of physical education at the district level.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of practicing physical education instructional supervisors/coordinators regarding their job role and responsibilities. The research provided a theory grounded in the data, which explained the district physical education supervisors’ experiences, perceptions, and perspectives of their role as the leader of the physical education program at the district level.

This chapter presents the themes that emerged from the data. The chapter is divided into three parts—the first section is an introduction of the participants, school district and the participants’ focus, the second section highlights the four themes and 13 common categories extracted from the data, and the third section discussed the Q-sort and document artifacts. The four themes of role description include supervisor as relationship developer, supervisor as advocate, supervisor as an engineer, and supervisor as pioneer.

Individual Participants

In this section the participants are introduced with pertinent information concerning their history in each district regarding demographics, years in the present position, experience education degrees, content responsibilities, and information about each district. This will give the reader background information to better understand the DPEIS, the district in which they work, and the relevant information to understand the symbolic interactionists’ theory as it is developed from the data.
Craig Archer

Mr. Archer is a white male in his forties who has held this position in Bolton School District for one year where he is responsible for health and physical education in grades kindergarten through twelfth grade. Prior to this he was a district physical education supervisor for 6 years and taught physical education for 14 years with a Bachelor of Science and Masters degree in Health and Physical Education. He also has a specialist degree in Educational Leadership.

Bolton School District has approximately 104,000 students with 65,000 teachers. There are 285 health and physical education teachers—114 teachers at 61 elementary schools, 71 teachers at 21 middle schools, 100 teachers at 15 high schools. Mr. Archer’s office is in a temporary location waiting for authorization to move because the present location is flooded and is not environmentally safe for him or the other office staff.

Mr. Archer indicates that this position is “ultimately there to support teachers as they address any kind of work with students,” “listening and communicating” while “serving others.” He specifies the role of the district physical education supervisor is to be a liaison between the school district and the community and state professional organizations, “bridging the gap between schools and community.” Staff development and curriculum development play a major function in this position as stated in the job description:

To provide leadership in the development, implementation and evaluation of health, safety, and physical education programs K-12, middle school intramurals.

Barbara Everett

Ms. Everett is a white female in her forties, who has held the position of Athletic
Director and Health and Physical Education Coordinator for 16 years in Brighten School District. She taught high school physical education for 10 years in the same district. Her Bachelor of Science, Masters, and Specialist degrees are in health and physical education. She also possesses an educational leadership certificate. Her responsibilities include supervision in health and physical education, athletics, and Safe and Drug Free schools.

There are 25,000 students in Brighten School District and 59 physical education teachers. There are 21 physical education teachers at 12 elementary schools, 19 physical education teachers at five high schools, and 19 physical education teachers at 15 middle schools. Ms. Everett’s office is located downtown in a building with other Brighten School District offices. “Athletic and Physical Education Director” designates her office door on the 5th floor.

Ms. Everett’s interest in the role of Health and Physical Education Director is centered on supporting teachers, communicating, motivating, and organizing. She indicates that this job is about working with other teachers. . . It is about support, support, support. . . Communication is the key.”

Daniel Carson

Being the Health and Physical Education Coordinator for Arnold School District, Mr. Carson, an African American male in his fifties, is responsible for the Health and Physical Education in grades kindergarten to twelfth grades. He has held this position for 5 years with prior experience in teaching physical education for five years and being a principal for 20 years in the same school district. He holds a bachelor’s degree in health and physical education and a specialist degree in educational administration.
Arnold School district has 104,000 students and 11,000 teachers. There are 200 physical education teachers with 95 elementary teachers, 65 middle school teachers and 40 high school teachers. The Arnold School district has a complex of office buildings, and Mr. Carson’s office is housed on the second floor with the curriculum and instruction department.

Mr. Carson’s focus “is on curriculum… You teach the curriculum, and [the] appropriate staff development to support curriculum.” He indicates that change “must be slow and methodical. Everyone wants to be better, [but] no one is willing to change.” He points out that community relations will take care of itself: “if you do everything prior to that, community relations then will work out.”

George Travis

Neilon County School District has 140,000 students and approximately 11,000 teachers. In Health and Physical Education, there are 350 teachers—150 elementary, 100 middle school, 100 high school. Neilon County school district has several annex office complexes and Mr. Travis’ office is located in the east annex.

Since this is Mr. Travis’ first year, his main focus has been motivating, organizing, problem solving, and making decisions with planning and change. He specifies that he needs “to motivate [the teachers] to do the things that we need to do to get better” and that he deals “with problems here so the teachers don’t have to deal with it later.” He states that he has “to plan what it is that needs to be dealt with—short term plans and long term plans and adjust for changes.” In representing the county office he strives to “do a good job because to the 350 teachers, I am the ‘County Office’. . . . I’m their first link to the County Office.” As a growing edge, he relates that he needs to “stay abreast on the latest
Francis Martin, a white female in her forties, has held the position of health and physical education coordinator in Taff County School District for three years and has taught health and physical education for 21 years in the same district. Her bachelors, masters, and specialist degrees are in health and physical education with an add-on certification (taking five educational leadership courses and a practicum from an approved institution) in educational leadership. Ms. Martin’s responsibilities include health and physical education as well as adaptive physical education.

The student population for Taff County School District is 85,000 with 8,000 teacher. There are 216 health and physical education teachers—65 elementary, 80 middle school, 80 high school and 11 adaptive physical education teachers. Ms. Martin’s office is located on the curriculum floor of the district’s office.

Ms. Martin concentrates on motivating, organizing, communicating, reading research, program development, and evaluation. She expresses concern for motivating and organizing by pointing out: “If people aren’t motivated and don’t have everything organized and communicated—commitment to them; it just doesn’t matter. . . . I mean curriculum is important, but I could have the greatest curriculum in the world. If people aren’t motivated and I don’t communicate it to them it’s pretty useless.” She also indicates that “writing curriculum is a massive undertaking of research [gathering].”
Ann Oliver

For three years Ann Oliver, an African-American female in her forties, was the health and physical education coordinator in Langley County School District, but for the last two and half years she has been the director of health, physical education and athletics in a combined position. The health and physical education department and athletics were brought together into one department involved in the wellness of the students. She has two coordinators under her supervision: (a) athletics for high school, and (b) athletics for middle school and health, physical education, and standards. She taught physical education for five years in the same county. Her bachelor’s degree is in health and physical education, while she holds a master’s degree in sports administration and management and masters in educational leadership. Ms. Oliver is presently working on her doctor of philosophy degree in Educational Leadership.

Langley County School District has 55,000 students with 222 health and physical education teachers---72 elementary, 115 middle school, and 35 high school. Ms. Oliver’s office is located in an athletic building far removed from the county board office.

Ms. Oliver’s major focus is on communication and service to teachers concentrating on curriculum, instructional programs, and staff development. She emphasizes that “If you cannot communicate and cannot make effective connections, then you won’t be able to serve people, [providing] resources to teachers is a service” and that you need “staff development to effectively do curriculum and instruction.” In order to have community relations “you have to be accountable to them with good instruction.”
Common Theme

Emerging from the data were four roles (themes) that were significant to the participants: supervisor as relationship developer, supervisor as advocate, supervisor as engineer, and supervisor as pioneer. The responsibilities (categories) that emerged and were common among the participants were: (a) support of teachers, (b) support of administration, (c) support of students, parents, and community; (d) communicator; (e) salesperson; (f) technology resources, (g) general resources, (h) staff development, (i) curriculum and instruction, (j) funding acquisition, (k) data collection, (l) empowering teachers, and (m) identifying trends. Figure 1 relates this data of roles (themes) and responsibilities (common categories) in a graphic overview.

Supporting Data

The Q-sort (Appendix G) and job description data documents supported the findings from the in-depth interviews with district physical education supervisors ranking Pajak’s (1989) Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice (Appendix A) from most important to the least important. The twelve dimensions were: community relations staff development, planning and change, communication, curriculum, instructional program, service to teachers, observing and conferencing, problem solving and decision making, research and program evaluation, motivating and organizing, and personal development. The analysis of the Q-sort resulted in tallying the number of times the district physical education supervisors indicated that a dimension was most important. Though each district physical education supervisor indicated that all the dimensions were important, a list of the top three dimensions resulted in instruction/curriculum receiving six votes, communications receiving five votes, and motivating and organizing receiving five votes—
a total of 16 votes out of a possible 18 votes. The data revealed that personal development and community relations ranked as the two lowest responses (11 out of 12 votes). The job descriptions did not add data to the findings because the documents were not the participants’ perceptions but a legal document giving background information about job qualifications (all district physical education supervisors must have a masters), experience (three to five years experience in teaching physical education), and responsibilities (such as being an athletic director). These documents were compared to the data from the interviews indicating that the categories (responsibilities) of communication and service to teachers were the most mentioned and personal development was not mentioned by the district physical education supervisors during the interviews. The district physical education supervisors’ conversation was focused outside of themselves and what they could do for others.
## DISTRICT PHYSICAL EDUCATION SUPERVISORS’ ROLE

### Role 1—Supervisor as Relationship Developer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility 1</th>
<th>Responsibility 3</th>
<th>Responsibility 2</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support of Teachers</td>
<td>Support of Students, Parents, &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Role 2—Supervisor as Advocate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility 4</th>
<th>Responsibility 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicator</td>
<td>Salesperson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Role 3—Supervisor as Engineer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility 6</th>
<th>Responsibility 8</th>
<th>Responsibility 7</th>
<th>Responsibility 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Resources</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>General Resources</td>
<td>Curriculum/Instructional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Role 4—Supervisor as Pioneer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility 10</th>
<th>Responsibility 12</th>
<th>Responsibility 11</th>
<th>Responsibility 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Acquisition</td>
<td>Empowering Teachers</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Identifying Trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As Emerging Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 1.
District Physical Education Supervisors’ Role Perceptions—Common Themes and Categories
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS—SUPERVISOR AS RELATIONSHIP DEVELOPER

The supervisors indicated that the role of DPEIS was one of being in the people business where relationships are critical. Working together while making connections and associations involved all interested parties in creating an atmosphere that is conducive to teaching and learning. These connections and relationships confirmed the supervisors’ accomplishment and achievements. Oliver summed it up by saying she believed that “one of the number one indicators of success are relationships.” The supervisor had to develop relationships with teachers, students, parents, administrators and the community if he or she was to be successful in the role of DPEIS. Responsibilities that comprised the role of “Supervisor as Relationship Developer” were: (a) support of teachers, (b) support of administration, and (c) support of students, parents, and community.

Responsibility One: Support of Teachers

The participants emphasized support of teachers and service to teachers throughout the interviews, which underscored the importance of this category (responsibility) of building relationships with teachers through support. The supervisors’ first priority was relationships with teachers and building these relationships. Indicators of building these relationships surfaced through comments from the participants that supported the DPEIS’ role in building relationships. The relationships were built by (a) visiting the teachers, (b) listening to the teachers, (c) being available to the teachers, (d) setting an example, (e) getting to know each other, (f) empathizing with the teachers, and (g) working together.
The participants explained how important it was to get out of their offices and into the schools to visit with the teachers, either through observations, conferences, or casual conversations. In visiting the schools, each supervisor pointed out what a valuable asset the contact with the teachers could be for developing relationships. Each supervisor indicated that he or she tried to visit each physical education teacher at least once or twice a year depending on the size of the school district. Archer explained how he connected with the teachers and aids in their development as teachers through

Modeling lessons, providing model lessons and showing how to use heart rate monitors, fitness assessment software, helping to teach, helping teachers link with their school improvement plan. . . .One day a week I just don’t come to the office and visit schools.

While visiting schools, interacting with the physical education teachers, and engaging in discussions at county meetings, the participants showed that listening to input and acting on that input from the physical education teachers developed trust between the supervisors and the teachers. This trust was imperative to building a strong relationship. Travis, as a new DPEIS, relied on the teachers for creating a working relationship to develop and define his role as DPEIS when he pointed out

They [teachers] will meet with me on a regular basis, and when we meet. . . we will discuss best practices as far as teaching goes, the best equipment that they need, what problems they’re having, what they feel like needs to be done, what’s not being done that has been done in the past, what hasn’t been done in the past that needs to be done in the future. What do they see is our strengths and our
weaknesses . . .? What information can we gather to support what it is we’re doing?

To tell us what it is we need to do in the future.

Archer specified that his style of leadership, hands on with input from teachers, created a working relationship by stating

If they don’t have a working relationship with [me] on the development of curriculum, how to assess students, grading schemes, etc., then it’s a top down driven thing and it’s not of and by them. . . .[You need to] make changes based on that input. . . .If you don’t act on their suggestions, it totally destroys your credibility. . . .So if you’re going to ask their opinion, you had better heed it and incorporate that in what you’re working on.

Participants demonstrated how being there for the teachers could actually support their instruction, create confidence, and develop a connection between the teacher and the supervisor. Carson indicated that he showed his support of the teacher and support of instruction by being

Always, always, always—constantly in touch [with teachers]. . . .You see something different [in each school]. What we find out in a lot of cases is management problems from our beginning teachers. And that’s what I do most of the times. To let them know there’s a better way to do this…So by visiting them, I always try to watch the beginning of the class. Because once the class is up and going, you can’t really tell. So, I try to see at least the beginning of the class. How the kids come in, is there a routine set? And [then I say] let’s talk about this. Let’s try this. . . .I’m never critical. I never say if I were you I would do this, I simply say, “Try this. This will work.” I try to be as positive as I can.
Archer indicated that “being there for the teachers” meant being available for the teachers to talk candidly and privately about anything. He explained

That it is really the first priority I have in a school system is getting out of the office, losing my tie and being among teachers and to see them, to know them, for them to know that they can say things to me in confidence. I can also bring things up to them…I think building relationships is more important than counting those relationships.

Travis stressed that relationships were “connections”:

If you feel a connection I think you’re going to be willing to “buy in” to what that person’s saying. Whether you agree with it or not, you can at least be willing to listen to it and to get some ideas from it. So I think that one on one conversation. . .[and] personal relationships really makes a big difference.

While all the supervisors indicated that mentoring teachers helps to build relationships, Carson gave examples of how being a role model and being an example himself supported his role and the physical education program. He confirmed mentoring teachers by explaining:

I try to be the ultimate role model for our teachers. And we do this with the teachers because we encourage the teachers to become role models. . . .There’s some [that] just call and talk about things—you know, ‘the administration don’t understand what they do.’ They think that P.E. is recess. Sometimes they’re frustrated—‘I didn’t go to school for four years to earn a degree to teach recess or to become a dumping ground.’ And that’s when you have to tell them if there’s a pile of trash someplace, I just may assume that this is where you pile the trash so I’ll dump
some. The next person to come along and sees that trash, if they don’t know any better, they dump their trash too. The next thing you know, you have got a pile of trash. If your program isn’t a dumping place, then it teaches the principal [it is not a trash program]. . . .But you got to treat your program just like the math teacher. I mean, nobody puts kids in math class when they misbehave. Why? Nobody puts them in science class when they misbehave.

So, what do they do? They send them to P.E. Why? Because all you do in their minds—that you’re not doing what you’re supposed to do. So, to have results, you’ve got to show this is what we’re doing; this is what we’ve accomplished.

Oliver supported relationships by getting to know her teachers’ strengths and weaknesses and sharing their talents with other teachers within the district:

Since I know where all the teachers are, and I know where most of their strengths and weaknesses are, I can call a principal at school A and say, ‘I need for this teacher to go to school D for two or three days and mentor a partner that this teacher can learn some skills that they’re having some challenges with.’

Everett indicated that knowing the teacher is good, but to see what the teachers are going through daily and knowing what barriers and difficulties they run into every day was valuable in developing relationships:

It’s hard for me to support directives, constant directives, on ways to improve and do things better when you’ve never seen what I [the teacher] do. I think it’s critical that system level individuals get back out because if you’re going to be the one that’s going to be supporting or you’re going to be pushing initiatives, or supporting
initiative, or adding initiative to various areas, then you need to know what these
teachers are going through daily.

In constructing a relationship, the supervisors pointed towards working together as
being significant in developing a strong physical education program. The teachers and
supervisor may not have always agreed and the teacher may have needed correcting, but by
working together the teacher and supervisor could overcome the obstacles. Ms. Everett
indicated that occasionally a teacher was not pulling in the same direction and she

May have [had] to spank someone’s hand. But they know that not only will I come
out and evaluate them and tell them what I think we can work on to make
them a little bit better. I’m the first one to write them a letter, and copy the
appropriate people on what a good job they did with something.

Ms. Everett pointed out that she gained support for her projects and ideas by supporting her
teachers:

First, the relationships are critical. The teachers have got to feel like you’re
advocating for them and that you support them. And if they believe that,
then you can ask anything and they will try to do it and help you. Because
it goes back to the whole idea of physical education and one of the concepts
that we teach and also carries over into athletics and that’s teamwork.

Leaders are successful that can establish a good team.

To summarize, building relationships and supporting the teachers through these
relationships were crucial. Visiting, listening, being available, setting an example, getting
to know the teachers, empathizing, and working together, the supervisors provided detailed
comments about how they developed and sustained relationships with teachers through
support. A background as to how this was done and how it defines the role of the district physical education supervisor was provided.

Responsibility Two: Support of Administration

Building relationships with administration, next to relationships with teachers, was indicated as being a top priority. Administration was defined as any person in a leadership position at the school level, district level or state level—e.g. principals, assistant principals, other curriculum supervisors/ coordinators, associate superintendents of curriculum, other district physical education supervisors, district superintendents and State Superintendent.

At the district level one can feel isolated, but the participants pointed towards relationships that had developed between supervisors as it was not unusual for them to email or call or to talk to each other, gathering support from the other district physical education supervisors. Support also came from the relationships developed with the principals as the supervisors indicated that they had to teach the principal why physical education was so important, sharing best practices in instruction, management, and resources. The supervisors specified that the more they met and saw each other at different functions, the more they felt connected. The supervisors indicated an essential element to the role of district physical education supervisor was the autonomy the supervisor had to perform his or her job.

Indicators from the interviews identified ways support of administration and relationship building were critical for the role of the district physical education supervisor. All the participants interviewed mentioned that they formed relationships with administrators for support, credibility, and power to carry out the role of district physical education supervisor.
Educating the principal and supporting the principal so everyone works as a team was articulated by Everett:

It is our role and our job to get that principal to buy in, to help expand; just like teaching a child how to hop or skip…I think you educate the principal when you get him on your side. And you get him on your side by being a team player.

Oliver identified ways to educate principals and ways to build relationships with principals when she specified how she made sure the principals understood what should go on in their schools concerning physical education. Oliver asserted that physical education was a core area and that one could get the attention of the principal by educating them with

Talking about, “What’s in it for me? What’s in it for my test scores? What’s in it for my overall student achievement?” Then what I’ve noticed is that those principals who understand how all of these pieces fit together and make a whole and full student, they don’t have a problem with [physical education]. . . .Most of my time is spent with keeping [administrative team] on target.

Supporting principals tended to be more problematic than providing resources. Travis expressed that

Principals see me as a resource person when they need me. . . .I would like for it to be where principals see me as somebody that they can call anytime about anything that they need help with anywhere remotely related to health and physical education. . . .I think it’s just not having as many interactions with them as I do with the teachers. . . .The more interaction, the comfort level with [the principals] is easier. . . .We’re going to have some times when the principals can come in and just talk to the curriculum coordinators and have some more one-on-one time with us.
In building the relationship with principals, the DPEIS’ role was one of stressing the importance of physical education by teaching and informing the principals. Archer pointed out that district physical education supervisors needed to: “Give [principals] perspective of instruction. . .supervision of instruction. . .staff training, e.g., team building. . . check facilities, discuss budgetary concerns” to support the principal. Time spent together shaped the relationship as the supervisor and principals worked together for the advantage of the students.

Gaining support from other district physical education supervisors increased best practices, camaraderie instead of isolation, and a better knowledge base. Martin learned from other supervisors because “when we do get together we share a lot of ideas. . . .There’s not a time we don’t sit and talk that you don’t pick up something from someone.” Archer articulated that through this sharing of ideas the supervisors should also share

Ideas on curriculum, how to bring teachers together to write curriculum. . . .How each supervisor used the national standards in formulating curriculum objectives. . . .How we should go about rewriting Georgia performance standards in health and physical education. . . .Share ideas about future things in curriculum, networking to share national speakers.

Being the only district physical education supervisor within a school district could make the supervisor feel isolated and alone but Martin stated that by meeting with other supervisors

Just helps you know that you are not alone. . . .because no one else in your school system thinks the same. . . .We’re working on now trying to figure out some ways to get together, we’re talking about getting together every two months
or three months at some different locations. Right now we meet at Red Cross meetings, so we don’t meet very [often]. It’s kind of hard back to back meetings. I see [other coordinators] at GAHPERD or other organizational type meetings.

The support system for new district physical education supervisors to help them feel a connection to the other district physical education supervisors was realized by meeting. Since Travis is a new DPEIS, he indicated that he “did not feel connected at first because [of] trying to learn too much.” The internet proved to be a way of feeling connected also, as Oliver voiced that she could email other district physical education supervisors to find out: “we are looking at how we structure first grade physical education. Can somebody send me an idea of what they’re doing”?

Carson identified ways to use the knowledge acquired from meeting with other supervisors to advance ones own knowledge base and the entire physical education program because

Always learning. . .learning experience. . .anytime you meet with someone else it’s a learning experience because every system is like every school—there is a uniqueness about every school this school system. There’s a uniqueness about every county in this state. So, by meeting with supervisors/coordinators you hear about what’s going on in their system and you try to tweak it where it would work in this system.

All the district physical education supervisors, except Everett, proposed meeting with other supervisors because it was crucial to develop a relationship with the administration in order to benefit the physical education program. Everett indicated that
I don’t think having required meetings or scheduling quarterly meetings at the state wide system level would be beneficial. . . .I don’t feel disconnected. I know they’re out there but, I guess I feel a little bit different right now because after we had to make all those cuts in [my county], some of them were openly critical of what we had done. . . .It was just a different style of leadership.

Even though Everett met with other district physical education supervisors at state meetings and conferences, she communicated that her relationship with other district physical education supervisors was strained because of her involvement in cutting positions in her county and the requirement that all her physical education teachers also coach. She felt that the other district physical education supervisors made comments to the newspaper without directly consulting her.

Searching for credibility and relationships with administration, Martin specified, “If you’re going to be successful in this position, you have got to come to the realization that the whole political bureaucratic piece is a big part of making things happen. . . .by being respected by folks, you can get things done.” She also mentioned that

You have a pretty positive relationship/respect with budget individuals and staff development. . . .because that job is a lot of decision making. . . .In this system with area superintendents because they are the direct line to purchasing for schools and then I think it’s really important that maybe your own department which is the curriculum department to have really good relationships.

Since Carson was a principal for 20 years, he could verify that “It makes a tremendous difference when you have sat where the principal sits. You understand deadlines; you understand some principals don’t really care about P.E. He also proposed that the district
physical education supervisor would have “more credibility if we had someone at the state level.”

The power to be a DPEIS and perform the responsibilities of the job differed for each district because of tradition, design of the power structure, and the leadership style of the person in that position.

Having a good working relationship with the superintendent was critical to the role of the district physical education supervisor. Carson, having a good relationship with his superintendent, could do just about anything he wanted as long as he did not embarrass the system or teachers. Martin also had a great deal of freedom with her only constraints being the amount of money she had to run her program. Oliver’s power was limited only by

Limitations that I place on myself or this office. . . .And one of the good things about the administrative team in our district is you can always complain about what you think you ought to have or what people are doing, but there is always the opportunity for you to stand up and at administrative meetings and [say] ‘this is what I see, this is where I think we need to go and this is how we solve it.’ Our superintendent who has a great respect for physical education has commissioned me to do the work that we’re currently beginning to embark upon which is to revamp the curriculum and why is it not addressing the needs of our kids. The population is ninety percent African Americans and we know that our kids are going into juvenile diabetes. Overwhelming amounts of our kids are obese, not given activities for various reasons. They don’t have outlets of social or private clubs and as far as athletics other than what we offer them. Then what are we doing to make sure that they are physically fit? So it helps to have the support of the administrative teams.
Even though the superintendent wanted to know what was going on and wanted to be kept abreast of things, Travis’ relationship with the superintendent in his district was really left in the hands of his executive director because of the chain of command. The district physical education supervisor did not have direct contact with the superintendent. Archer stressed that “political risks or outside influences in decisions, and protocol to follow” could influence the power afforded the DPEIS.

Building a relationship with a state coordinator was mentioned by every supervisor. Comments about support and relationship developing ranged from receiving support from the state coordinator, and being kept informed by the state coordinator to the credibility of the position of the district physical education supervisor, of the profession itself. With a state coordinator, Archer indicated that the supervisors would

Have an ally “[who could]utilize strengths of people that are working within the state. . . utilize district supervisors to formulate curriculum, budget ideas, staff development. . . help in networking. . . Have some consistency in curriculum, instruction, staff development, and funding.”

Archer also mentioned that the state superintendent/coordinator

Needs a background in physical education because [he or she] needs to be well grounded in the content area. . . Keep up with current trends. . . Be able to walk the talk. . . .and have a prerequisite—taught physical education at all levels, have helped to build district supervision of instruction and curriculum learning . . . .[and] does not necessarily need to have a doctorate because [of the] need to be grounded in the real world.
Everett pointed out that “a state coordinator would be very good to keep us abreast of things,” as Oliver articulated her opinion about the need for a state physical education coordinator by stating that

It creates a sense of urgency and a sense of importance at the State level because people always respect things [that] came from the State and so as it moves down, then you work in that order. . . .When it becomes the State Curriculum, it becomes this is what we feel is important for the children of Georgia, then you get state wide buy-in and not sectional buy in. . . .It allows you as you have a state contact to network with other districts. . . .If we had a state contact and it does affect the work. But if we don’t have one, it leaves it solely to the district to make sure that they have the buy in at the state level, at eh local level and that they implement their programs and get their kids what they need.

“If we had a state coordinator it would give support in each county. . . .Not having someone there makes you realize how much you need one,” specified Travis as he too communicated his concern for a state physical education coordinator. Credibility as a profession and as DPEIS had a direct correlation as Carson articulated:

We do not have a person at the top per say. . . .The buck stops with me which is not good. If we had a State person we would have someone that we could talk to, someone to help us when a teacher will call me. . . .It’s not my job to go in and tell the principal that you’re violating state policy. But if we had someone above me to say, “Well okay, I am the state person and I’m telling you to go tell this person the principal she needs to get on task”. . . .That would help.”
Martin, sharing similar comment, provided another point of view about the importance of a state physical education coordinator when she stated:

Well, first of all, not having a [state coordinator] has a huge impact on what we are and aren’t able to do at [the district level] because there is a perception if we don’t have one at the State level that there’s a different perception of having one I think at the local school level. If there was one at the state level, then there would be someone there…a lot of us are individually finding out different information and sharing it. . . .It would be nice to have one person that was able to be at the State level fighting for our cause. . . providing support down to the schools. Decisions are made and they’re made without health and physical education input and my guess is they’re not good decisions for health and physical education at all.

Building relationships with principals, other district level coordinators, the district superintendent, other district physical education coordinators and the state superintendent/coordinator were critical for the DPEIS. Through these relationships the district physical education supervisors could acquire support, credibility, and power to perform their role as a relationship developer.

Responsibility Three: Support of Students, Parents, and Community

The third category (responsibility) of relationships with students, parents and community was noted in the participants’ comments about concerns, actions, and being connected. Archer stated that the DPEIS’ role was to be a “liaison between the school district and state organizations and community organizations as well as helping to bridge the gap between schools and community.” Travis indicated that we need to involve the community to promote physical education by “pushing the fact that health and physical
education is a very vital link and important role in what we do every day. . .and thinking about what’s best for the kids.”

Once in the position of district physical education supervisor, contact with children became more indirect and Martin voiced how this change brought about change for the children:

I think if you’re in physical education, if you’ve enjoyed teaching and you’ve enjoyed kids, this kind of job is such a good opportunity to have effects on the kids. It’s brutal in that you’re not with kids and it’s such a change, a mindset change. . . .I think that if you don’t care about children and love children and respect what children need, then it’s really hard to drive decisions. I really do think you’ve got to put every decision you make, what’s going to be best for the kids. And, I think you’ve got to have some kind of love—love is a hard word—but you have to have some kind of real devotion to kids in order to make sure that your decisions are all geared to that way.

Carson’s passion was for children and stipulated that “teaching is a calling. . .you think about dealing with children. . .and we look at what is happening in our children and it’s really a lack of knowledge.”

If one had not kept the focus on children, Travis expressed that

You can get very tuned into sitting back and doing what you want to do in your little world and then you never move away from this wall. I mean if you stay behind your desk every single day and never go out to your teachers, I mean, I can do my job from this desk, I don’t have to ever leave this office. But can I do it effectively? No, and can I do this job and make sure that I’m helping the kids? No way.
Carson stipulated in working with students and parents that more time should be spent with kids about: “how to eat, what foods are nutritional. For instance, the average parent, average adult doesn’t know that French fries have no nutritional value at all. . . .” Carson could get the message to the students by an interoffice television program. Travis supported relationships with students when he detailed for his teachers the importance of making a connection:

If you make a connection with a kid, that kid’s going to want to be in your class. When you don’t make a connection with that kid, he may or may not want to be in your class. . . .I think if we’re not here for the kids, how are we going to convince those teachers that we work with that the kids are the most important thing.

Travis indicated that his support of students is indirect through the physical education teachers. Carson wants the teachers to be role models for the students “because if you’re not practicing what you preach, it’s kind of hard to tell a kid to do something if you don’t do it yourself.”

Relationships with persons in national and state professional organizations as well as persons within the universities and colleges, showed backing of the community and the physical education profession both locally and at the state and national level. Travis supported affiliation with the health and physical education national and state organizations: “It’s hard to say I’m a coordinator for this county and I don’t believe in what we’re doing at the state.” Martin shared the same philosophy of being in close contact and “involvement in state and national organizations so that you do make contacts, so that you do know what’s going on, what’s current, that you do have people to call is essential.” Martin pointed toward participation with the universities and colleges as a way to support
relationships with the community because: “they help me with personnel issues. . . .They have volunteered their services. . . .The colleges and universities have been a great connection, and I don’t hesitate to call them. . . .Ask them for some support. . . .Oliver pointed toward relationships and collaboration with several colleges and universities: “What resources do you have that I could share with my physical education teachers. . . .I’ll come talk to the physical education group.”

Using members of the community to serve on committees, or to look for direction and advice from the physical education supervisor, or being a concerned parent or simply being a member of society were significant relationships to be developed by the DPEIS and with persons in the community whether they were civic leaders, parents, principals, secretaries, or office workers.

Travis worked with civic leaders, parents, and school personnel on committees and as a result he was able to develop relationships as:

A committee that actually gets together and that’s civic leaders, school personnel, coordinators that I sit down and look at proposals for—[county curriculum] and whether they feel like those proposals are valid. . . .And so they meet several times a year to review materials to discuss any situations that we may be coming up with, any new information that may be coming out, and how we want to have that presented in the schools.

Martin pointed out that significant relationships are developed as she meets parents and community leaders as they serve on the superintendent’s advisory committee together. Carson built relationships as he was “the liaison between the American Heart Association, the American Red Cross, the CDC, the Board of Health, Teenage Pregnancy Task Force. I
sit on these committees.” Martin developed relationships as she was “Serving on various committees within the state—be it Kids Health, or the American Red Cross. . .March of Dimes. . .organizations which help to support our teachers.” For Carson the community was within his building, co workers and secretaries, who looked to him for advice and support in living a healthier life:

The more you use your body, the better it gets. . . .just ask anybody in this building, tell me something about—[the district physical education supervisor]—you will hear, ‘when I see Mr. . . I hid my French fries. . . .I take the steps. . . .I don’t let him catch me with a Burger King bag in my hands.

Martin explained that principals or superintendents may request the DPEIS to meet with parents “to answer parents’ questions on protocol and dance or something.” Being available to parents and persons in the community, Carson indicated, helped develop a relationship: “we have a group of parents who are concerned about not getting enough physical education and they want to meet with the superintendent. The superintendent would ask me to come and explain to the parents the policy.”

Everett shared that to fulfill the role as DPEIS and to be understanding and open to all persons, one must have a:

Love of children...love of people...you have to be willing to understand that you may get the individual in your office who’s a racist and that can be an African-American who’s racist or a Caucasian who’s a racist that wants to tell you how unfair and unjust and so I think you have to like people and understand there’s lots of different views and opinions and be able to take all of that in.
Summary

Relationships with children, parents, and community supported the role of DPEIS as they taught children, met with children, met with parents, sat on committees with parents and other members of the community, collaborated with universities and colleges, and participated in national and state professional organizations. These relationships developed as these persons worked and shared ideas.

Through relationship building, the DPEIS could promote physical education, and make a connection with teachers, administrators, students, and parents as well as the community. The relationships were built as the DPEIS listened to teachers, was available to the teachers, set an example for the teachers, and empathized with the teachers, and worked together with the teachers. The relationships that developed with principals, other district physical education supervisors, district superintendents, and state superintendent/coordinate acted as a source of knowledge as they served the community and were a liaison to bridge the gap between the schools and the community.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS—SUPERVISOR AS ADVOCATE

One role of the DPEIS is to be an advocate for the physical education profession through communicating and selling the value of the physical education program. The supervisors all supported the view that they were a salesperson in everything they did and everywhere they went. The supervisors indicated that they had to be effective communicators so they can advocate, inform, and validate the physical education profession. Seeking ways to be an active advocate for the profession, the district physical education supervisors’ comments pointed out that communication and being a salesperson were indispensable responsibilities to be performed within their role.

Responsibility Four: Communicator

The supervisors specified that communication was valuable in fulfilling the role as DPEIS by advocating for the profession and maintaining a connection with interested parties. Various audiences—teachers, students, parents, administrators, and the community—have a need for communications from the DPEIS. The participants indicated that they must have open communications, be constantly in touch, and be able to communicate effectively to establish and maintain a connection and partnership in advocacy. Face to face encounters, newsletters or electronic communications to disseminate information were methods of communications discussed by the supervisors.
Communication was mentioned by each participant, which reveals its importance. The participants indicated communication in advocacy could be displayed by: openness, listening, disseminating information, and effective speaking and writing.

Through the supervisors’ conversation it was established that with the relationships previously discussed and open communication, the supervisor earned credibility from teachers, parents, administrators, and persons in the community for support and belief in physical education and advocacy for the profession. Earning respect comes from being supportive and open as indicated by Archer:

Credibility is almost like respect. It’s not conferred, it’s earned. And I think I earned respect from various audiences by involving them, by listening having dialogue, open communication is two ways and basically acting on what I said I was going to do. You are basing it upon their input. So I think they have to be vested into the process and they have to know that you not only care, but that you do act on what they say.

As established in the interviews, the supervisors emphasized that communication was an exchange of ideas or messages where each party can speak and listen to the other for an understanding. The supervisors pointed out that listening in communication was just as important as talking, if there was to be an exchange of ideas and an understanding of the opinions of others concerning physical education. In establishing the role of advocacy, Travis specified that “communication and information is a big key and listening to the teachers is a big key,” while Archer concurred:

With all state programs and again that would be teachers, building administrators, parents, central office administrators, community members and if I have great ideas,
I have to communicate it in order for anything to happen well. It’s not what you do; it’s how you do it. It’s not what you say; it’s how you say it. So, communication, to me, is a two way street. It’s not just me telling, it’s me listening. That’s critical so that I can be a service to teachers.

A tool that enables the supervisor to be an advocate and fulfill the responsibilities of communication is e-mail. This tool allows the teachers to contact their supervisors, other personnel within the school districts, parents, students and persons within the community. Likewise the supervisors used email to get information out to the teachers and administrators. Everett stipulated that her communication was aided by modern technology:

Access to email has helped physical education teachers more than any text. . . .It is so hard with physical education teachers that are on the field. They are in the gym, where they certainly should be with their children, but it was always hard to catch them in that couple of minutes that they may walk into their office. . . .If you couldn’t catch them right that minute on the telephone, and some gymnasiums didn’t even have phones, so now, I can email a teacher and they can respond. We probably are communicating a little more during the day. . . .And so it gives me a chance to communicate.

Martin praised email as a way for her to be in touch with her teachers, but also as a way to extend her working day and be able to respond to her charges:

I don’t know how I could to the job without it [electronic communication]. I really depend on it heavily. In order to be out in the schools during the day where you’re going to have to be away from the phone, what electronic communication does for me is it can extend my day.
Archer disseminated information as he communicated with the principals, administrators, and board members “sending research findings that promote movement and cognition. . .So you have to keep putting it out there. . .So that they are aware of the link between movement and fitness levels and cognition and SAT scores.”

As an effective supervisor, establishing connections was discussed as being important for advocating the physical education profession and could be accomplished through communications. These connections are ways that the supervisor is able to associate with people that support the physical education program. Oliver stated that: “you have to be able to communicate. . .because if you cannot communicate and cannot make effective connections, then you won’t be able to serve people.” When making connections, Archer stressed that communication needed to be used appropriately and that one needs to go through the correct channels because you “would not want to talk to the superintendent [advocating an issue] without talking to the people who are involved [director of curriculum, associate superintendent of personnel, etc.] and who directly report to the superintendent.”

The county or physical education web page was stated as being a notable way to be connected with parents, students, administrators, and the community. Archer commented on getting information out by the Web page where an “on-line curriculum is accessible to parents, teachers and students.” Travis indicated that he sends out a newsletter once a month to “talk to teachers reaffirming what they are doing. . .Are we clear and concise about what we’re trying to get across to our teachers and to [central level personnel].” Archer pointed out that he used the web page to remind teachers of the National Standards and to promote the
Web sites that I send electronically to all teachers. . .[and] in all communications I have with board members, as well as, the superintendent. Much of that is shared and not just with teachers, but with parents, and the principal. Communications is important.

Oliver advocates with the administration about the physical education programs indicating that the physical education departments are already using “goals and data driven instruction and evaluations.” Being an effective supervisor and advocate for physical education, Oliver pointed out to administrators:

“Don’t cut out [physical education]; don’t throw the baby out with the bath water. I know we’re trying to get reading, math and science scores up, but don’t look at here’s some more time [taking the physical education scheduled time while you say,] why are the kids still doing this play stuff when they should be doing math?” . . So my role is to have the administrators understand why physical education is still important to kids. That physical education is not something to throw out.

Responsibility Five: Salesperson

As a salesperson, the supervisors found ways to encourage teachers, parents, principals, administrators, superintendent, and people within the community to back the physical education program. The supervisors, in the role of advocate, used selling through words and/or actions, to seek support, “buy in” from all concerned parties. The term “buy in” was a term that all the supervisors used when they wanted the teachers, superintendent, principals, etc. to accept what they were doing and affirm the value of physical education.

The supervisors underscored the importance of “buy ins” and being an advocate for health and physical education throughout the interviews. Everett indicated that she
encourages her teachers to sell themselves and their program to their principals and “get a buy in with the schools. . .and parents.” Travis agreed that “everyone needs to buy in—community, principals, faculty, staff, and physical education teachers.” Archer argued that it is vital to “sell a type of buy in from the state level administration to central office administration.” As a salesperson, Carson considered himself “the greatest because I read, I listen, I seize every opportunity, every platform I get to talk about the importance of health and nutrition.” Martin pointed out that being an “advocate is a constant battle.” Oliver specified that there needed to be a buy in from the “business sector and most of all, you need it from the colleagues that you work with.”

The indicators from the dialogue with the participants pointed out that being a salesperson as an advocate for the physical education profession is noteworthy. As a salesperson looking for a “buy in” from various persons, such as the teachers, parents, administrators, and the community, the participants showed how they sell the program and got “buy ins” through speaking out, gaining support by raising awareness, being a role model, and fighting for the physical education profession.

In advocating and selling the importance of the physical education program the supervisors pointed out that they search for opportunities to speak out about the magnitude of what an effective physical education program could mean to a school, school district, and community. Advocating through selling the physical education program was natural for Oliver when she stated

“Buy in” is very important because one of the things that I noticed when I was a classroom teacher was that when it comes to physical education, art, music and those areas that are not a part of the core, we sometimes get tunnel vision that kids
need to read, write and do arithmetic. We don’t understand that as we create this universal citizen that they need to be able to do other things, and that they need to be in good health. Teachers don’t understand [that] when their kids are not well, they do not perform well, not just physically, but also on their tests. They don’t have the alertness, the vitality, all the things that we think kids ought to be able to do.

Travis indicated that the supervisor has to be a salesperson everyday no matter where he or she is or what he or she is doing:

When [the supervisor goes] out and talks to the teachers, you’re a salesperson because you’re reaffirming what they’re doing in giving them suggestions about directions that we’re moving in and ways to go in that direction. You’re a salesperson to your direct boss and to their bosses and all the way up to the superintendent [sharing] the strength of your program and if there are any weaknesses, what you’re doing to get help with those weaknesses. By supporting health and physical education, you are supporting the four core areas. We’re salespeople to the community—pushing the fact that health and physical education is a vital link and an important role in what we do every day. As we advocate as salespersons, you don’t have a choice [except] to be a salesperson.

As an advocate for the profession, the DPEIS indicated that they needed to gain support by bringing awareness of the significance of physical education to the forefront. Archer pointed out that he pushes awareness to administrators and Board members by “sending research findings that promote movement and cognition.” Everett continually pressed for awareness and searched for support for physical education in “attending
meetings with other coordinators, assistant superintendents, superintendents. . . . It gives me an opportunity to constantly push [for physical education].” In dealing with children’s obesity and Type II diabetes, Carson drew support and awareness by introducing the Body Mass Index and by sending a letter home stating that ‘Based on Body Mass Index, height, and weight, your child scored ____ percentile, which means he or she is at risk of possible Type II Diabetes as well as heart disease.’ . . . so based on that—[I take] every opportunity I can get to talk about the role of physical education.

As a salesperson wanting a “buy in” from the parents, Carson had to encourage parents to “make sure that our kids [are] physical at school and our local administrators need to be sure that the physical education teachers are doing their part to help our kids understand the importance of nutrition and the performance of the physical activity.”

Teachers were encouraged by the supervisors to be advocates for the physical education program. Carson persuaded his teachers to be advocates for physical education by telling his teachers to sell their program:

Be Creative. Sell your program. Do things, let the P.T.A., and let folks know. Have a voice in your school. . . . We are not at the point we should be because if we’re going to talk about educating the whole child—math, science, and health should be in the same sentence, but not only is it not in the same sentence, it’s not even on the same page. But I think it’s going to get there. If we continue to grow unhealthy children like we’re growing now, something is going to have to change.

Travis pointed out that “teachers are salespeople. They sell their kids on what they’re teaching them every single day.” He also indicated that he was a salesman to the
superintendent and district administrators, getting support for the physical education program and seeking support from the community—“pushing the fact that health and physical education is a vital link and important role in what we do every day.”

Everett promoted physical education to parents and the community as athletic director for the county because she “spends a lot of time in athletic events and that’s where you see more parents…other community people…I make a point to wear things that say physical education.” Oliver searched for support and “buy in” from parents and community:

> They have myths and beliefs about what physical activity is going to be. If they didn’t have a positive experience, they’re not going to promote it in their home nor will they promote it in the classroom. You know, it’s just p.e…The community is one that will screen what kids need to know when they graduate. These are the skills I need from them to be employed by my company, by my agency, by the armed service, and in college…if they’re screaming about we want reading, writing, and arithmetic and that’s all, then it makes it hard for students because they’re not well rounded. But if they understand all of that, the other pieces [value of physical education], then they will put pressure on school districts to say these are the things we need and how do we help you do that?

Carson pointed toward being a role model as being a natural selling feature for the physical education program. He indicated that both teachers and supervisors “should practice what they preach.” Carson expressed concern about the idea of being a role model by specifying:

> There are people, my counterparts, when I go to some of our meetings; I kind of question their sincerity. As a health and physical education coordinator, we need to
be a role model. There must be a love for children. . . . There must be a love for the profession itself in that you do want them to live. . . . practice what you preach, and I don’t see that all the time. Even our P.E. teachers and it really concerns me to see some of our teachers [and supervisors], the condition that they’re in. But yet they stand and tell the children that you need to do exercise, so that, that blows my mind.

Archer pointed out the importance of having a DPEIS at the district level and that being a salesperson was a battle depending on “if they have an advocate at the central office to promote programs and best practices.” Martin indicated that she fights for the physical education program and was an advocate all the time:

It’s like a constant, constant, Oh, I hate to say battle, but almost a battle sometimes that every time you go to any meeting that there is a discussion—disciplines, *No Child Left Behind*—make sure that health and physical education disciplines are mentioned. Any time we’ve talked about *No Child Left Behind*, test scores, then I always will chime in to where they are expecting my hand to come up and say, you know, here’s how we can support that.

Martin also pointed out that being a salesperson; she has to fight for funding for the program and for the number of teachers in the district. She specified during budgeting that you’re a proponent—money is tight, [you have] to fight for staff development dollars to advocate for physical education so that we can get those dollars, to advocate through the need to have a good program to have adequate number of people in that program. We’ve been fortunate in being able to actually add positions in times when folks have been cutting positions.
During meetings, Everett has had to be on guard to support physical education because the other members of the administrative team might say, “that’s physical education you can reschedule.” Everett also indicated that being a salesperson means being ready for a fight. Her fights, however, usually revolve around rescheduling issues and valuing physical education.

Everett indicated that “it’s up to the supervisors to say, ‘wait a minute we’re certified teachers here. We’re talking about people who provide this, this, and this’ and there’s not a connection [understanding] regardless of how bright a person is, if their body fails. . .nothing else matters. Carson has “had to go down to the state legislature and defend physical education. So in that area and in our principal’s meetings I have been invited to speak.”

Summary

As the DPEIS is accomplishing his or her role as an advocate, the fight for recognition and support was realized as he or she spoke out, sought support through awareness, and was a role model. While speaking out and being a salesperson, the supervisors indicated that they have had to publicize, argue, and defend physical education as a core subject to insure healthy well-rounded students who can do well in school and for a lifetime
CHAPTER 7

FINDINGS—SUPERVISOR AS ENGINEER

The role of engineer describes how physical education supervisors described part of their job. Comments on ways that they skillfully and shrewdly manage the physical education program and provide resources for the entire school district were indicators that they were like engineers of a construction project. As an engineer oversees the contractors building a home by supporting the contractors, providing supplies and materials, giving advice on better ways to perform their job and providing a blueprint of the project, the role of the DPEIS as an engineer can be discussed in this same fashion. The physical education supervisor supports his or her teachers with resources (both technology and general resources), by providing training in order to perform one’s job at a higher standard (staff development) and by providing a blueprint of the job to be performed (curriculum/instructional development). Data analysis revealed four responsibilities that make up the role of the “supervisor as engineer:” (a) technology resources, (b) general resources, (c) staff development, and (d) curriculum and instructional development.

Responsibility Six: Technology Resources

As an engineer provides up-to-date resources to support projects, the DPEIS indicated that a major resource they provide for the physical education teachers was technology resources. Technology resources will not be discussed here as e-mails because they were discussed in communication. Rather this category of technology resource referred to software, web pages, and the use of technology in the class. The use of
technology was indicated by all the supervisors as being an initiative that is supported by the entire school district and an area where a great deal of emphasis and money have been allocated. The indicators of technology resources discussed by the supervisors were: technology for lesson plans and grades (grade book), web sites, software, technology equipment, instructional resources, and staff development.

The supervisors asserted that technology was used in physical education for lesson plans, grades, and attendance to support a more efficient working environment. Everett pointed out that technology needs in physical education were different from those in the regular classroom teacher because the physical education teacher rarely sat at his or her desk where a computer was located. Therefore, the physical education teachers should have handheld computers so that they will not “continue to mark [absences] on paper, then at some point put those absences into the program.” Everett specified that the physical education teachers’ time can be better spent by using the handheld computer to do attendance, assessments, and lesson plans. Travis affirmed the efficiency in the use of technology and that he received all the teachers’ reports online because he does nothing by paper.

The DPEIS indicated that the school districts used web sites for curriculum, assessments, and assignments where students, teachers, and parents could stay abreast of district activities. Archer pointed out that on the website

We have video clips, rubrics for teachers to use in assessing students, and actually students assessing students. . .benchmarks at all grade levels. . .professional content area, web related resources that teacher can use for homework assignments. This has taken a priority in the school system in all content areas.
Travis specified that on his county web site the teachers had access to “our academic outcome data base which is basically a lesson plan, a QCC connected data base that let’s them know what our objectives and goals are for each grade level.”

Knowing software, both in general education and specifically in physical education was indicated to be the responsibility of the DPEIS. Archer pointed out that in his role as district physical education supervisor he must “know what software has been adopted with the core instructional materials. . . .Our last [book] adoption in physical education did include software for nutrition and fitness planning at the high school level.” Travis commented that he was

Working on a resource guide that will be on a CD that will go out to the schools so the physical education teachers can download it on their computer. . . .Then you’ve got everything you need to at least get a feel for where we are.

Archer declared that he provided “Fitness Gram that is in all of our schools, a health related fitness program and physical fitness tests which are the activities that teach students the concepts of health related fitness.” Archer explained that he supported instruction by “providing materials to teachers. . . .Providing instructional resources by providing model lessons and showing how to use heart rate monitors, fitness assessment software.”

Technological equipment, such as pedometers, heart rate monitors, or CD players, were components of the technology resources supported by all the supervisors as they assisted the use of the technology, provided the technological equipment, or encouraged innovative use of technological equipment. Archer supported the teachers’ need to “understand how to use pedometers, heart rate monitors, PDAs, assessment instruments” and provided the assistance. Everett pointed out that in high school she confirmed the
teachers’ use of heart rate monitors in their personal fitness units to instruct students on the fitness level and develop good habits to stay healthy with proper weight control. Martin informed her teachers that technology “is an instructional thing. . . .We look at fitness and fitness gram and fitness software, heart rate monitors. . . .High school personal fitness classes work outs are stored [on software].” Oliver pointed toward the use of technology in the high school personal fitness lab, and suggested that the use CD players could excite the fitness program as students listen to their music as they walk or jog in the physical education classes which would make it more relative and fun. Travis also supported the use of technology to provide equipment list and material lists as a resource for the physical education teachers.

Technology was used by all the supervisors as an instructional resource for the physical education program. Archer stressed that instructional resources such as “assessment instruments can be downloaded from the school system’s web page” and were used as a technology resource and that he was able to monitor the online Health and Physical Education programs’ courses. By using the technology resources, he was able to

Supervise teachers and students. . . .I can help students analyze their work outs. . .

. Go to the website that their heart rate monitor data is being stored and evaluate their progress. . . . If they are having problems with their monitor, I can also determine that via the Internet.

Training in the use of the computer, websites, software, and technological equipment was articulated by the district physical supervisors as a purpose for providing staff development within their school districts. Archer theorized that training in the use of pedometers, heart rate monitors, PDAs, assessment instruments, and other technology was
sometimes a “forced fit” because of the perceived importance of technology and the need to use technology. Teachers are forced to be trained in all aspects of technology. Archer pointed out that in instructing his teachers that technology

Is part of a process not an end in itself. If teachers have a hard time utilizing technology, they’re typically not given enough time to be trained in it. It takes time to look up websites, use various fitness software. . . .[And know which] software to buy.

Therefore, teachers need training provided by the supervisors and time to become efficient at using the available technology. Archer affirmed that “children are turned on to technology” and the physical education teacher needed to stay abreast of technology to support teaching students in health and fitness. Oliver pronounced that the physical education teachers sometimes get left out of technology training because the county specified that the training was for classroom teachers, forgetting about the way the physical education teachers could use the technology. She pointed out it was her job to find ways the physical education teachers could use the technology—like wireless computers—standing in the middle of the gym or outside in the field:

So we need to make sure that they’re included in the loop when it comes to that kind of technology. . . .The capacity to go on the web and get activities for classes, to get lesson plans, to be linked into the state’s bank of lesson plans, the AAHPERD/GAHPERD banks of how to do this. . . how to get any kind of resource that they need for lesson plans.

Oliver, going beyond the classroom, supported the notion that teachers needed to learn how to “create a web page that parents can go to. . .to [see what] [students] are doing
and what they can do on the weekend.” Therefore, she would investigate ways to provide this kind of training for her teachers.

Responsibility Seven: General Resources

The supervisors as engineers asserted that their role required them to accommodate the teachers with the supplies, materials, and resources that were needed to teach in a physical education program just as an engineer provides supplies for a construction job. General resources referred to anything a physical education teacher might need to perform his or her role as teacher of physical education. The supplies and materials ranged from books, equipment, supplies, materials, curriculum guides, self-made materials to computer generate CDs, software, and research articles. Additionally, ordering equipment and acquiring the best bid for equipment was recognized as significant by all the supervisors. Equipment orders were handled through some of the supervisors’ central offices while some were handled within the school itself.

Martin stipulated that she “spends a ton of time in supporting teachers...getting them the curriculum materials that they need and instructional materials that they need.” Archer indicated that he puts “the best materials in front of kids that actually change attitudes and lifestyles like instructional supplies, materials, heart rate monitors for the teachers’ and students’ use.” Carson specified that he went beyond just supplying resources, to also searching for resources as he gathered data from other states to

Keep them [the physical education teachers] informed about current trends. For instance, we heard, we read somewhere that the state of California had taken team sports out of their curriculum, because only your seriously athletic kids would participate in basketball and soccer.
Carson used this information in discussions with his physical education teachers for curriculum development for his school district. Reading literature and research articles helped Carson and the other supervisors keep abreast of latest trends and resources that the physical education teachers would need.

Archer pointed out that he was responsible for “passing on current websites for instructional resources, purchasing current magazines in Health and Physical Education for teachers, providing in-service training in skill theme movement.” Martin voiced that if she or one of her teachers read a good book relating to physical education and instruction, she would do whatever she could to get that book for them. Everett communicated that the teachers were required to take In-tech (an intense study of the computer and technology); therefore, the supervisor was responsible for giving teachers an opportunity to develop their technological skills. The supervisors provided technological training as well as providing technology supplies and software.

Other forms of general resources provided by the district physical education supervisors were authorizing equipment, inspecting and replacing old equipment, providing resources to promote lifelong learning, and providing speakers from the community. Archer dealt with “authorizing equipment and approving additions to playgrounds” as the Eagle Scouts wanted to do a project of modifications to swing sets. Approval for new pieces of equipment for play grounds had to go the central office. Archer also provided inspection of “weight rooms for safety” to assure proper safe equipment for the students. Archer announced that his primary role was to be a “resource to the schools and provide current curriculum, instructional strategies, and techniques to the teachers to provide physical health and physical education to students so they can adapt lifelong healthy
practices.” Being one of two supervisors who expressed that they actually taught the students, Archer stated that he demonstrated the use of equipment while supporting lifelong learning for the students as he promoted the heart rate monitors while changing intensity throughout the workout. The students and teachers, through this training, learned how to change intensity and use the heart rate monitors to improve their health. The supervisors also supported the notion that speakers from the community (American Heart Association, American Cancer, or Red Cross), such as aerobic instructors, or CPR instructors were resources and were either brought in for staff development at a particular school, for district staff development, or to work directly with the students.

Responsibility Eight: Staff Development

Just as an engineer provides training in new equipment and procedures to construct a building, the DPEIS provides staff development to train or educate teachers in best practices, new trends, current materials, and to give teachers the tools necessary to grow and develop teaching strategies and techniques to benefit the children within the school districts. The DPEIS expressed that a major role was to develop and to provide staff development that was relevant and appropriate for the physical education teachers and that should increase student learning. The supervisors provided staff development for their own school district or with a couple of school district to share in the cost of bringing in a guest speaker. Peer teaching or modeling by the supervisor, conference attendance, and guest speakers or expert instructors were specified by the supervisors as indicators of ways staff development was provided.

Once the needs of the teachers, students and principals were gathered by the DPEIS, the method and design of staff development could be established. Archer commented that
the principals and teachers pointed out through staff development surveys that certain staff
development was necessary “to implement the school improvement plan.” Since Archer’s
main emphasis as a district physical education supervisor was support of teachers and staff
development, he “thinks that’s where the rubber meets the road—when he can provide
training for teachers…and support school district goals, and concentrate on areas where
students were most at risk—obesity and fitness, risk taking behaviors, nutrition, and
abstinence.” Travis indicated that the staff development in his school districted included
“shared ideas, QCC or academic outcome ideas, meeting objectives, and visiting other
teachers for strategies and techniques for best practices.” Carson pointed towards assisting
beginning teachers in meeting requirements like passing the Praxis test for certification and
for being a highly qualified teacher.

The most frequently discussed staff development was physical education teachers
sharing trends and best practices with their peers. Archer explained how teachers acquired
relevant knowledge through teaching each other and how the peer teacher shared the ways
they were using writing in physical education, different strategies, graphic organizers, and
vocabulary word walls. Oliver encouraged the teachers who attended conferences and
workshops to share new practices with the other teachers in the district.

Overcoming the roadblock of lack of funds, the DPEIS have used their own
teachers as resources for staff development as stated by Martin “to use her own teachers
[for staff development] since it was cost efficient.” Expenses were indicated as the major
reason for the district’s physical education teachers to present staff development and model
best practices. All the supervisors supported modeling as a means of providing staff
development and training. Carson supported Oliver’s view when she specified that she
could “only hope that what the teachers received from staff development was taken back to
the classroom and students,” and Martin felt confident that the teachers received from staff
development “specific information that they take directly back to the classrooms.” Archer
indicated that the supervisors “must plan training to utilize materials, equipment, software,
and the use of National Standards” which is relevant to the physical education program.

Martin pointed out that sending a few teachers to a conference and allowing those
teachers to present current information and best practices was cost efficient, because the
staff development dollars from the state department “have almost become nonexistent and
with the new state formula, the staff development dollars are going to be even tougher to
get. . . .I [have relied] on conferences and summer institutes for staff development.”
Through these conferences, the teachers have had the chance to be trained by experts in the
field of physical education. Archer mentioned that he encourages his physical education
teachers to network at these conferences to build resources for further contact and sharing.

Going beyond whether a teacher learned from his or her peer teachers, modeled
lessons, conference attendance or expert speakers, Oliver asserted that “what really needs
to happen in staff development is some type of monitoring of the work. . . .This is what I
was taught, when I go back and try to do it, is it right?” Therefore, Oliver, wanting the staff
development to do what it actually was supposed to do, stated that

People who understand the work need to mentor a buddy…that’s the whole staff
development. . . .You give them a bunch of stuff but you never go out to see if it works…So when you go out, do you see changed behavior as a result of a fifty
hour class? . . .How has it changed their behavior and the work that they do?
Oliver pointed toward monitoring as an essential part of the staff development process---giving teachers new information and then monitoring their behavior to see if they learned from the experience and changed their methods of teaching. However, she explained that her office was not capable of monitoring all the physical education teachers in the district and indicated that

I train other monitors like the principal what to look for…the [principals should know] what to look for when they go into a class…what are you suppose to see…they will become an expert at [observing and evaluating] before even the teachers do because they see it year after year after year in that administrative slot. The teacher may come and go, but the [principal or instructional specialist] knows what they’re supposed to see when they go into that classroom. . . .So the monitoring piece of staff development is important but I think the mentoring to make sure that they understand the work and the monitoring and the supervision of the work is important.

Responsibility Nine: Curriculum and Instructional Development

The district physical education supervisor as engineer, like the job construction engineer, is looking for ways to improve the physical education program by using the curriculum (blueprint), but seeks ways to improve instructional development so as to make the physical education program more viable (looking for new and innovative ways to do the job and ways to restructure the blueprint so that the job is performed more effectively and efficiently). The supervisors affirmed that with the assistance of the physical education teachers they develop the curriculum and instruction for the physical education program within the school district. Carson commented that he would bring together about 45 people
every five years to work on the curriculum after looking at curriculum from across the
United States where “we find the one that best fits and then we tweak it a little to fit our
county. . . .We select a curriculum that will benefit everyone.” Martin pointed out that the
curriculum for her county was made from “data driven decisions” and support from the
teachers—“the teachers are involved in the actual writing.”

All the supervisors supported the teachers’ involvement in the whole process of
developing the curriculum and determining the best practices in instruction. The thinking
behind this is that once the curriculum was written, the teachers were trained and became
trainers themselves. Oliver appointed teachers to be trainers that she did not know very
well because

One of the things I’ve found out…if we use the same [teachers] all the time, they
[the other teachers] don’t buy in because they feel like you don’t think that they
have anything to offer. Teachers are selected and a lot of times it’s not always a
P.E. specialist [it could be a classroom teacher]. As they sit on the committee, it
changes their thinking of what they thought [physical education] was…and it makes
the teacher look at their physical education teacher in a different way.

Archer included teachers in identifying curriculum needs and in writing the curriculum
itself. Travis specified that “it’s real important to have something [a curriculum] that is
short and concise, that says in first grade here are my materials, here are some
supplementary materials and here are some videos, and other things that I can use as well.”
Travis also pointed out that the curriculum should correlate with the county indicators and
with the state QCCs being “periodically reviewed to talk over new materials.” Everett
indicated that her teachers are actively involved in writing the curriculum.
Technology played a vital role in curriculum and instructional development as the supervisors affirmed ways in which technology was used. Archer pointed out that in his district he used the “paperless curriculum guide” which is “based on the NASPE standards that is online and is accessible to parents, teachers, students. . . .It’s integrating curriculum, assessment and student management.” Archer voiced that the district used a software program systemwide and that there was a web master that inputs the information provided by all the coordinators/supervisors, not just the physical education supervisor. Archer specified that, “We have scope and sequence, pacing guides, curriculum maps where the teachers can click on a curriculum map for any content area and it takes them to the objectives and resources that are applicable to that standard of curriculum.” Archer also pointed toward the use of “graphic organizers as another strategy that we are trying to promote systemwide in all areas.” Martin, using technology, articulated that her curriculum is web based. . . .You can go to our web site and pull up the curriculum and then you can actually pull up plans. So for example, if you pulled the integrated activity for P.E. Central then you can click on it and it will take you right to that activity. Now we were able to incorporate not just one of the things relative to the curriculum, but also any kind of resource that was with it. We also do assessments that way and both of them were available on CD. We have seventeen skill areas. There’s an assessment for every skill area for every grade level.

Once the curriculum is developed the teachers were responsible for the instruction of the best practice. Archer indicated that strategies and techniques of instruction depended on the level: “Elementary level—how actively engaged are the students… [the level] of
interactions students have in the learning process.” Archer specified that instructional strategies should incorporate “modeling critical elements and reciprocal teaching styles…expand current knowledge and are research based.” If instruction is to be data driven, then “data collection should inform instructional process.” Technology as an instructional tool has been established and discussed. Archer pointed out that “students need benchmarks to know where they are, what their goal is, and know where they are trying to go.” Therefore, “assessment should be integrated with instruction. . . . giving formative assessments and giving kids feedback on how they are doing.” Archer indicated that once the curriculum was established, the supervisors should “communicate the curriculum and best practices with the principals” giving them the tools necessary to observe and evaluate the physical education teacher.

Summary

The frequency of mentioning “support to teachers” disclosed that the supervisors believed in the importance of being an engineer. As an engineer oversees a construction project to make sure the job is done well and that the contractors have all the supplies and materials to complete the project, the supervisors as engineer have similar responsibilities to support the teachers for quality instruction with materials and supplies to get the job done. The DPEIS gave emphasis to providing the support through technological resources, general resources, staff development resources, curriculum resources, and instructional resources to skillfully and shrewdly oversee the development and education of the students to higher performance and activity.
CHAPTER 8

FINDINGS—SUPERVISOR AS PIONEER

The DPEIS was responsible for opening the way for others, such as a pioneer would do, by searching out a variety of ways to fund physical education, empowering teachers to become leaders, collecting and analyzing data, and identifying trends in education. As a pioneer, the DPEIS used the attributes of being a visionary, courageous, generous, hardworking leader to be a possibility thinker, a risk taker, a helper, and a worker with great effort and conviction. Just as the pioneer is the first to settle a territory, the DPEIS were charged with developing sensible, innovative ideas and converting them into action as he or she settled the virtual territory of physical education and devised ways to fund physical education, empower teachers to become leaders, collect data and analyze it, and identify trends in the profession. With the pioneer spirit, he DPEIS searched outward for inspiration, learned from the past, and improved on the present to shape the future. The supervisor as pioneer will take the profession of physical education into the twenty-first century venturing into the unknown and opening up new areas of thought, research and development.

Responsibility Ten: Funding Acquisition

The DPEIS’ role as pioneer with the responsibility of acquiring funds was indicated by all the participants’ statements as to how they pursued financial support and the amount of attention given to this detail. The supervisors indicated per pupil allotment and state or local funds were traditional means of acquiring funds, but had now broadened the
pioneering role to encompass grants and other innovative resources. The main issue presented by the participants was the lack of funds for physical education with physical education positions being cut and physical education programs eliminated.

The per pupil allotment from the state of Georgia’s Quality Basic Education source provided for inequality in funding and one specials teacher (art, music, physical education, and/ or foreign language teachers) per 345 students. The mandate for students in K-5 from House Bill 1187: the A Plus Education Reform Act of 2000 and State Code 160-4-2.12 stated that elementary students shall be provided a minimum of 90 contact hours in health and physical education and that one unit of health and physical education was a graduation requirement in high schools. Archer indicated that the State of Georgia does not fund physical education even though mandated by the state:

There is no funding that is directly tied to [the mandate to have 60 contact hours in physical education]. So if your school has 1200 kids and there are two physical education teachers, you will see them once every blue moon or you will see them more frequently but you will see four classes at once. . . .[There] just wasn’t enough funding.

Everett specified that there needed to be a “buy in at the state level because that’s where the funding is. That’s the source. They are the ones that determine how much funding is provided particularly for elementary and middle school physical education.”

With “funding short falls,” Archer indicated that for staff development, if he did not have enough money to bring in a presenter for staff development, he would look at internal resources like “excellent teachers who are doing a good job and utilize them [to present staff development].” Archer pointed out that
In the past two to three years the budget has really taken a hit. Everyone is asked to
decrease budgets and at the same time you still have an increase in obesity, in risk
taking behaviors, STDs, pregnancy rates, etc. at the middle and high school levels.
You have fewer funds to address the issue.

The DPEIS pointed out that they have to fight for funding and make budget
requests internally seeking support for the physical education program. They also had to
look externally for funding in the forms of grants from the government, from agencies like
the Center for Disease Control, and to businesses that support education. Looking for
resources to support staff develop and equipment acquisition, the supervisors searched for
funding through internal sources, business donations, and grants. “As we move, innovate
and update our programs,” Oliver pointed towards “finding various ways to get some of the
new things we want to do. There are big equipment items that we want or big programs we
want. We have to create partnerships with businesses so that could be in a form of a grant
or different foundations.” The pioneer spirit of searching the unknown gave the supervisors
the drive to fight for funding through various avenues. Even though business organizations
are receptive to Oliver’s ideas based on data and the needs of the students, they wanted to
know what is in it for them when they “give you $400,000 to build a fitness center.” In
Everett’s school district, an elementary school found a sponsor to help pay for playground
equipment. These business organizations used this donation as a marketing tool and a tax
write off to improve the community but at the same time insure name recognition and
advertisement.

Another resource for raising revenue supported by the participants was to apply for
grants. Even though for most of the supervisors, this was a new aspect like a pioneer faces,
they investigated grants that would match the viewpoint of the physical education program within the district. Martin pointed out that

There are grant dollars available and I think it’s important to take advantage of them when they really match up to what your philosophy or your goals. I don’t think you should go after grant dollars just for the sake of going after grant dollars. But I think when grant dollars are available and you’re doing something that lends itself to [your goals], then use those grant dollars. It is a perfect marriage. We have two [grants] right now in the health education areas where there was a match where both were already existing in our curriculum. We were able to secure funds and save the school system a half a million dollars. That’s pretty significant. I think it’s your responsibility to the tax payer and to the teachers to get them better training and to add some new things [to the physical education program].

Archer indicated that “part of our role is to look for grants outside of the school system to help again in funneling [resources] back to the kids, so that they can have everything that they need and so the teachers have those materials to reach those kids.” Everett pointed out that “there are grants available for children being healthy, doing things as a community in the school system to make kids healthy. And yet with that being the case, we don’t make the one small commitment [to write the grants].” Everett was the only participant who indicated she did not write grants which in her case could be because of time constraints due to the combination of athletic director and physical education supervisor in her job description. Archer pointed towards PEP Grants and National Health Grants for instructional supplies and materials like heart rate monitors. In securing grants, Carson encouraged his teachers to participate in writing grants:
When we wrote the health grant, we wanted 20 teachers to participate. We got 12. Perhaps had we had twenty, we might have been successful, who knows? But we have to persuade teachers and convince teachers that since we don’t have money, grant writing is [the way to go]. Sure it takes a little time.

Travis indicated that grant writing was part of his role and that he needed to enhance his ability to find and apply for appropriate grants:

That’s something that I haven’t had a whole lot of exposure to, but I am starting in the next couple of months. . . .I’m going to be getting a lot of help from a lot of different folks about how to write grants. If the county gives me a certain amount of money and I can supplement that with monies from other grants and things, that helps the county at the same time by [helping the physical education program]. Then they will know that the needs are being met, but not being met through the county funds. And that wins legitimacy to my program as well because a superintendent will see that we do need these funds, but I’m willing to go out and do whatever I can to bring other additional ways to get funding without having to draw on the system the whole time.

As indicated, grant writing and searching for funding resources were new experiences for some of the participants, but as pioneers they researched ways to acquire funds, sought help from other supervisors, the grant writing departments within the school district, and agencies to pave a pathway using data driven research to direct teachers and themselves to higher levels of commitment in funding the physical education program.
Responsibility Eleven: Data Collection

Data collection has become a vital task in the DPEIS’ role as pioneer in supporting the physical education program now and in the future. Data collection has become a new trend in physical education and in education as a whole. Data drives instruction, proves what we are doing, and tells us what we need to do in the future. Data collection has assisted the supervisors in grant writing by validating the need addressed in the proposal. Travis indicated that data and formal reporting of data needed to be useful, showing statistically significant information that has norms and that could be compared to other schools. Travis pointed out that data actually tells the story of the school district if the data is valid and relevant.

Sharing the collected data with the superintendent and administration, Everett specified that the information gives more accountability to the physical education teachers and the program in general because they

Will think higher, better of the [physical education teachers and the supervisor] if we have some accountability. If we say, “We’ve taken Suzy from point A to point B, and this was our goal to get them there, our objective was this, but this is our goal.” We want to put some things in place as a county so there will be a lot of data collecting. We don’t do any elementary physical education fitness testing—that’s probably a real weakness.

In supporting accountability Travis indicated that “through showing that we’re trying to continue to move ahead, we’re collecting data, we’re looking at where our strengths and weaknesses are and how we can get better and how we can help support the four core areas, and some other things that we can do to help show our worth in the community.”
Travis detailed how he needed to convince the teachers

To be on the same page and that we’re all thinking about what is best for the kids and how can we collect data and do things that will show us where our kids are so that we can make modifications and adjustments to move towards where the kids can improve. And by that improvement we put them into situations where they become active for a lifetime.

Carson indicated he used collected data to “see exactly what is being taught” through lesson plan review and observing in the physical education class. He was disturbed to find while visiting the schools that basketball was being taught and later when he returned several weeks later they were still playing basketball, because “most of the time the only kids playing basketball will be those junior varsity and varsity players. The rest of the boys who are in the band or who are in chorus will be sitting down someplace. These are the kids who need it the most.” Carson used the data “to make sure that everybody’s participating and the coaches don’t forget that this is a class and that you’re not here to coach basketball during the physical education class.”

Archer specified that collecting data helps “to determine if instruction is effective and that data collection should inform the instructional process....The data can be a baseline as a foundation in trying to move [forward] and change.” Archer also pointed out that Teachers find it distasteful to spend an awful lot of time on assessment, but it should be integrated with instruction…giving kids feedback on how they’re doing….It allows them [the kids] to make changes in their practice sessions and what they do outside the school to be more fit in health for a lifetime.
Oliver revealed that her department has not done a good job in data collecting, but she believed it to be a responsibility that a pioneer should attempt to develop innovative ways to use collected data and use the familiar resource of the Presidential Physical Fitness Test data “to assist the kids to understand about fitness, to help them change, to increase their activity,….and their behaviors.” Travis indicated that he too has collected some data in the past, but not to the extent that I’m trying to do this year….so we’re taking baby steps with it and collecting as much data as we can, but trying to collect data so that we don’t overwhelm the teachers. So things that I’m putting together, spread sheets and things like that I’m putting together are being put together to put the teacher as little effort to collect the data as possible.

The supervisors indicated a variety of data that was collected to support the physical education program. The most common data was fitness testing using the Presidential Physical Fitness Test, Physical Best, and other fitness testing as well as fitness components, e.g. BMI (Body Mass Index), percent body fat, weight, height, risk taking survey, etc. Supporting the variety of data collected, Oliver pointed out that she used the data to get to the core of [the students’] belief system and to motivate the students. We’ll have to be data driven—surveying kids to understand what they feel about fitness, “fitness isn’t for me,” “I don’t do it because it’s for the jock people”. . . .We need to get to the core of what they believe about physical fitness and then we’ll know what kind of programs we need to offer them.

With data collection, a baseline for grant writing was identified as well as a way to inform the teachers, principals, board of education, and the superintendent of ways to analyze curriculum and instruction. As a pioneer learned from the past and improved on the
present, Travis indicated that he collaborated with teachers using a survey to discover their needs for staff development. Collected data created an opportunity for action as the supervisors responded to what the data indicated. Data collection informed the supervisors as to whether or not the teacher and supervisor reached their goals. Having data gave the DPEIS something concrete to talk about to teachers, parents, administration, boards of education, and superintendents when discussing the instruction in physical education.

Responsibility Twelve: Empowering Teachers

The DPEIS supported their role as pioneer when they empowered teachers to achieve their highest level and as the supervisors made the teachers feel important, pushed them to grow, and encouraged them to take risks. Since the concept of emergent leaders is relatively new, the pioneer spirit of developing innovative ideas and converting them into action was supported by the district physical education supervisors. When the supervisors empowered the teachers, the supervisor paved the way as a pioneer by motivating teachers, enabling them, and permitting them to become leaders within the profession. There were four behaviors that emerged from the data as ways the supervisors empowered their teachers: (a) supporting and backing the teachers, (b) asking for input from the teachers, (c) permitting teachers to attend conferences and workshops, and (d) encouraging teachers to present best practices.

Supporting the physical education teachers and giving them opportunities to develop their leadership skills were some of the components of empowering teachers. Everett pointed out that if a parent complained to her about a physical education teacher, she would back the teacher and try to put everything in perspective. Carson pointed out that the site based administrator, the principal, was in charge of the physical education teachers,
but he empowered the physical education teachers through encouragement and staying positive. Carson emphasized that his part of empowering physical education teachers was by being a positive role model for the teachers to emulate.

Listening to teachers and using their recommendations empowered the teachers as it granted them a voice in what they were doing. Travis pointed out that he wanted the “teachers to feel some ownership in what we’re doing.” By listening to his teachers, Archer empowered them by

Hearing their recommendations and having those teachers give guidance to what it is that they are doing. I guess I provide them with opportunities to inform the process, inform their teaching practices, and inform the development of assessment instruments before we would start an initiative. We collect everyone’s ideas, get together, discuss the initiative, and pull in their ideas along with the national standards. I had better act on those recommendations because if I say “thank you very much” and do something totally different, those teachers are not empowered.

Furthermore, Archer also gave his teachers an opportunity to revamp the grading process and report cards. Carson enabled the teachers in his district “to work on the curriculum and on grant writing” to acquire necessary emergent leadership skills. Martin gathered a physical education teacher from each school to revise the curriculum, to work on textbook adoption, and to look at equipment specifications to decide what was going to be ordered for their schools. Martin indicated that the he and the teachers

Sat down as a collective group, went through all of it and really got their feedback. There are a couple of things where I maybe wasn’t a hundred percent in agreement, but as a collective group they were. I’ll make those changes accordingly.
Martin not only initiated collective group projects but encouraged individual teachers to bring their ideas and challenges:

An elementary school teacher saw something really good on a walking pedometer challenge and said, “Can we do this as a system?” I’m all for us doing this as a system, but I’m going to empower them by sending them out to see if some people want to do it. Then I’ll do everything I can to help resource-wise, administrative-wise here, and get the permissions and those kinds of things, but let them really do the work.

Travis indicated that he thinks that those “that have been leaders throughout the county in the past would step up to the forefront,” and he has empowered these teachers by setting up instructional lead teachers in health and physical education. Travis pointed out that he let the teachers

Make decisions about a lot of things—at least have a major input. Staff development is decided primarily by them [the teachers]. Usually, what will happen is I will come up with a couple of ideas and I will throw it out to the teachers and when we have a department chair meeting or instructional lead teacher meeting we make decisions.

Leadership does not necessarily mean just stepping forward to lead a group of people, but can also mean being a leader in the profession as a highly effective physical education teacher in the classroom setting an example for other physical education teachers. Martin pointed toward empowering all the physical education teachers to develop their leadership skills as they are “interested in the profession and interested in drawing on what’s best for the kids. . . .Even people who don’t want to be leaders per se system wide
will want to be leaders in the classroom. I think it really pushes them to learn more and know more.”

Other ways in which the supervisors empowered the physical education teachers to become leaders were: funding the physical education teachers to attend conferences and workshops, encouraging the physical education teachers to present best practices at these conferences, and persuading the physical education teachers to share with his/her peers at in-services or workshops. All the supervisors emphasized that for staff development, which was mentioned earlier, that they wanted their teachers to attend local, state, regional, and national conferences and/or workshops to learn the latest trends and best practices so that they can return to the district and share with their peers. The supervisors indicated this empowered the teachers as they attained confidence in presenting in front of their peers.

Archer motivated teachers toward leadership by “providing release time to attend local and state trainings and encouraged them to do a presentation and promoted them as they shared their excellent practices with [the other physical education teachers].”

As she told the story of how she was encouraged to be a leader, Oliver shared how she was empowered by her previous district physical education supervisors and how that influences her now. During her first years of teaching her supervisors

Made me feel real important. They gave me access to different avenues to be able to go to conferences. I used to present at GAHPERD and I’ve presented at AAHPERD before. . . .I was like 21 or 22 years old, down there doing my thing, thinking I was just great, great, great. . . .My supervisors never said, “Well, you haven’t taught long enough to do these kind of things [presentations].” They would just push me on… and made us feel like we could do anything.
Oliver was such a “go getter” as a physical education teacher that she has found it difficult to understand the present physical education teachers not taking more initiative to develop their own leadership skills. Oliver shared how the present physical education teachers would say, “We should do this and we should do that.” Oliver would reply, “Okay, what do you think should be our first steps?” Instead of making some suggestions, they would look at Oliver and say, “You’re the director; tell us what to do.” Oliver would then explain that they were the teachers having firsthand experience in the classroom, that they have been trained and held degrees in health and physical education and that they should have the knowledge, skills, and courage to make a decision. Oliver and the other DPEIS indicated that they were pushing their teachers to become emergent leaders within their system and within the profession.

Responsibility Thirteen: Identifying Trends

Being that a trend is a general inclination or tendency, the DPEIS indicated that their responsibility to identify trends whether from research articles, from professionals, or from the general public was crucial to keeping themselves and the teachers abreast of current practices as a pioneer would keep his/her followers abreast of information while paving the way for an innovative idea. The trends that were discussed ranged from the practice of writing grants and using data to drive this endeavor, as well as instruction, to the “New P.E” , to childhood obesity, to the physical education program’s role in No Child Left Behind.

The DPEIS indicated that they had a responsibility to find funds for physical education and staff development in physical education; this is a new trend in the physical education profession. Grant writing was disclosed by all the supervisors as being a current
trend. The revenues for physical education are being cut and physical education teaching positions are being cut, necessitating the district physical education supervisors’ search for alternative funding. Grant writing and data collecting were mentioned earlier as a responsibility of the supervisor, but in this section were pursued as a new trend and responsibility for the DPEIS. The teachers were helping the supervisors collect more data than they ever had before to assist in grant writing and to drive instruction. Travis indicated that the teachers

Collect data that’s easy for them to collect and we can get countywide that would affect 100,000 students. . . . We are able to get some real trends for where we are and then how can I use that data to better influence how we impact the kids and how I support what they’re doing. I’ve got to [as district physical education supervisor] be able to take what they wanted to do, collect the information, and be able to use it again to help them do what they wanted to do.

Martin pointed towards conference attendance, research articles, and web sites as good resources for finding current data, trends, and national standards in the physical education profession. All the supervisors indicated that they attended as many conferences and workshops, such as GAHPERD conference and Share The Wealth Conference, and as they could to discern the best practices and trends in order to bring information back to their districts and share with the physical education teachers, administrators, and superintendent.

Martin pointed out that getting information to the physical education teachers on conferences, getting them to attend conferences, and providing web sites, and recommending articles kept the teachers abreast of current best practices. Travis brought back up to date information from the GAHPERD conference and a conference on HIV and
Archer specified that keeping physical education teachers abreast of new trends goes into advocacy and leadership whether it is passing on current websites for instructional resources, purchasing current magazines in health and physical education for teachers, [or] providing in-service trainings in skill theme and movement; for example, having speakers come in to talk.

The “New P.E.” was first discussed with Carson and from his description, all the supervisors specified that they supported healthy lifestyle and lifelong learning with getting kids up and moving as being the New P.E. Archer indicated that the New P.E. has “been around for about 15 years.” Martin pointed out that

In education, everything usually comes around and around. In the past, when you talked [about the New P.E.] it might have been tennis and golf, then we moved on to outdoor education with camping and hiking….I think now we’re into the hiking and the camping and the tennis and golf and we’ve added fitness and self fitness evaluation and personal evaluation and personal fitness and rock climbing –I think the New P.E., so to speak, means lifelong learning.

Martin indicated that the physical education people had seen this all along and that the New P.E. was a way “to get folks on board that [used to] roll out the ball and [that leaned more towards] team sport orientation into [lifelong activities].” The New P.E. for Travis pointed toward

Coaches are no longer throwing out the ball and sitting down and reading a newspaper….Some parents may feel like that’s what they do. You don’t see that
very often anymore at all. Our teachers are very conscientious and have lots of kids, and they love doing what they’re doing.

Archer explained that the New P.E. embraced:

Not just rolling out the ball, but active engagement. Kids [are] using higher level thinking to analyze movement patterns. It is a skill theme approach, whether you’re at the elementary, middle, or high school; it’s not just a sport focus or an activity focused phenomenon, but it is a P.E. that has kids wanting to do things when they leave the gymnasium and wanting to be physically active for life.

Carson shared that he believed that “there was a resurgence of the thought that health and physical education was important and would play a vital role.” The DPEIS quoted research about childhood obesity as being an indicator that the physical education program needed to address the trend in supporting the health needs of children. Carson indicated that he and several of his teachers wrote a grant sponsored by the CDC using the research on childhood obesity and Type II Diabetes targeting the African/American population in his district. Their district was awarded a $1,000,000 grant to work with 62 schools creating activities for afterschool to help reduce the children’s weight and educate them about healthier lifestyles. Carson pointed out that the “federal government is going to spend 41 million dollars to keep you from getting fat. . . . There has to be a problem. The bottom line is either we prevent it with 41 million, or we spend 41 billion trying to keep these people alive. That’s the message.”

Even though Everett indicated that identifying trends was not as great a focus as other aspects of the job, she did emphasize that “the most brilliant mind is wasted if the body falls apart.” Everett pointed out that with No Child Left Behind
We have to constantly adjust elementary physical education, constantly adjust our teaching schedule and what we’re doing to accommodate testing. And testing is happening every other day. I’m certainly exaggerating that, but it is such a focus…I think right now that, not that the teachers aren’t open to new ideas, but there’s been so much change in their life, and their job that they don’t want any more right now.

With the emphasis placed on testing and children learning material for the test, Travis indicated that in his role he supported health and physical education as it supports the four core subject areas

Math, science, social studies, and language arts…there’s always been a big push over the last couple of years, especially over the last three to four years in: bringing test scores up. I mean everybody is concerned about test scores….

We’ve got some kinesthetic awareness going on with [integrating and teaching core areas in physical education]. So I think putting those motions to it as well really helps to reinforce what they do in the classroom.

The physical education program supported learning both in the classroom and the gym because movement is the key to learning.

Summary

The DPEIS identified the responsibilities of searching for funding for physical education, collecting data, empowering teachers to be emergent leaders, and discovering new trends and best practices as ways to set a course for the teachers within their districts as a pioneer paves the way for his or her followers. The participants searched for ways to engage the physical education teachers in grasping the new directions in which the physical education program and the profession were headed. The pioneering spirit was seen in the
district physical education supervisor as funding, data collecting, the “New P.E.,”

childhood obesity and the role *No Child Left Behind* were identified as concerns that each

supervisor had to research for validity and to decide if this was the direction his or her
district wanted to pursue. As a pioneer, the DPEIS had to find ways to present the vision
for the district; be courageous in taking risks; generous in the support of teachers; and a

hard worker as the data was presented, new and innovative ways to fund the physical

education program were investigated, the “New P.E.” was integrated into the physical

education program, and childhood obesity was addressed.
CHAPTER 9
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of practicing district physical education supervisors/coordinators regarding their job role and responsibilities. This chapter begins with a summary of the study, followed by a discussion of the findings and their relation to the literature.

Summary of the Study

In the first in-depth interview, the participants were asked to “Please describe the role of the district physical education supervisor/coordinator.” The follow up questions (Appendix D) were then taken from the emergent data. The grounded theory research design guided the entire research process from the in-depth interviews, to the data collection, to the analysis, to the final writing as the researcher constantly compared and contrasted the data to the point of theoretical saturation. Two interviews with each of the six participants were conducted during the summer and fall of 2004. Collected documents were used for context and to support the findings such as those from the Q-sort interview. Categories emerged as the researcher simultaneously collected and analyzed the data. Theoretical concepts emerged from the data as the categories and themes became evident. During the study, while collecting, coding, and analyzing the data, the similarities and differences were investigated using the constant comparative analysis of the categories and themes. The relevance of each category and the connections between each category helped to establish new theory.
In chapters four through eight, the research findings of four main themes (roles) and 13 categories (responsibilities) were presented from the data and details were given to describe the perceptions of the district physical education supervisors’ role. The four main themes or roles were: (a) supervisor as relationship developer, (b) supervisor as advocate, (c) supervisor as engineer, and (d) supervisor as pioneer (Figure 1).

Discussion of the Findings

The major findings in chapters four through eight are discussed in this section as they related to the existing literature on supervision and leadership at the district level. The findings also supported the symbolic interaction principles of reflection, interaction, and meaningful action as compared and contrasted through constant comparison analysis. This section makes connections among the four categories (relationship developer, advocate, engineer, and pioneer) connects them to the literature, and finishes with presenting the theoretical concepts supported by the data.

The results of the interviews were compared within and then across categories and themes to discover connections so that a hypothesis could be generated. This hypothesis is that by examining the words, phrases, and descriptions used by the district physical education supervisor, one can determine the perceptions of these supervisors’ roles and responsibilities. In developing a hypothesis, the researcher used the dimensions of supervisory practice, seeking support from the literature to ground the findings. Pajak’s (1989b) *Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice* (Appendix A) and Mohnsen’s (1999a) *Dimensions of Supervisory Practice in Physical Education* (Appendix C) supported supervisor as relationship developer and supervisor as engineer with little or no emphasis on the supervisor as an advocate or supervisor as pioneer.
Supervisor as Relationship Developer

Overall, the literature supported leadership as having three components: the leaders, the followers, and the circumstance or environment, while focusing on leadership as relationship (Popper, 2002) and leadership as social influence (Gabarro, 1987). The literature also confirmed the learning organization (schooling system) as being directed by an organizational leader, which supported social influence and leadership as an interactive system.

The district physical education supervisor in this study indicated that relationships with teachers were found to be a top priority by all the participants, referring to the fact that one can measure success by relationships—relationships with teachers, relationships with administrators, and relationships with students, parents, and community. Supporting this perspective was Crosby (1988) as he pointed out that success is decided by relationships as presented in his study of Japanese practices of gathering information and transmitting information to other groups. Wheatley’s (1992) study on the dynamic process supported the idea that the power that a leader has in an organization is created by relationships. Baker (1994) indicated in his research of developing managing networks that building relationships was the key to success in an organization.

The district physical education supervisors indicated that they built relationships and showed support of teachers while developing trust as they visited the teachers, listened to the teachers, were available to the teachers, empathized with the teachers, mentored the teachers, and worked with the teachers. The supervisors in this study supported the teachers by visiting them in their schools, observing them teach, conferencing with them, engaging in discussions with them, and providing feedback about their teaching. The supervisors
engaged in social interaction and gained influence over their followers as trust was developed and relationships were constructed in the environment of teaching physical education.

This study confirmed and then extended the literature on relationships as found in Pajak’s (1989b) *Dimensions of Supervisory Practice* by indicating that community relations and establishing and maintaining relations between the school and the community were important responsibilities for a supervisor. Pajak’s (1989b) study made no reference to having a relationship with the students, teachers, or administrators; but Mohnsen’s (1999a) study on physical education leadership supported the findings through liaison with teachers, principals, district administrators, boards of education, the communities and universities. Either Pajak assumed that relationship developing was automatic or was not a dimension that needed to be developed. Mohnsen’s findings, having similar dimensions were more like this study.

Findings from this study confirmed all three of the following studies as having similar emphasis on supporting teachers. In the theme of Relationship Developer in this study, the DPEIS were most interested in building relationships with the teachers and students while giving the teachers support. Porter’s (1994) findings in her study pointed out that the district music supervisors using—Pajak’s *Twelve Dimensions of Supervisory Practice* (Appendix A)—ranked problem solving/decision making, service to teachers, and community relations as the most important dimensions of their role. Porter used quantitative and qualitative methods in her study as a questionnaire was sent to 21 participants (music teachers) and a follow-up telephone interview was conducted with the 17 participants who responded to the questionnaire. Data were analyzed using range,
distribution, and mean scores of each item on the questionnaire, while grounded theory was used on the data collected from the telephone interview to establish preferred dimensions practiced and role development. Moving from a specials area (music) supervision to general central office supervision, Smith’s (1990) study showed a connection between his findings and Porter’s findings. Smith (1990) argued that central office supervisors who are specialists (supervision over one or two subject areas) categorized service to teachers and observation and conferencing as the most important dimensions of their role while generalists (supervision over several subject areas) identified planning and change, problem solving and decision making, and research and program evaluation as most important.

Smith used two surveys of 324 district level supervisors to analyze data using both descriptive and inferential statistics to establish preferred dimensions of practice. Relating the service to teachers and observation and conferencing as being indicated as the most important dimensions in Smith’s study compares to this study as the DPEIS indicated that by supporting teachers (service to teachers) relationships are developed. Floyd (1986) studied four outstanding central office instructional supervisors utilizing symbolic interactionism and qualitative research and employing in-depth, open-ended, unstructured interviews searching for meaning in their professional role. Three themes emerged from her data: influence over teachers and instructional programs, credibility, and flexibility in regard to job performance. The central office instructional supervisors earned credibility or trust by “demonstrating professional skills, experience, and leadership in instructional matters. . .and having effective interpersonal relations skills, especially active listening skills” (p. 174).
The influence over teachers and the instructional program emerged in this study and was compared to Floyd’s study, as the DPEIS built relationships and trust while establishing a leadership approach and role development to effectively support teachers and instruction. The researcher discovered that the DPEIS in this study developed relationships with a humanistic approach (Belasen, 2000) as they saw their role of being a sounding board for teachers to vent their feelings, to seek advice, and to share input. Accessibility was mentioned by all the supervisors as being the way that trust developed into a relationship in which the door was always open for the teachers to talk to the supervisor. Building the trust in a relationship is fundamental in the humanistic approach (Belasen, 2000) and the district physical education supervisors in this study seemed to think that their responsibility was to do that trust building.

Through contact with the teachers, the supervisor could see and understand what the teachers were experiencing so the supervisor could empathize with the teachers, especially since all the supervisors were once physical education teachers themselves. Mentoring teachers to higher performance and being a role model were affirmed by the supervisors. A working relationship was developed as the teachers learned to trust the physical education supervisor and were able to voice their opinions, impart new ideas, share their vision, and were encouraged to present best practices to their peers.

Historically, leaders’ effectiveness has been determined by how well they were able to “manage the bureaucratic maze of formal channels and vertical lines of authority;” however, the definition of effectiveness has changed to include a judgment on the leader’s “ability to. . .initiate and manage horizontal (peer) relationships; to find and secure resources from around the organization” (Baker, 1994, p. 7). In this study, peer relationship
building occurred with the administrators at the school level, district level and state level whether it was the principals, assistant principals, other curriculum supervisors, associate superintendents of curriculum, other district physical education supervisors, or district superintendents. The relationships were developed for support, credibility, and power to carry out the role of a district physical education supervisor. The conversations and interactions relating to relationship development confirmed that the symbolic interaction of using symbols was unique to the supervisors and their peers.

The district physical education supervisors in this study said that the relationship with the principals was critical for developing and implementing a successful physical education program within the schools. Educating the principals was expressed as being a top priority by the participants in this study. Lambert’s (2000) findings support this as she indicated that principals needed to be given the tools necessary to know what should go on in their schools concerning the physical education program and how the program could benefit the core subjects and the test scores. The principals were a vital part of the team and should be educated in the role of the physical education teacher. The district physical education supervisors indicated that they did not want the relationship with the principals to be problematic, but rather serve as a resource with interactions shaping the relationship as the district physical education supervisors and principals worked together for the advantage of the students.

The relationship developed with the students, parents, and community helped to define the physical education program, the DPEIS’ role, and the supervisors’ understanding of the social world and motivation. The district physical education supervisors commented that they were the liaison between the school district and the community. Baker (1994)
pointed out that whenever the supervisor met with parents, teachers, administrators, or community members, it gave him or her an opportunity to build relationships. In Mohlsen’s (1999a) study of physical education leadership, the supervisor voiced that it was their responsibility to cultivate the relationships with teachers, administrators, students, parents, and communities and to give the support and resources necessary for the teachers to perform their jobs effectively. These district physical education supervisors were responsible for bridging the gap between the schools and the community and promoting health and physical education and optimal programs for children.

Supervisor as Advocate

Through communicating and being a salesperson for physical education, the district physical education supervisors in this study felt it was their role to be an advocate selling the value of the school physical education program. The district physical education supervisors realized that they were advocates everywhere they went, no matter what they were doing.

The district physical education supervisors affirmed that they had to make connections in order to advocate for physical education. Open communication, constantly being in touch with teachers, administrators, and board members, and being able to communicate effectively supported the supervisor’s effectiveness in being an advocate. Using e-mails, newsletters, and personal contact, the supervisors were able to share research findings, promote movement, and establish connections. Michael Blakstad’s studies in the early 1990s indicated that CEOs’ (supervisors’) use of electronic e-mails was a poor means of communicating with employees where as the use of face-to-face meetings as a channel for communicating was rated as being more effective (Blakstad & Cooper,
Blakstad’s study was in direct opposition to this study in which the district physical education supervisors indicated that the e-mail was an essential medium for communicating with the teachers, parents, and community. The difference in the data could be the dates in which the two studies were conducted and the commonality of computer use today.

Blakstad hypothesized that

Not everybody receives information best in the same way. Sometimes people may miss an essential idea or message if it is only expressed in one form. . . . Experts often do this by reinforcement of a message on video, in text [e mail], and through discussion (Blakstad & Cooper, 1995 p. 13).

Belasen (2000) supported J.B. Walther (1996) as he studied the difference between face-to-face communication and e-mail communication and found that even though e-mails are efficient and fast, lacking the face-to-face communication could affect relationships and transactions. Archer, a firm supporter of electronic communication, indicated in this study that it is hard to communicate with teachers the common goal and vision electronically and that face-to-face contact is important. Price Waterhouse in 1993 had an outside organization to conduct a study that “compared the way in which its clients regarded the firm with the partners’ own perception [of communications]; the partners were confronted with an eye-opening account of the mismatch between the two” (Blakstad & Cooper, 1995 p.14). A future study could have the DPEIS conduct a communication audit to determine the difference between their perceptions and the perceptions of teachers, students, parents, and community about the communication and general operations of their role as an advocate for the physical education program. Organizational communication expressed by Charles Bantz in Giddens’ (1984) work demonstrated how the organizational
culture is created and maintained by communication as it “transforms organizational meanings and organizational expectations” as the district physical education supervisor performed his or her role as advocate (p. 31).

The DPEIS in this study said that they had to get “buy-ins” for the physical education program from the teachers, principals, students, parents, administrators, and the community. Supervisor as advocate, only in the dimension of communication, confirmed Pajak’s (1989b) *Dimensions of Supervisory Practices*, indicating that the supervisor had to ensure open and clear communication among individuals and groups throughout the organization. Some of the supervisors proposed a common goal and vision for the physical education program to draw backing from all stakeholders, but this is an area that could be studied further to confirm the literature in learning organizations. Belasen (2000) found a similar notion when he confirmed that setting specific, realistic, and relevant goals and gathering acceptance by all individuals were substantial for two reasons: “they lead to a buy-in climate and they serve as a source of motivation and commitment” (p. 174). In this study the DPEIS were interested in “buy-ins” as they advocated for physical education, but did not confirm motivation and commitment literature. Belasen also indicated as in developing a high quality physical education program that interested individuals had to receive feedback to help maintain the buy-in; that conclusion was supported by this study.

As a salesperson, the district physical education supervisors said that they had to speak out, raise awareness, be role models, and fight for the physical education profession. Neither Pajak’s nor Mohsen’s dimensions included being an advocate as a salesperson. Mohsen (1999b) indicated, though, in her study of leadership in physical education that the district physical education supervisor had to have “endurance for advocacy” (p. 5). The
supervisors took every opportunity to speak out concerning the advantages of the physical education program and brought awareness to the significance of having an effective physical education program. The supervisors further indicated and supported Mohnsen’s (1999a) study on physical education leadership stating that they had to be on guard to fight for the physical education program. They had to fight for funding, fight for recognition as to how physical education can support *No Child Left Behind* and testing, fight for keeping the physical education schedule instead of changing at the administrators’ whim, and fight for awareness of the value of an effective physical education program. Supervisor as an advocate was the least supported category in the literature.

*Supervisor as Engineer*

The district physical education supervisors believed that one of their roles was similar to that of a construction engineer. On the job site, these engineers provide supplies, advice, and blueprints that enhance the construction of the building. Likewise, the DPEIS provide teachers with resources (technological and general resources), training (staff development), and blueprints (curriculum/instructional development) that enhance the building and maintenance of a physical education program.

Horine (1991), in the study of the effectiveness of policies and procedures, indicated that consistency in policy and procedure is what makes an organization work. In this study, the district physical education supervisors did not directly refer to policy and procedures; but through their conversation, they alluded to its importance by indicating that they worked on scheduling, prioritized, had a strategic plan, and were consistent with teachers in everything they did. The district physical education supervisor as an engineer
supported the board of education’s polices and procedures and passed this information to the physical education teachers.

The physical education supervisor as engineer provided consistent support for teachers as they accomplished the task of teaching children principles of lifelong fitness and healthy active living. Referring to leadership as three components of leader, follower, and situation or relationship, Zaccaro & Klimoski (2001) hypothesized that leaders either focused on the task-oriented style of leadership or the socioemotional style of leadership, which was popularized in theory during the 60’s and 70’s. In this study the district physical education supervisor was not found to be so much of a task-oriented person but more of a relational and social leader by giving the teachers the responsibility of completing tasks while providing the necessary tools for them to perform the task. The supervisors in this study articulated that they supported the teachers by promoting the use of technology to do lesson plans, grades, attendance and web sites for curriculum, assessments and assignments, and as an instructional resource. The use of technology can be time consuming to learn and costly; and as Blakstad & Cooper (1995) indicated, the leader has to put a value on meeting objectives and, if appropriate, spend the money on the needed resources like technological equipment and software. Baker (1994) supported the notion of developing relationships with suppliers in order to acquire the necessary resources. The district physical education supervisors said that they had to know what software was best for the physical education teachers, as well as keeping informed about the use of general software by the whole district. The need to provide technological equipment (pedometers, heart rate monitors, or CD players), instructional resources (web page, online physical education, and assessment instruments), and staff development (computer use, use of
technological equipment, and software use) was also expressed by the district physical education supervisors.

The general resources that the district physical education supervisor said that they made available for the physical education teachers to do their jobs were supplies, books, equipment, curriculum guides, self-made materials, computer generated CDs, software, and research articles. The district physical education supervisors searched for the best bid for equipment, stretching the dollar as far as it would go. In some cases, the district physical education supervisors consider themselves a resource as they demonstrated lessons, provided hands-on instruction, and monitored personal fitness records.

The supervisor as engineer in this study asserted that staff development was the responsibility of the DPEIS to educate the physical education teachers in best practices, new trends, and current materials and to give the teachers the tools necessary to develop teaching strategies and techniques to benefit the students. The findings in Smith’s (1990) study were consistent with the findings in this study as she indicated that in her study that the outstanding district level supervisors viewed staff development “as a method for introducing new ideas and information and for providing assistance and support to the professional staff” (p. 118). The district physical education supervisors indicated that staff development had to be appropriate and relevant if the physical education teachers were to increase student learning. Staff development, with input from the teachers and principals as to the need, was provided by the district physical education supervisors for their own district or for more than one district in order to share the cost of guest speakers. Staff development, reported in Joyce and Showers’ study in 1983 and cited in Pajak (1989a), showed that staff development “led by professionals within the district, was ongoing, and
accommodated varying needs” was the most effective (p. 112). Keeping the cost in mind, district physical education supervisors in this study confirmed and extended Joyce and Showers’ (1983) point of view by encouraging their own physical education teachers to teach the other physical education teachers within the county, sharing best practices and new trends learned at conferences and workshops. Providing opportunities to attend conferences and having relevant staff development for music teachers was stressed by Porter (1994) in her study of supervision of music teachers. A prime example of this is seen in Oliver, who took staff development to the next level by monitoring the staff development participants’ behavior to see if they learned from the experience and whether or not they made necessary changes. This supported Joyce and Showers’ (1983) study of effective staff development as an ongoing process.

The final resources that the district physical education supervisors in this study expressed as being their responsibility were curriculum development and instructional development as they provided the blueprint to the teachers as to what is taught and how it is to be taught. Dimmock & Walker (2000) shared in their study that curriculum development is part of the schooling organizations’ ideologies and social culture. Therefore, the stakeholders, teachers, students, and principals should be involved in the planning and implementation of the curriculum (Bruner, 1986). In this study, as in Bruner’s study, teachers and principals shared their needs and concerns to assist the DPEIS in writing the curriculum, creating a curriculum guide (some were put on CDs), and establishing best practices in instruction. District physical education supervisors’ perspectives on incorporating current trends, principals’ and teachers’ views, goals of the district, and financial restraints were emphasized in Pajak’s (1989a) study on central office supervision.
The findings in this study confirmed and extended the literature on Pajak’s (1989b) and Mohsen’s (1999) *Dimensions of Supervisory Practice*, indicating that supervisors as engineers devote most of their time to this component. Pajak’s (1989b) study revealed that the responsibilities of staff development, planning and change, curriculum, instructional program, service to teachers, and observation and conferencing were dimensions of supervisory practice. Providing staff development, maximizing resources, shaping curriculum, improving instruction, streamlining organization, articulating policies and procedures, and utilizing National Standards from Mohsen’s dimensions confirmed the role of supervisor as engineer. Pajak’s and Mohsen’s dimensions were more task-oriented.

*Supervisor as Pioneer*

A pioneer is someone who ventures into unknown territory or opens up new areas of thought, research, and development. That is, pioneers do things that nobody else has done before. The physical education supervisors in this study saw themselves as pioneers because they acquired funds, collected data, and identified trends in health and physical education.

Since budgets for physical education—a big issue for the DPEIS—demanded a great deal of time and energy, the supervisors placed a major focus on this endeavor. Funding physical education teaching positions, funding staff development, and funding equipment were the main emphases in budgetary matters. Even though the state mandates 100 minutes a week for the elementary students (Georgia Legislature, 2000), the state does not fund the mandate, resulting in the district physical education supervisor having to search for funds. The supervisors even indicated that they had to fight for budget requests, from the local budget at the district level. In seeking funding for physical education
Greenberg (1999) indicated that the district physical supervisor had to get creative, looking at grants, corporate donations, and partnerships to acquire the necessary funds for physical education. This is a current trend because there has been a decrease in governmental funding and an increase in program needs, requiring educators to look to both public and private avenues (DeGraw & McGinnis, 1991). Forging into the future and paving the way for the physical education teachers, the supervisors looked toward enlisting businesses as sponsors and applying for grants.

In order to apply for grants, the district physical education supervisors needed a baseline of data collected within the district. Data-driven curriculum and instruction was another focus for the district physical education supervisors in this study, with four out of the six participants indicating that the supervisor needs to acquire funding for physical education. Travis in this study indicated that data collecting told the story of his district while supporting accountability for the physical education program. The data showed the DPEIS where the physical education programs’ strengths and weakness were located. This study confirmed Pajak’s (1989b) and Mohnsen’s (1999a) Dimensions of Supervisory Practice as research and evaluation to encourage experimentation and assessment of outcomes for accountability. The district physical education supervisors indicated that they had not done much data collecting in the past and are still working to get a grasp on the whole data collecting focus, again functioning in the pioneer role. The district physical education supervisors needed to develop a time line for perfecting data collection as indicated from the findings in Fritz, Brown, and Banset (2005). Most of the data collected was in the area of health and physical fitness—Body Mass Index, percent body fat, weight, height, and risk taking surveys.
The behaviors that the district physical education supervisors in this study said were necessary to enable teachers to be empowered and to become leaders within the district and in the state were (a) having the teachers present best practices at conferences or workshops to the teachers within the district, (b) supporting the teachers, (c) backing the teachers, and (d) receiving input from the teachers. Kotter (1982) indicated that shared information, whether from the leader to the followers or from the followers to the leader, empowered people. By supporting and backing the teachers and by receiving input from the teachers, the supervisors gave the teachers permission to develop the skills for leadership as the supervisor encouraged high performance, critical thinking, articulating of one’s views, and giving the teachers an opportunity to have a voice in what they were involved in doing. Travis theorized that teachers that have been leaders in the past would step to the forefront within the class, in the district, and in the state. Oliver was empowered herself as a physical education teacher when she was encouraged by her supervisor to present best practices at conferences and in front of her peers. So, Oliver has empowered the present physical education teachers in the same manner, encouraging them to present best practices. Oliver indicated that the physical education teacher needs to take responsibility to be a “go getter” in order to develop critical thinking and self-initiation to follow through on the ideas that they brought to her.

The district physical education supervisor as a pioneer in this study was responsible for identifying trends—certainly a responsibility of a pioneer. The trends identified as part of the responsibility of a pioneer were: grant writing, data collecting, the New P.E., and the physical education teachers’ role in No Child Left Behind and testing. Mohnsen (1999) found in her studies that the new trends were: new theories on learning, increases in
information, advances in technology, increases in home schooling, need for lifelong learning, increase in longevity, and increase in violence. Only two of her findings—new theories on learning and life long learning (technology is a trend but it was mentioned earlier)—were indicated in this study. Since the supervisor indicated it was his or her responsibility to secure funds, grant writing was considered as the way to get the extra funds to provide a quality physical education program. Before writing a grant, the supervisor has to gather data as a baseline for the grant and then for accountability as to whether goals were met. Carson supported the concept of the New P.E. and the resurgence of health and physical education, which the other district physical education supervisors announced has been around but should always be addressed anyway. The New P.E. was described as being non-competitive and allowing all children to be actively involved in vigorous activity in class and for a lifetime. The supervisors emphasized that students could be academically smart as indicated by testing, but without a physically fit body all the education would not help the students live long, productive lives. The supervisors supported learning through movement to increase the mental capacity of the students.

Connecting Supervisor as Relationship Developer, Advocate, Engineer & Pioneer

From the data, it was determined that the role of the district physical education supervisor is multifaceted. The role mandates that this person be a relationship developer, an advocate, an engineer, and a pioneer. Answering the research question of “How does the district physical education supervisor define his or her role as a district physical education supervisor and how he/she perceives the responsibilities of his or her job,” the perceptions of the role and responsibilities centered around developing relationships with teachers, students, parents, administrators, and the community as he or she promoted and sold the
physical education program. It was established that the supervisors advocated for physical education everywhere they went. The supervisors provided supplies, materials, and services to the physical education teachers. Supervisors centered on providing teachers, students, and administrators with the latest trends and finding monies to bring these trends to the teachers’ classrooms. The supervisor as relationship developer supervised all the other roles of the district physical education supervisor in supporting teachers, administrators, students, parents, and the community, and advocating for the profession while the engineer was providing the necessary supplies for the job and the supervisor as pioneer was searching for ways to keep the field of physical education current and moving into the future. The second research question of “What does the physical education supervisor indicate as being the most important and least important aspect of his or her job” was harder to answer because the role and responsibilities are so multifaceted that pinpointing the most important was hard. The findings from the Q-sort indicated motivation, organization, communication, and instruction/curriculum were the most important and the interview data supports this conclusion except in the area of motivation. Further research on motivation and commitment theories should be conducted. Leadership as relationships in organizations was a thread that was interwoven throughout all of the responsibilities. Even though relationship theory was confirmed by this study, the school culture, and setting goals and a vision were omitted from this study.

Theoretical Concepts Established From the Data

This grounded theory study focused on the perceptions of practicing district physical education instructional supervisors as to their roles and responsibilities. The theory was developed out of the data as the researcher continually collected data and
analyzed the data. Concepts were reviewed and grouped together into categories so that properties or distinctive features could lead to hypotheses about the connection between the concepts. The theory was tested and retested, investigating the theory from a different point of view. Connecting the ideas led to the following theories:

1. The district physical education supervisors’ role is to build relationships.
2. The district physical education supervisors’ role is one of an advocate.
3. The district physical education supervisors’ role is to support the teachers, students, parents, administrators, and the community.
4. The district physical education supervisors’ role is to provide necessary supplies, material, resources for the physical education teachers.
5. The district physical education supervisors’ role is to confirm finding trends and best practices and communicating these to his or her charges.
6. The district physical education supervisors’ role is to empower physical education teachers to become leaders as they present best practices and have a voice in the decisions relating to curriculum and instructional development and other decisions affecting the physical education program.

Continuous comparison between the empirical data and the emerging theories continued throughout the analysis as the researcher reviewed this study’s data and data from other studies and from the literature to find negative cases which would falsify the theory. The literature supported and illuminated these theories in instruction supervision, conceptual leadership, learning organizations, dimensions of supervisory practice, and the caring theory. Searching for quality theory, the researcher looked for the codes to fit the data in a natural way without being forced. Each of the theories mentioned above did just
that. The theories worked in explaining the role and responsibilities of the district physical education supervisor and were interpreted with theoretical sensitivity and relevance as the researcher sought to keep her own preconceived notions or ideas out of the process. Since there was little knowledge about the role of the district physical education supervisor, the grounded theory assisted in securing findings that were grounded in the data with the assumption that in certain social situations there are common actions, words, or phrases. Through this analysis, a richness of the experience of the role of the district physical education supervisor could be understood as the contextual reality of their social world. Even though qualitative research is not intended to generalize, the data, findings, and interpretation can give a deeper understanding to the role of a DPEIS from the perspective of six practicing district physical education instructional supervisors.

The DPEIS failed to confirm the way culture played a part in the role of the district physical education supervisor as this was a topic that was left silent. How does culture affect the school, district and the learning organization? What is the role of the DPEIS in relation to the culture theory? The first step in shifting the school culture is to examine the existing beliefs of the DPEIS. How can the DPEIS support diversity and equalization within their department and across the whole district? What policies and procedures need to be changed? Since collaborative and collegial school cultures and norms of mutual support, respect, and continual professional growth promote organizational learning, studies in learning organizations need to be further investigated to support the theory of culture and caring (Leithwood et al., 1998).
CHAPTER 10
IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The implications for this study will focus on the district physical education supervisor’s role in relation to the principals, physical education teachers, students, university teacher preparation programs, state coordinator of physical education and to the district physical education supervisor and how the findings can affect future studies. The implications are divided into three categories: (a) practical significance, (b) theoretical significance, and (c) methodological significance.

Practical Significance

Principal

Looking back to the first district physical education supervisor, Carl Betz, the present district physical education instructional supervisors should emulate Betz and the way he instructed the principals. The data seemed to indicate that the principals need to have training in effectively evaluating and managing the physical education teachers and program to assure high quality. Instead of teaching the principal to teach the physical education teachers, the principal needs the essential training in what to look for in a physical education program, the components of a superior physical education program, and new trends relating to physical education as in the “New P.E.”

Students

Findings from this study have implications for the students because the district physical education supervisor needs to have the students’ best interests in mind in whatever is planned or action taken to provide an effective physical education program as indicated in
the data as a new trend in data driven instruction. Data indicates that the district physical education instructional supervisor needs to develop a relationship with the students and their parents to bridge the gap between the schools and the community.

**Physical Education Teacher**

The district physical education instructional supervisors need to support the physical education teachers by providing the necessary supplies and materials for an effective physical education program as revealed in data indicating the supervisor as an engineer. The data also indicated that district physical education instructional supervisors need to encourage empowerment of the teachers to become emergent leaders as they present best practices within the district and at state conferences and are encouraged to share their opinions about all aspects of the physical education program to encourage leadership development.

**University Teacher Preparation Program**

Findings in this study have implications for the university teacher preparation program as it addresses the issue of leadership in physical education so that students preparing to teach physical education can be taught the necessary skills for leadership—whether leadership within the school, the district, or the state. Leadership has been documented to improve instruction. Therefore with leadership in physical education, the quality of instruction will improve—prompting the reason for leadership skills to be a part of the core curriculum program for all teacher preparation programs. The data seems to indicate that these skills should be added to the core curriculum: (a) relationship developing (b) building skills, (c) interpersonal skills, (d) work ethic skills, (e) promotional advocacy skills, (f) research skills, (g) best practice skills development, (h) evaluation skills, (i) data
collecting skills, (j) funding acquisition skills, (k) data driven instructional skills and (l) different leadership styles and approaches for organizational leadership, and (m) any other skills necessary to lead the quality of physical education whether in the classroom, at the district office, or at the state level.

State Physical Education Coordinator

The district physical education instructional supervisors from this study indicated in the data that a state coordinator in physical education who has specific training in physical education should be hired to direct the entire state of Georgia. The state physical education coordinator can have the best interests of the physical education program as he or she advocates for the physical education profession and physical education program while promoting healthy movement and activity for lifelong learning. If leadership affects the quality of physical education, then the leadership at the state level can improve the quality of instruction in the entire state.

District Physical Education Supervisor

The district physical education supervisor, as noted from the findings in this study, needs the tools necessary to be an effective leader for the physical education program, whether at the classroom level, district level, or state level. Since the data revealed that leadership is relationships and the success of a program is seen in the leadership, the district physical education instructional supervisor needs to support and build relationships with teachers, parents, students, administration, and community. Since the district physical education supervisors in this study indicated that they needed to be engineers to oversee the physical education program, it would appear that the district physical education instructional supervisor needs technology training and development, staff development training,
curriculum development training, instructional development training, and training in acquiring the best resources, leadership dimensional practices, as well as training in how to give the best service to teachers for a quality physical education program. From the data and the literature, the district physical education instructional supervisor seems to need training in leadership development—acquiring the leadership style that fits the leader, followers, and situation, and promotional skills, motivational skills, and organizational skills to be an advocate for the physical education program and the profession of physical education.

Theoretical Significance

The findings from this study provided a knowledge base with the theoretical concepts derived from the data about the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor. The findings were consistent with the teacher leadership literature of relationships and teacher influence. The theoretical concepts from this study confirmed theories of caring, instructional supervision, and dimensions of supervisory practice and has extended literature to include the theoretical significance on the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor. The theory of advocacy and the extensions of relationship theory, supervisory practice theory, and instructional supervision were supported and confirmed in this study.

Methodological Significance

By using qualitative research, a fuller picture of the stories told by the district physical education instructional supervisors on their perceptions of their roles and responsibilities was made more vivid than in some previous studies done in instructional supervision by quantitative methodology. This study was significant in that it applied the grounded theory methodology in studying the role and responsibilities of the district physical
educational instructional supervisor. Since there was little knowledge about the district physical education instructional supervisor in the literature, the grounded theory assisted in establishing theories that support this role. The findings significantly contributed to research by broadening our understanding of the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor. This study can be used for a future reference and literature review if a researcher chooses to use the grounded theory qualitative methodology.
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Appendix A

DIMENSIONS OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICE (EDWARD PAJAK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>Establishing and maintaining open and productive relations between the school and its community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>Developing and facilitating meaningful opportunities for professional growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Change</td>
<td>Initiating and implementing collaboratively developed strategies for continuous improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Ensuring open and clear communication among individuals and groups throughout the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Coordinating and integrating the process of curriculum development and implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Program</td>
<td>Supporting and coordinating efforts to improve the instructional program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service to Teachers</td>
<td>Providing materials, resources, and assistance to support teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edward Pajak’s Dimensions of Supervisory Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation &amp; Conferencing</td>
<td>Providing feedback to teachers based on classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision-Making</td>
<td>Using a variety of strategies to clarify and analyze problems and to make decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Program Evaluation</td>
<td>Encouraging experimentation and assessing outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating and Organizing</td>
<td>Helping people to develop a shared vision and achieve collective aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>Recognizing and reflecting upon one’s personal and professional beliefs, abilities, and actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix B

**DIMENSIONS OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICE (WILES & BONDI, & GLICKMAN)**

Wiles & Bondi; & Glickman  Dimensions of Supervisory Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiding human development</td>
<td>Group development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and developing curriculum</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving classroom instruction</td>
<td>Direct assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging human relations</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing staff development</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling administrative functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; initiating action</td>
<td>Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using authority to establish an organizational climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing an operating theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing organization &amp; work environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Supervision: A guide to practice (5th ed.*)* by Wiles, J. & Bondi, J., 2004, Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill
## Appendix C

### DIMENSIONS OF SUPERVISORY PRACTICE IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION

|-----------------------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth and development</td>
<td>Student and staff development /wellness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimum use of available facilities</td>
<td>Maximize resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum and new program development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid physical education objectives</td>
<td>Improve instruction and fitness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations to human relations</td>
<td>Liaison with teachers, principals, district Administrators, Board of Education &amp; Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative leadership</td>
<td>Cooperative leadership-physical district Advisory committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Assessment and Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective basic organization</td>
<td>Effective organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following basis of scientific evidence</td>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative leadership with universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in employment of techniques</td>
<td>Use of National Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

First Interview Question:
What does it mean to you to be a physical education district supervisor?
Explain the role of the district physical education instructional supervisor.

Second Interview Protocol

Many of the Health and Physical Education Supervisors referred to the phrase “buy in” concerning the Health and Physical Education discipline. Elaborate on the phrase “buy in”? Who needs to buy in to the physical education program and why? How are you a salesperson for physical education? Give specific examples.

Many of the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors indicated that the role of the supervisor is one of “an advocate for our discipline”. How is this a part of the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors’ role? Give me specific examples.

Some supervisors indicated that a critical part of the role of the District Health and Physical Education Supervisor is to advocate to the superintendent and administrative center. Tell me how you feel about this. How can you be the “voice” of physical education?

One of the supervisors indicated that relationships are indicators of success (kids/teacher; teacher/parents; school/community; etc.) Do you agree or disagree with this supervisor? Can you elaborate on this? What relationships are important and how do you sustain these relationships?

Several District Health and Physical Education Supervisors refer to the need to have a love of children and people to perform the role of District Health and Physical Education Supervisor. Do you feel this is important? Why?

Tell me how do the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors encourage students to adopt life long healthy practices?

In your role do you feel you are more of a resource person to the health and physical education teachers or the principals and administrators? Explain?

Several District Health and Physical Education Supervisors indicated that their role involves keeping the Health and Physical Education teachers abreast of new trends, new practices, research, etc. How do you think this fits your role as a Health and Physical Education Supervisor?

One Health and Physical Education Supervisor referred to the trend of a focus on the “New P.E.” what do you think he was referring to? Do you support a “New P.E.”?
Tell me how data collection is an essential job for you as a District Health and Physical Education Supervisor.

How do you use data collecting and what for?

How do you empower your Health and Physical Education Teachers? Give me some examples? If no, why not?

How does technology fit into the role of the district physical education supervisor? Is it important to have electronically disbursed information? Why?

What kind of information is electronically disbursed?

Distinguish between the titles of District Health and Physical Education Supervisor, Coordinator, and Director? Which title are you? Which do you prefer?

What is your style of leadership?

How do you think the role of the State Health and Physical Education Coordinator (if we had one) affects your role as a District Health and Physical Education Supervisor?

Do you think it is important for the State Health and Physical Education Coordinator to have a degree in Health and Physical Education? Why?

Do you think it is important to meet with other District Health and Physical Education Supervisors? Why?

Do you feel connected to the other Health and Physical Education Supervisors in the state of Georgia? What are ways to make this connection?

As a District Health and Physical Education Supervisor express your feelings about the role of maintaining a common mission or goals for the health and physical education program in your district and whether or not the physical education teachers’ opinion and support of this mission or goals are important?

Differentiate between a vision, a passion, and a philosophy?

How do District Health and Physical Education Supervisors gain support, credibility, and respect from teachers, administrators, and community.

How does having so many years in a particular school system as a teacher and/or administrator before becoming the district Health and Physical Education Supervisor influence credibility, support, and respect.

Does being an Athletic Director as well as a Health and Physical Education Supervisor warrant more credibility, support, or respect.

Who gives the District Health and Physical Education Supervisor flexibility and freedom to do basically what needs to be done?

Do you have this kind of freedom?
Appendix D INTERVIEW PROTOCOL Second Interview Continued (page 3)

One District Health and Physical Education Supervisor indicated that he/she struggles with “working the system”—what is meant by that?

   Elaborate on your struggles, difficulties, or hindrances that affect your role as a District Health and Physical Education Supervisor.

Several District Health and Physical Education Supervisors indicated that time is a factor in the role of a supervisor because of all the “other” jobs that must be juggled? Is this a positive or a negative aspect of the role? Why?

   Give me some examples of your “other jobs” and how they affect your role?

What is your role in screening, interviewing, and hiring physical education teachers in the school system?

   Explain the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors’ role in evaluation of the Health and Physical Education teachers.

In an ideal situation where there is enough funding for both an Athletic Director and a District Health and Physical Education Supervisor, voice your opinion about connecting these two departments together.

Why is it important for a District Health and Physical Education Supervisor to have a degree and an informed background in Health and Physical Education?

Explain why you think it is necessary or not necessary for the District Health and Physical Education Supervisor to have an association with the state and national professional organization.

Securing funding and grant writing came up in several interviews. Explain how this relates to your role as the District Health and Physical Education Supervisor?

Curriculum and Instructions were mentioned as part of the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors’ role by all the participants. How are the teachers involved in this process? Share how Curriculum and Instructions are a part of your role?

A majority of time in each interview was related to how the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors’ role is to be a support to teachers and to provide service to teachers. Give me specific examples of how you support your teachers or provide service to your teachers.

Give me some examples how Staff Development, Inservice, or Professional Development are important aspect of the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors’ role. How do these aspects improve student learning.

What other aspects of the District Health and Physical Education Supervisors’ role that you would like to discuss?
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DEMOGRAPHIC INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Please fill out the following information)

How do you describe yourself? (Please circle one)
   American Indian or Alaska Native
   Asian
   Black or African American
   Hispanic or Latino
   Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   White, non-Hispanic, non Latino
   Other

What is your age range: 20-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, 61-70

How many years have you held this position?

   Were you a classroom teacher? For how many years?
   Have you ever taught physical education? How many years?

Do you have a degree in Health, Physical Education?

If not, what is your degree?

What is your certification?

Do you hold certification in Leadership?

How many content areas are you responsible for?
   Name the content areas:

How many students are in your school district?

How many teachers are in your district?

How many physical education teachers are in your school district?

How many elementary physical education teachers?

How many middle school physical education teachers?

How many high school physical education teachers?
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DOCUMENT ARTIFACTS

PROFESSIONAL JOB DESCRIPTION

TITLE: CURRICULUM DIRECTOR—SECONDARY HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SYSTEM—WIDE ATHLETIC DIRECTOR

QUALIFICATIONS:
1. Possesses a Master’s Degree in Health and Physical Education and in Administration and Supervision.
2. Has had five successful years of teaching experience in physical education and/or health.
3. Has had successful experience as a coach in high school athletics.
4. Any alternatives to the above qualifications as the Superintendent and Board may find appropriate.

REPORTS TO:
Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education

JOB GOALS:
To administer, under the control of the Assistant Superintendent of Secondary Education, all aspects of the county athletic programs.

To help participating students achieve a high level of skill, an appreciation for the values of discipline and sportsmanship, and an increased level of self-esteem.

PERFORMANCE RESPONSIBILITIES:
1. Coordinates and supervises the secondary instructional programs in physical education and health.
2. Works to develop, maintain, and improve the secondary instructional programs in physical education and health.
3. Serves as liaison between the xxxxxx County Public Schools and the Georgia High School Association, XXXXXX County Recreation Department, and any other such bodies or agencies designated by the Superintendent.
4. Works with staffs at the senior high schools to maintain a successful athletic program for all grades.
5. Serves as director of all phases of the middle school athletic programs.
6. Works with the Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education in program and staff development.
7. Selects and purchases material and equipment.
8. Develops and publishes curriculum guides.
9. Performs personnel and program evaluations.
10. Makes personnel recommendations.
11. Works with high school staffs for the maintenance of a successful athletic program.
12. Schedules and monitors the assignment and pay of officials for football, softball, basketball, wrestling, and baseball.
13. Schedules, with the xxxxxxxx County Medical Society, physicians for required physical examinations for all athletic teams.
14. Schedules, with the Medical Center of xxxxxxxx Georgia, emergency vehicles for each home football game.
Appendix F continued

Document Artifacts

Professional Job Description Curriculum Director-Secondary Health and Physical Education and System-Wide Athletic Director

15. Coordinates with the xxxxxxx Police and xxxxxxx County Schools’ Security Department, police for assistance in traffic control and game security for athletic events.
16. Coordinates the scheduling of all athletic contests played by county schools.
17. Formulates in cooperation with school staffs, a list of county athletic policies which can effectively serve the athletic programs of the system.
18. Works as liaison between schools and the city in scheduling and utilizing city-owned facilities.
19. Works in cooperation with complex principals and athletic directors for compliance with all rules and regulations of the Georgia High School Association.
20. Oversees the expenditure of line items in the budget to pay for officials, facility rental, football insurance, and security.
21. Assists in the formation of policies regarding coaching duties and pay.
22. Works in cooperation with the Director of Operations for proper maintenance and care of athletic fields, equipment, and facilities.
23. Performs other duties as assigned by Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education.

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT: 210 day work year. Salary to be determined by placement on the appropriate schedules.

EVALUATION: Performance of this job will be evaluated annually in accordance with provisions of the Board’s policy on Evaluation of Administrative Personnel.
Appendix G
Q-SORT

Analysis of The Role of the Supervisor of Physical Education Q-Sort Protocol

Participant ___________________________ Investigator ___________________________

In front of you is a stack of thirteen (13) cards, each with a phrase that describes a dimension of supervision. Please arrange the cards so the most important dimension of supervision is first, the next most important is second, and so forth until all 13 cards are so arranged. If you cannot decide between two or more sources, they can be placed side by side as ties. After you have arranged the cards, I will ask you to explain and give examples for your rankings. (Participants may change ranks at anytime).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Explanation/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Explanation/Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service to Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation &amp; Conferencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving &amp; Decision-Making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research &amp; Program Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motivating &amp; Organizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INSPIRATION

Staff Development

First Interview