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Interest in the field of supervision has been growing recently in Canada. This may have partly caused and partly been caused by the work of the Kellogg Foundation in initiating a survey of Canadian supervision.

In Alberta, as in other parts of North America the theory of supervision has been undergoing considerable modification for many years. Also, as is inevitably and universally the case, practice has followed theory somewhat reluctantly and sporadically, and, in some cases, has taken unpredictable directions.

Alberta's educational authorities have long recognized the need for a change from the old policy of inspection for teacher-rating purposes to one of supervision for teacher-growth purposes; but various complicating factors have retarded implementation. The need for a good program of in-service training is disputed by no one; but the means by which such a program may be carried out is not so clear.

The overwhelming importance of a good supervisory system to the general educational achievements in
any area has not been questioned by traditionalist or progressivist. The best form of such supervision can be ascertained only by constant research and constant evaluation in the light of whatever educational objectives seem to be paramount.

Most leaders of education in the province of Alberta have obtained advanced training in the large American universities and have, therefore, tended to bring to the province from time to time some of the current expert opinion from various sources. This is surely a healthful process, provocative of many learned disputes but offsetting any tendency towards the dull uniformity and final degeneration characteristic of inbreeding. By and large, then, although we cannot complain, neither can we ever cease striving to maintain the invigorating atmosphere which could, with any prolonged period of indifference, be swept away.

Statement of the Problem.

The objective in this study will be to compare existing supervisory practices in Alberta with current widely held expert opinion or theory on the subject. From this comparison and from the ideas expressed by Alberta school superintendents, it should be possible to synthesize a somewhat definite picture of the situation, diagnose some
of its more serious shortcomings and even suggest remedies—remedies which, in most cases might be considered only catalysts, playing, nonetheless, a valuable role in acceleration of natural maturation.

Purposes of Study

There would seem to be considerable need for research and study in the field of supervision in Alberta.

In the first place, little of an organized or formal nature has been done on the subject. In 1953 the Canadian Education Association, working with the Kellogg Foundation instigated a project in Educational Leadership, "designed primarily to assist school superintendents across Canada in solving some of the pressing problems in their difficult jobs of providing educational leadership and supervision in Canadian communities". A short course for representative superintendents across Canada was held at the University of Alberta from May 19 to June 5, 1953. This was followed by similar courses in 1954 and 1955.

These short courses were taken by very busy men with little time for individually launching investigations or researches. However, valuable summaries of problems and suggestions for improvement were made. This gradually awakening consciousness was reflected in a short study made (1) by a Committee representative of the Alberta
Department of Education and the Alberta School Inspectors' Association and (2) by the Co-ordinating Committee, representative of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, and the Department of Education. The aim of the study is that a plan be developed for improving supervisory practice and relationships among those engaged in supervision. A four-page report in 1955 made certain rather general recommendations.

This study, if it does nothing more than indicate specific possible manifestations of the generalizations and show how many of these specific points have been implemented elsewhere, giving, at the same time, educational experts' evaluations of the implementations, should fulfill a real purpose. The superintendents of Alberta and the higher Departmental officials might then further consider their opinions and the consequences of taking certain specific actions suggested by those general opinions.

Anything that can be done to crystallize definite plans for supervision should be of value to the supervisory staff and, therefore, to the teachers in the schools.

Subjects in the Study.

All divisional and county superintendents in the province of Alberta were included in the study. Each of these men is responsible for the administration and
supervision of the schools in his area. This area is generally called either a school division or a county and covers many hundreds of square miles. Rather close approximations of areas may be obtained from the accompanying map (p. 6). Although the superintendent is a civil servant representing the provincial Department of Education, he works very closely with the divisional school board elected for that school division by the people of that division. He advises the Board upon every conceivable matter and is present at Board meetings. To a lesser degree he works with the other autonomous school boards that control village, town or private schools which may not have become officially amalgamated with the division that geographically surrounds them. He is expected to supervise the work of all teachers of elementary and junior high school grades within his "inspectorate" (the division--including any non-participating villages and towns), the number of such teachers varying from about fifty to about one hundred and ten. He is expected to make at least one official visit to each teacher each year and make an official report of this visit. He is also expected to give each teacher practical assistance. For this rather formidable task of administration and supervision, he ordinarily has no professional assistance. In a number of cases the divisional board has employed a "travelling teacher" to
give assistance to inexperienced teachers, but in only three or four cases has the board employed a qualified man—a genuine associate or assistant. Thus, the superintendent stands alone to decide what must be done and what will just have to be left undone.

Location of the Study.

This study was made in Alberta, Canada. Alberta, the second most westerly of Canada's ten provinces, has only the large, mountainous province of British Columbia lying between it and the Pacific Ocean. Much of Alberta's western boundary consists of the continental divide, but east of the divide, the mountains melt down rather quickly to the foothills, and, before long, to the great plains. Thus Alberta is classified as one of the three prairie provinces, the other two, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, lying further east. On the south, Alberta borders on the state of Montana.

The accompanying map (p. 6) shows that the populated areas of Alberta have been divided into fifty-eight school divisions or counties. The ones that are shaded are those whose superintendents of schools participated in this study by replying to a questionnaire. Those areas that are stippled have superintendents who failed to respond to the questionnaire. It will be noticed that large areas in the north and along the west side of the
province have not been divided into school administration areas. Much of this territory consists of mountain, forest, or muskeg, with extremely sparse population.

Alberta has, almost ever since its admission as a province in 1905, been well-known for the high standard of its schools. In the late 1930's, while other provinces were discussing badly needed reforms, particularly in administration, Alberta was fortunate enough to have good leadership not only among its educationists, but also at the political level in the Minister of Education, Mr. William Aberhart, who was also Premier. Things were then done—not just talked about. The large school divisions, with their many features conducive to progress, were formed and teaching was officially made a profession. It took more than a decade for neighbouring provinces to make comparable progress.

Alberta, as a leader and pioneer, may again, if some of the prophetic leadership is still forthcoming, be the model in western Canada for the organization of an effective, modern supervisory program.

The Questionnaire.

The questionnaire (see Appendix) consists of the following:

(1) Forty-two questions respecting the general theory of supervision.
(2) Sixty-seven questions respecting general practices of supervision.
(3) Twenty questions respecting general attitudes on supervision.
(4) A space for general comments.
(5) A page for information about that particular superintendent and his school division.

Procedures Used in the Study.

The first step taken in this study was to investigate thoroughly the literature dealing with supervision, this literature consisting of many of the books written on the topic and many of the pertinent articles appearing in various publications in the past decade.

The second step was the making of an analysis of these materials in order to arrive at a definite number of basic principles and procedures of supervision.

After this the questionnaire was made. Throughout its construction, constant reference was being made to the principles and procedures that had received considerable emphasis in the many books and articles previously reviewed.

A letter (see Appendix) dated April 30, 1955, was then sent to all Alberta superintendents and this was followed in a few days by the questionnaire itself. After about fifty to sixty per cent of the returns were in, a further letter dated June 6, 1955 was sent to all
of those who had not replied and a short letter of thanks was sent to all who had done so.

Following this, returns came in from enough additional superintendents to raise the total to about seventy-five per cent.

At the end of June, a personal letter was written to all those who had not responded. This brought forth some additional replies, making the total something over eighty per cent.

In the meantime, conferences were held in Edmonton with Mr. M. O. Edwardh, Supervisor of the Teacher-Service Bureau, and with Mr. H. C. Sweet, Assistant Chief Superintendent. These men were very helpful, Mr. Sweet providing a number of pamphlets and publications dealing with developments of supervision in Alberta.

This left only the analysis of the responses to the questionnaire, their interpretation, and the establishment of their relationship to the principles derived from the extensive review of literature—all this to be followed of course, by conclusions and recommendations or suggestions.

Limitations of Study.

Probably no study yet made has completely fulfilled the desires of him who made it. Nevertheless, no major obstacles blocked the progress of this research.
One obvious limitation was the failure of several superintendents to complete and return the questionnaires. It is possible that the replies of these men may have changed, to some degree, certain averages, for it may not be safe to assume that their responses would be distributed in the same fashion as those of their fellows who actually reported.

More subtle, but of equal importance, is the limitation imposed by inevitable misinterpretation of certain data, especially where the subjects may originally have misinterpreted certain questions.

Besides this, it is never possible to know whether a certain practice was marked "desirable" because the superintendent had arrived at that conclusion through his actual experience or simply because he had been told by his superiors, his professors in the faculty of education or his textbooks that this particular practice was supposed to be desirable.

In spite of all this, the limitations were not serious, and valid conclusions should definitely be forthcoming.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENTS IN SUPERVISION IN ALBERTA

It must, of course, be realized that developments in any field of human behaviour do not readily lend themselves to mathematical measurement even with efficient use of the finest statistical techniques. No attempt shall be made to do so here. Nevertheless certain trends are very clearly distinguishable and certain practices have been undeniably and quite definitely altered.

In the mid 1930's, just a few years before the outbreak of World War II, a revolution in nearly every aspect of education hit Alberta with tremendous force, and quite naturally, supervision received a share of the transformation wrought by the zeal of the reformers.

The most publicized changes took place in the field of curriculum, and by the early '40's, the "Activity Programme" was theoretically supreme. In the 38th Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year 1943 (6. p. 26), Dr. H. C. Newland, Supervisor of Schools for Alberta, had this to say in his report:

In a great majority of Alberta elementary schools the child is recognized as the centre of school work, and the child's all-round growth and development as more important than skills in traditional "subjects"; and although the superintendents estimate that 60% of the teachers are "amenable to progressive principles" they also show that not more than 40% are really giving effect to the principles of the activity programme. Most teachers realize the importance of the pupils' personality problems; but their treatment of
the problems is merely sympathetic—not scientific. Even when teachers take account of individual needs and differences in making promotions, they still tend to be more concerned with the pupils' individual accomplishment in the skills than with their personal adjustment to group living. . . . It can be noted, also, that many parents still view the school in terms of progress in school "subjects" and the inculcation of "discipline." They want "drills" and "skills," especially in submarginal areas, where the school is regarded solely as an instrument for economic betterment. . . . The superintendents agree that the activity programme, in the hands of professionally-competent teachers, will do more for our boys and girls than ever was possible under the regime of the traditional programme. But the exigency of wartime services and employment has undoubtedly caused a sharp decline in teaching personnel.

Another innovation which caused even more controversy amongst the public for the first few years, although much less in the past decade than the curriculum modifications have, was the organization of the province into large school divisions by legislative action in 1936 (26, p.2). Previous to this time the chief feature of Alberta's school organization was the small school district which elected its own board, and employed, retained, and released its teachers with very little assistance or interference from the Department of Education. Although some of these boards represented villages, towns, or cities where there would be a staff of several teachers, most of them represented rural districts whose populations consisted of anything from three or four families up to a couple of dozen farmsteads. The school, of course, would have one room, one teacher and between four and fifty pupils of grades one to nine or ten. For purposes of
"supervision" (inspection) the Department of Education divided the province into a number of inspectorates and appointed for each an inspector of schools whose chief duty was to spend one-half day with each teacher in his inspectorate each year and write an official report on the teacher in each case. One copy of this all-important report was sent to the apprehensive teacher, one to the Department of Education and one to the school board, whose secretary was instructed to read it at the next annual meeting of ratepayers. The most prominent feature of the report was the small square containing the inspector's final grading of the teacher. These ratings were to run from a high of Excellent down through Very good, Good, and Fairly good, to Fair. In most cases, it was hardly considered the duty of the inspector to give direct assistance to a teacher. His job was to observe the lessons being taught, test some classes, and write his report according to his findings. Sometimes the result was undoubtedly an improvement in the work, for the teacher would try to improve the weakness mentioned in the report before the next annual (although highly secret as to exact day, week or month) visit of that inspector. It should also be stated that some assistance was given by the one-hour lecture delivered by the inspector at the fall convention of the teachers of his inspectorate.

The total of all this would, according to
present-day concepts, amount to no supervision.

Now, with the formation of the large school divisions after 1936, the inspector took the title of superintendent of the school division, although retaining the title of inspector to apply to his position with respect to any village or town schools that withheld their membership from the large division that surrounded them. By the end of 1943, the whole province was organized into divisions, fifty-one in number, the only rural districts still outside of divisions being those in National Parks, those in mining centres and a very few isolated districts, chiefly in the north. Forty-three inspectors were serving as superintendents of 49 divisions, some assistance being given those superintendents responsible for two divisions by those having lighter responsibilities (6, pp: 55-56).

Now the Department had accepted in principle the idea of in-service training, and it was suggested to the superintendents that their chief function was educational leadership rather than inspection. They were encouraged to regard their visits to classrooms as opportunities to assist teachers to solve their problems.

A difficulty here, however, was that the new position of superintendent of the division and, thus expert for the divisional school board, entailed a great amount of administrative work. Tremendous amounts of detailed work from the engaging and placing of teachers to drawing up
lists of library books fell upon him, and the actual time for supervision was so small that little more than the one visit for inspection purposes was possible—in spite of the official change in philosophy. Even so, a few little things became noticeable. The spot on the teacher's report headed "grading" was now left vacant. Only a guess could now be made from the script whether this might be Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fairly Good, or Fair. And a few brief visits besides the official half-day one might be made, particularly at the beginning of the year to see that everything was getting under way smoothly, and again if any particular trouble arose.

These superintendents did not pay official calls to rooms devoted solely to high school work in spite of the fact that they advised the divisional board respecting all phases of operation of any such rooms operated by that board. Three "inspectors of high schools" inspected and wrote reports on all high school rooms in the province. There were 327 such rooms in the province in 1943 and three men were able to make 477 inspections, writing an official report in each case (6, p. 69). The following summary shows the average time spent by each of these three men in his working year of 276 days.

1. For a summary of the work of these "superintendent-inspectors" in 1943, see Appendix.
AVERAGE TIME SPENT IN DIFFERENT DUTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duties</th>
<th>Average No. Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation and meetings in School Districts</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports and correspondence</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and other work in connection with authorization of High School programmes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special duties assigned by the Department</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee meetings</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the years from 1943 to 1953 although certain tendencies are discernable, and although it is practically certain that individual superintendents made somewhat radical departures from the more traditional practices, yet, by and large, the situation with respect to supervision as a whole does not seem to have altered greatly. A note by Mr. W. E. Frame, Chief Superintendent of Schools, in the 49th Annual Report of the Department of Education for 1954 (5, p.15) states:

Members of the supervisory staff continue to modernize their methods and encourage in-service training on the part of teachers. The tendency toward surveys and co-operative supervisory exercises grows. Greater professional interest on the part of teachers, as evidenced by wider reading and formal study, has been noted. Most of the divisional staffs are holding two or more one-day institutes a year.

The same difficulty already mentioned as inherent in the new position of superintendent of the division was still present. But the "few little things" previously
mentioned were now becoming more noticeable.²

The number of visits of less than half-day duration seems significant. These increased from 1694 in 1943 to 3140 in 1954, while the half-day visits remained about the same. Moreover, the number of complete reports issued dropped from 3598 to 2552. This would indicate that, for a growing number even of the half-day visits, formal official reports were not made. The total number of visits with no reports increased from 1083 to 4761. It should also be noted that the actual number of teachers or ratio of number of teachers per superintendent had not changed greatly.

Only too obvious is the fact that there was still very little time for supervision. In the 1954 report (5, p. 28), is found the following statement:

Several methods of providing additional supervisory service are reported by the superintendents. In the Clover Bar, High Prairie, Lacombe and St. Mary's River Divisions full-time supervisors of instruction are employed. Their duties are established by cooperative planning with the superintendent. These officials may supervise extensive testing programs, encourage suitable follow-up procedures, or give attention to in-service training of teachers by spending considerable time in the classrooms. There also may be time for considerable guidance work, both of individual teachers and groups of teachers and for assisting the supervisors in correspondence centers. The Divisional Supervisor can assist in planning their work and help teachers who have recently come from places outside the Province. He may assist teachers in centralized and one-room schools to organize and carry out

² For a summary of the work of the superintendent-inspectors for 1954, see Appendix.
remedial programs. While there is considerable dissimilarity in the duties entrusted to him in these divisions, all superintendents are agreed that the employment of this officials has made it possible to improve supervision and to relieve the superintendent of considerable detail.

In the Taber, Red Deer, Smoky Lake and Pincher Creek Divisions, Music Directors are members of the staffs. In the County of Vulcan the teachers of Industrial Arts and Home Economics are responsible for these courses in five centers. In the Castor Division a competent person was employed to assist correspondence-course supervisors in organizing their work. Several superintendents indicate their boards' acceptance of the need for additional supervision.

This has an encouraging tone, but in point of plain fact, only four divisions would seem to have an actual supervising-assistant for the superintendent. These are not employees of the Department of Education but are hired by the Divisional Board.

The chief hope for increased supervisory services would seem to lie in the direction of making principals into supervisors of their own schools rather than into teacher and administrator. It is doubtful if much of this nature has actually been accomplished, although, in the 1954 report (5, p. 34) is found the following:

By rearranging schedules and through employing substitute teachers, the principals of many of the larger schools have found the opportunity to devote considerable time to supervision. Principals' Associations in many divisions contributed to improving the supervision through many procedures including preparation and distribution of tests, clarifying promotional policies and content of courses, and distributing professional literature.
The situation with respect to supervision of high school rooms seems also to have undergone no marked reform between 1943 and 1953. The number of high school classrooms had increased from about 800 to about 1200 (5, p. 37) and the number of high school inspectors had been increased from three to four and a half. The explanation of the fraction is given in the following summary:

**AVERAGE TIME SPENT IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF DUTIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Inspection</th>
<th>Investigation and meetings in school districts</th>
<th>Travelling</th>
<th>Reports and Correspondence</th>
<th>Clerical and other work related to high school programs</th>
<th>Examinations</th>
<th>Special duties assigned or authorized by the Department</th>
<th>Post-Graduate Work</th>
<th>Committee Meetings</th>
<th>Conventions</th>
<th>Curriculum revision and construction</th>
<th>Average calculated on basis of four and one-half full-time high school inspectors, since one member spent more than half time as a Superintendent of Schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Average calculated on basis of four and one-half full-time high school inspectors, since one member spent more than half time as a Superintendent of Schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Their supervisory activities included "classroom visitation, individual or staff conferences, attendance as a consultant at Institutes, Workshops, subject-study groups and Principals' Association meetings" (5, p. 42).

The preceding table shows that a rather small percentage of time was available for supervision, that this
was scattered over about 270 teachers per inspector, and that it consisted very largely of inspection for the purpose of making the official report.

In the appendix there appear two versions of a "Guide for Evaluating the Work of the Teacher". The first is the guide that appears on the back of the form now used by the superintendents in making their reports and the second is the one that holds a similar position on the back of the report form for use by the high school inspectors.

At the present time there are strong indications that another wave of reform is about to sweep through the supervisory practices of the province. It is still difficult to discover whether it will bring about lesser or greater changes than did the one of fifteen years ago, but its presence can hardly be denied.

In the introduction, it was mentioned that the Canadian Education Association, with the financial backing of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, started, in 1953, a five-year project in Educational Leadership designed primarily to assist Canadian school superintendents or inspectors. It should be illuminating to consider briefly some of the chief outcomes of the short-courses held in connection with this project and then see what echoes are audible in the more practical reports of the annual conferences of school superintendents.

Following is a brief statement of the central
ideas running through the 1953 course (25, p.19):

1. A basic attribute of desirable educational leadership is that such leadership rejects autocratic direction, centering instead about the sharing of responsibility and inspiration in the processes of achieving purposeful goals.

2. Such a concept of leadership underlines the value of group procedures such as those used throughout the course: not merely at a level of techniques, however useful they may be, but also as expressive of an underlying philosophy which prizes highly the worth of each individual and his unique contribution in a given situation.

3. There is need to carry further a thorough study of reporting upon the work of teachers. Presumably the justification for such reporting by supervisory personnel is improvement in the over-all teaching-learning situation. Yet written reports involving direct or indirect ratings tend not to create climate wherein the superintendent or principal can give that leadership which best promotes the professional growth of teachers and thereby the educational growth of pupils. There is therefore need for careful reappraisal of reporting purposes and procedures, and development of possible alternatives.

4. There is great need for further research and evaluation at all levels of Canadian education. Educational decisions continually have to be made solely on the basis of opinion, since facts have not been systematically sought out, recorded, and made available as a basis for decisions. Education is ultimately an art; moreover action in education must frequently be taken before all the facts are in. Nevertheless there is ample room and vital necessity for far greater attention to scientific research as an aid to artistic judgment, if education is to move ahead.

5. The superintendent ideally should be a professionally-trained educational administrator with successful teaching experience, who should be chief coordinating official of the school system, with the function of providing educational leadership in the area which he serves.

One panel of attending superintendents (25, pp.26-28) discussed amongst other things: (1) kinds of in-service groups that might be developed--institutes, workshops, study
groups and staff meetings, (2) in-service training through the individual approach, using (a) classroom visitations by means of scheduled visits to check on school plant or curricula or by means of planned visits to determine the needs of the teacher and assist the teacher in developing a programme to meet those needs or by casual and "on-call" visits to assist with special problems, (b) individual conferences (c) inter-visitations, (d) professional and academic courses for improvement. They listed (25, p.28) certain things that could be done by the superintendent to establish desirable relationships with teachers as follows:

(a) Be sincere  
(b) Respect the teacher as a person  
(c) Give commendation and constructive criticism  
(d) Focus attention on the learning situation  
(e) Assist the teacher to develop himself  
(f) Be receptive to new methods and ideas  
(g) Give credit where credit is due  
(h) Maintain a balance between personal relationships and professional responsibility.

The whole group agreed on the following points:

1. We commend the efforts being made to make information available on an inter-provincial basis and urge an expansion of these services.

2. Because written reports on teachers involving ratings, direct or implied, do not create the best climate in which a superintendent, inspector, or principal can give that leadership which best promotes professional growth of teachers and thereby the educational growth of pupils (a) such written reports should be eliminated as rapidly as it is possible to develop other more constructive methods of evaluation; 

(b) an extensive study at an early date of this proposal is recommended to the Planning Committee of the CEA-Kellogg Project.

3. University credit towards an educational degree
should be granted for participation in work growing out of an in-service programme acceptable to the institution concerned.

4. Training in in-service education procedures should be provided for superintendents by Provincial Departments of Education.

5. Superintendents should be given opportunities through leave of absence with pay for periods up to one year to pursue further professional studies approved by their Department of Education.

6. Superintendents, in order to promote the leadership role of the principal, should encourage the following desirable developments:
   (a) A principal of a school with four or more classrooms should hold a degree from a recognized university together with at least one year of professional training.
   (b) A principal of a school with four or more classrooms should hold a Principal's certificate based on a prescribed course of training.
   (c) The principal should do some regular teaching.
   (d) The principal should regard the development of public interest in and support for his school as an integral part of his responsibility.
   (e) Principals within a locality or larger region should meet frequently with the superintendents to discuss educational problems of common interest.
   (f) There should be continued expansion of workshops for principals.

A second group spent some time discussing reports on teachers. The following may be quoted (25, p. 35):

Report forms vary from a detailed check list, as used in Newfoundland, to informal reports or memos where the superintendent is free to report as he finds necessary. Actual rating of teachers is done in some provinces, and usually this is reported only to the Departments of Education, or made available to other superintendents on request, rarely given to the school boards. Copies of reports are generally supplied to the teachers, school boards and the Departments of Education concerned. Ratings are not used directly in determining salary increments.

It was suggested that reports might not be
required in the case of all teachers, but might be used in special cases or on request of the teacher or the Board. Instead the superintendent might present an evaluation of the general educational program annually, with suggestions for improvements or modifications. The superintendent might keep his own file on teachers to be used in interchange of information among superintendents, and for his own guidance in further work with the individual teacher.

A list of recommendations of this group includes (25, pp. 37-38):

Further research into the problem of the optimum load of superintendent as far as his administrative and supervisory activities are concerned; and, in connection with this consideration of the advisability of appointing an assistant or assistants to the superintendent to whom specific duties could be delegated.

The preparation of a handbook for school trustees to assist them in policy-making and to guide their activities. Such a handbook has been prepared by the Ontario School Inspectors Association ..... 

That superintendent should be the chief education official whose function is to improve education in the area he serves;

That colleges of education throughout Canada be asked to develop course dealing with the administrative and supervisory activities of principals;

That provincial departments of education give leadership, through the superintendents, in the organization of principals' groups to study the problems of supervision and to initiate supervisory programs within their respective schools;

That the principals' teaching load be alleviated sufficiently so that they may be able to work cooperatively with their teachers in improving the teaching-learning situation within their schools and communities;

That wherever feasible or advisable, principals be given the opportunity to assume supervisory responsibility not only in their own schools but also
in neighboring rural schools, in order to allow the superintendent to devote a larger portion of his time to more isolated schools and other aspects of the supervisory program;

That the C.E.A. be asked to gather detailed information concerning the administrative and supervisory functions, throughout Canada, including qualifications required for appointment of principals, and to provide for dissemination of this information to all Departments of Education, school boards, and superintendents of schools;

That future workshops study the functions and importance of the position of vice-principal;

That research be conducted in an endeavour to determine the optimum size of a school area for administration purposes.

A third group spent considerable time on public relations. Following is a summary of certain principles they established (25, p.54):

1. **Sincerity, Honesty and Integrity** should be the basis of all information and of every activity, individual or group, concerned with a public relations programme. Techniques may vary to suit the needs but the principles and ideals remain constant.

2. **Personal commitment** both of the leader and the group to democratic principles and practices is essential to an effective and continuous programme.

3. **Involvement** of key people, from groups or community, interested—or potentially interested in education—is important. Those who have shared in analyzing the problem are most likely to initiate action to bring about its solution. A genuine effort must be made to reach every segment of the school community.

4. **Two-way Communication** in public relations means the interchange of ideas and opinions, rather than an attempted imposition of these by persons of authority. This can be achieved most effectively by face to face interviews.

5. **Public relations is a continuous process.** Each contact made by pupils and teachers with the
public is a public relation experience, good or bad. With proper leadership this contact can lead to greater interest in and support for education. Sporadic "programmes" are ineffective.

6. Sensitivity to public reaction is an essential quality of every participant in public relations. It is this capacity by which one may recognize support and identify the blocks. In this way opposition, criticism, and antagonism may often become the basis for active and positive support. This principle implies, further, a respect for the social and religious customs of individuals and groups.

These were also added (25, p.61-62):

(a) The superintendent must be personally committed to the need for and value of public relations. This implies that honesty, sincerity and integrity rather than personal expediency and aggrandizement must be his criteria for action.

(b) The leadership role of the superintendent depends upon the professional competence and educational statesmanship which he provides. Not only does this mean that he is well informed about educational trends and developments, but also that he is able to interpret those trends and stimulate appropriate action in every group, directly or indirectly interested in our schools.

(c) The superintendent must realize that the great trilogy in public relations is: (1) the child, (2) the teacher, (3) the parent. These three are the ones most vitally concerned with our schools. And only when they have achieved mutual understanding and respect may we look for a successful programme of education. Therefore, the individual school must become the nucleus or focus of any public relations programme.

(d) The two-way process implicit in individual and group involvement is an essential and integral part of good public relations. The superintendent, from the very nature of his many complex duties, cannot and should not be solely responsible for public relations. His role is varied. Sometimes it is informal and casual; at other times it is that of an educational leader ready to advise, coordinate and evaluate.
(e) The superintendent will best serve his role as an educational leader in his community by adapting his professional activities to his own personality and ability. This means that he cannot be expected to be equally expert in all aspects of his work in supervision, administration, and their component public relations.

A certain panel discussion came up with the following ideas (25, p.9):

In some larger Canadian centres superintendents are employed by the local board rather than by the provincial department. Among the major difficulties of extending this pattern throughout a province would be the following:

(a) Many boards would not be as capable as the province to select superintendents.
(b) Wealthier areas would tend to secure the better men, leaving remote rural areas which represent the greatest challenge to supervision in the hands of less capable superintendents.
(c) The provincially employed superintendent can from time to time perform a valuable advice function to the board because of his departmental connection. He might be less able to do so as a regular employee of the board.

There is room for reconsideration of possible modifications of reports on teachers expected by boards and/or the department from superintendents. In New Brunswick no report is ordinarily made, except where specifically requested. In another province the report is read at the annual meeting of the ratepayers....

From another panel comes this (25, p.92):

Supervision must aim at benefitting the child, not the teacher.
The supervisor can function most effectively in classroom visits not by any process of observing and reporting, but rather by working with the teacher on some problem focusing about the pupils or an individual pupil. For example, it might be a case of diagnostic testing, leading to formulation of a plan for remedial action....
Both superintendent and principal should supervise in the classroom.....If principals are to do so, however, they must be allowed time free from
teaching or administrative duties... The grant structure in Newfoundland allows for a full-time supervisory principal for every six teachers. In Quebec Catholic schools it is a full-time supervisory principal for every seven or eight teachers. The good teacher welcomes supervision, provided it is competent and helpful, rather than cursory and restrictive.

Under some circumstances it may be necessary for a supervisor to submit a report on a teacher's work to the school board or department. This is an activity of a secondary nature, and only in exceptional circumstances does it contribute to the main business of supervision, which is encouragement of an improved teaching-learning situation.

Another interesting point that arose (23, p.40) was the suggestion that:

With assistance, advice, and resource materials, superintendents and teachers should be commissioned to:

(1) undertake research in curriculum problems;
(2) adjust existing curricula to local needs;
(3) build locally needed new curricula.

This, however, did not come from the superintendents themselves but from the British Columbia Deputy Minister of Education.

Dr. G. M. Dunlop of the University of Alberta felt that (34, p.42):

...the superintendent can rarely carry out a research program himself. His role is to provide impetus and encouragement to a series of research committees within the school system.

Two addresses delivered at this impressive gathering would also seem to bear special mention.

M. Michel Savard, inspecteur-général des écoles primaires catholiques, Departement de l'Instruction publique, Quebec,
suggested very strongly that administration and supervision are such opposing functions that they can scarcely both be discharged by the same individual (69, pp. 23-24).

Later, in his definition of supervision he said (69, pp. 25-26):

To supervise is to teach. To teach is to communicate, to share, to help, to make discoveries, to cultivate and to bring to fruition. To teach is to give oneself to others. The success of this mission is intimately associated with wholesome human relations. And what is meant by wholesome human relations if not the meeting of two people who, by their contact and mutual understanding, each contribute to the other's betterment. This does not mean that the supervisor and the one he guides should ignore the necessity for authority and guidance. It does imply, however, complete confidence springing from the moral authority of the supervisor.

It is precisely this moral authority which is in danger, every time that the same officer who is obliged to decide in favour of the common good is called upon to meet an individual with a view to his own individual welfare.

As a school inspector, every time I was called upon to evaluate the teaching personnel by a precise and fractional mark I had the impression of showing a serious lack of respect for a human being. Conscious that I was wounding the personality of each teacher by directly undermining his sense of security which is the basis of all emotional stability and an indispensable condition of efficiency, I was afraid of losing his confidence, and, at the same time, of diminishing my own moral authority.

The supervisor must lead each one to discover himself, and in so doing, to think and act on his own initiative. The inspector accepts his role with a vision of his position in the vanguard, to train and to stimulate; not in the rear, to command, to correct, and chastise.

Dr. J. G. Althouse, Chief Director of Education, Ontario, delivered an address which might by many be
considered more old-fashioned. A few quotations are significant (9, pp. 32-36):

At the moment, let us simply note that the leader must be out in front of the rest. That fact is significant in many contexts. He must be ahead in personality and intelligence, or, if he finds that he is not, he must know how to make ripe experience and long familiarity with the local scene command the confidence even of those who are brighter and more forceful than he. Every superintendent will have to try to lead teachers, trustees, parents and ratepayers some of whom have better intellects and stronger personalities than his own. Perhaps this workshop could profitably devote some time to the study of how to lead adults who are more able than oneself.

One obvious way in which the superintendent may maintain his position of leadership is by keeping up to date in professional knowledge. This involves the early formation of the habit of professional reading, a habit not always characteristic of those who essay educational leadership in Canada. To be well informed about one's profession, one must know the sources of information, and must use at least some of those sources methodically and persistently.

It is fatally easy for a professional leader to become so honestly concerned over the difficulties of individual members of his flock that he fails to maintain the professional pre-eminence which alone justifies his claim to leadership...

...knowledge of the local situation is not complete unless it is accompanied by a good understanding of the contemporary, general picture of public education...

This is the place to point out that the current scene is always obscure unless we know a good deal about the history which has led up to that current scene—the history, indeed, which is being continued in the unfolding of that current scene. If for use there is no general history of education worth learning before Dewey, and no local history of education worth remembering before the opening of the latest new school, we must not be surprised when our educational goals turn out to be sadly out of perspective.

I suppose that what I am saying is that pretty solid, general training in education should be an important part of every superintendent's equipment, of everyone else who attempts to offer educational leadership.
You will notice, I hope, that I have coupled the close study of the locality with assiduous attention to general history...

...The point I am seeking to make is that part of recognized experience is vicarious; it comes from thoughtful study of what has befallen others who have essayed similar journeys. Unless you are able and willing to undertake this study, you have little claim to recognition as a leader...

For positions of educational leadership, only those need apply whose souls are bright and burning with sustained enthusiasm and with devoted determination to make a better world by making the people better who must live in it. If you have the honest conviction that this is possible, if you have some idea of how you propose to try to do it, do not be deterred by fear of your limitations. Go ahead; try, with the help of God, to do it ever keeping that clear aim unsullied by the preoccupation with administrative details to which you will be tempted. 3

These brief comments and quotations taken from the report of the short course held in Edmonton, Alberta, for representatives of the superintendents from all over Canada should be sufficient to give the general flavour of the feelings of the experts, and, to some extent, of the actual superintendents in the field. Actually, however it should be remembered that only a small fraction of the superintendents from each province had the opportunity of attending and those few who attended would not be a random sample, but would have been chosen for particular reasons.

3. It might be noted that in Alberta there are no statutory qualifications for a superintendent of schools. In practice he has always been a teacher with a bachelor's degree, but in many cases, he has taken no University courses in History of Education, or even any University courses on any phases of education (26, pp.3-4).
The 1954 short course held under this CEA-Kellogg Project chiefly reiterated the same principles, and little space will be devoted here to it. Further discussion was carried on about democratic supervision and about the importance of building up principalships as supervisory offices (24, p.16 and p.31). The following summary of Accepted Principles in a Good Supervisory Program may be worth quoting from the report of this 1954 CEA Short Course (24, pp.52-53):

1. A supervisory program starts with a problem or problems arising from a situation involving teacher(s) and pupils where they are.
2. Supervision is a cooperative service involving team work and its planning and evaluation. The team may be a superintendent and teacher, a principal and teacher, a supervisor and teacher, or a group of above.
3. A major purpose of supervision is to assist the teacher to identify, to isolate, to analyze, and to solve her problem(s), with the focal point, the child and the instruction of the child.
4. Since the primary purpose of supervision is the improvement of instruction, it becomes the responsibility of the supervisory staff to encourage, to assist, to guide, and even at times, to direct teachers to maximum professional development.
5. When the problem is peculiar to a particular teacher, or classroom, supervision is done through the teacher. When the problem(s) involve a number of teachers, supervision may be an involvement of a group. It is interesting to note that Group B (1954) rated classroom visitation as the most important technique providing it is followed by a conference with the teacher, or some additional techniques.
6. Supervision is effective only insofar as it leads teachers, principals, superintendent, and other members of the supervisory team to think and if necessary and advisable, to follow this thinking by related and suitable action.
7. Since teaching is a creative art, the improvement of the teaching-learning situation is to be found not in giving the teacher a bag of tricks, but rather through releasing her creative abilities, developing her originality, and cultivating her self-confidence.

8. Evaluation of the supervisory process must be in terms of what it does to:
   (a) The Teacher
   (b) The Child
As only a part of the evaluation is objective, it necessarily follows that the remaining portion is subjective, and therefore very difficult to appraise.

9. A measure of the value of the supervisory program is the extent to which it makes teachers self-confident, self-dependent, self-critical, and self-directive.

10. Since the effects of education are often slow in showing themselves, especially in interests, attitudes, and thought patterns, it becomes necessary to plan the supervisory service in terms of a long-range program.

Now what about the echoes from the CEA-Kellogg Short Courses that can be heard in the Annual Conferences of Alberta School Superintendents? As might be expected, the conference of February, 1954 was much more a sounding board for these echoes than was the conference of January, 1955, following as it did the pace-setting 1953 CEA-Kellogg meetings. In either case, however, the statements of theory and general principles have met the down-to-earth very real situations that the practising superintendents meet in their day-to-day work, producing, in some cases, very little effect on the hard wall of reality, and, in others, making a very noticeable impression.

At the 1955 conference (19, pp. 2 and 3) Dr. Coutta, now Dean of the Faculty of Education of the
University of Alberta, launched a discussion on the improvement of instruction through improved supervisory practices. He agreed that study groups and group supervisory processes were good devices, but that there was still a real need for in-service training on an individual basis. He did not think that individual supervision necessarily means undemocratic supervision, that the nature of democracy is a more subtle thing which will be preserved wherever there is proper respect for the personality of the individual. He warned that it would be very wrong to assume that teachers are trained when they graduate from the training school and urged that the superintendent teach teachers, help them examine themselves to improve their technique of teaching, and stimulate them by distribution of supervisory bulletins, circulars, periodicals and books. Another warning given was that inter-visitation would have little or no value unless there were some definite criteria on what is to take place.

The note of temperance, of restraint on the reforming zeal of the theorists and the realistic viewing of the consequences of application to the situations as they exist in Alberta schools may also be detected in the reports of the group meetings of these superintendents at their 1954 and 1955 conferences.
One group decided that the most effective vehicle for group work in supervision was the teachers' institute and that the principals needed to develop as supervisors (19, p. 4), and another section discussed the possibilities that might lie in "action-research" (19, p. 5). Promotion policies, curriculum, textbooks, elementary science, workbooks, conveyance of children to school, and a few other topics took up much of the time at the 1955 meeting (19, pp. 7, 8, 9), while, at the 1954 gathering, it would seem that nearly the entire time was taken up with consideration of some of the challenges thrown by the CEA-Kellogg course.

The individual approach to supervision came in for its share of thought. Apparently (18, p. 2), the abandonment of inspectors' reports was not seriously considered. But the desirability of having a short visit near the beginning of the year and another near the end in addition to the official half-day was reiterated, and it was also suggested that a simple "memo" report instead of an official report might suffice for even many of the half-day visits. This, of course, was merely confirming the trend observable earlier from the data in the 1943 and 1954 Annual Reports of the

---

4. The superintendents divided themselves into groups for discussion of different topics
The desirability of establishing the concept of the superintendent's visit as assistance rather than inspection was also affirmed. The importance of the individual conference following the visit was stressed (18, p.2).

He may endeavour to show her how to improve classroom tone, atmosphere, or learning situation; or where her presentation lacks forcefulness, organization is inadequate, or preparation is insufficient. It may be necessary to interpret the curriculum during this conference.

Another section or panel at the 1954 gathering classified the responsibilities of the superintendent when he visits a classroom into six categories (18, p.3):

1. Records.
2. Classroom organization.
3. Procedures and Methods of Instruction (Looking for planning, observing lessons, examining notebooks and assignments, etc.)
4. Measurement of Pupil Progress (By oral discussions, paper-and-pencil tests, checking notebooks, examining enterprise displays, etc.)
5. Pupil Promotion Policies.
6. Professional Improvement of Teachers (Suggesting reading material, advice respecting Summer School, etc.)

Although two committees (18, pp. 4 and 5) took up the topic of group supervision, both treating the
topic very respectfully, both also seem to have been somewhat incapable of playing the role of an actual participant. One committee agreed that the problem of successful introduction of group procedures is, in essence one of arousing the interest of principals in this field and getting them started in the role of leader for a group supervision program. The other committee also asserted that (16, p.5):

Group supervision establishes a new role for the principal. A group project demands his supervision, requires his time, and provides a purpose for his visitation of classrooms. Senior principals eventually should take some responsibility for junior schools and rural schools in their respective areas.

Thus again may be seen the real factors existing in Alberta—heavily worked superintendents, great distances throughout the rural divisions, relatively untrained teachers—greatly modifying the application of theoretical principles, even begetting a reluctance to make self-identification with the scheme. What is more, there seems little doubt that premature impulsive attempts to do any differently would result in a good measure of chaos.

Two other groups, studying the question of Report-Making on Inspection and Supervisory Visits, seem to have felt somewhat more at ease (16, p.6):

There was general agreement that written reports have a particular place in the field of supervision. The formal report may improve the quality of instruction by offering constructive criticism of various aspects of teaching or by giving encouragement to the
teacher who may be despondent or defeatist in her attitude. Reports also have an important evaluation function for the teacher seeking employment or better certification, for Boards seeking guidance in employment and dismissal of teachers, and for the Department of Education.

The question of honesty in reporting was discussed. There was some agreement that adverse criticism should be included only as a summary of a teacher-superintendent interview, and only when supported by specific instances. There was some consensus of opinion that, to the skilled reader of reports, omissions might be equally as significant as included statements.

It was agreed that complete formal reports should be written at the request of the teacher or Board, at the discretion of the Superintendent, and in any event so that a teacher will receive at least three reports during her first six years of service. In all other cases, consistent use of the memo report is recommended. However, it was considered satisfactory procedure to issue no report following a short supervisory visit, a visit to gather data, or a visit where no criticism is offered.

A teacher-superintendent conference following a supervisory visit is a valuable adjunct of the written report. Written reports should follow closely after the visit. The content of supervisory reports to teachers should not be revealed to the principal. It was thought that a report on the school as a whole would serve a useful purpose.

Discussion on the form of report resulted in the recommendation of a simplified, letter-size form, which has since been approved by the Minister. This form is to be used for formal reports to the Board on the teacher. It may be accompanied by a "memo" report to the teacher at the discretion of the Superintendent.

A rather significant item at the 1954 Annual conference was the presentation by Dr. G. L. Mowat, one of the High School Inspectors, of an interim report of the committee set up to study relationships involving principals of schools and field men of the Department (13, pp.8 and 9):
The committee had restricted itself to developing a plan for improving supervisory practice. There were three basic assumptions: all persons concerned with educational work have a contribution to make; the responsibility of a supervisory officer for educational practices and results is in direct ratio to his proximity and accessibility to the classroom; and supervision includes group meetings in addition to classroom visitation.

General principles were outlined in the fields of administration, instruction, and evaluation. The implications of these principles for the High School Inspectors, the Superintendents, and the school Principals were examined. Discussion developed concerning the privileges, duties, and rights of the Superintendent with respect to high school classrooms. A new concept of the Superintendent's responsibility developed at the time of the formation of School Divisions. As he is the senior executive officer of the Division, he is therefore administratively responsible for advice to the Board re staff employment, transfers and promotions. In order to have some valid basis for recommendations he should be familiar with the work of the High School teacher in the classroom. The Deputy Minister emphasized the need for clarification of the position of the Superintendent, establishing his right to enter Divisional high school rooms if he wishes.

It was pointed out that he did not have the same responsibility with respect to independent districts. The High School inspector is still definitely responsible for all formal reporting. There was general agreement that the Superintendent should be the final administrative authority in direction of Divisional policy.

In April 1955 the final report of this committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Mowat was completed and a statement based upon its recommendations was prepared by the Department of Education. This statement (7) was put in the hands of all the supervisory staff. The major implications would seem to be (7, pp. 3 and 4):
a. Locally: The principal should have time to supervise the work of the teachers of the grades under his principalship, or to relieve other competent teachers of his staff to supervise where frequent and regular supervisory contacts are desirable. The abilities of the whole staff should be utilized for the professional advancement of all the members, as well as for instruction. When it is feasible that this be done, the principal should be consulted with respect to the appointment of teachers to the staff of the school.

Administratively the principal should assist the superintendent by exercising, periodically, supervision of equipment, maintenance and repairs.

b. Divisionally: The availability of assistance being a major factor which determines the adequacy of supervision, the superintendent, depending upon circumstances, should have supervisory assistance for specified groups of schools, or in the division as a whole, where the numbers and sizes of schools make impractical the provision of adequate time for the resident principal to supervise.

The superintendent should familiarize himself with the quality of instruction provided by teachers who join the divisional staff, and maintain adequate contacts with all high school teachers.

c. Regionally: The high school inspector should:
1. Meet the high school staff of each division, or failing this, the principals, at least once annually;
2. Make a thorough study of high school instruction for the whole division periodically and regularly;
3. Be on call by any superintendent who has become familiar with a situation that needs immediate attention, at the request of the superintendent;
4. Continue in consultation with respect to any plan of supervision developed by the superintendent and principals.

"Immediate purposes" appearing in the statement (7, p.5) were:

(a) To develop the principalship into a leadership position having an intimate responsibility for instruction.
(b) To make available frequent and sustained supervisory assistance in the school, division and region respectively.

The final section of the report (7, pp. 5 and 6) lists the functions of principal, superintendent and high school inspector:

**Functions of Principal**

(a) To meet his staff regularly in the carrying out a program for the improvement of instruction.

(b) To make provisions for visiting or to visit teachers, and provide for constructive discussion and assistance in instruction problems.

(c) To refer problems to the superintendent, be familiar with problems which are the concern of the superintendent and to provide for follow-up as in (a) and (b) above.

(d) To give leadership in educational methods and programs.

(e) The development of promotion and evaluation policies in co-operation with superintendents and teachers.

**Superintendent**

(a) To develop supervisory programs; to visit classrooms in divisions and inspectorates.

(b) To refer problems to the principal, to discuss them, and to provide for follow-up measures within the school or area.

(c) To become familiar with high school problems, to refer them, when necessary to the high school inspector and to provide the "follow-up" measures.

(d) To serve as consultant to study-groups of teachers in schools or Alberta Teachers' Association groups.

**High School Inspector**

(a) To visit classrooms upon request of the superintendent, to discuss problems with principal and superintendent, and to advise.

(b) Regularly and thoroughly to study
divisional secondary education, by visiting each teacher, and by investigating other aspects of the organization and administration.

(c) To act as consultant to study-groups of teachers in schools or Alberta Teachers' Association workshops, to the extent which it is feasible to act in this capacity and also to carry out his other responsibilities.

As this report (7) is an official statement from the Department, it is to be taken rather seriously as an indication of what definite supervisory changes are actually going to be instituted as a result of the new "revolution of the '50's".

Most apparent is the official acceptance of the oft-repeated demand that the principals are going to be expected to play an increased role in supervision, even to the making of classroom visitations. Only time will tell the extent to which this hope is implemented. Later in this thesis, attention will be given to this question of the extent and nature of desirable supervision by the principal.

Another rather obvious conclusion from the report (7) is that the divisional superintendent is, in some way, going to have his scope broadened to include some nature of inspection or supervision of the high school rooms. If he were to be relieved of some of his many other duties, this proposal could mean the beginning of a real supervisory program for high schools, with the
superintendent co-ordinating the efforts towards definite improvement in classroom instruction. If he is given but little relief, this proposal could mean, at worst, little more than a double inspection for high school teachers, with this added one by the local superintendent having no written report but, rather, a verbal and secret one to the Board to affect promotions and dismissals. Actually, even though the idea of principal-supervision were to develop rapidly, the superintendent would gain very little extra time, for he would still need the half-day visits to teachers for the making of official reports. It is doubtful if this function would be handed to the principal, although he probably could make oral and secret reports to the superintendent to take the place of written ones.

The position of the high school inspector does not seem to be left in a very clear light. Apparently (7, p. 2) he is still to visit teachers in their classrooms at regular intervals. If this means at least one half-day every two years, then, with the existing staff, no duties beyond those already fulfilled could be added.

On the other hand, if the visits are to be only on request and the main duty is to act as consultant to study groups, the situation would be very different. There would probably then be no lack of time, but the question arises as to the competency of any one man to be the expert on all matters pertaining to high schools. This first obvious weakness might cause the collapse of what,
fundamentally, is probably a good idea, and the high school inspector changed to a high consultant might not find valuable employment.

All in all, changes are inevitable, and it shall remain for following chapters to investigate further the types of changes already proposed and already (in some cases) carried out elsewhere and relate them to the Alberta scene.
CHAPTER III

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES IN SUPERVISION

The concept of supervision has changed greatly. Before 1920 it was chiefly inspection. From 1920 to 1935 it was thought of as direction, --telling what, when and how to teach. Since 1935 it is considered co-ordination and service. (48, p.105)

This statement, expressed in various ways, may be found in nearly every one of many recent books on supervision.

Bradfield (20, pp.21-23) says that the role of supervision has changed from that of direction and instruction to that of educational leadership concerned with in-service education and improvement. He then lists eight principles that seem to characterize the modern concept of supervision:

1. Techniques of supervision should provide for democratic leadership. Teachers are more creative, as they feel that they can make worth-while decisions. Individual personality is respected and working together is encouraged.

2. Techniques of supervision should provide for group action. A co-operative working atmosphere is established where provision is made for faculty sessions in which teachers as a group have an opportunity to identify the problems of the school
and to plan ways of meeting them. Modern supervisors must be alert to opportunities to bring teachers together in working groups; to take advantage of the strength that results from group action.

3. Techniques of supervision should provide for good human relations—not "just assisting with classroom problems". The teacher's personal problems and out-of-school life are important for the school. Supervisors should not increase tension but reduce it. They should allow teachers to express views without fear of reprisal, recognize their contributions and give them a sense of worth.

4. Techniques of supervision should provide for teachers' continuous self-improvement. Their interests must be aroused. Dictatorial orders are of doubtful value. Their own plans (in group work) should interest them more. Good supervision will encourage every teacher to engage in some kind of experimental and research work.

5. Techniques of supervision should assist teachers in all phases of their work. "The growth of the whole teacher" is as important as "the growth of the whole child". Supervisors should give teachers the kind of help that they can use to help themselves. Methods
should be adapted to the individual teacher. Some do best with just the essentials of direction. Others need much—e.g., a well-planned series of demonstrations, etc.

6. Techniques of supervision should be adapted to each teaching-learning situation. The amount and kind of supervision needed depends upon the qualifications of the teacher. Meetings, bulletins, etc., may not be useful for all. Each teacher needs to be studied.

7. Techniques of supervision should provide for improving the whole teaching-learning environment through a cooperative effort. Even buildings, grounds, and supplies are important.

8. Techniques of supervision should provide for varied individual and group procedures. There should be individualized supervision as well as group supervision. No one technique is "best."

It would, however, be a great error to assume that all or even most of these concepts are products of the last decade.

Burton in 1922 (21, pp. 9-10) mentions in-service training in the following quotation:

Supervision consists of:
1. Improvement of the teaching act.
2. Improving teachers in service.
5. Rating teachers.
In 1925 there appeared in the Journal of the N. E. A. (14, p. 9):

The highest and most professional aim of expert supervision is to minister to the three most vital needs in the progress of the teacher:

1. Skillful technique of teaching.
2. Inspiration to professional growth.
3. A creative participation in the curricular development of the school system.

In 1932, the following eight supervisory duties were pointed out (15, p. 16):

1. Unifying and obtaining continuity within a given field of instruction.
2. Directing improvement of classroom teaching.
3. Improving teachers in service.
4. Selecting and organizing subject-matter content and instructional materials.
5. Participating in the selection, assignment and transfer of teachers.
6. Participating in extra-curricular activities.
7. Developing and maintaining morale.
8. Participating in professional activities.

In 1938, in a book on supervision (15, pp. 19-23), statements are found which seem curiously like those of 1955, thus:

Certain highly important trends are discernible in the theory and practice of supervision in this country.

1. There is an increasing objectivity in defining the scope and activities of supervision. This shows the influence of scientific thought in education.
2. There is equally clear a tendency towards emphasis upon democratic attitudes, beliefs, and procedures. This is the result of modern, philosophic thought in education.
3. There is a tendency toward the extension of supervision to include far more than in times past. This is probably the result of more careful and more analytic thought
concerning the relation of education to life.

4. There is an extension of the practice of distributing supervisory duties among a larger number of persons.

Supervision is still what it always has been, an expert technical service primarily concerned with studying and bettering the conditions that surround learning. Supervision may be divided into three major functions as follows:

1. Studying the Teaching-Learning Situation
   (a) Analyzing objectives of education and of supervision.
   (b) Surveying the products of learning.
   (c) Studying the antecedents of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory Growth and Pupil Achievement.
   (d) Studying interests, capacities, and work habits of pupils.
   (e) Studying the teacher at work and aiding her to study herself.
   (f) Studying the Curriculum in Operation.
   (g) Studying the materials of instruction and the Socio-Physical Environment of Learning.

2. Improving the Teaching-Learning Situation:
   (a) Improving the Educational Objectives and the Curriculum.
   (b) Improving interest, application and work habits of pupils.
   (c) Improving the teacher and her methods.
   (d) Improving the materials of instructions and the Socio-Physical Environment of Learning.

3. Evaluating the Means, Methods, and Outcomes of Supervision:
   (a) Discovering and Applying the Techniques of Evaluation.
   (b) Evaluating the general worth of supervision.
   (c) Evaluating the results of given supervisory plans.
   (d) Evaluating factors limiting instructional outcomes.
   (e) Evaluating and improving the personnel of supervision.

Not only this, but some statements are found which seem to go far beyond 1955 insofar as Alberta is concerned
Traditional supervision has centered around the teacher and the classroom act, and has been based upon the concept of undertrained teachers who needed careful direction and training, but now, since most teachers have had many years of extensive training, they should take their place as co-operating members of a total group concerned with improvement of learning. It will take some time yet before all this can come to pass in Alberta.

In the same book of 1938 (15, p. 23) the following contrasts in supervision were made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Modern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>Study and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher focused</td>
<td>Aim, material, method, teacher, pupil and environment focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation and conference</td>
<td>Many diverse functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random and haphazard</td>
<td>Definitely organized and planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposed and authoritarian</td>
<td>Derived and co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person usually</td>
<td>Many persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not too different from a 1953 summary of supervision in Spears' new textbook (75, pp. 108-109):

THE RANGE OF SUPERVISION

Service for the individual teacher
Utilization of non-school personnel and facilities
Probationary teachers given extra attention
Evaluation of the outcomes of instruction
Visitation of schools and classrooms regularly
In-service programs arranged for continuous growth
Selection of instructional materials
Institutes and workshops made meaningful
Organization of continuous curriculum study
Numerous other leadership services, including community contacts, the correlation of administrative functions, addressing meetings, arranging demonstrations, etc.
THE SPIRIT OF SUPERVISION

Stimulation of instruction and learning, satisfaction in the work

Unity of supervisory effort
Participation and promotion by a maximum number
Encouragement rather than discouragement
Respect for personality, recognition of effort
Visits by supervisors that are welcomed by the teachers

Inspiration without uncertainty
Service rather than dictation, sharing rather than ordering, security rather than fear
Idea drawn from the entire group
Organization that respects democratic principles
New things tried without tearing down the good in the old

Enough has been said of the modern concepts of supervision to make it clear that there are certain outstanding features which are so prominent that they cannot escape notice.

1. There is a striving for democracy

2. There is considerable attention given to the importance of the curriculum and the nature of curriculum that supervisors should promote.

3. There is great emphasis on the idea that the whole purpose of supervision is in-service training.

4. There is always present the stated desire that supervisory services be expanded much beyond the point where they now are.

Some attention shall be devoted to each of these four aspects of the theory and practice of supervision.
Supervision and the Democratic Concept

The growing concern about the degree of democracy inherent in various aspects of educational institutions is reflected in the standard 1926 text (14, pp.77-81). Quoted in the text are Kilpatrick's "principles of sane supervision" from his "Supervisors En Masse", Journal of Educational Method, 2:36-37, October 1922:

1. Growing is the Great End, the Growing of All Together.
   (a) Growing is the essence of the good life.
      To grow is to live, the only way to live well.
   (b) The teacher's business is to help the children thus to grow.
   (c) The supervisor's business is with the teachers to help them grow--to grow as persons in themselves, to grow specifically in such fashion that they will best help their children to grow.

2. Professional Study is Necessary.
   (a) A proper study of available sources will throw significant light on the purpose and bearing of education, on the nature and process of learning, on the nature and function of subject matter and on the nature and function of method.
   (b) If teachers will progressively avail themselves of the foregoing, they will themselves the more likely grow--and pupils will, in turn, the more likely grow--and be the happier.
   (c) It is the supervisor's duty to be able and disposed to lead the teaching body in and to the progressive appropriation and application of the professional material suggested above. In this it is highly advantageous that all concerned feel themselves as pioneers working together in a joint social venture.

3. Democratic Supervision Demands Respect for Personality.
   (a) Democracy demands that each respect the other's personality as it is now and with reference to what it may become.
(b) The right of self-direction follows from the respect due to personality, a right to be accorded in the degree that others are equally considered.

(c) The good teacher will grant the greatest feasible self-direction to the pupils; this means growing in them and respect for their personalities. In like manner, the supervisor will ever seek to extend the self-direction of the teachers; it brings growth to them; it respects their personalities. Democracy is thus served.

After quoting Kilpatrick, the authors then go on to say that many students of education have sharply criticized these statements and that there is readily noted an absence of reference to the objective and research side of supervision. However, they further declare (14, p. 79):

...the statement is valuable since it presents and reflects the Dewey philosophy of education with its emphasis on democracy, freedom and growth.

Few concepts in education have been more abused than that of democracy. Because of mistaken ideas concerning democracy many foolish demands have been made, and many untenable positions taken by workers in all lines, including teachers. On the other hand, many administrators, for the same reason, have seemed almost to renounce their rights as leaders and executives...Democracy has implicitly in it the idea of delegated authority and of obedience to properly constituted expert leadership. ...supervision is a matter of constructive, co-operative leadership. Authority should be delegated most judiciously, and expert leaders should be rigorously trained and carefully selected. Much of the criticism that has come from the teaching staff concerning supervision indicates that the critics themselves have been somewhat lacking in a correct understanding of what true democracy is. Many of the strictures on the lack of democracy are not based so much upon any real lack of democracy in the leadership as upon the fact that there is leadership at all.
Liberty and freedom under leadership is not desired so much as liberty and freedom from leadership of any kind. The liberty of whim, notion, and caprice is desired in place of the liberty of real democracy.

In a statement quoted by Barr and Burton from Hosie's "The Democratization of Supervision", School and Society (2, pp.331-336), March 20, 1920, appears a rather bitter reaction to the plans of Dewey and Kilpatrick for "democratization":

He [the supervisor] is indispensable, and where he is actually functioning, there is little excuse for agitation for more democracy in the school system. If agitation there is, it will be found to spring mainly from a desire to lead rather than to be led. In fact under the guise of devoted democracy, there may too often be described, only too thinly concealed, the ugly form of bolshevism rampant.

The text also discusses (1st, pp.189-193) the question of teacher-rating, a controversial question in view of the concern over democracy and its meaning. The writers consider that rating of teachers is quite essential in spite of arguments that it leads to unprofessionalism cannot be standardized, may lead to abuses and may set up artificial standards. The writers argue that when the administrative rating by rating cards or something similar is abolished in theory, there will still be rating, but very subjective, secret, and based upon little evidence. Administrators would be faced with necessity of rating, but would simply lack courage to do so openly and honestly. Because of the hatred of administrative rating, some teachers might
even object to supervisory rating just on principle.

Supervisory reasons for rating are listed as (14, p. 449):

(a) To improve the teacher in service.
(b) To stimulate self-analysis, self-criticism, and self-improvement.
(c) To raise professional standards.
(d) To provide supervisors and principals with uniform standards with which to judge teachers, analyze their work, and stimulate improvement.
(e) To provide teachers a statement of the standards by which they are being judged, toward which they should devote their efforts to improve.

It is stated (14, p. 453) that supervision has not been good enough, that many supervisors lacking sufficient background have been appointed, but that there is no argument for abolishing the very valuable supervision.

An example of the proponents of the "democratic" Dewey-Kilpatrick school is Collings. But, peculiarly enough, there are certain highly undemocratic overtones to his writings (29, pp. 221-222 and 231-232). He would have one of the chief duties of the supervisor be to persuade teachers to read books promoting belief in the concept of education held by Collings himself—books by himself, Dewey, Kilpatrick, and Meriam. Moreover, teaching improvement would be measured continuously in terms of an Activity Score Card and Computation of Group Drive Index and Response Index, all to be charted to demonstrate "improvement" in teaching. Thus, indoctrination of teachers in a particular brand of "democratic, activity, group growth" educational
philosophy would seem to be one of the aims of this supervisory program. And surely the indoctrination of any one type of belief is essentially undemocratic. It need hardly be mentioned that this highly enthusiastic group of "progressivists" ostensibly following Dewey, wielded tremendous influence in education throughout the 1930's and 1940's and are still a powerful force.

Gradually, however, a less autocratic type of democracy is coming to the foreground—a belief that there are many different correct answers to the same question depending upon the situation, a belief that a teacher may be a very good teacher even if he employs methods and techniques quite at variance with those promoted by the superintendent. Several writings will be cited as indicative of such a trend.

Mones (63, p.79) says that the good supervisor works with people and yet can become a separate identity and stand apart to take responsibility. He does not use prefabricated "best" techniques but uses those that arise naturally from the situation.

Ward (82, pp.213-216) dislikes standardized techniques and feels that the supervisor should be a co-ordinator to bring together all the traces of evidence valuable and relative to the solution of the problem; for methods of solution are created by the circumstances demanding correction or adjustment. A lack of standardized
techniques, a wealth of quickly-created, quickly-used and quickly-discarded methods, all devised to correct or to adjust a situation with little or no thought of filing for future reference would constitute good supervision.

Frazier says that he and all other supervisors should do a great deal more to study older teachers in order to benefit from their experience and in order to discover how they developed into good teachers. He states (42, pp. 75-79):

We should try to make their concerns ours, not always our concerns theirs. We often err in trying to get experienced teachers to adapt themselves to our way of working. If we understood, we could probably help them in their own direction and according to their own objectives and methods.

In this same vein, Abrahamsen in writing of the 1951-52 research project conducted in the Connecticut public schools by Yale University and the Bureau for Interracial Education (1, pp. 82, 85), asserts that this project, whose principal activity was a program of in-service education for teachers, promoted no "new way" of teaching. Various experiments were made, but the acceptance of a theory depended upon whether it worked when that teacher tried it. So any principles learned by the teacher were real ones because he had had supervised practice in using them.

Smith (73, pp. 12-14) says that the new larger
units of administration, improved buildings and equipment, higher teacher qualifications, all are good if made effective through co-ordination and through a high type of supervision to keep the individual classrooms functioning with maximum efficiency. He makes the following points:

1. Supervision should be a unifying and co-ordinating influence in the school.
2. Supervision is intended to increase the strong points of teaching.
3. Supervision should recognize the good being done to help teachers improve in those fields too.
4. Supervision should strengthen and justify our faith in many of the old procedures and techniques of teaching.
5. Supervision should emphasize the fact that successful teaching has no recipe.

The stress here given to the unifying and co-ordinating role of the supervisor again reflects something of the dawn of the broader concept of democracy. After all, if the teachers dislike the supervisor, not as much value accrues from the supervision as would be the case under happier conditions. If principal, superintendent and whatever other assistant supervisors there may be do not closely co-operate for a unified effort, little but frustration can result.
In this connection, Smitter (74, pp. 375-380) makes the following suggestions:

1. Supervisors (or "consultants") must be well-trained in school procedures and in adult education (to reach the teachers and make them like it).

2. The superintendent must praise the supervisor and give him (her) plenty of praise -- always.

3. The superintendent must co-ordinate the work of the general supervisor and that of the various special supervisors. Thus, it is poor for the health supervisor to criticize a teacher for poor lighting when the arrangement was made by the general supervisor to obtain more informality in the classroom.

4. More in-service training for supervisors is needed.

5. Confidence and support of the principal (administrator) must always be forthcoming. Get his teachers to accept the supervisor.

6. The administrator should plan with the supervisor and teachers, a long-range program of supervision-- and each day have a purpose.

7. Provision must be made for the supervisor to have all the teachers in a group quite frequently. Group work saves time.
3. Time-off should be allowed for teachers—to take at least one day per month in an "institute" with the supervisor.

This important matter of inter-relationships and co-ordination of effort was dealt with quite extensively by Burton (22) in 1929. So, although far from a brand-new idea, it is receiving fresh emphasis with the waning of autocratic democracy.

From staff relationships to the field of public relations is only a small step, and, in this connection, one might wish that Spinning's advice (77, pp. 56-68) were always applicable, when he says to the superintendent; "Don't worry about public relations, just do your job." Fortunately, that advice does work a great deal of the time to a much greater extent than is easily believed in this day of highly-advertised public-relations experts so eagerly consulted by businessmen and educators alike. The public, given a little time to adjust to something new, is usually wise enough to appreciate what is being done by the man who does a good job in his field even though he does not try to play demagogue, politician, or statesman. Unfortunately, this does not always work out, but the only hope of true democracy is that it finally will.

The important point of the whole matter is that a preoccupation with "public relations" may stifle initiative
and produce a listless laissez-faire which may provide a measure of security and freedom from controversy but no satisfaction in achieving anything. Of course, even an educator should be practical, and, as far back as approximately forty years ago, Chancellor (27) wrote a very practical book giving superintendents good advice on ways of handling board members and dealing with the public. The counsel is still good, but much of the present-day morbid absorption in the fine nuances of public relations might better be transformed into the purposeful activity of accomplishment. The result might well be that public relations would greatly improve.

In further catering to those widely accepted interpretations of democracy previously mentioned, a tremendous drive was instigated to get teachers into groups, committees or "workshops" at frequent intervals. Obviously, group instruction, although not as effective as private tutoring, is certainly more efficient. Repeating the same thing to a hundred different people is hardly as businesslike as telling the hundred people this particular thing while they are in a group. No one has ever denied the necessity of group instruction. The "workshop", however, is not just a meeting to hear a lecture. In fact, for several years, the word "lecture"
was almost blasphemous. Instead, all members were supposed to participate and reach a "group solution" to some problem. In that way the problem was democratically solved and each participant had undergone a growth from within. Having basically many commendable features, this democratic workshop idea became, during the '40's another aspect of autocratic democracy and has, in the '50's been attacked rather vehemently.

The better type is discussed by Graham, (43, pp.333-336). Pre-requisites for any accomplishment in such ventures are small groups (under thirty-five), common interests, ample time, a leader to keep all discussion on the topic and a very definite stated purpose of the meeting. Graham, a workshop enthusiast, defends the lecture-type meeting in all cases where new material or anything of a technical nature is to be presented.

Fitzpatrick (40, p.70) makes very unkind remarks about workshops in general. He uses the old story of the king who wore no clothes. Because his tailors kept telling him how fine his clothes really were, he thought it was only the fault of his poor perception that he could see none on himself. It was finally a small child who opened his eyes by asking him why he went naked. Fitzpatrick compares the "fancy talk" about workshops to the clothes for the king. But the child saw that he was
just naked, -- and the school board members are the children.

In the "double talk", "participation" means anything but individualism or democracy. The end is simply "social integration", reduction of "social tensions". One participates that he may participate; by letting others decide, one decides. By subordinating oneself to the group, one becomes an individual.

In "Is Anybody Listening", William H. Whyte, Jr., writes:

Instead of the voice of the natural leader, then, polls and surveys—tests and scales and field work. No ordinary mediocrity this, but planned, engineered mediocrity—and the social engineer's jargon is the measure of it.

In view of the above, much that has seemed inexplicable in school board-superintendent relations, and in "workshops" and "group dynamics" will seem clearer.

Not much less bitter is Bartky, as shown by the following remarks (17, pp. 268-9, 288, and 289):

Committees are not substitutes for leadership talent...There is nothing innately democratic in the employment of committees to do what can be better and more efficiently be accomplished by the existing line-and-staff agencies...the self-instruction which results from participation in committee action is apt to be a hit or miss affair. It is extremely unlikely that it will strike at basic teaching weaknesses. More often it is wasteful of time. It might take years for a teacher to get something from serving in committees that she could obtain directly from a supervisor in but a few moments.

In his review of Bartky's book (55, p. 319),
Lynch remarks that:

Some students of supervision and some practitioners... might be inclined... to peg his position somewhere near the "autocratic" end of the autocratic-democratic scale. His continual reminders, however, that supervision is too complex a process for cookbook recipes or stereotyped methods, and that the supervisor can assume no patterned approach toward all teachers gradually build up into a view widely accepted in the field of practice.

Before leaving this complex question of just what is democratic supervision, it will be useful to go back briefly to one of Dewey's statements (32, pp. 216-218) in his "Democracy for the Teacher". Here Dewey pleads for freedom for the teacher to make her own course of study and to evolve her own methods of teaching. If teachers must employ methods dictated by others, teaching will be mechanical, capricious, and clumsy. The only way to grow in responsibility is to share responsibility. Otherwise those of initiative will just quit teaching.

No one can deny that any teacher with good training, good intelligence, and enthusiasm should certainly have considerable freedom in the handling of her own pupils. It is not so clear that the course of study for every school or school room should be different from every other one. But, although a course of study probably should be at least partly prescribed, surely the teacher should not be dictated to or even mildly coerced with respect to methods of teaching that course. Unfortunately, Collings and other disciples of Dewey seemed to run to a
rather autocratic extreme on method—the very part that should be left as free as possible.

To preserve some semblance of similarity of program in the schools of at least each small area, and, at the same time, to retain democracy, committees or workshops became widely used for curriculum-formulating purposes. Some outspoken reaction against the workshop and committee idea has already been pointed out. Martin, (56, pp. 350-353) makes his comments in particular about curriculum committees, suggesting again the presence of autocratic democracy. He insists that programs of curriculum-change frequently have been semireligious rituals designed to make new converts to a predetermined plan,—that agreement is sought artfully and subtly. He maintains that the leaders or superintendents usually do not have a clear idea of what they are trying to improve and do not conduct genuine experiments. He contends that, even if the aforementioned evils were eliminated, the committee process would still be poor because the abilities of most teaching staffs to use group techniques in problem-solving is limited. He has only contempt for these leaders of curriculum committees who "know it all from the start" and who brush aside as trivial the reasonable questions asked by the teacher (until she

5. We might also remember that the teachers he has in mind are all university graduates.
learns better!

It seems, at this point, that there is a perceptible drift from the consideration of the first feature of contemporary concepts of supervision—the striving for democracy, to the second one respecting the importance of the curriculum and the nature of curriculum that supervisors should promote.

But before taking leave of this highly charged question of democracy, just a glance at some gleanings from Wheeler, (85, pp. 90-95). The teachers attending his Summer School class at Columbia expressed certain opinions about democratic and undemocratic supervisors. Here are a few statements from descriptions of the democratic type of supervision.

It was all right to be different... I wanted to try a new method of teaching spelling. The supervisor helped me and encouraged me. Teachers often approached him informally. He created a 'belonging' atmosphere. I got credit for what I did. The supervisor put himself in my place. Criticize kindly and give positive help for improvement.

...invites one teacher to help another.
...gave the impression that we were all engaged in an experiment.

Amongst the undemocratic characteristics were listed such things as just writing and holding no conference with the teacher, leaving before a particular lesson was completed, and interrupting a class to "show the right way" or for some other reason.
To the writer there appears no easy formula for democratic supervision. It is doubtful whether forcing people to vote in elections would further democracy. It is doubtful whether the holding of innumerable referendums would do so. The parallels in both pupil-teacher and teacher-superintendent relationships are rather obvious. The maintenance of democratic relationships depends not so much upon exterior trappings as upon attitudes. Mental freedom is not enhanced by subtle coercion into making opinions on things about which there is inadequate knowledge. Individuals differ greatly, and what is servitude for one is freedom for another. Deep and sincere friendliness and respect is probably as safe a criterion as any to use. This should be universal and should be the keynote. It should apply to children, adolescents, and adults of all degrees of intelligence, ability and ambition. But to consider all people identical, to suppose that proper treatment for one is the proper treatment for all, implies a warped interpretation of democracy rather out of place in our individualistic society. There is no implication of autocracy, no lack of respect and friendship implied if the opinion of the three-year old child is not consulted by the father when he buys a new heating system for the home. Whether it does in the case of his wife depends entirely upon the wife—her knowledge of and attitude
toward the matter. Every case must be considered on its own merits. Certainly any superintendent who does not try to give the opportunity for each teacher to develop to the extent of her willingness and ability, is guilty of undemocratic procedure. The fact that this is difficult to avoid is inescapable, but there is no great promise that committees, votes and workshops will rectify the situation. In some cases it may simply provide a "democratic" veneer for a fundamentally autocratic supervisor who therefore can tell his conscience he is democratic but who might never become as truly democratic as one of his colleagues—a keen discernor of individual differences, who has never promoted a workshop in his life.

The Supervisor and the Curriculum.

One of the chief efforts of state departments is the improvement of curriculum—another is improvement of teaching. (49, p.103)

This statement probably has as much validity in the Canadian provinces as in the states of the United States. It is to be expected, therefore, that the supervisory staff of the Department would be quite intimately connected with curriculum growth and, in any case, would have to be responsible for the application of the curriculum in the schools of the province.

In the previous section we have already mentioned
curriculum with reference to democratic concepts, noting the "what" of the curriculum and the "how". Dewey (32, pp. 216-218) felt very strongly about giving the teacher complete freedom to make her own course of study. But his disciple, Collings, (29, pp. 221-232) felt just as strongly that the teaching methods should be ruthlessly standardized in conformity with the new "activity-growth-group drive" philosophy. We have also seen that impatience with this autocratic democracy was expressed by various people. One example was Martin (56, pp. 350-353) who referred to the leaders of teachers' curriculum committees as "know it all" leaders who brushed aside practical questions as trivial and went on with the "semireligious rituals designed to make new converts to a predetermined plan".

Bartky also expresses dissatisfaction with this attitude, apparently feeling, like the writer, that the greater degree of freedom should be allowed in the "how" or the methods and that a varying degree of prescription, dependent upon circumstances, in the "what"--in the actual courses of study, would not necessarily violate in any way the democratic spirit.

Bartky declares (16, pp. 241-244) that he does not want to be burned at the stake by "superdemocratic curriculum construction" priests, but that he will bravely
maintain that it is a mistake to think that there is some "moral right" that teachers, even those who are young and hold no more than a bachelor's degree, should determine what is to be taught. He contends that it is just as proper to give them a curriculum as to have the surgeon, even without your advice on methods, give you an appendectomy. Bartky insists, however, that he does not believe in the overwhelming importance of curriculum in the first place, that curriculum methodology, audio-visual aids, etc., are just tools and that the real hope lies in training teachers to be teachers. He intimates that the supervisors are, therefore, of tremendous importance, for they are the teachers' teachers and helpers. Following is his list of the five prime duties of the supervisor.

1. He provides a curriculum or assists the teacher to build her own.
2. He suggests methods, or encourages the teacher to build her own.
3. He encourages the teacher to learn about children.
4. He tells the teacher about parents and public.
5. He cares for the teacher's mental health in order that she may be effective and enthusiastic.

It is one of the tasks of supervision, affirms Bartky, to assist in making the curriculum which best fits a given teacher. The "child-centered" curriculum, he avers, is good in theory but not in practice except for a very few special teachers. The curriculum must be, in the end, produced by the supervisor to fit the teacher's abilities and needs. Bartky complains that since the 1920's it has
been considered bad taste for an educator to lower himself
to the point of discussing definite methods of imparting
definite information in school, that it has not been
considered scholarly to concern oneself with the actual
teaching of specific things, and that, in the training
institutions, vague principles and aims and objectives
are discussed in ambiguous terms. He argues that the
plain, practical matters are considered "unimportant
details" to be relegated to the artificer—the teacher
who does the "dirty work", the plebeian task of educating
the child.

Flinker (41, pp. 31–32) also complains about
supervisors who give advice about something of which they
are ignorant in practical details. He suggests that
higher authorities may hand out a directive to "change
the program to a more modern one". So the superintendent,
who may know very little about it, asks the teachers to
"take some courses" or "read some books" on the new types
of program and introduce them next term. Actually, of
course, this kind of situation would remind us again of
Collings, who listed the books that the supervisors should
urge the teachers to read. Flinker quite reasonably
observes that whatever the teacher is doing should be
really supervised and real help and encouragement given.

No benefit will accrue from constant argument
over objectives of education and content of curriculum. Unfortunately little truly objective experimentation is done in this field. What is called "experiment" is usually someone's eager effort to prove a certain theory right. Naturally, it will always be proved so—to his satisfaction.

Thus, although the prescription of a certain amount of content of programs of study might well be defended, it would seem the antithesis of professional supervision to become so attached to some particular brand of ideas as, subtly or otherwise, to coerce teachers into accepting them. Encouragement to read and study should always be forthcoming, but not encouragement to read only certain books of which you approve and not encouragement to take only courses from the "right" men. Obviously, the onus of responsibility rests solely on the superintendents. Their superiors may play the same game with them. A certain degree of "inbreeding", of lack of broad, sympathetic and all-embracing eclecticism in selection of members of faculties of education has led to some rather sensational attacks upon "educators" in the past few years.

Bartky, urges that the stress be removed from the field of curriculum,—that animosities be laid to rest, that the teacher be put back into the position of
prominence and every effort be made to make the teacher happy in his work, with a sense of accomplishment and with a constantly growing broad education, not in any particular field but in all fields—to become a cultured man. Chancellor says (27, p. 115):

We indeed read too much of pedagogy and study too much the subject-matter of our curriculums, when we read so much that we never have time to read economics, sociology, literature, religion, science and poetry, and to hear the best music and study the best art.

Barr (13, p. 29), using as corroborative work Bruner's "Tentative List of Approaches to Curriculum and Course of Study Construction", urges that superintendents and curriculum-directors recognize the sources of objectives of education so that narrow-minded convictions and proselytizing zeal will be transformed into an eclecticism worthy of the name.

In the third section of this chapter consideration will be given to the implications of the apparently universally-accepted statement that the outstanding purpose, the real objective of supervision, is to provide in-service training.

**Supervision and In-Service Training.**

Instructional supervision, therefore, has the large purpose of improving the quality of instruction... by promoting the professional growth of all teachers, and... by training of teachers in service (14, p. 2).

This statement, appearing in Proceedings of the N. E. A. in 1923 and quoted by Barr should serve as a
reminder that it is not only of recent years that leaders in educational thought have considered in-service training to be the raison d'être of supervision. Nor is the idea new that supervision is the most important facet of educational endeavours. Ayer and Barr (11, p.112) quote Cubberley's statement of 1916 as follows:

All other types of [the superintendent's] work are in a sense preliminary to this...function [supervision], though as school systems grow larger and larger, the superintendent must, of necessity delegate more and more of this work to subordinates.

The authors then go on to say (11, p.113) that the superintendents, as their work expands, usually find it more expedient to delegate the supervisory duties to others than to transfer administrative and organizing duties—that more poorly qualified men may then come to do most of the supervising and the results are, naturally, unfortunate.

A list of supervisory duties performed by 140 superintendents of Washington and Oregon in 1927 (11, pp. 127-128) shows a not too striking difference from the duties performed today. Following is the list, with the number (out of the total 140) of superintendents who did each one:

1. Confer with individual teachers .......... 117
2. Plan teachers' meetings .................. 111
3. Inspect instruction ........................ 107
4. Direct teachers' meetings ................. 100
5. Discuss topics in teachers' meetings .... 99
6. Initiate new teachers ........................ 97
Bail (12, pp. 714-716) reports a recent (1947) study in which 460 teachers were interrogated respecting the type of supervision they receive and the type that they desire. Only twenty of them were satisfied with their present supervision.
135 said they got regular inspection only (40.2%)
137 said they got very little supervision (29.2%)
118 said they got no supervision (25.7%)
20 said they got helpful supervision (4.3%)

Following is a summary of what these teachers said they wanted to receive from supervision:

259 wanted constructive criticism (56.3%)
120 wanted recommendation of new techniques (26.1%)
115 wanted demonstration teaching (25.0%)
107 wanted recommendations on materials and equipment (23.3%)
60 wanted recommendations on books and articles (13.0%)
36 wanted assistance with special problems (7.8%)
35 wanted assistance with classroom control (7.6%)
32 wanted inspirational supervision (6.9%)
31 wanted long interviews following visitations (6.7%)

A co-examination may well be made not only of these 1947 data and of the previous 1927 data but also of the previously cited 1928 statements of Ayer and Barr (including their 1916 quotation from Cubberley) and the 1953 pronouncements by Spears (76, pp. 27-28). The latter contends that administrators have mastered the managerial and organizational aspects of school operation, but still are inadequate in instructional improvement, or, as it is now called, supervision of instruction. The reasons, he believes, are that there is no lack of operational matters to take up the time and that there is often a feeling of inadequacy in the supervisory field. Spears insists that there must be much more of the following:
1. Direct supervisory help to teachers in their classroom settings—not tomorrow but immediately.
2. Better organized curriculum.
3. Real and continuous in-service teacher-training.
4. Services in testing, guidance and mental health.

He declares that all the great administrative efforts to secure teachers is wasted energy, for merely having positions filled means very little. The true answer, he counsels, is to be found through the supervision of instruction—through definite, organized in-service training.

It is not, therefore, that these are new ideas, but it is simply that they have had a chance to spread more widely during the past several decades and the tremendous need which is making itself more and more every day has brought about a sharper realization of the truth. Nowhere is this more self-evident than in Alberta where the general ability of recruits into the teaching profession has dropped so sharply in the past twenty years (6, p. 41) and where even the amount of pre-service training given to this lesser raw material has, for elementary teachers, been reduced in an effort to fill the gaps in the ranks.

It has come almost to the place where whatever training there is, is in-service training. This need not necessarily be all to the bad.

Farley asserts (37, 119-124) that teachers never really learn their college courses fully anyway and
that in-service education is more important than pre-service. He is, of course, referring to the acquisition of skills and techniques of the profession, and not to a background of general education and culture, for he observes that in these days the possession of at least a bachelor's degree is practically universal amongst teachers.

Moffitt complains that in these days of teacher-shortage, many school boards are accepting the minimum requirements for certification (the bachelor's degree) as an adequate criterion for teacher-success, but he warns that education which stopped there would be pitifully inadequate—that teacher in-service training is essential. He further protests that, although the major responsibility for administration of this belongs to the superintendent, it is doubtful if he is performing this most important of all his professional duties.

Moffitt did research, questioning teacher-training institutions and numerous superintendents from many parts of the United States about their views on in-service training. There was unanimous expression of the belief that it was a tremendously great need but that most were not doing much about it beyond holding a few meetings or workshops and encouraging summer courses. Moffitt discovered that several institutions such as
George Peabody College for Teachers and the University of Michigan were conducting some off-campus teaching and he agrees that it is a desirable trend for college and university people to leave the campuses to furnish leadership for teachers on the job, but he observes that, in actual fact, the leadership of the superintendents is essential if any real training is to be given.

In this connection, Curtis (30, pp. 459-467) also affirms that although it is quite desirable for the college to take some responsibility for off-campus in-service training, that a special supervisor, approved by the college, would actually have to spend the year in that area to conduct the course.

Moffitt, himself, had recently completed a year of directing a group of 30 young elementary school teachers in a graduate study program. The project, a true laboratory in-service course, was a co-operative one between the university and the school system, and, Moffitt reports, quite a desirable one for the following reasons:

1. This method of group study enables the young teacher to get help when and where it is needed.
2. The child becomes a person that lives and behaves when you specifically study him. No textbook in Psychology can take the place of this lab-work.
3. Studying while teaching presents a separation of that which we accept as philosophy from that which we have the courage to try to achieve in teaching.
4. Reading and discussions have new meaning when used with experimentations, minute observations, and self-directed teachings.
5. The continuing interchange of ideas with other teachers provides stimulus for continuing to try our best.
6. Real growth takes place when specific problems are present to work with.
7. There is more democratic self-realization.

Moffitt concludes by maintaining that the superintendent's chief job is to improve the quality of the teaching-learning-growing processes, and that although there are various plans, the superintendent must adopt one suitable for his area.

On the same theme, Allen and Lassie (5, p.30) assure us that their state recognizes the fact that preparation for teaching is only well-begun when a student becomes a classroom teacher. In that state, a provisional certificate is granted after four years of study in one of the fourteen institutions provided. The courses of these four years of work are so arranged that each student has some experience with various levels of public education, with emphasis on one level. After a fifth year of college study, the Standard General Certificate is granted, but, before this fifth year of study is undertaken, it is required that there must be at least one year of teaching. During this year the teacher and his advisors work out the series of courses which will best fill the needs of that teacher in his fifth year of study. The authors emphasize that during that year of teaching, the very best of supervision must be provided. The
superintendent and assistant supervisors get assistance from the colleges which keep in touch with the student-teacher at all times. Usually two staff members of the college, one from the education department and one from a subject-matter field, are responsible for each student-teacher.

Parmenter also reports on a thorough internship program in that state (67, pp.129-133). Since 1947 the government has provided for each county an instructional supervisor whose special job it is to teach the interns. Principals often give considerable assistance, too. These interns work under a regular classroom teacher and receive some assistance from this teacher and the principal. For the regular classroom teacher who has had his degree for only a year or two and is, therefore, still in need of considerable in-service training, this supervisor also gives assistance to the superintendent in organizing and executing such a program.

Clarke outlines the plan now being used in Arkansas (28, pp.85-89). He acknowledges that the plan requires a large number of good supervisors, but he considers it quite workable. Again the emphasis is upon training on the job. No professional courses whatever are provided during the first four years of post-high school education. Purely general education courses from the faculties of arts and sciences are studied.
These faculties co-operate by advising students on the best background courses for them if they are planning to be teachers. So professional courses are non-existent until the fifth year.

Penrose intimated (66, pp.19-21) that the idea of even the fifth year of professional courses had been abandoned in Arkansas, so that this year of training was entirely in the hands of the master-supervisors who gave these B.A. and B.Sc. graduates concentrated training during a year of internship. Apparently there would be no faculty or school of education any longer.

A similar system, but only as an emergency measure, has been employed in Massachusetts and Connecticut (2, pp.106-113). Here, to ease the teacher-shortage, any students who held B.A. or B.Sc. degrees with superior college records obtained while securing those degrees, and with excellent recommendations in English, character, and speech, were allowed to teach school (provisionally) after a six-week summer course. Then came the intensive work of the field-supervisors for the year on the job. Because of the careful screening already done, about 90% of these interns secured pass marks on their internship year and were allowed to proceed with teaching.

Another of these programs was undertaken in the state of Minnesota (31, pp.359-362) where, in order to
ease the teacher-shortage, teaching permits were granted to people with degrees in liberal arts who would take a summer session in education and agree to do further summer work. As in Massachusetts and Connecticut, only applicants with superior recommendations and high scholastic averages in their programs were accepted. During the first year of teaching, the student had continual supervision. The school principal taught regular classes to any on his staff and the supervising teacher spent a great deal of time in the classroom of each student, at first giving demonstrations and later giving constructive criticisms. The assistant superintendent co-ordinated the work for his area (Minneapolis schools). Supervisors for special fields also gave them priority. Principals taught them about courses of study, textbooks, guides, testing program, reports, records and even philosophy. Supervising teachers taught methods and techniques, and worked closely with the principal. The University of Minnesota co-operated with the supervising teacher in planning a seminar in elementary school practices for these people. Field trips were made to study other classrooms. During the second year, refinement of techniques was stressed, and a student-teaching-supervisor from the University of Minnesota conducted one class per week with them. The venture seemed a good one in on-the-job teacher-training.
In the case of fully qualified teachers (as distinct from interns) who were partaking of the laboratory courses and attending the regular lesson-lecture sessions after school hours, there might well be enough recognition by the university to allow a certain number of credits to be built up in this fashion. Whitehead (36, pp. 101-106), in a report from North Carolina high school teachers, states that although 66% of the teachers were enthusiastic about the great value they had received from such courses, 37% of the teachers felt that either there should be no compulsion to take them or else credits should be given for them.

There seems no end of evidence to show the rapidly growing awareness of the tremendous need for training on the job. Besides the very obvious essential of the student's having a good background of general education, however, it would also seem to the writer that, particularly if the more complex methods of teaching are expected to be performed, there should be some measure of pre-service professional training too. Fickes and Lurry (39, pp. 99-105) are particularly concerned about the attempted use of the core program. They point out the first necessity of an excellent background in not only one or two subject-matter fields but many of them in order to see their interrelationships. This involves
very high intelligence and considerable length of time (more than for ordinary B.A. or B.Sc. degrees) in subject-matter fields. Then special professional training on interrelationships of thought would have to be followed by several years of very efficient supervision. In one county, a special effort was made in this direction, and, besides the regular superintendent, supervisor of elementary schools, supervisor of junior high schools and supervisor of senior high schools, there was appointed a special core-supervisor. The authors state that without this, the pre-service training would have been completely ineffective. They also take care to announce that, because of the special competencies necessary, only a few teachers should be expected to prepare for using core curriculum and that no attempt should be made to steer the majority of teachers in that direction.

These remarks are particularly thought-provoking because of the long-standing interest in core curricula in Alberta.

It is fairly clear that, if a supervisor is so rushed for time that he gets to see each teacher only three or four times individually and three or four times in a group during the whole school year, he can hardly give much more recognition to in-service training than to try to correct a few glaring weaknesses and try to give
specific help on the pressing troubles that the teacher has on her mind at that time. But if he has just a little more time than this and doesn't waste it, the returns per hour of time spent may be very high.

Bartky's adjuration (16, pp.211-244) to begin with what the teacher has instead of trying to develop systems of logic and basic principles, seems well worth thinking about. If time is available, it might be possible to develop one or two basic principles in a year, but not more than one or two. Von Eschen (31, pp.135-156) states that an extended and complex experimental study showed, amongst other things, that supervision was most effective in those areas in which the program was most concentrated—and it should, therefore, be centered upon a very particular area in which it is especially desired to improve. And shouldn't this special help be, at least sometimes, directed towards improvement in a field in which good work is already being done? Anderson (10, pp.61-62) states the case of some teachers who did their most outstanding work after the age when they were eligible for retirement, simply because they were no longer afraid of seeming stupid by asking numerous questions about fields in which they had always been considered already highly competent.
Again it is possible that Bartky (16, pp. 241-244) is right in his condemnation of the supervisor's wasting valuable time talking about "aims and objectives" of education. Instead, as Kirtland (52, pp. 267-268) suggests, if teachers are to develop ability to accomplish something, the supervisor will have to acquaint them with actual and highly practical and immediate ways and means. It has to be recognized, asserts Kirtland, that this is very largely the way that a teacher may become acquainted with newer materials of instruction and learn how to make use of certain appropriate materials that may not be so new but have never been utilized by that teacher. Supervisors have a chance to see these things really at work in at least one place and so can evaluate, learn and pass on their findings.

The supervisor must also recognize that, in the end, if he does not follow educational research and translate the findings into practice through enlightenment of the teachers, then this job will probably never be done at all. Farley (37, pp. 119-124) points out that there is a constant increase in knowledge, of which all teachers need to keep abreast, --that it is while they are at work with their own pupils that this knowledge should be made available for practical application. In this respect summer courses, asserts Farley, cannot hope to approach
the effectiveness of ample supervision. Undoubtedly, even though the teacher may have a fine background of pre-service training, even for these older learnings, the practical applications have to be made on the job. Supervisors, not training schools, are the only ones who can be of assistance right where it counts. These experiences are largely individual ones and need individual attention. In the previous discussion on democratic principles, limitations inherent in committee meetings and the workshops have been dealt with. Group instruction obviously has its place and is more effective when done by a superintendent who can help with the individual applications of the material of lessons. Similarly, bulletins and pamphlets have their place. But it is not difficult to understand Ward's (82, pp. 213-216) hearty dislike of them unless there is ample supervision to give interpretation and guided application of them on the job. If there is not, then the written guidebooks will largely be ignored.

All this necessary individualized assistance plus group work takes a good deal of time, and, unless time is blocked out, there is certain to be trouble. Thompson (79, pp. 80-84) gives the reminder, however, that although this is necessary for solid accomplishment, to avoid becoming just a "repairman" being called
hither and thither to deal with "problems", yet there must be some time available to deal with unexpected things, and the only way to provide this bit of leeway is to avoid scheduling too tightly.

After all, some things that may seem trivial to the supervisor may be monstrous in the eyes of the teacher. Thus, many supervisors today consider discipline to be no very large problem. But Schubert (71, pp.112-113) says:

One of the most perplexing problems facing many teachers in our schools today--particularly young teachers--is that of maintaining control in the classroom. Teachers complain that they have to do more policing than teaching.

Bartky contends that until the days of Parker much was written about classroom control, but that with the advent of Progressive Education, it was assumed that there was no problem of control if proper motivation were provided. So then, he continues, teachers mentioned control difficulties only to those who they were sure would not betray the confidence, for it was the same as confessing that you were not operating a democratic, child-centered classroom. Bartky alleges, however, that recent studies in social psychology definitely indicate that control requires as much attention in a democratic approach as it does in an autocratic one, and that it should, therefore, be respectable to revive consideration of this subject. He maintains that young teachers now
have to learn in a hit-or-miss fashion how to improve their classroom-management techniques, and that old textbooks on classroom control should be resurrected and new studies made.

Surely classroom control must be eligible as a proper topic for supervisory assistance without arousing any such attitudes as Barmy suggests.

Teachers do not, as a whole, resent criticism and would not resent criticism of discipline any more than of anything else. But if criticism carries with it a disdain, an attitude that the whole thing is too ridiculous for a normal person to encounter, then the situation is entirely different. Generally speaking, constructive criticism is actually desired. Bait's study (12, pp. 713-716) showed that 259 out of 460 teachers (56.2%) wanted more constructive criticism from their supervisors than they were getting. Wheeler (65, pp. 10-95) reporting on the 1952 summer school class held at Teachers' College, Columbia University, gave as one of the outstanding conclusions of the teachers there present that they wanted supervisors to realize that problems were natural things, that they wanted to be treated as adults with no "Pollyanna technique" but with honest, straightforward criticism and definite help for whatever is weak.
The following list of "Etiquette for Supervisors" (36, p. 142) is pertinent:

1. Determine the purpose of a specific visit, but, please, don't keep it a secret.
2. If possible, be present before the class begins.
3. Stay for the full period whenever possible.
4. Sit where you can watch the students.
5. Look for something good in our room.
6. Follow up your observation by definite action, suggestion, question or comment.
7. Relax.
8. Smile.

Much more likely to be resented by an intelligent person than constructive criticism is a subtle and vague coaxing to be original. "Originality" for the sake of novelty having become a fetish of our time, it should be examined for what it is worth and no more. Newness for its own sake seems hardly a desirable standard. Almost anybody can start something, but it takes genius to finish it--to bring it to perfection. The fact that Shakespeare was a culminator rather than an innovator does not detract from his achievement.

Graybeal (144, pp. 178-179) says:

Supervision is at its highest and best when it frees teachers from emotionalized habits of fear, anxiety, hate, and insecurity--when it encourages them to express ideas in their own ways but does not try to coerce them into being "creative".

This brings up the thought of mental hygiene. To what extent should a superintendent concern himself about the mental health of his teachers? Surely he should know enough about the subject at least to avoid
contributing to the mental insecurity of the teacher. Ideally, no doubt, he should be able to make positive contributions to the mental well-being of his staff. Penrose (66, pp.19-21) considers the improvement of mental health of teachers to be the primary aim of good supervision. Bartky, too, (16, pp.241-244) considers that the supervisor should know a good deal about mental hygiene and even psychiatry. He reminds us that all teaching, even in the best of cases, involves much nervous tension, leadership conflicts, split allegiances, etc., and that all the "needs"—security, recognition, etc., occur in cycles like hunger. Shouldn't the supervisor, he asks, know about these cycles and be able to deal with them?

Probably it should not be considered too much to expect every supervisor to have done a good job of a certain minimum amount of study in the field of mental hygiene.

Of course, the supervisor is expected to be greater than most men can be. It is well that he should have to aim for the heights. There have been prepared countless long lists of necessary qualities of supervisors, and even then the lists often contain widely different items. The following enumeration (46, pp.47-50) by a "public relations" expert, reflects the emphasis of its
composer: leadership, intelligence, reverence, vigor, up-to-dateness, planning ability, creativity, thoroughness, congeniality, foresight, alertness, common sense, ambition, tactfulness, self-control, courage, staff relations, sense of humour, self-improvement, open-mindedness, devotion.

Miller (61, pp. 362-369) makes note of the fact that in a certain published list of supervisor-characteristics, the most important one of all appearing in the 1936 table, viz. a high degree of scholarship, seemed to have been dropped from the list in 1943, and "attractive personal appearance" substituted. There is the question of whether this signifies something or not.

A good inventory entitled "If I Were a Supervisor" was prepared by Johnson (50, p. 88) and is here reproduced:

1. I would seek to win the confidence of those under my supervision.
2. I would strive to understand and interpret the curriculum more fully, its background and its general and specific aims.
3. I would construct brief analytical bibliographies and reviews of recent articles and books which would aid my teachers.
4. I would encourage professional improvement of teachers.
5. I would measure periodically the effectiveness of my supervision.
6. I would make supervision an unquestionable teaching aid, thereby motivating teacher appreciation and cooperation.
7. I would replenish and refresh my knowledge of methods of teaching the subjects included in my curriculum.
8. I would familiarize myself with new technics, devices and methods of improvement.
9. I would attempt to coordinate school, home and civic organizations.
10. I would strive for a spirit of congeniality, consideration and fairness.
11. I would find out just what is expected of me by the superintendent in order to prevent friction among principals, teachers and special teachers.
12. I would remember that supervision is a cooperative undertaking.
13. I would study the child with his teacher and together we would try to understand him and help him to grow and to develop to his utmost capacity.

The overwhelming question that arises from all this discussion is how thinly the supervisor can spread himself and still produce any beneficial effect. That "thinness" is the question towards which attention shall now be directed.

Expansion of Supervisory Services.

Most writers in the United States where there is many times as great a supervisory staff per teacher as there is in Alberta, and where there is very much more pre-service training, still feel that expansion of supervisory services is necessary.

In one of the texts on supervision current in 1928 (11, p. 332), it is asserted that supervision may very often be neglected for various reasons, and, primarily, all too frequently, because the superintendent's greatest interest does not lie in supervision.

Making appointments, building school buildings, the getting of money, and the pleasing of the
community absorb the time of many superintendents of schools. There seems to be for them a kind of fascination about building buildings, getting money, etc. Such activities apparently seem more tangible and essential than the more direct task of seeing that good teaching is done. The superintendent is not wholly to blame for this condition. In the first place, many superintendents have been unwisely trained to believe that school building, finance and personnel problems are first. All too frequently, boards of education interest themselves primarily on these matters. The appointment of teachers, the building of school buildings, the getting of money and keeping the community pleased are all important matters, but primarily the schools exist to educate boys and girls, and however important these accessories of education may be, they must be kept in a secondary position. The crucible of education is the classroom, and the superintendent's chief interest should ultimately end in teaching and in the improvement of teaching.

The text goes on to suggest that, unless there is extremely sparse population and extreme poverty, there should be provision made for the hiring of an expert general supervisor in addition to the superintendent. The authors warn, however, (11, p.114) that the general supervisor must be of equally high caliber to the superintendent, and that in some places, where population demanded the hiring of a considerable number of assistant supervisors, many of the latter were inadequately trained. In such cases, they point out, the chief superintendent was often lulled by the numbers of his assistants into abandoning leadership, and many fundamental phases of supervision suffered—particularly such phases as constructive criticism of the techniques of teaching, diagnostic testing, demonstration lessons and professional
meetings for improvement of the teachers.

Most of these suggestions made three decades ago are still applicable in certain areas of North America, including Alberta. However, an extreme degree of sparseness of population and poverty could hardly be said to exist in Western Canada.

Adkins and Proudfoot report (4, pp. 428-432) that a recent drive has been made by the state to introduce a better and more uniform system of supervision throughout West Virginia. Most of the hiring of staff had been on the-county level. The result was that, although some counties had adequate supervisory services with supervisory principals entirely freed from clerical and teaching duties and with a general supervisor and assistant special subject-matter supervisors in addition to the superintendent, yet, at the other end of the scale some counties in the poor, remote, unpopulated areas had principals who were more administrative than supervisory, and had no general county supervisors other than the county superintendent himself and the assistant county superintendent.

Miel insists (60, pp. 75-77) that the greatest necessity today, even in the more favored localities, is still further expansion of consultant and supervisory services. The assurance is given, however, that this is
constantly being achieved through increased state appropriations for the purpose and through the assumption, by statement departments of education, of leadership in co-ordinating pre-service and in-service training.

The necessity of obtaining greatly increased appropriations is always one difficulty that lies in the path of any development in almost any field. This particular type of expansion requires, of course, a very considerably augmented staff of highly qualified supervisors, men with excellent post-graduate records at universities and with a number of years of successful teaching experience. The dearth of qualified personnel to staff such tremendously expanding supervisory services has led in some places (54, pp.33-34) to the institution of an apprenticeship program. Teachers of superior qualifications are offered the opportunity to spend two years working in curriculum development, supervision, teaching for various lengths of time in different grades—and while doing all this according to the plans made by the director, receive the same salaries that they had been getting in their previous teaching positions. Then they would be ready to take positions as supervising principals or general supervisors or superintendents.

This discussion of the cry for expansion of supervision should not be left without taking note of the
fact that a considerable volume of that cry has been
directed at high school supervision. Jessen (49, pp. 103-104) states that significant effort in that field
had been slow until shortly before World War II, but that interest then grew rapidly with many special high school supervisory departments (not inspectorial) being established in one state after another. Miller (61, pp. 362-369) also corroborates the growing trend towards realization of the need for high school supervision. According to a certain piece of research from which he draws his information, the percentage of high school teachers that felt there should be a great deal more high school supervision rose from 63% in 1936 to 75% in 1942.

Presumably, the reason for lack of such services in the high schools was that the teachers were well-trained. Maul (57, p. 59) states that the bachelor's degree for high school teachers was well maintained as a minimum even during wartime, with five of the states enforcing a Master's degree. He admits, however, that although many states demand the bachelor's degree for elementary teachers, there are many teachers in the Negro areas of the southeast and some in frontier regions with only two years of training, and, for the whole nation, only half of the elementary teachers have degrees.
It is, therefore, easy to see why supervisory emphasis should be upon the poorly trained elementary teachers.

But this does not by any means condone neglect in the high school field. Farley gives a reminder (37, pp. 119-124) that there is still need, with highly trained teachers, ample supervision—that society keeps changing and leadership is needed to facilitate group action to gear education to changing needs.

Hightower (47, pp. 243-246) maintains that administrators should be conscious of the fact that all teachers, even the best, have potentialities far beyond those which are being realized. He insists that in-service education must be a continuous process over the years, and that colleges should prepare their graduates to expect this essential service.

Otto (64, pp. 372-380) reports on some experimental work done by Johns Hopkins University. He asserts that it showed very clearly that the work done by supervised teachers is superior to that done by unsupervised teachers and that this value was for the experienced and well-trained as well as for the inexperienced.

The need for tremendously expanded quantity and quality of "service-type" supervision is recognized universally throughout the education world. The only
objections uttered are aimed at dictatorial, inspectorial types, and not everyone would voice even these objections. For each twenty to thirty teachers, a supervisor with absolutely no duties, administrative or otherwise except supervising instruction, would appear to be the generally accepted minimum requirement. The essentiality of adequate high school supervision also seems to be a prevailing conviction.

It has been shown that some awareness of all this has made its way into Alberta by way of the C.E.A.-Kellogg short courses. One of the main reflections in official policy was the placing of new emphasis upon supervisory activities of principals. There is no doubt that, as far as it goes, this is a praiseworthy development, for certainly the principalship role has been little more than that of a teacher with administrative duties. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to examination of expert educational opinion respecting the duties of principals.

It should be kept in mind, however, that in the previous pages, the various opinions and recommendations by numerous educators respecting expansion of supervisory services, were made even though the role of principal in the places with which these people were acquainted had already evolved beyond that being at present visualized
in the latest Alberta reports.

Whatever is done to improve the principalship should not be construed as having constituted the smallest action in showing recognition of the urgent recommendations made anywhere throughout this chapter up to this point.

Ayer reports (11, p. 99) that a piece of research had just shown that principals were spending only 20% of their time in supervision of instruction, 65% in administration and 15% in other things such as clerical work and teaching. Ayer declared, however, (11, pp. 95-97), that the principal's responsibility for supervision was greatly increasing, and rightly so—even for the technical and specialized work. He estimated that a minimum of 50% of the principal's time should be spent in supervision and only 20% in administration, with the other 30% going towards the study of curricular and other problems, the directing of clerical work, and a little teaching. Ayer suggested (11, p. 99) the following as the basic duties of elementary principals:

1. Improving Technique of Teaching
2. Improving Teachers in Service
3. Improving Classification and Promotion of Pupils
4. Improving Curriculum
5. Improving Selection and Use of School Supplies
6. Improving General School Conditions.

He then presented a summary (see Page 103) of the data obtained from a careful study of the elementary school
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Exercising Each Level of Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ini-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tiates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Daily Schedule</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping School Records</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Tardiness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Absentees</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Discipline</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspecting Building</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Janitors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharging Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Instruction</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Teachers' Meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Textbooks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Courses of Study</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Library Books</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing Educational Tests</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classifying Pupils</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principalship throughout the whole nation, observing that the low percentages shown for many of the items indicate a need for expansion.

With the remark (11, p.104) that high school principals were spending even more time on administration and less on supervision than were the elementary principals, probably because of their more expert, highly specialized, well-trained, experienced staff, --and with the observation that the high school principals should be doing even more than the others, Ayer included (11, p.109) a resumé (see page 105) of a study made of high school principals in the state of Washington in 1927.

The foregoing material does tend to indicate the lack of development of principalships in Alberta. However, it might be noted that, in many aspects, the situation in the United States has not changed so very greatly in a quarter century. Again one must be careful to recognize, however, that if no extensive increase in certain supervisory activities of principals has been apparent, there are other things to be considered:

1. There has been significant modification in some phases.
2. The amount of supervisory work done even a quarter century ago was not inconsiderable.
3. Expansion in supervisory services from central
Table 58 (after Ayer and Barr)

The Percentage of Principals Performing Each Activity in Different Sized Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>100 or less</th>
<th>101 to 400</th>
<th>401 to 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Confer with individual teacher</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Direct teachers' meetings</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plan teachers' meetings</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inspect instruction</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiate new teachers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Examine teachers' marks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Establish uniform marking system</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Explain curriculum to staff</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Suggest professional reading</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Give I.Q. Tests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Prepare instructions to teachers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Make out courses of study</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Interpret I.Q. tests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Criticize instruction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Make study of causes of failure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Construct list of curriculum objectives</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Instruct teachers in methods</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Instruct teachers in classroom management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Administer diagnostic tests</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Examine textbooks for pertinency.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Instruct teachers in scoring and evaluating tests.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Inspect daily schedule of teaching</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
office, through assistant superintendents and
general supervisors of instruction has been
developed to a point where it is not com­
parable with the situation in 1926.

For information on principalships in the 1950's
there is the recent volume by Jacobson, Reavis, and
Logsdon. They contend (48, p.103) that supervision is
still sadly insufficient in the United States and that
the chief reason is the intensified drive for economy in
school operation. They feel that it is somewhat un­
realistic to suppose that the principal will assume a
much greater supervisory role than customary. They
declare that he generally does not feel comfortable in the
area of improvement of instruction and that, consequently,
he lets the largest part of the problem of supervision fall
into the hands of the county assistant superintendent and
county supervisors of instruction. The principal meanwhile
happily busies himself with installing new record systems,
improving extracurricular programs, investigating the
guidance program and, in general, fulfilling the numerous
administrative duties. The authors (48, p.393) deplore
this situation, insisting that even if the central office
staff is large, it should encourage and support the local
school principals in a program of continuous education of
faculty members. They state the reminder that no amount
of pre-service training is satisfactory, that training is always a matter of degree and must continue during service. In almost the same words that Ayer used in 1928, these authors remark on the great desirability of supervision by high school principals and the fact that they are even more remiss in allocating time to this end than are the elementary school principals.

A table (see page 108) is included (48, p.106) to illustrate the actual supervisory activities being undertaken by (1) principals of schools where the principal did no teaching and (2) principals of small schools where the principal carried at least some part of the teaching load. Following this, another small table is presented--this one showing how principals without teaching duties and those with teaching duties actually distribute their time and how those same people believe that they should distribute their time.

Raab (68, pp.88-89) believes that the principal should be allowed to choose his own teachers, that he should know all the children and be acquainted with their progress, maybe teaching a little to keep his hand in, but cutting administration to a bare minimum. Pattington also feels that most of the routine administration should be divided up and allocated to different teachers on the staff, that the principal should be chiefly concerned
Table (after Jacobson, Reavis and Logsdon)

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE SCHOOL
PERFORMED BY SUPERVISORY AND TEACHING PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Activity</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help each teacher with her problems.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing and adjusting individual pupils</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing teaching</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing parents</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading discussions at teachers' meetings</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing teachers with extensive instructional materials</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with teacher groups on problems of their choosing.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking individual teachers to report at teachers' meetings.</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving or arranging demonstration lessons</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving tests to classes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting and applying research studies</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking &quot;supervisors&quot; to examine and report on classes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching or coaching groups of pupils</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving lectures at teachers' meetings</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS' TIME GIVEN TO MAJOR FUNCTIONS
UNDER ACTUAL AND IDEAL CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervising</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil personnel</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with providing a superior type of supervision. The suggestion is made that summaries of the work done by each teacher for the past week should be made, and preparations made with each teacher for the work of the following week.

Smith (73, pp.12-14) takes issue with principals who neglect their supervisory functions, asserting that the old excuse of having too many administrative duties was no longer valid, since it is now common to have an administrative assistant, a clerk, and even special "Dean of Boys" and "Dean of Girls". He intimates that it is usually a feeling of incompetence in subject matter that causes the lack, and that principals had better do something about it.

Eaves (35, pp.74-77) believes that higher standards should be set up for elementary school principals, but he feels confident that they really are developing more and more skill in supervising the instructional program. He diagnoses one of the chief difficulties as the assignment of both the administration and supervision of a twenty-teacher school to one principal. In this case, he insists, administration would necessarily absorb all the time and that the elementary schools should follow the example of the high schools which have two separate non-teaching men for these schools of over ten rooms, besides
their full-time clerks and counselors.

Smitter (7th, pp. 375-380) implies that this is already accomplished in the elementary schools throughout some states, and there is, in each elementary school, a supervisor who relieves the principal of all but his administrative work. Apparently, if the schools are under eight or ten rooms, one supervisor might serve two schools.

Enough facts have been presented now to gain some impression of the part actually being played by principals in supervision and of the part that they and other educators think they should be playing. One thing is obvious; a strong staff at the central office is indispensable in the co-ordination of whatever work might be done.

Insofar as the Alberta situation is concerned, any serious attempt to enhance the supervisory responsibility of the principalship, unless it is done carefully and gradually, with corresponding increase in the central county or divisional staff, may encounter insuperable obstacles.

(1) There is a shortage of well-trained experienced people to assume the duties of actual supervisory principals.

(2) Such trained men as there are holding principalships are frequently much more interested in administration than in supervision.

(3) Salary inducement is not great.

(4) Some successful and well-trained teachers,
whose interests lie more in instruction than in administration, could not be easily lured into becoming principals, and would prove unsatisfactory in their administrative functions even if they were. However, it might well be that some of these people could be induced to become county (divisional) supervisors of instruction.

(5) Traditionally, supervision has a very close connection with inspection and rating, and one member of the Alberta Teachers' Association does not "inspect" another member of that organization. Special Departmental representatives, the superintendents, have been responsible for this work. Principals, in many cases, would offend the teachers on the staff by seeming to assume an inspectorial role. This might often occur even when there was a complete absence of all basis for such interpretation. Principals know of this and hesitate.

(6) It would be unethical for one member of the A.T.A. to make any derogatory or disparaging statements about another member, unless the statement were written and previously presented to the teacher being so maligned. If the principal is to be of full value as an assistant supervisor responsible to the central office, he will probably find it necessary to discuss the work of his teachers. In some discussion there will appear statements open to a possible interpretation as deprecatory. In any such
discussions, in oral reports being given to central office, there will be implied rating. Thus, written reports would be far more satisfactory, open and honest than oral ones, and principals will hesitate before willingly assuming the report-writing job. This would surely tie them to "inspection".

(7) School boards feel that local taxation already pays too great a share of education. Asking them to hire principals of relatively small schools--principals who do little or no teaching--would cause resentment.

It would seem to the writer that leadership must come from the Department of Education. For the reasons just outlined, it does not seem practical to hope for the establishment of a truly functioning, modern supervisory organization solely or largely by approach from the principalship side. A prolonged effort to put supervision preeminently on a local rather than a provincial basis might, in time, see some progressive counties setting up a good central office of supervision. But, like the situation only lately being rectified in West Virginia, it might result in deterioration in the backward counties. The obvious first step in modernizing Alberta's supervision would be the appointment by the Department of at least one supervisor of instruction for each county or division--two or three in many of them. This would actually not relieve the
superintendents of much of their present duties but would provide the services which cannot be performed by them now. It would provide the nucleus for the growth of an organized system of in-service training in the province.

Although some of today's principals and even a few of the superintendents might be drained off into these positions, actually most of the principals and the superintendents are, at heart, primarily administrators and would not be interested. Background educational requirements should be even more advanced than present requirements for superintendents, but it should be possible to fill the ranks with instruction-loving teachers possessing these qualifications. With this nucleus, the trend towards greater supervisory responsibilities for principals could slowly be nurtured.
CHAPTER IV
THE STUDY

As was stated in the introduction, the portion of this study which deals with the practices, theories and attitudes of Alberta's school superintendents, was made possible by the co-operation of these gentlemen in completing a rather lengthy questionnaire (see appendix). In many cases valuable comments were also volunteered. The map of Alberta, included in the introduction, shows that there were several school divisions or counties whose superintendents as of May, 1955, did not respond to the questionnaire. In the main, these were frontier areas in the northwest and northeast of the province. The number of superintendents does not precisely agree with the number of school divisions or counties, although this is very nearly the case. In a few instances, one superintendent is responsible for two school divisions. Outside of the three cities of Calgary, Edmonton and Lethbridge, each of which employs its own superintendent, there was, as of May 1955, a total of fifty-five superintendents, each in charge of one (or, in a few cases, two) division or county. Nine of these men did not complete the questionnaire nor did they give any reason for not doing so. Two others, whose areas are shaded on the map to indicate that they did reply,
did not actually complete the questionnaire but wrote explaining the reasons for not doing so. One of these two was considerate enough to show at some length why he was unwilling to take part. Essentially it was because so many attacks have been made on certain aspects of educational policy that he feared that any type of research might be distorted by some editors into illustrating more incompetence on the part of the educational authorities. The other man merely stated briefly that "most of the questions were framed with an obvious bias". Adding these two men to the nine who did not reply at all makes eleven to subtract from the total of fifty-five, leaving forty-four, or 80% of the total with completed questionnaires.

Chart I shows the academic training of all fifty-five superintendents, including the eleven who did not complete the questionnaire (72, pp. 13-16). Of the fifty-five, three hold doctors' degrees, nineteen hold masters' degrees, and thirty-three hold no degree higher than the bachelor's. Of the eleven who failed to respond, one holds the doctor's degree and the other ten hold no degree higher than the bachelor's.

The information shown on all other charts concerns only the responding forty-four superintendents.

6. See appendix.
7. See appendix for Charts 1 to 7.
In some cases, individual items were omitted by some of the forty-four participating superintendents, so that the totals on all charts do not always equal forty-four.

Chart II shows the length of time that these men have held the positions of superintendent. Keeping in mind that the majority of the non-participants were in frontier divisions, it would seem very probable that the percentage of Alberta superintendents who have held such a position for five years or less is actually greater than the data illustrated in Chart II indicates. According to the data which are consolidated in the chart, the median number of years as superintendent is nine.

Chart III reveals that these superintendents have all had some experience as teachers, although ten of those reporting had not taught for more than ten years. Five, however, had over twenty years' teaching experience. The median is fourteen years.

As may be seen in Chart IV, only about half of the superintendents had over five years' experience as principal before being appointed to the superintendency. The median in this case is six years.

Chart V indicates that there is considerable difference in the number of teachers under the supervision of each superintendent, with the median lying at seventy-five. It should be remembered (see Chart III) that this
number does not include high school teachers, for whose supervision the superintendent has not been responsible. He has, of course, been the Board's advisor on the selection and promotion of high school teachers. In Chapter II, it has already been pointed out that supervisory services even for beginning high school teachers has been virtually non-existent.

The divisional or county superintendent, with his forty-five to one hundred and fifty teachers, generally has no administrative or supervisory assistance. Only two of the forty-four reported an assistant, although two others had a travelling teacher.

Charts VI and VII reveal that the average superintendent spends about \( \frac{1}{4} \)5\% of his time engaged in supervisory work and \( \frac{1}{4} \)5\% in fulfilling his administrative duties. Nearly 25\% of those reporting were able to spend only about 30\% of their time attending to supervisory matters.

The replies given on the questionnaire as a whole will be organized in this chapter under the same subheadings as were used for Chapter III. The four outstanding features of supervision, according to modern concepts, will now be reconsidered from the viewpoints and the practices of the Alberta superintendents. The various succeeding tables will show the distribution of responses on each question asked.
An examination of Tables I and II will give some idea of the beliefs and the practices of Alberta superintendents with respect to democratic supervision. Practically all believe that they should play the role of co-ordinator of educational activities rather than the dictator of such activities (Table I, Items 4 and 5). In this day of super-advertising and Dale Carnegie, only four men—nine per cent of the total—would go so far as to agree with Spinning (77) that a superintendent should do the best job he can and forget all the talk about public relations (Table I, Item 7). Similarly, most men felt that they should study public relations extensively (Table I, Item 6). A few commented that lack of time made such study impossible; another said that, instead of the phrase "study extensively", the phrase "be much aware of" would be more suitable; yet another believed that, although public relations are important, book knowledge would be of little value as it is mostly a matter of common sense; and, finally, another superintendent believed that a compromise was best, that is, he should do the best he can and then pay whatever attention was necessary to public relations that might be involved. By and large, the younger men seemed to accept the necessity for study of public relations without question. This, however, could in no way be
# Table I

## General Theory of Supervision—Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The superintendents of Alberta in general are not democratic enough in their dealings with teachers.</td>
<td>6 32 6</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 14 73 <img src="en" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You are not democratic enough in your dealings with teachers.</td>
<td>6 33 5</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 14 75 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is very important that the principals in any school division understand and appreciate the work of the superintendent with the teachers.</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is important that the superintendent co-ordinate the work of associate and assistant supervisors.</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> 42 1 1</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 95 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. One of the most important aspects of supervision should be its unifying and co-ordinating influence on the system.</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> 39 4</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 99 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A superintendent should study extensively the field of public relations.</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> 37 4</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 99 9 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A superintendent should do the best job he can and forget all the talk about &quot;public relations&quot;.</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> 4 39 1</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 9 99 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Superintendents should urge acceptance of educational theories only to the extent that individual teachers liked those theories when they tried working with them.</td>
<td>11 29 4</td>
<td><img src="en" alt="" /> <img src="en" alt="" /> 25 66 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the "blank" column consists of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Make unrequested (by the teacher) visits to the classrooms of teachers with over ten years' experience and of good standing.</td>
<td>D 39 P 0 N 5 K 100</td>
<td>B 89 0 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make unrequested (by the teacher) visits to the classroom of teachers with less than ten years' experience and of good standing.</td>
<td>D 42 P 0 N 4 K 100</td>
<td>B 95 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visit only when called upon.</td>
<td>D 3 P 35 N 6 K 100</td>
<td>B 77 80 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work in close co-operation with the principals.</td>
<td>D 40 P 0 N 4 K 100</td>
<td>B 91 0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Keep written record of all visits and conferences.</td>
<td>D 36 P 25 N 14 K 82</td>
<td>B 57 32 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Make written report to teacher.</td>
<td>D 35 P 30 N 9 K 80</td>
<td>B 68 20 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Make written report to principal.</td>
<td>D 4 P 33 N 7 K 32</td>
<td>B 9 76 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Make written report to higher authorities.</td>
<td>D 29 P 26 N 9 K 66</td>
<td>B 59 20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Use a standard form for reports.</td>
<td>D 37 P 32 N 9 K 84</td>
<td>B 73 20 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Make rating of the teacher in the reports.</td>
<td>D 4 P 33 N 8 K 9</td>
<td>B 7 86 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Select new teachers for the staff.</td>
<td>D 4 P 11 N 0 K 100</td>
<td>B 93 0 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Require each teacher to follow a prescribed course of study.</td>
<td>D 31 P 26 N 13 K 70</td>
<td>B 59 30 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Organize or assist in radio broadcasts.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prepare and send news items to papers.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Speak to various organizations—on educational matters</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Write articles for publication.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arrange for outstanding authorities to speak to Home and School and other groups.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Arrange for displays or exhibits of school work</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Attend educational conferences of province-wide scope</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Promotes adult-education classes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "blank" column consists of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
interpreted to mean that they are fundamentally any more democratic.

The majority (Table II, Items 14 to 21) considered that the various promotional services were desirable, but some intimated that it was difficult or impossible actually to execute certain of the services mentioned. Some also stated that such services as arranging programs for Home and School and preparing exhibits of school work were left to the individual schools to perform.

With respect to the visiting of teachers, making reports on them and rating them (Table II, Items 1 to 11), many of the superintendents indicated that there was certain Departmental policy on some of these matters and that they were employees of the Department. In Chapter II some phases of Departmental policy have been surveyed and trends in practice noted. There the "complete" report and the "memo" report were mentioned. As one of the superintendents points out on his questionnaire, the Department requires a standard form for all complete reports, and it is required that teacher, Board and Department each receive a copy. The simple "memo" report goes to the teacher and sometimes to the Department but not to the Board. Principals have not been provided with any of these reports. The Department does not require a complete report upon every visit, nor is it necessary that
even a "memo" report be given. As was also mentioned in the earlier chapter, the rating of teachers passed out of practice before 1940, but, in the complete report, there is always a rating or evaluation implied. There is no actual rating of E, VG, G, FG, or F. The report itself has to be carefully read and interpreted, noting what is not said as well as what is said, in order to arrive at just where this teacher stands in the scale of proficiency. Although Table II shows that four men, nine per cent of the total, make a rating of the teacher in reports, it is practically certain that these men meant an implied rating. In the unofficial "memo" report, there is no rating—implied or otherwise.

There would seem, however, to be considerable latitude allowed by the Department with respect to actual frequency of making complete reports on any particular teacher or teachers, and a few men suggest that they make very few of these, generally only on the request of the teacher (Table II, Items 7 to 9). These few men are reducing inspection to a minimum, presumably enhancing the supervisory nature of their duties accordingly. Again, as was discussed earlier, inspection and supervision are not necessarily antonymous terms, and the conscientious writing of numerous reports would not necessarily indicate undemocratic processes nor the absence of the true spirit
of supervision. Nevertheless, the trend is away from official reports in the name of more democratic supervision.

As might have been expected, the greatest lack of agreement comes in connection with the promotion of educational theories (Table I, Item 2). There is reflected here the influence of the long prevalent autocratic democracy such as was seen exemplified in the work of Collings. It is not easy to reconcile a loyalty to the ideals of freedom and democracy for teachers with a conviction that certain educational beliefs and theories must be promoted at all costs. Should superintendents urge acceptance of educational theories only to the extent that individual teachers liked those theories when they tried working with them? Twenty-five per cent of the superintendents replied in the affirmative, with one man succinctly commenting, "Proselytizing is a fruitless process". Some others, however, felt that the affirmative stand needed qualification. Thus, one insisted that the "try" by the teacher be an "honest" attempt, implying thereby that there was at least some obligation on the part of the teacher with respect to implementation of suggested theories. It is truly difficult to know just how to make improvement in instruction entirely compatible with freedom for all and complete avoidance of any suggestion of coercion. As one man amongst the sixty-six per cent who answered "False" to this question
wrote as an extra comment, "Then some teachers would never change."

Possibly the continual provision of plenty of opportunity to discover new ideas, and the requirement of teaching a definite or partly definite program of studies would be sufficient to produce a gradual improvement in most teachers. In this connection Item 13 of Table II should be noted. One superintendent suggested that his answer would be different for different subjects and another intimates that his answer would be different for different teachers. A third man appended a reminder that the answer must be "Performed" because the Department authorizes programs of study. This would seem strange when one reads from the table that thirty per cent of the superintendents assert that they do not require each teacher to follow any prescribed course of study. The answer or most of the answer to this may be found in another comment, the substance of which was that, although the Department does authorize courses in a broad way, they should not really be called "prescribed", for the curriculum guides are meant to be only suggestive. Thus, it becomes a question of how closely each teacher should be required to follow the provided courses, and attitudes vary somewhat amongst the group as a whole. Actually there is fairly rigid adherence to some courses such as those in mathematics, with this tendency becoming more
pronounced as the grades become higher. Again, in social studies, there is very loose interpretation until the higher grades are reached and then there develops only a moderate degree of rigidity.

Now in this survey of the reactions of Alberta's men in the field to questions concerning "democratic" attitudes and procedures, the discussion is veering over into curriculum, and that must deserve some special attention.

Before turning to that field, it should be possible to conclude that the supervisory staff is very much concerned about the democratization of their role, particularly in the field of public relations, that some do see the shallowness of the common interpretation of "striving for good public relations", that the importance of co-ordinating educational activity is very well recognized, that the making of written reports is generally approved with a sizeable minority questioning the procedure, particularly in the presentation of such reports to higher authorities, that most consider the actual rating of teachers in plain terms as being undesirable and that there is some confusion as to the extent of prescription of methods and material that would be most satisfactory.

The Supervisor and the Curriculum

A study of Tables III and IV will serve to
### TABLE III

**GENERAL THEORY OF SUPERVISION—PART B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>F  B</td>
<td>T  percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The supervisor should point out aspects of the curriculum which may be given different degrees of emphasis by each individual teacher to fit that teacher's particular abilities.</td>
<td>40 1 3 44</td>
<td>91 2 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The supervisor should spend considerable time giving specific instruction in methodology for the teaching of particular subject matter.</td>
<td>12 2 4 46</td>
<td>27 55 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Superintendents should work out some specific plan so that definite provision would be made for teacher intervistations.</td>
<td>39 2 3 44</td>
<td>89 5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher-intervisitations would be valuable chiefly if the supervisor had definite plans made for visitation of definite places and prepared his institute lectures and individual conferences on the basis of common knowledge of those particular situations.</td>
<td>36 3 5 44</td>
<td>82 7 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. For all mediocre teachers and for all teachers with less than four or five years of training and four or five years of experience, there should be provided a very definite and quite detailed curriculum.</td>
<td>31 9 4 44</td>
<td>70 20 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The supervisor should realize that only with exceptional teachers and exceptional facilities could the &quot;child-centered school&quot; be successful.</td>
<td>27 11 6 44</td>
<td>61 25 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The "blank" column consists of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
### TABLE IV
GENERAL ATTITUDES ON SUPERVISION—PART A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>BL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YT</td>
<td>YA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENNA</td>
<td>ENN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOKL</td>
<td>SOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you believe that promotion from grade to grade should depend primarily upon mastery of subject matter?</td>
<td>14 29 1 44</td>
<td>32 66 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you believe that the University is partly responsible for our retention of an unsatisfactory high school curriculum?</td>
<td>11 16 17 44</td>
<td>25 36 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you think that it is possible to offer, in the average-sized Alberta high school, a high-school program which will be satisfactory for all pupils without regard to their abilities?</td>
<td>8 28 8 44</td>
<td>18 64 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you think that the &quot;non academically inclined&quot; pupil is being neglected in our present-day Alberta junior and senior high schools?</td>
<td>14 25 5 44</td>
<td>32 57 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think that the &quot;academically inclined&quot; pupil is being neglected in our present-day junior and senior high schools?</td>
<td>15 26 3 44</td>
<td>34 59 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If you think that both are being neglected, which one do you think is more seriously neglected?</td>
<td>9 9 26 44</td>
<td>20 20 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you think that neither is neglected, which one do you think might more clearly show a slight tendency towards neglect?</td>
<td>16 8 20 44</td>
<td>36 18 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "blank" column consists of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
give an indication of the thought and feeling of Alberta superintendents toward certain general aspects of curriculum, particularly in their assumption of curricular responsibilities.

The replies to the first question in Table III show quite conclusively that the staff as a whole is aware of the desirability of diagnosis of the work of the various teachers and of taking into account these individual differences in curriculum work with them.

A first glance at the totals on the second question, however, might lead one to a rather less happy conclusion—that Bartky's criticisms (see chapter III) may be well founded. Perhaps the majority of these superintendents do feel that it is bad taste to lower oneself to discuss the practical matters of how definite things might best be taught. Perhaps they do consider such things unimportant, to be relegated to the artificer—the teacher who has the plebeian task of educating the child. However, from the comments made by several who answered in the negative, it is clear that their reason for so answering was not that at all, but, instead, that they considered that this work should have been done in the teacher-training institutions. Here arises, however, the possibility that the instructors in the teacher-training institutions may have the attitude that Bartky describes. In fact, he
attributes it to them even more than to superintendents. If this is so, or if the instructors simply neglect the practical matters not because they feel it beneath them, but because they feel that these matters are best learned on the job under the direction of the supervisors, the teachers never do get this vital instruction which might get them started properly. To the writer it seems that, for a mixture of the two reasons cited, specific instruction in the teaching of definite subject matter is neglected at the teacher-training stage, but that, to a certain extent, this neglect is justified. First of all, it would seem that background of subject matter and training in principles of education might be the proper thing to expect at the training institutions and that the practical applications and detailed procedures would be best learned on the job. This would not be so completely true where all teachers have a minimum of four years' training, but, in Alberta, most of the teachers of elementary grades have had less than two years. On the other hand, the superintendents should not be held too blameworthy for making their answers of "False" to this question unless they did so for the reasons given by Bartky. After all, they know that it is not possible for them to fulfill duties additional to their present ones—that they would have to be in several
places at once if they were to accept the obligation to
give this specific type of instruction to their teachers.
Thus, although no one seems too much to blame, the fact
remains that there is an obvious vacuum here with nobody
feeling any extensive personal responsibility. This
matter properly fits under the heading of "in-service
training" and is discussed more fully there.

The fifth item in Table III shows that Alberta's
superintendents as a whole are not offended by the idea of
a definite and detailed curriculum. In Chapter III the
democratic and anti-democratic implications of the pre-
scriptive "what" and the prescriptive "how" in curricula
were discussed. From the comments accompanying this item,
it seems obvious that it is not a predilection for
authoritarianism that prompted the seventy per cent posi-
tive replies, but a realization of the impracticability of
having relatively untrained teachers try to build their
own curricula. One man, while answering "True", commented
that "at least it is what the weak teachers need and cry
for". On the other hand, one man out of the twenty per
cent who answered "False", said, "Don't stifle the initia-
tive of the beginning teacher". It is unlikely that many
of the seventy per cent who answered "Yes" would stifle
any initiative that was discernible, but initiative alone,
even when present to a remarkably high degree, is insufficient
to develop inventions in education or in any other field without plenty of sound knowledge of the whole area under consideration. The initiative of the beginner can get plenty of exercise if left to work out personal variations of any methods of imparting instruction in a pretty thoroughly prescribed program. With time, he might beneficially modify the program itself, but not for awhile.

The promotion of teacher-intervisitations seems a method of giving teachers new ideas on the "what" and the "how" of curriculum without causing a feeling that the supervisor is trying to push some fancy of his own onto the teacher. On a mere casual basis, this technique would have very limited value, but, if visits were well planned with specific purposes for each one and if, at a following institute, the superintendent were to present a summary of observations that all had been able to make, along with some tentative conclusion, then there should be positive benefit. It is possible that a committee of teachers, under the direction of the supervisor, could make the summary—and a few superintendents put a reminder of this in their comments. Only one man exclaimed at the sight of the word "lecture". The data on the third and fourth items of Table III show that most of the superintendents believe in the value of planned teacher-intervisitations, but some, in their added remarks, observe that many miles
between teachers in rural Alberta renders this impracticable. With increasing centralization, this factor will become less potent, but the remark of another superintendent, that "They won't do it when they have only to cross the hall" is also, unfortunately, sometimes true. This prejudice could probably be overcome, too—with time, effort and the provision by the Board of substitute teachers for those days or half-days that the room-teacher was out observing.

Illustrative of the prevalence of the loose, broad or "democratic" attitude on the "what" of curriculum is the 66%-negative reply given to the first item in Table IV. It might be pointed out, however, that if promotions are based upon considerations other than those of subject-matter mastery, then there could not be a truly definite and detailed program of study for each grade. A child of third grade level in subject matter who found himself in the sixth grade (or even the fourth grade) because of other considerations could not and should not be expected to be subject to application of the definite and detailed studies outlined, provided and prescribed for the sixth grade. But then the teacher is presented with an impossible situation. The subject of promotions is material for another whole piece of research. Here it may be remarked that there is some slight incongruity of thought on this subject of definite studies, an incongruity based
upon (1) the fairly widespread theoretical acceptance of Dewey's free curriculum, combined with (2) the stark necessity of dealing with the teachers that exist and giving them specific programs. Supervisors apparently need to clarify their own thinking on this subject. Item 3, Table VII may further indicate the wide prevalence of the obsession with the "how"—the peculiar idea that results do not matter but the ritual does. The latter must be prescribed but the content may be left to the teacher.

It is probably true that most people who oppose the broad, free, teacher-constructed curriculum are not so concerned about subnormal children who, they usually feel, would not learn much anyway, but are worried about normal and, particularly, above-normal children who might be learning a much greater body of knowledge if there were plenty of definite things that they had to be taught. It is also probably true that most people who favor the "curriculumless curriculum" have particularly in mind the sorry plight of the subnormal children who are faced with frustrating barriers if they have to meet definite standards and who will gain only unpleasant experiences by attending school.

This pattern of thought would seem also to apply to the school superintendents, for, generally speaking, those 25% who thought the high school curriculum still too University-dominated, too rigid and academic (Table IV,
Item 2) felt that the non-academic pupil was being most neglected. Fourteen men consider that the non-academic pupil is being neglected and fifteen feel that the academically-inclined pupil is neglected. Nine consider that both are neglected in favor of the "average" but that the non-academic gets the worst of the deal; nine others feel the same way except that they think it is the academic who is forgotten. Of 24 men who believed that nobody was being neglected seriously, 16 thought that the non-academic ones might be very slightly and 8 considered that the tendency might lie in the other direction. (Items 4-7, Table IV). Some comments were, "The present organization seems to favor the mediocre and dull at the expense of the bright" and "Usually too many average 'Johnnie's' are catered to, so others are neglected. Not enough suitable for non-academic types and nothing provided to challenge the academicals". One man questioned the responsibility of the high school to provide for the non-academic type.

Most of the superintendents see (Item 3, Table IV) that we can never hope to provide a curriculum for use in the average two to six-room high school that could satisfy all. Grouping into different classes cannot be done without sufficient population. Only the most Utopian believe that the question can be left up to the individual teacher, who, if he has initiative, will provide a different
program for each child to suit that child. In the Rousseau tradition, this might even be possible with from one to five pupils per classroom, and would be more satisfactory than any grouping could be.

It is quite clear that there has not been much serious effort made to find suitable "school work" for those adolescents who are incapable of making much progress with the three R's and to whom the intricacies of the atom and of responsible government are an infinite labyrinth of bewildering paths to nowhere. Whether or not this is the responsibility of public education needs to be carefully considered.

It is not true that they have been entirely neglected even in the small high schools, but, instead of something new being invented for them, traditional schooling in the three R's and the sciences has been modified to bring the fringe members into the edge of the picture and, unfortunately, at the same time, though a "watering down" of the traditional studies for that purpose, to provide a program which does not challenge the better minds that have already gathered much of this material in their own reading from lower grades in school.

This topic will not be pursued further here, for the responsibility of supervisors for curriculum is not clear-cut. But they cannot avoid a great deal of implied responsibility, for it is they who must interpret curriculums
to the teachers on the job. Next to the teachers and pupils they are the most intimately concerned with it, and escape from the obvious conclusions should not be sought.

**Supervision and In-Service Training.**

In the first few pages of this chapter it was pointed out that Charts VI and VII indicate the almost equal allocation of time by superintendents to the supervisory and administrative fields. Yet the overwhelming majority of these men (Item 10, Table V) are convinced that more time should be spent in supervision than in administration. They would agree with Spears (76, pp. 27-28) that there is an immediate and pressing need for direct supervisory help to teachers in their classroom settings.

The impossibility of reducing time spent by Alberta's superintendents on operational matters is only too obvious. Therefore, in this case, whatever degree of truth lies in Spears' contention that administrator-supervisors are generally men who have achieved their positions through mastering the managerial and organizational aspects of school operation but are inadequate in instructional improvement, would have little or no bearing on the fact that inadequate time is applied to supervision. These men recognize the inadequacy but cannot, even if they would, escape the not inconsiderable quantity of minimum administrative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrations lessons are unsatisfactory techniques as they are highly artificial situations and are usually rehearsed beforehand.</td>
<td>8 3 4 2</td>
<td>18 77 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is the function of a supervisor to see that teachers maintain good discipline.</td>
<td>32 1 0 2</td>
<td>73 23 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervision should help teachers to improve in the fields in which good work is already being done.</td>
<td>42 1 1</td>
<td>95 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The supervisor's discussion of &quot;aims&quot; of education with most teachers is largely a waste of time and energy.</td>
<td>7 3 6 1</td>
<td>56 62 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In such discussions, it is better to begin with what the teacher has, instead of developing systems of logic and basic principles.</td>
<td>36 1 4</td>
<td>92 9 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisors have the responsibility of following educational research and translating the findings into practice through enlightenment of the teachers.</td>
<td>h 4 1 h</td>
<td>h 0 0 100 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is chiefly through the supervisor that teachers may become acquainted with various methods and materials of instruction both old and new.</td>
<td>20 1 7 8</td>
<td>45 39 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The superintendent should not block out his schedule too tightly as he needs to have time available for unexpected occasions.</td>
<td>h 4 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The superintendent should give honest, straightforward constructive criticism, but should also give very specific assistance.</td>
<td>h 4 0 0</td>
<td>100 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. More time by &quot;administrator-supervisors&quot; should be spent in supervision (obtaining effective teaching) than in administrative duties</td>
<td>39 2 3</td>
<td>69 5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A skilled supervisor is likely to do more good for the teacher with a few individual visitations and conferences than a large number of committee meetings or &quot;workshops&quot; will accomplish</td>
<td>19 16 9</td>
<td>43 36 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. More valuable than &quot;professional&quot; courses for the training of teachers at university would be a good background of general education and extensive period of internship under the guidance of skilled supervisors</td>
<td>23 14</td>
<td>52 32 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Principals and/or superintendents might well teach first and second-year teachers regular classes in professional pedagogy--possibly for credits in first and second-year education</td>
<td>14 25 5</td>
<td>32 57 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Without plenty of supervised practice in the use of various &quot;important&quot; educational principles, there is no point in having the teacher-in-training memorize such principles</td>
<td>39 5 0</td>
<td>89 11 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The most important duty of the superintendent is to provide adequate in-service training for the teachers</td>
<td>25 12 7</td>
<td>57 27 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The superintendent and his staff should have far more to do with in-service training of teachers than the university through its summer school courses has</td>
<td>28 12 8</td>
<td>55 27 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supervisors should realize that a very prevalent problem amongst teachers is a lack of good mental health</td>
<td>21 16</td>
<td>7 28 6 4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Supervisors should, generally, know much more about mental hygiene than they do, and make use of this knowledge in assisting teachers to become successful</td>
<td>32 8 8 4 6 6 18 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Supervision of the best type tends to free teachers from emotionalized habits of fear, anxiety, hate and insecurity.</td>
<td>40 2 2 4 9 1 5 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Supervision of the best type encourages teachers to express ideas in their own ways, but does not try to coax them into being &quot;creative&quot;.</td>
<td>36 2 6 4 8 2 5 1 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Superintendents and other supervisors should have to take at least every fifth year as classroom teachers again.</td>
<td>8 29 7 4 1 6 6 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. One of the most necessary qualities of a superintendent or supervisor is a high degree of scholarship</td>
<td>34 5 5 4 7 1 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Bulletins and pamphlets from central office are of practically no value to teachers unless sympathetic and individualized interpretation is given to each teacher by frequent supervisor visitation.</td>
<td>30 11 3 1 2 6 5 2 1 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "blank" column consists of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
### TABLE VI
**GENERAL PRACTICES OF SUPERVISION—PART B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct surveys to determine special needs of various groups.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>39 19 22</td>
<td>39 43 50 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make detailed yearly report to chief superintendent on the status of education in the division.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>42 39 1</td>
<td>45 51 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute to teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lists of current literature in the various fields</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>37 19 22</td>
<td>48 43 50 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans and descriptions of a number of good projects or enterprises.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>37 21 21</td>
<td>48 43 50 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of various effective teaching procedures and techniques.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>42 34 19</td>
<td>45 51 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of various available instructional aids.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>41 28 14</td>
<td>45 51 2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular &quot;news letters&quot; or &quot;bulletins&quot;.</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>40 35 7</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports of significant researches in education.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>34 13 27</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In giving personal assistance to the individual teacher, the superintendent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses principles and philosophy of education.</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>33 26 15</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps teachers formulate some specific objectives.</td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>44 38 6</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discusses with teacher his methods of evaluation.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>43 34 2</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps with specific curriculum problems.</td>
<td>12.</td>
<td>44 34 1</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest specific readings for the teacher to meet particular problems.</td>
<td>13.</td>
<td>42 30 12</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls attention to the good points in the teacher's program.</td>
<td>14.</td>
<td>44 41 0</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps interpret sections of the program of studies.</td>
<td>15.</td>
<td>44 41 0</td>
<td>41 46 16 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gives assistance in filling out certain record forms</td>
<td>31 28 14</td>
<td>70 64 32 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Encourages the teacher to try any varied procedures that the teacher may feel inclined to try</td>
<td>40 37 5</td>
<td>91 85 11 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Compiles and distributes tests</td>
<td>49 24 17</td>
<td>64 55 39 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Collects and records the results of these tests</td>
<td>42 19 21</td>
<td>68 64 33 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Conducts orientation programs for new teachers</td>
<td>30 19 25</td>
<td>68 63 57 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Gives individualized advice about audio-visual aids and field-trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While visiting the teacher, the supervisor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Notes evidence of good student-teacher relationship</td>
<td>41 40 02</td>
<td>100 95 0 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Asks for plans of instruction</td>
<td>41 36 7</td>
<td>93 82 16 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Checks the extent to which expected outcomes are met</td>
<td>41 36 7</td>
<td>93 82 16 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Asks to see records of student progress</td>
<td>41 39 05</td>
<td>93 89 0 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Checks the appearance of the teacher</td>
<td>39 36 35</td>
<td>89 82 7 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Checks mannerisms of the teacher</td>
<td>37 36 35</td>
<td>84 82 7 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Checks the teacher's use of English</td>
<td>40 37 34</td>
<td>91 84 7 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Checks teaching procedures used</td>
<td>41 39 05</td>
<td>93 89 0 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Checks condition of library and equipment</td>
<td>43 30 03</td>
<td>93 93 0 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Checks general appearance of the room</td>
<td>43 21 03</td>
<td>93 93 0 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Checks ventilation and lighting</td>
<td>43 21 03</td>
<td>93 93 0 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Checks instructional aids being used.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Checks size of class.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Uses standard check sheet for recording above date.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Holds conference with the teacher following a visitation.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Holds more than four full-days of institute per year.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Holds three or four full-days of institute per year.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Holds one or two full-days of teachers institute per year.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Encourages experimentation in classroom work.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Encourages teachers to conduct researches.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Encourages teachers to attend summer school.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Keeps acquainted with the trends in Faculty of Education.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Encourages teacher-institute school visitations.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Encourages teachers to write articles for publication.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Encourages teachers to give papers at institutes.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "blank" columns consist of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
### TABLE VII

**GENERAL ATTITUDES ON SUPERVISION—PART B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you believe you provide a service for the teachers desired by the teachers? ....</td>
<td>36 1 7 44</td>
<td>82 2 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you believe that, because of you, teachers of your division feel more satisfaction in their work? ....</td>
<td>31 0 13 44</td>
<td>70 0 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you tend to stress the development of (a) &quot;satisfactory teaching methods&quot; or (b) achievement of high standard of &quot;results&quot;? ....</td>
<td>27 10 7 44</td>
<td>61 23 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a) (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does purposeful activity which tends to produce noise in the classroom make an unfavorable impression on you? ....</td>
<td>9 34 1 44</td>
<td>20 77 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think there is any place in the school for periods when &quot;you can hear a pin drop&quot;? ....</td>
<td>27 14 3 44</td>
<td>61 32 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you think there is a place for corporal punishment in schools? ....</td>
<td>40 3 1 44</td>
<td>91 7 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The "blank" columns consist of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
duties. Several of them made additional comments to this effect.

Most of the participants in this study agreed that the most important duty of the superintendent is to provide adequate in-service training for the teachers (Item 15, Table V). Many of those who did not respond in the affirmative stated that they were hesitant because "most" is such an all-inclusive term as used in that question and there was some lack of certainty as to the exact meaning of "in-service training". The time available of course, does not allow even much group training, to say nothing of individualized work. Items 37-39 of Table VI show that most of the superintendents hold only one or two days per year of teachers' institute. Thus the results do closely approximate those obtained in the United States by Moffitt (62, pp. 355-361), who found unanimous expression of the conviction that in-service training is a tremendously great need, but that, where there was only one administrator-supervisor for an area, not much was really being done beyond a few meetings, institutes, and workshops.

Of the forty-four participants in this study, over half believe that a good background of general education and an extensive period of internship under the guidance of skilled supervisors, would be more valuable than professional courses for teacher-training at university (Item 12,
Table V). Also over half of them consider that the superintendent and his staff should have more to do with in-service training of teachers than the university through its summer school courses has (Item 16, Table V). It would appear, therefore, that the plans being used in Florida, Arkansas and in various other places as reported in Chapter III, would not seem at all radical to the Departmental field men in Alberta. Many of those who left these two questions unanswered, and some who answered them in the negative, submitted explanations which implied that, in most respects, they were sympathetic towards the general idea. Typical of some of these comments were:

Both [professional pre-service and internship] are needed even though university methods do leave something to be desired.

We need both, but there should be some systematic instruction as at the Faculty of Education.

The university does have better-trained personnel.

Then there were many statements that indicated a favorable attitude toward the idea but also a conviction that the supervisory staff will never be augmented to the extent where such extensive in-service training as would be necessary in an internship program would be practical.

It would probably be true to say, therefore, that more than the 52% and 55% who stated an unqualified "True" are actually in agreement with the general principles of the concept, and practically all would seem to favor the
internship principle if the organized system of pre-
ervice training were not threatened.

Even the actual teaching of classes to regular
first and second-year teachers by the supervisory staff,
impractical as such a proposition would be under present
conditions, elicited the approval of one-third of the
group (Item 13, Table V). The majority, who felt it
inappropriate to stray so far from reality, made such
comments as "Where is the required supervisory staff?"
and "Where could this be done?" Quite truly, the time
and the place are necessary adjuncts of most activities
in this world. Time was the chief limiting factor in
the fulfillment of all items from 10 to 16 of Table V.
But the highly necessary place becomes an obvious obstacle
in the holding of regular classes. Even so, the time is
approaching when, through increased centralization, groups
of ten to twenty or more teachers might be able to meet
for such classes once a week. The physical difficulty of
overcoming the space element is probably not as stubborn
as the one of securing a sufficiently large supervisory
staff to handle these laboratory classes. The North
Carolina teachers (36, pp. 101-106) may have had some justi-
fication in asking that, in the case of classes for experi-
enced teachers, some university credits should be given.
Of course, making such a program compulsory for interns
would be tantamount to giving them credits for it also.
The fourth and fifth items of Table V are rather interesting. An overwhelming majority of the superintendents agreed that, in discussions, it is better to begin with what the teacher has than to attempt to develop systems of logic and basic principles, but only seven of the forty-four men would go so far as to say that the supervisor's discussion of "aims" of education with most teachers is largely a waste of time and energy. At least two men saw that these two items constituted a trap, that the fifth item may have been a prelude to the fourth, as it might be considered self-evident that if one begins with what the teacher has and does not try to develop systems of logic and basic principles, then one would not get into philosophic discussions of aims of education with most teachers. Bartky (16, pp. 281-282) did make that very conclusion, plainly stating that these "aims" are monotonously repeated in every "Education" book or class, mainly couched in vague, ambiguous phrases, and that, taking into consideration what the teacher has the discussion of these aims is largely a waste of time and energy. The two men who became aware of this relationship between the two items disclaimed the presence of any such automatic connection and thereby disclaimed the

8. The teachers Bartky has in mind all hold the minimum of a bachelor's degree
presence of any actual trap at all by arguing that surely the teacher "has" enough background to make it possible to find some satisfactory place to commence a discussion of educational objectives. Of course, those two men are correct, but the thought still remains that: (a) the pre-service, academic education of Alberta teachers compares extremely unfavorably with the preparation of teachers in the western United States with which Bartky is probably most familiar; (b) the tremendous amount of immediate, vital, practical service needed by most of the teachers—such an amount that it could not be supplied by twice the existing supervisory services—should have precedence over attempts to instill anybody's brand of philosophical general aims of education; (c) the strong accent on aims and objectives has been somewhat associated with the democratic "what" and autocratic "how" of "progressivism". Thus, an immediate favorable response to any situation involving "aims" is almost automatic amongst a large section of educationists.

Thus, it may be that the statement made by these two superintendents, although perfectly valid in theory, is actually a rationalization of an automatic response rather than the expression of an optimistic estimation of the educational background of most teachers. At any rate, only seven men were realistic enough or pessimistic
enough to agree completely with Bartky on this matter.

It might also be noted (Item 9, Table VI) that 75% of the superintendents expressed the belief that they should discuss principles and philosophy of education and 59% signified that they did so. Of course, all of them may have thought it desirable to discuss such matters if conditions such as availability of time and teacher-readiness were present, and the ones who made up part of the 75%, but not of the 59%, may, quite properly, feel no guilt for the discrepancy, but consider their action, or lack of action, productive of optimum results in the given situation.

The tenth item of Table VI shows all superintendents agreeing that help should be given in the formulation of specific objectives. This, however, should not be confused with general aims and objectives discussed previously. The need for the specifics is undeniable.

All forty-four participants acknowledged the responsibility for following educational research and translating the findings into practice through enlightenment of the teachers (Item 6, Table V), although some commented that there was no time actually to do this. The replies to Item 7 in Table V reflect hesitancy in assuming too much—even theoretically. Many added remarks characterized the answers to this item, some asserting the physical
impossibility of being the chief source of methods and materials although considering it proper in theory; others saying that in actual practice it really does turn out that the teachers get nothing except what little the superintendent does give them, but that there should be somebody else to do this; and a few hopefully pointed to summer sessions.

The third to eighth items of Table VI and Item 13, Table VI further indicate some of the undesirable spread between what the men consider proper but, lacking staff, facilities, and time, can do little about. Even those who stated "Performed" for these items no doubt are reporting a very modest degree of performance. It is hardly possible to expect anything else.

Although many of the superintendents expressed a reluctance to make a definite answer to Item 11, Table V, partly because of uncertain relation between "a few" and "a large number", the consensus of opinion seemed to be that more value lay in individual visitations than in committees and workshops. Of those who refrained from committing themselves to either True or False, most commented that both approaches were valuable, that there should be more of both and that certain teachers needed more of one than of the other.

Thirty of the forty-four men were willing to admit (Item 23, Table V) that bulletins and pamphlets from
central office lose most of their potential utility unless individualized interpretation is given to each teacher by frequent supervisor-visitiation. One contributor, who replied in the negative, believed that if the pamphlet really contained information that the teacher was wanting, then no individualized interpretation would be necessary. This would, no doubt, be true if the "want" was a desire but not if the "want" were a lack. Vital information might be lacking and not actually desired because, if for no other reason, of unawareness of its existence. However, there is probably much truth in the contention that if the bulletins stated certain curriculum requirements that had to be met and that were fairly measurable rather than much vague material dealing with the "how" of doing some not-too-definite thing, then, too, individualized interpretation might not be necessary to so great an extent. But the necessity would not disappear. In fact, then would come more expressed desire on the part of the teacher for assistance with the "how". If the democratic spirit were to prevail, teachers would ask for solutions to real problems instead of some more easily-generalized ones that might make a better impression on the supervisor. Without a greatly increased supervisory staff, however, such desirable calls for supervision would be to no avail. Even as it is, the superintendents could view with little more than amusement the eighth item of Table V. Remarks
of "Don't worry! we learn that in two months" and "What about blocking the overtime?" express the absurdity of even attempting an organized supervisory program with conditions as they are.

Forty-two of the Forty-four superintendents are not so enamoured of novelty for its own sake as to state openly that they would try to coax teachers into being creative (Item 20, Table V). But six of the forty-two would not commit themselves. It may be that the replies to this question cannot be accepted as highly significant, as several professed bewilderment and considered the query ambiguous. The writer would like to suggest that not only all educators, but all composers, artists, architects and poets give some very deep thought to a definition of "originality" and after having done so, carefully consider how many things often accepted as original are really so, and how much comparative value has been given to the world by the expending of effort in trying to be "original". If some serious contemplation of such things were carried out, not only education but also art, music and poetry might rapidly improve.

Much more productive than expending energy on a quest for originality would be some effort devoted to a scientific study of mental health, what it means, how it is nurtured and its importance in everyone's daily life,
Two-thirds of the superintendents, accustomed to being responsible for just about everything imaginable, were quite willing to admit that they should know more about mental hygiene than they do and use that knowledge in assisting the teachers (Item 18, Table V). Eight men weren't sure and eight thought either that any additional knowledge of mental hygiene would not be worthwhile or that they wouldn't have time to obtain and use such knowledge anyway. With the application of elementary principles of mental hygiene (Item 19, Table V) there was almost unanimous approval. It is surely the aim of democratic procedures—of the conversion of the inspectorial into the supervisory service role, of the encouragement toward teacher self-realization of positive achievement, of the recognition of such achievement—to foster the development of a higher degree of mental health than has been prevalent in the teaching body. It is probable that many of the great industrial organizations in North America have taken considerably greater positive action to assure moderate to excellent mental health amongst their workers than have most departments of education across the continent. It is not a matter to be passed over lightly.

One outstanding conclusion to be reached from examining the responses to the questionnaire is that, in general, the superintendents seem willing to do their best
in every way that seems possible. They are willing to
assume responsibility for anything promising beneficial
results even though there may be, at present, insufficient
assistance, time, and material to make more than a token
gesture towards accomplishment.

It is refreshing to note that thirty-four of
the forty-four feel that one of the most necessary qualities
of a superintendent or supervisor is a high degree of
scholarship (Item 22, Table V). There are, it is true,
five men who deny the truth of such an allegation, and
there may be more of similar attitude throughout the
continent. Surely those five alone have not caused the
serious concern expressed in many circles (61, pp. 362-369)
that educationists today are losing their high regard for
scholarship and are content to follow the newest slogans
and play to the gallery. It is certainly true that when
those who are supposed to be educationists begin to lose
the love for knowledge in all its phases from the beautiful
and sublime but challenging lines of Browning to the also
sublime and also challenging intricacies of the beautiful
logic of the calculus or the electron theory—when that
occurs education will have to start afresh from new
sources. As yet there seems to be rather slight evidence
that there is a tendency in that unhappy direction in
Alberta.

In-service training in nearly all respects seems
to have the support of the present men in the field. With the formation of even a moderately adequate supervisory staff, as has already been suggested in Chapter III, the enlightened interest of the existing body of superintendents should set a good tone for the initiation of a genuine program of in-service training.

Expansion of Supervisory Services

The immediate need for rapid expansion of supervisory services—which has already appeared to be pretty well established from the general survey of the Alberta situation as shown in Chapter II and the authoritative advice of experts in Chapter III—is corroborated by the data compiled from the questionnaire.

The information given in Chapter II from the Alberta official publication (5, p. 28) respecting the virtual absence of professional assistance to the superintendent is merely confirmed by the answers obtained from the men themselves. Twenty-five of the forty-four men agree that several associates or assistants are needed in practically every case (Table VIII, Item 1). Some of those who answered in the negative or left a blank commented that "several" associates might not be necessary, that one qualified associate along with extra clerical help and a growth in responsibility of principals might accomplish a
### TABLE VIII

**GENERAL THEORY OF SUPERVISION—PART D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The superintendent has been given more and more to do, with little subtracted. He needs several associates or assistants in practically every case.</td>
<td>25 11  g 44</td>
<td>57 25 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Since practically no individual assistance is now given to high school teachers in Alberta, there being only a handful of &quot;high school inspectors&quot; for the province, there is a great need for a tremendous expansion (in effect the founding) of a high school supervisory staff.</td>
<td>22 14  g 44</td>
<td>50 32 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There would be still a great need for supervision if all teachers had Master's Degrees in Arts and Education and had plenty of experience.</td>
<td>37 4 3 44  g 44 9 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "blank" columns consist of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, do you consider that supervision in your division is adequate?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If not, do you think the situation might be significantly improved by:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) giving principals of schools 4 to 6 rooms one-half day and principals of schools of over 6 rooms the full school day for purposes of supervision and administration?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) giving each divisional superintendent an associate or assistant supervisor of instruction?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Which of the above (a or b) would you consider the better improvement?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you believe that the additional money would be worth it to the extent that you would:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommend that this should be the very next addition to expenditures for education?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recommend that existing expenditures be pruned to allow this expansion of supervisory services?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you believe that principals should spend most of their non-teaching time dealing with administration leaving supervision pretty well to the superintendent and any assistants he may have?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The "blank" columns consist of those who did not indicate whether Performed or Not Performed.
great deal of what needs to be done. It would be a mistake therefore, to infer that even those eleven men who signified non-concurrence with the statement, considered that supervision is adequate as it stands. Actually, it would be unrealistic to expect more than moderate improvements in a short time, and this writer, at the end of Chapter III, suggested the appointment of only one proficient supervisor to many of the divisions, with the strong recommendation that it be two for the better-populated ones. Apparently 57% of the superintendents feel that more than one is necessary.

Turning to Table IX, it is noted that ten of the forty-four assert that they do consider supervision in their own divisions as adequate (Item I). Again the statements appended to some of these ten minority responses reveal a few unusual interpretations. Thus, there are such expressions as "fairly", "as good as is permitted by conditions" and "Am I to admit that I'm not doing a good job". In other words, in the minds of a few of the men, the item appeared to question the extent of their own effort to provide good supervision. At least thirty-one of the group, however, felt no personal connotations, stated that supervision was not adequate, and volunteered such remarks as "Too many teachers" and "Insufficient time". More than one supervisor needed and more responsibility needs to be taken
by principals who should have more time for supervision.

Continuing with Table IX, it is shown that seven of the forty-four superintendents would not give principals of four to eight rooms a half-day for supervision and principals of schools of over eight rooms the full school day for such purposes (Item 2). Reasons given by some of these seven dissenters from the majority opinion were that too many principals lack the required training and experience for fulfilling supervisory duties. There were only three of the Forty-four (Item 3) that did not think the appointment of an associate or assistant supervisor of instruction would bring significant improvement in supervisory services.

Fifty per cent of the superintendents felt so strongly the necessity of such appointments being made immediately, however, that they were willing to recommend that this should be the very next addition to expenditures for education (Item 4). Nearly all of those who considered it hardly possible to go that far, pointed out certain other deplorable conditions for which the funds necessary for amelioration had not been forthcoming. Some of the commonest of these were: more classrooms and more teachers to keep enrollments per room down to thirty, library books in schools where there are practically no books other than texts, and provision of something besides pure academic work for non-academic pupils—e.g. some shop work. It was
not the purpose of this study to investigate economic conditions, but the writer is quite certain that such a degree of poverty as is indicated by these statements of conditions reminiscent of depression days or of austere pioneer times, does not exist in actual fact. Most present-day commentaries on Alberta stress the splendid financial condition of the province and the general high prosperity of the people. Of course, calculations based upon monetary units do not measure the degree or extent of certain types of poverty that afflict mankind.

Suffice it to say that besides the desperate need of expansion of supervisory services, there is also, in some cases, urgent want of indispensable necessities such as books. In spite of all this, fifty per cent of the superintendents were willing to see the very next expenditure go for the provision of a supervisor of instruction. Additional comment would seem superfluous.

Four men would even try to prune present expenditures to provide the supervision—but nearly all expressed the conviction that there was nothing that could be pruned without closing the classrooms. One or two suggested the possibility of reducing the number on the staff of the Faculty of Education and using some of them as supervisors. The opinion was also expressed that there might be an oversupply of clerical help in the Department. It should be mentioned here too that probably
most of the superintendents envisioned the remuneration for the new supervisor as coming from the divisional or county treasury, and were, therefore, thinking in terms of the possibility or impossibility of eliminating or augmenting expenditures at that level.

Considering the great emphasis that has recently been placed upon the exaltation of the principalship in Alberta (see Chapter II), it is rather surprising but nevertheless encouraging that so few of the comments on the questionnaire expressed any conviction that this would be a solution to the problem. As the writer has stated earlier, this conversion of principals into effective supervisors is a long process requiring constant care in development over a period of some years for achievement even on the limited local scale. It is no answer to the immediate need for a concerted in-service training program.

There were five men (Item 5, Table IX) who were so pessimistic over the potentialities of supervision development through the principal that they would keep him completely out of the field, allowing him to stay with administration. This is probably too bleak a viewpoint, for much possible value could lie in that direction eventually, although never to the extent of replacing an adequate central supervisory staff. One of the five men did say that his reply would be different when principals
became well qualified.

It is certainly to be hoped that there will be no attempt by the provincial authorities to evade responsibility for progress by subtly transferring this obligation to the local divisions and counties. It would, of course, not even be subtle merely to state bluntly that all supervisors must be engaged by the divisional boards. The boards already have this privilege, and even receive the regular teacher-grant for so doing. It would not be subtle to require them to exercise this privilege. That would cause outright resentment and hence would not even be considered. But promoting a campaign to free the principals for most of the school day—in the hope that such action would tend to soften and slow down the rapidly growing and insistent demand by all conscientious educators, including the superintendents, for immediate improvement in supervisory conditions—would be subtle evasion unless accompanied by the assumption of responsibility for simultaneous expansion of supervisory services at the divisional or county level and the appointment of appropriate staff to make such expansion effective.

Many superintendents expressed a degree of uncertainty with respect to the question of high school supervision. As can be seen from the second item in Table VIII, twenty-two out of the forty-four agreed that there is a great need for the tremendous expansion actually the
founding, of a high school supervisory staff. But what about the other twenty-two who refrained from committing themselves or disagreed? They do not consider that high school supervision is unnecessary by reason of the fact that high school teachers do, on the whole, have higher academic qualifications. The third item of Table VIII shows this plainly. As one of the contributors commented, "these [academic qualifications and experience] help only good teachers." It is readily ascertained from a perusal of the supplementary remarks offered by the twenty-two who left blanks or answered "False" to the second item of Table VIII, just what their reasons were if they were not just considering the better preparation of high school teachers. Several, in postscripts, mentioned the new statement issued by the Department of Education (7) already discussed in Chapter II. They suggested that it appeared that something was already being done in approximately this direction and that, therefore, it was hardly correct to speak of founding such a program. Two of the forty-four men stated doubts as to the major premise and so refrained from replying. There was also a certain amount of opinion that, with an enlarged and strengthened supervisory staff in the divisional office, this same staff might play at least some part in working with high school teachers.
As was noted in Chapter II, there has been some hint already made in the Departmental pamphlet (7) of broadening the scope of divisional responsibilities to include some nature of inspection or supervision of high school rooms. The writer has already discussed this (see end of Chapter II) along with possible implications for the staff of high school inspectors. With respect to this situation, it might further be stated here that:

(1) There has not yet been any guarantee that there will be even one associate supervisor of instruction appointed for each county or division.

(2) Even if there were, as already noted from the first item of Table VIII, twenty-five of the superintendents feel that several such men would be necessary to initiate an organized and purposeful in-service training supervisory program. Surely this cannot be an exaggerated request considering that there are over seventy-five teachers, not including high school teachers, in about fifty per cent of the divisions and counties (Chart V). Even to make two or three quick trips including one half-day visit for report-making purposes to each of seventy-five teachers is plenty for a superintendent with administrative duties. But to become acquainted with the actual work being done by each teacher, to give adequate individual assistance with the week-to-week problems as they
develop and, at the same time to carry out an organized in-service training project, would be far too much for one supervisor without administrative duties. If the ten to thirty high school teachers of the division—those who have traditionally fallen completely outside the sphere of inspection or supervision of the divisional superintendent—were added to the already large group of elementary and junior high teachers, then fifty per cent of the superintendents would have over ninety teachers. Instead of the need for one or two associate supervisors per division, two or three would then be essential.

(3) Is it better to have three men responsible for teachers of all grades from one to twelve, or to have two men for grades one to eight or nine, and one for senior high school? By and large, it seems that specialization has proved its worth, at least up to the point where the answer to this question should be self-evident. There are certain advantages to the one-room school where a teacher has all grades from one to eight, but these advantages almost disappear if one to eight becomes one to twelve, and they are never so great that the same system is retained in centralizations. On the whole, one grade per teacher seems more satisfactory. Supervisory practice in the United States would indicate that the same conclusions hold true in the field of supervision. There seems nothing to justify any trend in the opposite direction for Alberta.
(4) Where one division has too few high school teachers for one high school supervisor, as would most frequently be the case, one man could be responsible for two, three or four divisions in order to have twenty-five to thirty-five teachers. In the better-populated divisions, those of about one-hundred fifteen teachers or more, there would need to be, for a modern supervisory program, two elementary supervisors, one junior high man and one senior high man spending half his time in that division.

(5) The divisional superintendent would remain sole administrator for the division and would act as co-ordinator of the supervisory services.

The study of the questionnaire results, as reported in this chapter, indicates that, on the whole, the superintendents of Alberta schools are quite aware of the shortcomings in the existing supervisory practices. Their opinions do not differ very extensively from those of the experts studied in Chapter III. They can visualize the nature of desirable reforms but do not lose sight of realities. They do not parrot one set of slogans but show a wholesome diversity of attitude on controversial questions. Their responses placed against the background of the Alberta picture, combined with the study of general practices and current opinion in the United States, has made it possible to produce what, it is hoped, will be a useful synthesis of
knowledge on this subject productive of some consideration, in various quarters, of the recommendations which have seemed natural sequences of that synthesis.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The objective of this study was to compare existing supervisory practices in Alberta with current widely-held expert opinion or theory on the subject and with practices in other parts of America. From this comparison and from the ideas expressed by Alberta school superintendents, it was possible to assemble a somewhat definite picture of the situation. The problem was to diagnose some of the more serious shortcomings and make recommendations which should rectify them.

The field of supervision in Alberta and in Canada as a whole was one which seemed seriously lacking in formal study or research. In view of this fact, the Canadian Education Association and the Kellogg Foundation instigated, in 1953, a joint project in Educational Leadership. Short courses for representative superintendents across Canada were held at the University of Alberta from May 19 to June 5, 1953, and again in May 1954 and May 1955.

The need for work in this field by students of education was voiced many times during these short courses.

The first step taken in this study was to investigate thoroughly the literature dealing with supervision.
The second step was the making of an analysis of this material in order to arrive at a number of basic principles and procedures of supervision. After this, the questionnaire was made. Throughout its construction, constant reference was being made to principles and procedures that had received considerable emphasis in the many books and articles previously reviewed.

This questionnaire consisted of 129 questions aimed at discovering the theory and practice of supervision prevalent among the superintendents of schools in Alberta.

The analysis of the responses to this questionnaire and their interpretation, along with the establishment of their relationship to the principles derived from the extensive review of literature, resulted in the formation of conclusions and the proposal of certain recommendations.

**Review of Developments in Supervision in Alberta.**

The educational reform which swept Alberta in the 1930's included some modification in outlook towards supervision.

Some evidences of reform were:

1. With the great administrative changes whereby several thousand small school districts were organized into about fifty large "school divisions", the men who
had been "inspectors of schools" became "superintendents" of school divisions.

(2) The practice of giving the teacher a specific rating on the official report by the inspector (superintendent) was discontinued.

(3) The Department of Education, accepting in principle the idea of in-service training, suggested to the superintendents that their chief function was educational leadership rather than inspection. They were encouraged to regard their visits to classrooms as opportunities to assist teachers to solve their problems.

The acceptance of this principle had to remain pretty well a matter of theory. The new role of superintendent of the school division included that of general expert for the divisional board, and entailed a great amount of administrative work. Actual time for supervision was so small that little more than the one official visit for report-making was possible—in spite of the official change in philosophy.

Limitations of time have remained. Nevertheless, there has been a discernible trend towards more visits to classrooms, more of these visits, however, being very short ones and not accompanied by official reports. Even for the half-day visits, there has been a trend toward ignoring the official report.
Traditionally, the high school teachers were never inspected by the ordinary school inspectors (nor later by the divisional superintendents). This work was done by a small group of high school inspectors, each one responsible for inspecting about 270 high school teachers. Usually, each teacher was called upon once every two years, and, on the basis of this half-day visit, an official report was made. Any modifications in the traditional pattern with respect to the high schools have been very slight. The giving of a specific rating or grading to the teacher was, however, dropped.

The 1953 and 1954 short courses held under the C.E.A.-Kellogg project are symbols of the new reform movement in education, but whether this new surge will be as profound in its effects as the one of the 1930's remains to be seen. In these short courses, supervision as a whole was the subject under consideration, and many experts participated in them. Considerable attention was given to the idea of expanding supervisory services in order to provide opportunity for in-service training programs to develop. In connection with this, there was some discussion of the desirability of the superintendents' having assistants or associate supervisors on their staffs and of the importance of building up principalships as supervisory offices. The nature of democratic supervision was dealt with rather extensively at both short courses.
At the annual conferences of Alberta superintendents, some echoes of the short courses were heard. Here, however, the advanced theoretical speculations of the short courses mingled with the experience of the superintendents themselves with their very real situations met in their day-to-day work. Always apparent was a note of temperance, of restraint on the reforming zeal of the theorists, and the realistic viewing of the consequences of application to the situation as it exists in Alberta schools. Part of this situation includes relatively untrained teachers, great distances throughout most of the divisions, and already heavily-worked superintendents.

An expression of confidence was made in the value of written reports, but the desirability of making other visits, purely to give assistance, was also affirmed. Approval was also given to group supervision, and, in this connection, it was considered that this movement should mark the beginning of the establishment of a new role for the principal, culminating in his taking responsibility for smaller schools and rural schools in that general area.

In April 1955, a final report of a committee set up to study relationships involving principals of schools and field men of the Department was completed. A statement based upon its recommendations was officially issued by the Department of Education and is, therefore, to
be taken rather seriously as an indication of what definite supervisory changes are actually going to be instituted as a result of the new "revolution of the '50's".

Most apparent is the official acceptance of the oft-repeated demand that the principals are going to be expected to play an increased role in supervision, even to the making of classroom visitations.

Another rather obvious conclusion from the report is that the divisional superintendent is, in some way, going to have his scope broadened to include some nature of inspection or supervision of the high school rooms. If he were to be relieved of some of his many other duties, this proposal could mean the beginning of a real supervisory program for high schools, with the superintendent co-ordinating the efforts toward definite improvement in classroom instruction. If he is given but little relief, this proposal could mean, at worst, little more than a double inspection for high school teachers, with this added one by the local superintendent having no written report but, rather, a verbal and secret one to the Board to affect promotions and dismissals. Actually, even though the idea of principal-supervision were to develop rapidly, the superintendent would gain very little extra time, for he would still need the half-day visits to
teachers for the making of official reports. It is doubtful if this function would be handed to the principal, although he probably could make oral secret reports to the superintendents to take the place of written ones.

The position of the high school inspector does not seem to be left in a very clear light. Apparently he is still to visit teachers in their classrooms at regular intervals. If this means at least one half-day every two years, then, with the existing staff, no duties beyond those already fulfilled could be added.

On the other hand, if the visits are to be only on request and the main duty is to act as consultant to study groups, the situation would be very different. There would probably then be no lack of time, but the question arises as to the competency of any one man to be the expert on all matters pertaining to high schools. This first obvious weakness might cause the collapse of what, fundamentally, is probably a good idea, and the high inspector changed to a high school consultant might not find valuable employment.

The Investigation

The portion of this study which deals with the practices, theories and attitudes of Alberta's school superintendents was made possible by the co-operation of
these gentlemen in completing a questionnaire. In many cases, valuable comments were also volunteered. Of the fifty-five superintendents of divisions and counties, nine did not reply, two replied but did not complete the questionnaire, and forty-four did complete the questionnaire.

The academic training of the whole group of fifty-five is as follows: thirty-three hold bachelors' degrees, nineteen hold masters' degrees, and three hold doctors' degrees. The academic training of the forty-four participants is as follows: twenty-three hold bachelors' degrees, nineteen hold masters' degrees and two hold doctors' degrees. All of the following statistics apply only to the forty-four who responded.

The majority of the subjects have not been superintendents for as long as ten years. Their median experience as school teachers was fourteen years, with ten having taught for ten or fewer years and only five for more than twenty years. Only about half of the superintendents have over five years' experience as principals. The number of teachers under the supervision of each of these men varies from about forty-five to about one hundred fifty, with the median lying at seventy-five. These numbers do not include the high school teachers. In only two cases did the superintendent have the services of a qualified
assistant, although in two other cases travelling teachers were employed. The average percentage of time spent on administrative work was forty-five per cent. The same percentage was the average for fulfilling supervisory duties. Nearly twenty-five per cent of all those reporting were unable to spend over thirty per cent of their time attending to supervisory matters.

From the reading of numerous books and articles dealing with supervision, it seems quite clear that there are certain outstanding features of modern concepts of supervision which are so prominent that they cannot escape notice:

1. There is a striving for democracy in schools.
2. There is considerable attention given to the importance of the curriculum and the nature of curriculum that supervisors should promote.
3. There is great emphasis on the idea that the whole purpose of supervision is in-service training.
4. There is always present the stated desire that supervisory services be expanded much beyond the point where they now are.

The replies given on the questionnaire were organized, therefore, under those headings.
Supervision and the Democratic Concept

Concern about the degree of democracy inherent in various aspects of educational institutions has been reflected in nearly every book on education written since 1920. The Dewey-Kilpatrick-Collings-Meriam group was responsible for starting a tremendous controversy over the essential meaning of democracy. This controversy has had profound effect on all phases of education including supervision.

The current emphasis on "good public relations" depends for its popularity upon certain interpretations of democracy. The fact that, by and large, the younger superintendents seemed to accept without question the necessity for a study of public relations, could in no way be interpreted to mean that they are fundamentally any more democratic than some of those who considered that the sensible idea is to fulfill the duties of one's position to the best of one's ability and forget all the talk about public relations.

Another phase of the theory of democracy is involved in the writing of reports on teachers. The actual statement of a grading having been discontinued for nearly twenty years, the rating is now implied only, and there seems to be some latitude allowed by the Department with respect to actual frequency of making complete reports on
any particular teacher or teachers. A few men suggest that they make very few of these, generally only on the request of the teacher. These few men are reducing inspection to a minimum, presumably enhancing the supervisory nature of their duties accordingly. Although the trend, then, does seem away from official reports in the name of more democratic supervision, there is no universally-accepted philosophy which would declare that the conscientious writing of numerous complete reports indicates either undemocratic processes or the absence of the true spirit of supervision.

The greatest lack of agreement amongst the participants comes in connection with the promotion of educational theories. There was, in many cases, a great difficulty involved in trying to reconcile a loyalty to the ideals of freedom and democracy for teachers with a conviction that certain educational beliefs and theories must be promoted at all costs. Twenty-five per cent of the group considered "proselytizing...a fruitless process", but the majority felt that they should urge teachers to accept certain theories. Many felt, however, that teachers as a group might accept them without coercion through "workshops". The question of "democratic" curriculum is discussed under the heading "The Supervisor and the Curriculum".
The Supervisor and the Curriculum

In considering curriculum, one still cannot get away from the preoccupation with democracy. Dewey felt very strongly about giving the teacher complete freedom to make her own course of study. But his disciple, Collings, felt just as strongly that the teaching methods should be ruthlessly standardized in conformity with the new "activity-growth-group drive" philosophy. This viewpoint, that the "what" of curriculum, the subject matter to be taught should, in the name of democracy, be left up to the individual teacher to decide, and that the "how", the methods of teaching (e.g. the activity method) be decided upon by authorities and prescribed for the teachers, has been quite popular since 1930. In the 1950's, however, there seems to be a trend developing in the opposite direction. Bartky says that the authorities (through the supervisors) should provide the curriculum but only suggest methods. He believes that bothering the teachers with aims, principles and objectives is a waste of time and that the "plain, practical" matters should cease to be considered unimportant details.

About one quarter of Alberta's superintendents consider that they should be spending considerable time giving specific instruction respecting the teaching of particular subject matter. About one half of the group
disagrees. Disagreement stems largely from the conviction that there would be no possible time in which to do it, and that this work should have been done by instructors in the teacher-training institutions.

Seventy per cent of the superintendents believe that, for the majority of the teachers, a definite and detailed curriculum is advisable. Some said it was wrong, that it would "stifle the initiative of the teacher". Although seventy per cent would ignore Dewey to the extent of having a definite curriculum, their loyalty to him becomes more marked when only one quarter of them state that they stress achievement of a high standard of "results" rather than "satisfactory teaching methods". Also, in spite of the seventy per cent preference for the detailed and definite curriculum, only one-third of the group believe that promotion from grade to grade should depend primarily upon mastery of subject matter.

Generally speaking, the twenty-five per cent of the group who think that the high school curriculum is still too rigid, academic and university-dominated also feel that non-academic pupils were being neglected. Altogether about one-third of the superintendents feel that the non-academic pupils are neglected, and also one-third feel that the academic pupils are neglected. In some cases, the same men are in both categories. Very few of the men think it
possible to offer, in the average-sized Alberta high school, a program satisfactory for all pupils.

Supervision and In-Service Training

It has long been recognized that the primary purpose of supervision is the training of teachers in service. There may be a place in the school systems for inspection, but inspection, in its simplest form, does not contribute toward in-service training of teachers. In many places, including Alberta, there has not yet developed a strictly supervisory program. The inspectorial staff has made a gesture in that direction, a gesture being all that conditions permit. In other places, well-organized supervisory programs have been under way for some years.

Internship programs have been built up in certain states. Special supervisors work constantly with the intern for his year of work in the classroom before he returns to the teacher-training institution for his final year of study. The same special supervisors also give assistance to the regular supervisory staff in providing a definite in-service program for the regular teachers. In a few cases, programs of teacher-training have been practically abandoned until after an internship which may be commenced with a Bachelor's degree in arts or sciences. In Maryland, only students with very high records in their arts and science programs are allowed to intern for teaching
core curriculum or activity program. They then receive extra core-curriculum supervisors while interns.

Over half of Alberta’s superintendents believe that a good background of general education and an extensive period of internship under the direction of skilled supervisors would be more valuable than professional courses for teacher-training at the university. Furthermore they consider that the superintendent and his staff should have more to do with in-service training of teachers than the university through its summer school courses has.

Group instruction by the supervisor, like committee meetings and workshops, has its place, but the supervisor has a function to perform which training schools can never do. This is the giving of assistance right where it counts, in the individual classroom. Even bulletins and pamphlets may be nearly useless without individual interpretation. Most of the Alberta superintendents recognize this. In connection with the program of in-service training, it is now a generally accepted principle that the supervisor should have at least some training in mental hygiene. In fact, the good supervisor should have an excellent cultural background and considerable knowledge in many fields. Most of the participants in this study were willing to accept these principles.
The Alberta superintendents believe that in-service training is the primary function of supervision, but admit that the amount of it actually carried out is rather small. They feel that they should make themselves more familiar with the findings of research but cannot find the time.

Expansion of Services

The desirable reforms in supervision that have been mentioned cannot be instituted without a great deal larger supervisory staff which, of course, means the availability of more time to carry out an actual program of in-service training. Rapid expansion of supervisory services is the essential condition which is prerequisite to the modernization of the whole program. Fifty-seven per cent of the Alberta superintendents agree that several associates or assistants are needed in practically every case. Many of the others think that one qualified associate along with extra clerical help and a growth in responsibility of principals might accomplish a good deal. From the questionnaire responses, it was seen that besides the desperate need for expansion of supervisory services, there is also, in some cases, urgent want of indispensible necessities such as books and desks. In spite of all this, fifty per cent
of the superintendents consider that the very next expenditure in education should go for the provision of supervisors of instruction. There is fairly general agreement that the extension of the supervisory roles of principals, although containing much ultimate potential value, would never replace an adequate central supervisory staff and is no answer to the immediate need for a concerted in-service training program.

It seems quite certain that the central supervisory staff for the division or county should be employed by the provincial government rather than by the divisional board or county council. Experience in some parts of the United States has shown that where the hiring of staff had been on a county level, the result was often unsatisfactory. Although some counties had adequate supervisory services with supervisory principals entirely freed from clerical and teaching duties and with a general supervisor with assistant special subject-matter supervisors in addition to the superintendent, yet, at the other end of the scale, some counties in the poor, remote, unpopulated areas had principals who were more administrative than supervisory, and had no general county supervisors other than the county superintendent himself and the assistant county superintendent.

The superintendents of Alberta also recognize
the need for a tremendous expansion, practically equivalent to the founding of high school supervisory services. Some feel that the new developments respecting inspector-superintendent-principal relationships might constitute the first step in founding a program of high school supervision. The consensus of opinion is that the services of qualified supervisors are just as necessary for the high school teachers as for the elementary ones.

Conclusions

Supervision and the Democratic Concept

1. The supervisory staff is very much concerned about the democratization of its role, particularly in the field of public relations.

2. Some do see the shallowness of the common interpretation of "striving for good public relations".

3. The importance of co-ordinating educational activity is very well recognized.

4. The making of written reports is generally approved with a sizeable minority questioning the procedure, particularly in the presentation of such reports to higher authorities.

5. There is a trend away from the actual rating of teachers and toward the consideration of such practice as undesirable.
6. There is some confusion as to the extent of prescription of methods and material that would be most satisfactory.

7. There seems to be no clear-cut concept of the precise characteristics of "democratic supervision". Attitudes play such an important part that the consideration of the presence or absence of such exterior trappings as "workshops" gives practically no indication of the presence or absence of the more fundamental characteristics of democracy.

The Supervisor and the Curriculum

8. There are no well-validated pieces of scientific research that point to any particular type of curriculum as being of paramount value.

9. There seems some incongruity based upon: (1) the fairly widespread theoretical acceptance of Dewey's free curriculum, combined with (2) the necessity of dealing with the teachers that exist and giving them specific programs.

10. It is impossible to do very good work with a group of children widely diverging in ability and attitudes.

Supervision and In-Service Training

11. The superintendents in Alberta are willing to assume responsibility for many things that promise beneficial results, even though there may be, at present,
insufficient assistance, time and material to make more than a token gesture toward accomplishment.

12. Given the staff, time and material, Alberta's superintendents would be eager to direct a genuine in-service teacher-training program.

Expansion of Services

13. Rapid expansion of supervisory services is the essential condition which is prerequisite to the modernization of the whole program.

14. Principals of schools, to an even greater extent than superintendents, are likely to remain primarily administrators rather than supervisors.

15. Some degree of specialization has proved beneficial wherever it has been used over a period of time.

16. Cost of, and responsibility for, the expansion and modernization of supervisory services should be assumed by the province rather than by the divisions or counties.

Recommendations.

Supervision and the Democratic Concept.

1. Every supervisor should give ample opportunity for each teacher to develop to the extent of his willingness and ability.

2. Much of supervision should be kept on an individual basis. The mere presence of groups does not indicate
either a greater or lesser degree of democracy.

The Supervisor and the Curriculum

3. Identification with any particular school of thought on curriculum should be avoided. The synthetic-eclectic method of using consensus of opinion of as many educated and interested men as possible should be encouraged.

4. Every effort should be made to nurture a sense of accomplishment in the teacher and to encourage him to acquire a broad education, not only in pedagogy, but in all fields, so that he may become a cultured man.

Supervision and In-Service Training

5. High standards of broad academic achievement should be required of all supervisors. Some special work in essential areas should be included.

6. Every effort should be made to increase the general education requirements of teacher trainees. The minimum of a bachelor's degree, already in effect in many places, should be the aim.

7. A genuine internship system should be instituted to give practical training-on-the-job to young teachers or probationary teachers.

8. Supervisors should make themselves more familiar with
educational research and translate it for their teachers.

**Expansion of Services.**

9. As a first step in the inauguration of an expanded and modernized supervisory system, the Department of Education should appoint a highly-qualified supervisor of instruction for each school division or county.

10. After a survey of each division in order to determine its special conditions and needs, one or two further supervisors for most divisions should be appointed.

11. Where possible, one supervisor in each division should have charge of junior high school rooms and one or two others have responsibility for the elementary rooms. If there were two elementary supervisors, they might split the division geographically, or, if centralization were fairly complete, one might take grades one to three throughout the division, and the other grades four to six.

12. Two high school supervisors, with particularly outstanding qualifications in different subject-matter fields, should be appointed for each block of three to seven divisions.

13. The divisional or county superintendent should remain sole administrator for the division and act as coordinator of supervisory service.
14. Salaries for superintendents should be substantially increased and more uniformly-high qualifications be demanded for the position. Similar salaries and qualifications should apply to the supervisors.

15. Action should be taken to overcome the shortage of well-trained experienced people suitable to fill the role of superintendent or supervisor.

16. In conjunction with the above, encouragement should be given to develop the role of principal of schools into one of real leadership in the field of supervision.

17. Both of the desirable outcomes stated in Numbers 5 and 6 should be furthered by the setting aside of a special grant by the Department of Education for the purpose of paying bonuses on a graduated scale to all school teachers (including principals) who take training beyond the bachelor's degree. If this bonus were at all generous, it might act as a stimulus toward the building up of a sufficiently large group of well-qualified individuals to fill not only the positions of superintendents and supervisors but also of principals.

18. Divisional boards should be strongly urged to provide the clerical help required by superintendents, supervisors, and principals.

19. Supervisors and instructors in supervision from places with modernized programs should be invited to give summer school courses in Alberta.
20. Official reports by the superintendent to the Department on the work of each teacher might well become rather few, generally to be made only on the request of the teacher.
STATUS OF SUPERVISION IN ALBERTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Part I. General Theory of Supervision
Check either "true" or "false" for each statement.

1. The superintendents of Alberta in general are not democratic enough in their dealings with teachers. [TRUE FALSE]

2. You are not democratic enough in your dealings with teachers. [TRUE FALSE]

3. It is very important that the principals in any school division understand and appreciate the work of the superintendent with the teachers. [TRUE FALSE]

4. It is important that the superintendent co-ordinate the work of associate and assistant supervisors. [TRUE FALSE]

5. One of the most important aspects of supervision should be its unifying and co-ordinating influence on the system. [TRUE FALSE]

6. A superintendent should study extensively the field of public relations. [TRUE FALSE]

7. A superintendent or supervisor should do the best job he can and forget all the talk about "public relations". [TRUE FALSE]

8. Superintendents (supervisors) should urge acceptance of educational theories only to the extent that individual teachers liked those theories when they tried working with them. [TRUE FALSE]

9. It is probably better to help teachers in their own direction than to try to get experienced teachers to adapt themselves to your own or anyone else's way of thinking. [TRUE FALSE]

10. Supervision should emphasize the fact that there are no "best" techniques or methods for all teachers, that there is no over-all recipe for successful teaching. [TRUE FALSE]
11. Demonstration lessons are unsatisfactory techniques as they are highly artificial situations and are usually rehearsed beforehand. **TRUE** **FALSE**

12. It is the function of a supervisor to see that teachers maintain good discipline. **TRUE** **FALSE**

13. Supervision should help teachers improve in the fields in which good work is already being done. **TRUE** **FALSE**

14. The supervisor's discussion of "aims" of education with most teachers is largely a waste of time and energy. **TRUE** **FALSE**

15. In such discussions, it is better to begin with what the teacher has, instead of developing systems of logic and basic principles. **TRUE** **FALSE**

16. Supervisors have the responsibility of following educational research and translating the findings into practice through enlightenment of the teachers. **TRUE** **FALSE**

17. It is chiefly through the supervisor that teachers may become acquainted with various methods and materials of instruction both old and new. **TRUE** **FALSE**

18. The superintendent should not block out his schedule too tightly as he needs to have time available for unexpected occasions. **TRUE** **FALSE**

19. The superintendent should give honest, straightforward constructive criticism, but should also give very specific assistance. **TRUE** **FALSE**

20. More time by "administrator-supervisors" should be spent in supervision (obtaining effective teaching) than in administrative duties. **TRUE** **FALSE**
21. A skilled supervisor is likely to do more good for the teacher with a few individual visitations and conferences than a large number of committee meetings or "workshops" will accomplish.

22. More valuable than "professional" courses for the training of teachers at university would be a good background of general education and extensive period of internship under the guidance of skilled supervisors.

23. Principals and/or superintendents might well teach first- and second-year teachers regular classes in professional pedagogy--possibly for credits in first- and second-year education.

24. Without plenty of supervised practice in the use of various "important" educational principles, there is no point in having the teacher-in-training memorize such principles.

25. The most important duty of the superintendent is to provide adequate in-service training for the teachers.

26. The superintendent and his staff should have far more to do with in-service training of teachers than the university through its summer school courses has.

27. Supervisors should realize that a very prevalent problem amongst teachers is a lack of good mental health.

28. Supervisors should, generally, know much more about mental hygiene than they do, and make use of this knowledge in assisting teachers to become successful.

29. Supervision of the best type tends to free teachers from emotionalized habits of fear, anxiety, hate, and insecurity.
30. Supervision of the best type encourages teachers to express ideas in their own ways, but does not try to coax them into being creative.  

31. Superintendents and other supervisors should have to take at least every fifth year as classroom teachers again.  

32. One of the most necessary qualities of a supervisor or superintendent is a high degree of scholarship.  

33. Bulletins and pamphlets from central office are of practically no value to teachers unless sympathetic and individualized interpretation is given to each teacher by frequent supervisor visitation.  

34. The supervisor should point out aspects of the curriculum which may be given different degrees of emphasis by each individual teacher to fit that teacher's particular abilities.  

35. The supervisor should spend considerable time giving specific instruction in methodology for the teaching of particular subject matter.  

36. Superintendents should work out some specific plan so that definite provision would be made for teacher-intervisitations.  

37. Teacher-intervisitations would be valuable chiefly if the superintendent (supervisor) had definite plans made for visitation of definite places and prepared his institute lectures and individual conferences on the basis of common knowledge of those particular situations.
38. For all mediocre teachers and for all teachers with less than four or five years of training and four or five years of experience, there should be provided a very definite and quite detailed curriculum.

39. The supervisor should realize that only with exceptional teachers and exceptional facilities could the "child-centered school" be successful.

40. The superintendent has been given more and more to do, with little subtracted. He needs several associates or assistants in practically every case.

41. Since practically no individual assistance is now given to high school teachers in Alberta, there being only a handful of "high school inspectors" for the province, there is a great need for a tremendous expansion (in effect the founding) of a high school supervisory staff.

42. There would be still a great need for supervision if all teachers had Master's Degrees in Arts and Education and had plenty of experience.
Part II. General Practices in Supervision

If the practice seems desirable even though time does not permit you to perform such a service, place "X" in the "Desirable" column (the D column). If you or one of your associates or assistants performs the service, place an X in the "Performed" column (the P column). If the service is not performed, place an X in the "Not Performed" column (the N column).

1. Make unrequested (by the teacher) visits to the classrooms of teachers with over ten years experience and of good standing.

2. Make unrequested (by the teacher) visits to the classrooms of teachers with less than ten years experience and of good standing.

3. Visit only when called upon

4. Announce visits in advance

5. Work in close co-operation with the principals

6. Keep written record of all visits and conferences

7. Make written report to teacher

8. Make written report to principal

9. Make written report to higher authorities

10. Use a standard form for reports

11. Make rating of the teacher in the reports

12. Select new teachers for the staff

13. Require each teacher to follow a prescribed course of study

14. Conduct surveys to determine special needs of various groups

15. Make detailed yearly report to chief superintendent on the status of education in the division
Services to teachers in classrooms

Distribute to teachers:

16. Lists of current literature in the various fields

17. Plans and descriptions of a number of good projects and enterprises

18. Descriptions of various effective teaching procedures and techniques

19. Descriptions of various available instructional aids

20. Regular "news letters" or "bulletins"

21. Reports of significant researches in education

In giving personal assistance to the individual teacher, the superintendent:

22. Discusses principles and philosophy of education

23. Helps teachers formulate some specific objectives

24. Discusses with teacher his methods of evaluation

25. Helps with specific curriculum problems

26. Suggests specific readings for the teacher to meet particular problems

27. Calls attention to the good points in the teacher's program

28. Helps interpret sections of the program of studies

29. Gives assistance in filling out certain record forms
30. Encourages the teacher to try any varied procedures that the teacher may feel inclined to try.
31. Compiles and distributes tests.
32. Collects and records the results of these tests.
33. Conducts orientation programs for new teachers.
34. Gives individualized advice about audio-visual aids and field-trips.

While visiting the teacher, the supervisor:
35. Notes evidence of good student-teacher relationship.
36. Asks for plans of instruction.
37. Checks the extent to which expected outcomes are met.
38. Asks to see records of student progress.
39. Checks the appearance of the teacher.
40. Checks mannerisms of the teacher.
41. Checks the teacher's use of English.
42. Checks teaching procedures used.
43. Checks condition of library and equipment.
44. Checks general appearance of the room.
45. Checks ventilation and lighting.
46. Checks instructional aids being used.
47. Checks size of class.
48. Uses standard check sheet for recording above data.
49. Holds conference with the teacher following a visitation.
Up-grading and Projection Services

50. Holds more than four full-days of teachers' institute per year

51. Holds three or four full-days of teachers' institute per year

52. Holds one or two full-days of teachers' institute per year

53. Encourages experimentation in classroom work

54. Encourages teachers to attend summer school

55. Encourages teachers to conduct researches

56. Keeps acquainted with the trends in Faculty of Education

57. Encourages teacher-interschool visitations

58. Encourages teachers to write articles for publication

59. Encourages teachers to give papers at institutes

Promotional Services

60. Organizes or assists in radio broadcasts

61. Prepares and sends news items to papers

62. Speaks to various organizations on educational matters

63. Writes articles for publication

64. Arranges for outstanding authorities to speak to Home and School and other groups

65. Arranges for displays or exhibits of school work

66. Attends educational conferences of province-wide scope

67. Promotes adult-education classes
Part III. General Attitudes on Supervision

Check "Yes" or "No" for each question.

1. Do you believe you provide a service for the teachers, desired by the teachers?
   YES  NO

2. Do you believe that, because of you, the teachers of your division feel more satisfaction in their work?
   YES  NO

3. Do you tend to stress the development of (a) "satisfactory teaching methods" or (b) achievement of high standard of "results"? Check (a) or (b)
   (a)  (b)

4. Does purposeful activity which tends to produce noise in the classroom make an unfavorable impression upon you?
   YES  NO

5. Do you think there is any place in the school for periods when "you can hear a pin drop"?
   YES  NO

6. Do you think there is a place for corporal punishment in schools?
   YES  NO

7. Do you believe that promotion from grade to grade should depend primarily upon mastery of subject matter?
   YES  NO

8. Do you believe that the University (Universities) is partly responsible for our retention of an unsatisfactory high school curriculum?
   YES  NO

9. Do you think that it is possible to offer, in the average-sized Alberta high school, a high-school program which will be satisfactory for all pupils without regard to their abilities?
   YES  NO

10. Do you think that the non-academically inclined pupil is being neglected in our present-day Alberta junior and senior high schools?
   YES  NO
11. Do you think that the "academically inclined" pupil is being neglected in our present-day Alberta junior and senior high schools?

YES  NO

12. If you think that both are being neglected, which one do you believe is more seriously neglected?

NON-ACAD. ACAD.

13. If you think that neither is being neglected, which one do you think might more clearly show a slight tendency towards neglect?

NON-ACAD. ACAD.

14. In general, do you consider that supervision in your division is adequate?

YES  NO

If not, do you think the situation might be significantly improved by:

15. giving principals of schools of 4 to 8 rooms one-half day and principals of schools of over 8 rooms the full school day for purposes of supervision and administration?

YES  NO

16. giving each divisional superintendent an associate or assistant supervisor of instruction?

YES  NO

17. Which of the above (15 or 16) would you consider the better improvement?

(15)  (16)

Do you believe that the additional money spent would be worth it to the extent that you would:

18. recommend that this should be the very next addition to expenditures for education?

YES  NO
If not, what would you like to see as the next additional expense? 

19. Recommend that existing expenditures be pruned enough to allow this expansion of supervisory services? 

If so, would you have any suggestions re pruning? 

20. Do you believe that principals should spend most of their non-teaching time dealing with administration, leaving supervision pretty well to the superintendent and whatever associate or assistant supervisors he may have? 

Comments on supervision 

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
STATUS OF SUPERVISION IN ALBERTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Name ________________________________________________________________

Number of years as superintendent ________________________________

Number of years as school principal ________________________________

Total years of teaching experience ________________________________
  (including principalship period)

In what subjects and what grades did you chiefly specialize?

_________________________________________________________________

Circle degrees you hold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>MINORS</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.Ed. or B.Sc.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>M.Ed. or M.Sc.</td>
<td>Ed.D. or Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List university courses on supervision you have taken:

Course
__________________________________________  ________
__________________________________________  ________
__________________________________________  ________

List the titles of any associates or assistants you may have in your work of administration and supervision of the schools in your division.

_________________________________________________________________

How many teachers are employed in your division? ______

For how many of these are you responsible from a supervision standpoint? ______

Who is responsible for the supervision of the others? ______

About what percentage of your working time do you devote to administrative functions? ______

What percentage do you use for actual supervision of instruction? ______
The whole question of supervision of schools has been receiving widespread attention in the past two or three years. Here in Alberta the Kellogg Foundation has been assisting the superintendents to keep aware of recent developments in this field and to interpret modern research in the light of their own experience. It seems most probable that the next few years will see great change in both theory and practice of supervision right here in Alberta. Much of both the extent and direction of this change will certainly depend upon the present staff of superintendents.

The Kellogg Foundation has given me encouragement to conduct a survey of the theory and practice of supervision in Alberta. I feel sure that such a piece of research, if reasonably well done, will be of very definite and immediate value not only to superintendents but also to practically everyone closely connected with education.

In a few days you will receive from me a set of questions, very easily and quickly answered by placing check marks in True-False columns or something similar. There will be no need to consult your office files for statistics of any kind. In fact, I believe you will enjoy the short time required to indicate your responses. The writing of extra comments would be welcome, but that is a time-consuming process and is not vital to the success of this piece of research. However, if you should feel strongly enough about any point to wish to take a few minutes to comment, such statements certainly will be put to good use.

Naturally, all material will be kept strictly confidential and only generalizations will be published. When the research is complete, I will send you a summary of the findings.

Your co-operation will be most highly appreciated, for upon it depends the success of the whole venture.

Yours sincerely,

Horace F. McCall
Seba Beach, Alberta
June 6, 1955.

Two or three weeks ago you received a list of questions dealing with various aspects of supervision of schools. Returns have now been received from about 60% of the superintendents; but, in order to produce from this research findings that are highly significant, more than 60% is necessary.

Mr. Frame has suggested that a larger percentage might have come in on the first call if I had previously obtained official departmental authorization of the study. Apparently superintendents receive so many requests for various types of information that some of them seldom respond without notification of this official authorization. This, of course, I had not known and I don’t believe the Kellogg Foundation knew about it.

However, we hope that most of those remaining will see fit to reply eventually. Probably a lack of time rather than a lack of inclination or of official authorization has been the factor that has held back 40% of the returns.

I believe you will find that the time required is much smaller than you think. No statistics need be consulted. Nearly all responses are made by placing check marks in appropriate columns. If you really do not approve of this research, we would appreciate a short note from you in explanation.

It may be that you have mislaid the questionnaire. However, as this will be true in only a few cases, I shall wait several more days before sending you a duplicate.

A reply at your earliest convenience will certainly be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Horace F. McCall
I thought I should drop you a note with a new self-addressed envelope, as I shall not be in Seba Beach for the next month or more and I shall want to get the completed questionnaire just as soon as possible after you have found time to give it your attention and mail it.

If there is something about this piece of research of which you disapprove, or if for any reason you have decided not to submit the questionnaire, I would greatly appreciate a short note from you.

Yours sincerely,

Horace F. McCall
This is to acknowledge receipt of the completed "supervision questionnaire" and to offer a very sincere "thank you" for your trouble.

All individual responses will be kept strictly confidential.

A summary of the results will be mailed to you when the research is completed.

Sincerely yours,

Horace F. McCall
### SUMMARY OF WORK OF ALBERTA SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS
### FOR 1943*

#### 1. MILEAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Transportation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average per Inspectorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Rail or bus</td>
<td>44,591</td>
<td>1,037.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Road</td>
<td>337,278</td>
<td>7,843.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Other means (Air, etc.)</td>
<td>6,388</td>
<td>148.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>388,257</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,029.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average per Inspectorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Schools in Divisions</td>
<td>2,369.5</td>
<td>55.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Schools in Inspectorates outside Divisions</td>
<td>469.75</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Schools not in Inspectorates</td>
<td>174.5</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Indian Schools</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Private Schools</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,067.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>71.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. INVESTIGATIONS OR ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average per Inspectorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Districts in Divisions</td>
<td>2,086.00</td>
<td>48.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Districts in Inspectorates but outside Divisions</td>
<td>232.50</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Official Trustee Duties</td>
<td>259.25</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Attendance work</td>
<td>165.75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Examination Work for Department</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Teaching in Summer School</td>
<td>182.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Other special work for Department</td>
<td>419.5</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Reports, Correspondence, Office Duties</td>
<td>4,008.25</td>
<td>93.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Divisional Board Meetings</td>
<td>603.25</td>
<td>14.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Conventions, School Fairs, Festivals</td>
<td>414.75</td>
<td>9.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,485.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>197.33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE.** In computing averages the number of inspectors as of December 31, 1943, has been taken as divisor. Since there were many changes of staff during the year, with inspectorates vacant for various periods, the average must be regarded as approximate.

---

*6, p. 51.*
### SUPERVISION AND INSPECTION

4. Number of rooms visited in supervisory capacity during the year and reports submitted to the Department:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outside</th>
<th>In Div. but</th>
<th>Outside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Inspect-</td>
<td>in Inspec-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tors</td>
<td>tors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once.</td>
<td>1,587</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice.</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times.</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more times.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Number of visits of half-day duration.............. 4,722
Number of visits of less than half-day duration 1,694
Number of complete reports submitted.................. 3,598
Number of memo. reports to teachers.................... 1,799
Number of visits with no reports....................... 1,083

6. Number of rooms the work of which was not inspected or supervised during the year:
   (a) In Divisions........................................ 257
   (b) Not in Divisions.................................... 156
   Total.................................................. 413

7. DISTRICTS, ROOMS AND OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Divisions</th>
<th>Not in Divisions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Total number of districts....</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>3,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Total number of districts in which local school was operated........</td>
<td>2,703</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>2,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Number of operating rooms....</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>4,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Number of operating schools (including Elementary, Intermediate and High Schools):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) One room.</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Two rooms.</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Three rooms.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Four rooms.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) More than four rooms....</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total..........</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.—This return does not include the cities of Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat.
8. The following table summarizes the extent to which instruction in Grades IX, X, and XI has been authorized in one-room schools of the Province for the December term:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF WORK OF ALBERTA SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS FOR 1954*

The following tables are compiled from statistics supplied by the superintendents. It should be kept in mind that the major cities are not included, since they do not come under the jurisdiction of any particular superintendent. The figures are for the school year ending June 30, 1954.

**DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In Divisions</th>
<th>Not in Divisions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts...</td>
<td>3,794</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of districts in which local school was operated</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLASSROOMS**

Number of rooms operating during the year:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Under teachers...</td>
<td>3,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Under supervisors.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms not visited during the year</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of operating rooms on which a full report was not issued</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms visited in a supervisory capacity during the year:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Once...</td>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Twice...</td>
<td>1,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Three times...</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Four times or more...</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*5, p. 13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private and Indian Schools</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of schools in inspectorates</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms operated</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of reports issued</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of rooms not visited</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction in grades above the eighth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of one-room schools offering instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Grade IX</td>
<td>278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Grade X</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Grade XI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Grade XII</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF WORK**

**Number of days spent in work of supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Co-operative and group supervision</td>
<td>1,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Schools in division and inspectorate but not in division</td>
<td>2,687.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Schools not in inspectorates</td>
<td>287.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Indian schools</td>
<td>49.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Private schools</td>
<td>47.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of days spent in Investigation or Administrative work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) In divisions</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) In schools districts not in divisions</td>
<td>178.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Outside of inspectorate</td>
<td>39.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,808.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance of duties as Official Trustee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance work</td>
<td>208.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination work for Department</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports, correspondence, office duties</td>
<td>4,394.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special work for Department other than above</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending meetings of divisional boards</td>
<td>977.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendance at subdivisional meetings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>6,193.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Days</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>14,140.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE OF MILEAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles travelled</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>44,002</td>
<td>814.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>11,407</td>
<td>285.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,100.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Own car</td>
<td>466,775</td>
<td>8,643.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Car mileage not charged to Department</td>
<td>53,914</td>
<td>998.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Other conveyance</td>
<td>11,326</td>
<td>209.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>532,015</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,852.13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>591,424</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,952.29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDE FOR EVALUATING THE WORK OF THE TEACHER
[used by Superintendents of Alberta schools]

I. Personal and Professional Qualities:

Appearance, health, alertness, vigour.

Voice and enunciation, command of English and adaptation to level of class taught.

Classroom manner, poise, patience, courtesy.

Strength of personality, leadership, tact, resourcefulness.

Mental ability, insight with respect to teaching purposes, understanding of children.

Attitude, sincerity, enthusiasm, industry.

Preparation (academic and professional), scholarship, knowledge of subject matter.

Appreciation of aims of curriculum and of standards of pupil-achievement.

Interest in co-curricular activities.

Professional outlook and growth, effort to keep abreast of development in new courses, aims and methods.

II. The teaching and Learning Situation; Management; Organization:

Discipline and control.

Planning and preparation, adherence to program and timetable.

Clearness of aim in teaching, participation of pupils in planning.

Association of presentation with necessary correlated previous knowledge.

Natural and logical lesson-development from the point of readiness.

Procedure in presentation, exposition, questioning.
Guide for evaluating the work of the teacher (continued)

Balance between instruction and class activity.

Pupil-participation in lesson-work and group activities.

Degree of success with enterprise work.

Skill in detecting pupils' difficulties and in using these as a basis of teaching.

Expression of main learnings or conclusions.

Provision for tests, records and reports.

Attention to pupils' assignments.

Attention to health of pupils.

III. Education Growth of Pupils:

Neatness, posture, order, courtesy, co-operation.

Attentiveness and response of classes, facility and quality of pupils' oral and written expression.

Initiative, self-reliance, confidence.

Attitude of pupils to teacher, class and school; their interest, effort, sense of responsibility.

Pupils' growth in:
- Ability to study.
- Initiative.
- Willingness to accept responsibility.
- Logical and accurate thinking.

Progress in courses.

Attainment of pupils in school subjects and related activities.
GUIDE FOR EVALUATING THE WORK OF THE TEACHER
[used by Alberta High School Inspectors]

I. Personal and Professional Qualities:

Appearance, vigour, voice and enunciation, classroom manner, poise, patience, courtesy.

Strength of personality, leadership, adaptability, tact.

Mental ability: insight, alertness, initiative, resourcefulness.

Scholarship, academic and professional training, mastery of subject-matter and of aims of curriculum.

Efforts to keep abreast of developments in new courses, aims and methods. Professional reading.

Use and command of English.

Sincerity, professional outlook and growth.

Interest in co-curricular activities.

II. The Teaching and Learning Situation, Management, Organization:

Discipline, management and control of classes.

Planning and preparation of work, adherence to program and time-table.

Definiteness of aim; clarity and efficiency of presentation.

Skill in detecting students' difficulties and in using these as a basis for teaching.

Balance between instruction and class activity. Student-participation in classroom procedures.

Use of blackboard, equipment, illustrative materials, bulletin board, study room; neatness and arrangement of supplies; pupils' understanding of purpose and techniques.
Guide for evaluating the work of the teacher (continued)

Acceptance of responsibility for teaching English in all subjects.

Frequency and efficiency of tests; adequacy of reports.

Records, their completeness and use.

Conduct and supervision of study periods.

Guidance of pupils, educational and vocational methods adopted.

III. Educational Growth of Students:

Teacher's progress with courses.

Attainments of students in school subjects and related activities.

Attention and response of classes, facility and correctness of students' oral and written expression.

Attitude of students to teacher, class and school; their interest, effort, sense of responsibility.

Character of attitudes and habits formed in students.

Pupils' growth in:
  Ability to study;
  Initiative;
  Willingness to accept responsibility;
  Desire for further development;
  Accurate thinking.
APPENDIX C
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Doctor's Degree
2 out of 3 took part

Master's Degree
All 19 took part
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23 out of 33 took part

Participants  Non-participants
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[Chart showing the distribution of years as superintendents, with shaded bars indicating the number of superintendents in each category.]
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