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BEYOND CLINICAL SUPERVISION:
A CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE MODEL

Supervision of instruction may have more potential to improve the effectiveness of schools than any other activity. Yet, very little work time of supervisors and teachers is dedicated to the cooperative study, analysis, and improvement of instruction. Supervisory models and approaches based on one or two classroom observations a year are of little use in the complicated task of instructional improvement. Such minimal approaches do more harm than good because they perpetuate the myth that instructional supervision is a reality in American schools.

The purpose of supervision is to work cooperatively with teachers to improve instruction. The goal of the supervisor is not simply to help teachers solve immediate problems but also to engage with teachers in critical inquiry on teaching and learning. Improvement of instruction is a long-term, continuous, and cooperative process. In the final analysis however, only teachers can improve classroom instruction. Teachers need freedom to develop their own unique teaching styles. But they also need social support as well as professional and intellectual stimulation. Therefore, improvement of instruction is most likely to be accomplished in a nonthreatening atmosphere, by working with colleagues rather than superiors, and by fostering in teachers a sense of inquiry and experimentation.

Although supervision can be broadly conceived as any set of activities designed to improve instruction, it fundamentally is a process that involves a cycle of systematic planning, observation, diagnosis, change, and renewed planning. Clinical supervision is one of the popular contemporary approaches to improving instruction, one that is consistent with many of our assumptions about improving teaching and learning. The purpose of this paper are twofold: first, to analyze critically clinical supervision, and then to propose a classroom performance model that both builds on the strengths of the clinical model and overcomes its major shortcomings.

Clinical Supervision

In education the movement away from the traditional industrial model of supervision that focuses on close control, inspection, and ratings has been dramatic. The strong emphasis on practices designed to improve teachers’ classroom performance has been called the “clinical supervision movement.” The movement had started in the late 1950s with the work of Robert Anderson, Morris Cogan, and Robert Goldhammer as they developed ways of helping their teaching interns at Harvard. The systematic study of classroom behavior in an atmosphere of colleagueship became known as clinical supervision. Clinical cycles consist of a preobservation conference, observation, analysis and strategy, post-observation conference, and postconference analysis. Cogan elaborated that both the preobservation and postobservation phases of clinical approach by identifying eight steps in the process.
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It is difficult to disagree with either the goals or procedures of clinical supervision as outlined by Cogan, Goldhammer, and their colleagues. Sullivan summarizes the hope placed in the approach:

_The significant way in which clinical supervision differs from the previous supervision is in its content. It is historically and substantially unusual because of its emphasis on analysis rather than inspection and its presentation of a model rather than the smorgasbord of lists, charts, tables, and examples which so often occur in supervision literature._

Despite the promise held out nearly 30 years ago by this innovation in supervision, research on supervision of instruction is primitive. In his review of the research, Reavis draws the following conclusions: (1) teachers are distrustful of supervision as typically practiced; (2) teachers prefer clinical supervision over more traditional practices; and (3) the effects of clinical supervision on teacher behavior and pupil performance are not clear. Although teachers tend to prefer clinical supervision, many important questions remain unanswered. Does clinical supervision improve teaching performance? Is student learning affected by the clinical approach? Do teachers have more positive attitudes as a consequence of clinical supervision? Denham laments that given the present state of instructional and research technologies, the lack of data-based answers to such questions is inexcusable. Others echo that complaint. Although clinical supervision remains popular with teachers, there is little evidence about its effectiveness. What are some of the problems with clinical supervision?

The developers of clinical supervision conceived of supervision as separate from administration. Yet, in practice, and as in traditional supervision, the clinical supervisor is typically the principal. The roles of the principal and supervisor however, often conflict. The principal’s primary concern is the well-being of the school as a whole; the supervisor’s major concern is the instructional progress of individual teachers. At any given time the good of the school may not coincide with the developmental needs of an individual teacher. Teachers know this instinctively and consequently are hesitant to expose teaching weaknesses to principals. After all, this same principal may be required to make tenure and merit decisions later. Although clinical supervision was originally intended to remove role conflict by separating the roles of principal and supervisor, in practice this has not occurred and the conflict continues.

Another problem for both clinical and traditional supervision emerges from the conflicting coordinating strategies used in schools. All formal organizations are designed to accomplish goals; hence, there is a need to coordinate activities and resources, including activities of members of the organization. The two most commonly used coordination mechanisms—bureaucracy and professionalism—produce conflict in school. Bureaucratic control over teachers comes down the hierarchical chain of command and is embedded in school policy. It involves formal authority, division of labor, impersonality, specific rules and regulations, and record keeping. There is little doubt that such control is functional for some school activities. For example, attendance and other record keeping functions are accomplished through routine procedures. Professional control, on the other hand, is anchored in the acquired skills, values, and knowledge of professionals. Teacher professionals are expected to have internalized the appropriate responses to classroom problems; that is, they are expected to
base their actions on their specialized knowledge, using discretion in determining the best interests of their students.

What is the dominant coordinating system found in contemporary public schools? The evidence suggests that coordination in schools is more likely to be a function of bureaucratic rather than professional controls.⁹ There has been much speculation as to why this is the case. To a certain extent, public control and pressures for accountability diminish the authority individual teachers have over their own work. Moreover, many teachers do not desire greater decisional participation.¹⁰ Regardless of whether teachers wish to control their own work professionally or to have it controlled bureaucratically, the point is that instruction will not be improved until teachers take personal and professional responsibility for improving it.

Despite the fact that more serious efforts to implement clinical supervision are characterized by less authoritarian relationships, the approach remains a relationship rooted in the formal authority structure of the school. Responsibility and initiative for instructional improvement are understood by both teacher and supervisor to reside with the supervisor. The bureaucratic norms require that the supervisor initiate and the teacher respond. Similarly, as practiced, clinical supervision does little to encourage a strong professional orientation among teachers. It clearly places the responsibility for instructional improvement with the officers of the school, creating no need for teachers to develop norms of professional responsibility. In fact, like traditional models of supervision, clinical supervision too often encourages teachers to exhibit dependence and seek approval.

Still another problem shared by traditional and clinical supervision, to the detriment of both, is the emphasis of external rewards for teachers. Hills has noted that accountability efforts stressing external control and close supervision undermine teacher professionalism and promote a trade-union mentality bereft of commitment and service motivation.¹¹ For several decades there has been a trend toward teacher unionization. Unions exist to advance what motivational theorists call external rewards. External rewards are peripheral to the job of teaching; they include such things as salary, security, status, and working conditions. There is evidence that extrinsic rewards subvert the individual's sense of self-determination and make behavior dependent on external causes; the external rewards themselves become the basic reasons for behavior.¹² Interestingly, when unions emphasize external rewards, schools typically counter with demands for accountability. Thus, the by-products of unionization and its organizational counterpart, accountability, are antithetical to the purposes of supervision. The continuing battle of teachers and boards over external rewards is not conducive to the improvement of instruction. Although clinical supervision is a major advance in supervisory philosophy, problems related to teacher motivation remain. By focusing extensively on the classroom behavior, clinical supervision ignores the influence of the school organization itself and the relationship between the organization and the individual.

Finally, although the purpose of supervision is instructional improvement, the clinical model is also flawed by the lack of a specific definition of improvement of instruction. Teachers and supervisors typically supply such definitions without benefit of conceptual guidance. Teacher behaviors that are appropriate in one setting may not be desirable in another. In contrast to the specificity of the other
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aspects of the clinical model, the expected outcomes of the clinical approach are ambiguous. 13

In brief, clinical supervision is a plan for improving instruction that is attractive to scholars and practitioners alike. The research shows that teachers and administrators prefer clinical supervision over the traditional approach; however, there is little hard evidence regarding the effectiveness of the clinical model.

The Classroom Performance Model

If supervision of instruction is to become effective, then a model needs to be developed that will (1) foster supervisor-principal cooperation, (2) encourage teacher professionalism by reinforcing norms of autonomy and self-direction, (3) concentrate on the intrinsic motivation of teachers through teaching itself, (4) define clearly the outcomes of instructional improvement and guide action toward that end, and (5) confront organizational constraints and opportunities in each school. The clinical model is a step in the right direction, but the process needs a stronger theoretical focus.

A Congruence Perspective

The basic elements of a system can fit together well and function effectively, or they can conflict producing problems and ineffective performance. The notion of system congruence as a predictor of effectiveness is not new. For example, Homans' classic analysis of the nature of human groups stresses mutual interaction, consistency, and balance of key elements in a social system, and Gutezel and Guba postulate that congruence among system elements promotes effectiveness and efficiency. 14 Likewise, a basic assumption of the classroom performance model is that effectiveness is a function of the congruence among key elements of the system.

The classroom performance model builds upon the work of Leavitt 15 and especially the congruence model for analyzing organizational behavior developed by Nadler and Tushman. 16 The proposed model has three sets of components, which are concerned with the fundamental elements that affect teacher and student performance in the classroom. In simple terms, What are the basic organizational constraints (inputs) that affect classroom activities? What is the nature of their interactions (transformation processes)? What is the quality of the classroom performance (outputs)?

The classroom performance model is based upon the open-systems and congruence assumptions. The inputs to the classroom system are those school constraints that are relatively stable. In particular, five sets of organizational constraints are specified: (1) formal organization (2) informal organization, (3) leadership style of the principal, (4) school climate, and (5) resources. Five critical elements in the classroom social system interact to produce the transformational processes: (1) teaching task, (2) teacher, (3) student, (4) classroom climate, and (5) formal classroom structure. Finally, three sets of outputs serve as the bases for evaluating classroom performance: teacher, class, and individual student performance. The basic performance question is—to what extent is actual performance consistent with expected performance. Performance information is transmitted back to the classroom and organization, and the classroom performance model can then be used to make modifications in the classroom system or in the school constraints.
School Constraints (Inputs)

The classroom social system is embedded in the larger social system of the school; hence, the major internal elements of the school are important organizational inputs for the classroom system. These elements are school properties that regulate, set limits, and provide opportunities for the kind of behaviors that occur in the classroom.

The formal organization of the school furnishes important inputs for the classroom system. It presents opportunities as well as constraints for improving the teaching-learning process. Schools vary in the type and degree of bureaucratization; some are authoritarian structures; some are professional bureaucracies; others are more aptly termed organic, integrated, or mechanistic structures; and still others are best described as loosely coupled systems or organized anarchies. The point is that boredom, rigidity, goal displacement, conflict, communication distortion, apathy, excessive formalism, indulgence, tension, and chaos—as well as esprit, incentive, expertise, flexibility, efficiency, and effectiveness—all have their roots in the formal structure. Without knowledge of the impact of bureaucratic structure, the successful diagnosis of the underlying causes of teaching-learning problems in the classroom will be hampered.

The informal organization provides another important set of constraints for life in schools. Supervisory and teacher behaviors are affected by the informal organization; informal norms, values, cliques, and leaders are significant inputs into the classroom social system. Supervisors must understand the networks of informal relations and unofficial norms that exist within a school if they are successfully to develop strategies to help teachers improve instruction. In fact, without the support of the informal organization effective supervision is probably not possible.

Leadership is still another key input into the classroom social system. The principal’s and supervisor’s leadership styles provide important constraints for what goes on in the classroom. Although the literature suggests that the principal’s leadership is crucial in the development of effective schools, no one style is appropriate for all schools. Effective leadership is contingent upon many factors and a variety of models provide useful tools for improving effectiveness. Moreover, leadership is an expression of culture. Leaders have purpose, beliefs, and commitments, and the situations in which they perform are imbued with ideals, rituals, and traditions. The leadership patterns of principals, supervisors, and teachers are critical in developing an atmosphere conducive to critical inquiry and the improvement of instruction.

The classroom performance of teachers is also determined in part by the organizational climate of the school. Climate is a general concept that refers to teacher perceptions of the school’s work environment. It is affected by the formal organization, informal organization, and the leadership practices of the principal, and it in turn influences the behavior of its members. Climate can be conceived in a variety of ways. The climate of interactions among teachers and principals can be described in terms of the degree of openness; organizational dynamics can be viewed along a healthy-unhealthy continuum; the pupil-control orientation of the school can be mapped in terms of custodialism and humanism; and the managerial system of a school can be portrayed as lying along a continuum of participative to exploitive. Each of these perspectives provides valuable information for the supervisor and principal as they work to improve instruction.
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Resources are the final organizational input to be considered. Three major kinds of resources are available to teachers in varying degrees. First, material resources are the physical facilities and materials used in teaching, such as classroom furniture, curriculum materials, supplies, and computers. Second, people resources are the individuals who comprise the support system for teaching. They include secretaries, teacher aides, and guidance personnel. Finally, in-service resources are teachers' opportunities to grow professionally through planned developmental activities. Programs or workshops on the gifted, on developing writing or reading skills, or on questioning strategies are examples of in-service opportunities.

In brief, the formal organization, informal organization, and individual leadership in the school produce an organizational climate that—along with the available resources—provides the environment for supervision. The primary task of the supervisor is to take these organizational forces, and together with the teacher, plan and develop an instructional program that leads to the accomplishment of a set of performance levels.

Classroom System

The classroom is where most teaching and learning occurs; it is here that students are transformed into educated individuals. What are the key components of the classroom and what is the character of their interactions? Five key elements of the classroom system have been identified.

The teaching task is the basic job performed in the classroom. Teaching has been defined in a variety of ways, but for our purposes it is a system of intentional actions aimed at inducing the learning of skills, knowledge, and values. Teaching and learning are inextricably linked; the purpose of classroom teaching is student learning. Skills refer to learning how to do things (e.g. typing and reading); knowledge is learning to know something (e.g. facts and logic systems); and values involve learning to make normative judgments (e.g. decisions regarding right or wrong, or good or bad).

Teaching implies strategy. Teachers are trying to motivate students to learn. What learnings? Is the task clear? Does the task require joint problem solving? What are the basic goals and objectives of the teaching task? What are the plans to achieve the ends? The strategy depends upon the learning task; the teacher's skills, knowledge, and values; and the students' abilities and interests. Regardless of the method used the teaching task has a number of phases—preparing, presenting, analyzing, reinforcing or correcting, and evaluating.

The teacher is the second key component in the classroom system. Here the emphasis is on the teachers' personal characteristics. Critical aspects of the teacher are his or her knowledge, values, and skills. Other important personal attributes of teachers are their perceptions and expectations for students and their motivational needs. The expectation that students can achieve often has positive consequences. Likewise, strong needs for security, dominance, and ascendency have predictable consequences. Although the motivational forces of teacher and student behavior are complex, there are a number of useful models.

The third element of the classroom system is the student. The personal characteristics of students are also central to the teaching-learning process. The skills, knowledge, values, and abilities that students bring to the classroom are fundamental factors related to teaching and learning. Similarly, the expectations and
perceptions that students have of school, teachers, peers, and themselves influence their school performance. Moreover, the interests, motivations, and perseverance of students are crucial in mediating classroom activities.

A fourth component of the classroom system is its formal organization—arrangements that have been explicitly created to facilitate the teaching-learning process. Four categories of formal classroom arrangements seem especially important: 1) learning process arrangements—the teacher-directed structuring of learning activity; 2) physical arrangements—the entire physical learning environment (particularly seating arrangements); 3) behavior arrangements—the rules and routines that govern the behavior of teachers and learners; and 4) learning materials arrangements—materials, especially text and workbooks, used to communicate the content of the class. Each of the four types of arrangements can be used to structure the learning situation, and each may affect the effectiveness of the learning environment.

The classroom climate is the final element in the classroom system. The informal social organization of student life in the classroom—including student norms, values, attitudes, interactions, and leadership—defines the classroom climate. Student leaders sometimes exert as much leadership in the classroom as teachers. Similarly, although teachers set the formal expectations for the class, which are supported by official practices and procedures, students often set and enforce their own informal expectations. Students are at times as important as teachers in motivating student behavior. Likewise, student rules are often as influential as those of teachers. Teachers however, do control students, and the way they do it has a lot to do with the quality of teacher-student interaction.

In sum, the classroom has been conceived as a system of five basic components including the teaching task, teacher, student, formal classroom organization, and classroom climate. In any social system however, the vital issue is not merely the components of the system but how they interact. What is the dynamic interaction among the classroom system components? To explore this question, we return to the concept of congruence.

Congruence

Congruence is the fit or match between any pair of components in the classroom system. The model postulates that effectiveness of performance is a function of congruence among key components; the better the fit between pairs of components, the more effective the performance. Effectiveness is the degree to which actual performance is consistent with expected performance. The principle of congruence suggests that classroom performance is most effective when all the component pieces fit together. In addition, effectiveness is enhanced when the fit between the broader set of school constraints and classroom components is consistent.

The five components of the classroom system produce ten possible pairs of congruence relationships. For example, to what extent is the formal classroom structure consistent with the informal classroom climate? To what extent are teacher and student needs consistent? Figure 1 delineates examples of crucial issues for all ten of the pairs of components. Moreover, an eleventh congruence relationship—between the set of classroom components and the set of organizational inputs—is described.
### Figure 1
Definitions of Match Between System Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Crucial Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher ↔ Climate</td>
<td>To what extent are teacher needs supported by the classroom climate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ↔ Climate</td>
<td>To what extent are student needs met by the classroom climate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher ↔ Task</td>
<td>To what extent are teacher needs met by the teaching task? Does the teacher have the skills and abilities to achieve the task?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ↔ Task</td>
<td>To what extent are student needs met by what is taught? Do the students have the abilities and interests to accomplish the task?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ↔ Teacher</td>
<td>To what extent are student and teacher needs consistent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task ↔ Climate</td>
<td>Does the classroom climate facilitate the teaching task? Does the classroom climate hinder or promote the demands of learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task ↔ Formal Structure</td>
<td>Do the formal classroom arrangements facilitate the teaching-learning process? Do the formal classroom arrangements motivate behavior consistent with the task demands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher ↔ Formal Structure</td>
<td>To what extent are teacher needs met by the formal classroom arrangements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ↔ Formal Structure</td>
<td>To what extent are student needs met by the formal classroom arrangements? To what extent do students have a clear perception of classroom expectations, the convergence of student and teacher goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Structure ↔ Climate</td>
<td>To what extent are the goals, rewards, and norms of the informal classroom organization consistent with those of the formal organization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom ↔ School</td>
<td>To what extent is the internal structure of the classroom components consistent with the broader school constraints?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers and supervisors need to diagnose problems in the classroom by determining the nature and location of incongruent relationships and then planning action to improve them without jeopardizing other relationships. A variety of configurations of key elements can lead to effective behavior. The key to effective supervision is to help teachers identify and overcome incongruent fits. This process of diagnosing and developing congruent system relationships is not simply an intuitive process, but rather the goodness of fit is based on theory and research. Any supervisor who attempts to use this congruence model for analysis of classroom behavior needs to know the relevant body of theoretical and empirical knowledge.  

**Output: Effectiveness of Performance**

The output of the classroom is performance on three levels: teacher performance, individual student performance, and class performance. There is no single criterion of effectiveness; rather, at each level multiple criteria of effectiveness are employed, and performance is evaluated by comparing the expected with actual outcomes on each level.  

Teacher performance is assessed by determining the extent which the teacher is actually behaving as he or she desires. Such behaviors as flexibility, academic emphasis, organization, enthusiasm, warmth, openness, and clarity, which are often related to successful teaching, are likely candidates for evaluation. Individual student performance is another important dimension of classroom effectiveness. Are teacher expectations for individual students being met? The cognitive growth of each student as well as the socioemotional development of each student should be carefully monitored throughout the year. Finally, since the classroom is a system, a basic concern is the question of class performance, or how well the system as a whole is functioning.  

Four imperative functions of all social systems are goal achievement, adaptation, integration, and latent pattern maintenance. These functions are key criteria for evaluating the operating effectiveness of the system. In the model, goal achievement is the class accomplishment of academic and social performance goals that have been set by the school and teacher. Adaptation is the extent to which the class has accommodated to the demands of the school environment. Integration is the social solidarity of the class. To what extent has the class become unified as a group? Finally, latency is the maintenance of the integrity of the class value system. Effective systems typically require a high commitment to the group and its norms and values. The commitments of students to their class, teacher, and school are indicators of how well the class is functioning.  

The classroom performance model is pictorially summarized in Figure 2. Formal organization, informal organization, leadership, organization climate, and resources are the five major forces that provide the primary supervisory opportunities and constraints to influence class performance. These inputs are critical ingredients for transforming the classroom into an effective teaching-learning system. The teacher, the student, the teaching task, the formal classroom arrangement, and the informal classroom climate are the five basic components that interact to define the system. The model postulates that effective classroom performance is a function of the congruence among these key elements; the better the fit between pairs of components, the more effective the
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system. The output of the system is performance at three levels; therefore, effectiveness is a function of the degree to which expected performance is congruent with actual performance at the teacher, student, and class levels. Effectiveness is enhanced further when the fit between the broader set of school constraints and the classroom components is consistent. Feedback loops communicate effectiveness problems when expected behavior and actual outcomes are not the same.

The Diagnostic Cycle

What is needed is a mechanism for linking the classroom performance model with clinical supervision. The diagnostic cycle is a problem-solving process that provides such a vehicle. It is a general systematic approach to problem-solving. Supervisors and teachers need to be involved in collecting data on teaching performance, comparing these data to expected performance levels, identifying the causes of the problems, developing and selecting a course of improvement, implementing a plan of action, and evaluating the plan. The diagnostic cycle incorporates these activities into a series of steps and at the same time is guided by the classroom performance model. Specifically, the cycle is organized into five related steps: (1) problem identification, (2) diagnosis, (3) planning, (4) implementation, and (5) evaluation. Each of these steps will be described briefly in relation to the model:

1. **Identify problems.** Problems are often suggested by symptoms that things are not working well. Poor discipline, high rates of absenteeism, low teacher morale, and parental complaints are symptoms of problems. Although symptoms are important guides in problem identification, if one is not guided by the classroom performance model, it is easy to confuse symptoms with both problems and causes of problems. The model defines a *problem* as a discrepancy between expected and actual performance. Three sets of classroom outputs have been defined—teacher performance, student performance, and class performance. When actual behavior in any of these areas is not consistent with expected performance, a classroom problem exists. Problem specification is a matter of performance outcomes—not inputs or interactions within the system. In practice, the problems are identified by a teacher-supervisor team, which meets and makes its performance expectations explicit. Then, unless performance data are available, the team decides on the means to collect data to verify the problem.

2. **Diagnose causes.** After the problem has been identified, the search for causes begins, and again is guided by the model. The key constraints and opportunities of the formal organization, informal organization, leadership, climate, and resources need to be analyzed. Moreover, data about the students, teachers, teaching task, formal classroom arrangements, and classroom climate are collected. The critical step in diagnosing causes is the assessment of the matches between each pair of components. The eleven matches defined by the model (see Figures 1 & 2), including the extent to which the internal structure of the classroom is consistent with the school environment, must be analyzed. A lack of fit (mismatch) between the components is the root of negative consequences for performance outcomes. The diagnosis of these mismatches in the system must be linked
to the problem. Which mismatches account for the performance problems? Here the supervisor and teacher generate hypotheses about problem causes. This phase forces the supervisory team to make hard decisions. It must decide on the most crucial aspects of each component; it must determine the mismatches; it must link the mismatches to behavioral consequences related to the problem; and it must decide which problem to attack first. None of these decisions is either obvious or simple. These are decisions that require reflective and informed professional action.

3. **Develop action plans.** After identifying the problems and the relationships between system mismatches and classroom performance, the next phase of the cycle is to develop a strategy for action. The mismatches in the system must be addressed. In developing a plan, the alternatives are carefully explored, the consequences of each alternative are considered, and a realistic course of action must be determined. The selection of a plan of action in no way implies an ultimate solution; on the contrary, the choice is a first approximation that will probably be changed and refined as progress toward the solution is monitored.

4. **Implement action plan.** Once a plan of action has been formulated, the decision needs to be implemented. Clearly, the teacher is the key actor in this phase. It must be the teacher's plan, one to which the teacher is committed. Ultimately, the teacher translates the plan into specific procedures.

5. **Evaluate action plan.** Once implemented, the plan needs to be monitored and evaluated. Data needs to be collected to determine if the plan is having its intended consequences. Are there dysfunctional consequences? The evaluation phase of the cycle is critical in providing information both for assessing past practices and guiding renewed effort. Thus, evaluation is both an end and a beginning.

Thus, the diagnostic cycle is used as a repeated process to examine and improve the classroom environment. Improvement is defined concretely in terms of effectiveness, and effectiveness is said to be the product of a system of congruent components. The teacher and supervisor keep returning to their analysis of the learning environment as a system, looking for mismatches among the system components and hypothesizing which account for unexpected and negative levels of performance. Focus on system mismatches legitimately makes performance the complex product of a number of organizational and individual factors. The model directs the attention of supervisor and teacher toward building a strong learning environment, not just examining the teacher's role and style of teaching.

**Conclusion**

The public is demanding that schools and teachers become more effective. There are cries for a longer school year, more homework, orderly classrooms, and structured learning activities. The list of effective teaching practices grows. We join the ranks advocating strong leadership, high expectations for students, high academic standards, curriculum-based achievement, and the mastery of basic academic skills. We also believe with many others, that critical thinking, self-discipline, responsibility, good citizenship, a positive self image, and so on
are worthy aspirations for the school. But improving schools and teaching are complex processes. There are no quick fixes.

Only when teachers are treated as professionals and provided genuine opportunities for critical reflection will we be in a good position to improve teaching. The formulation proposed in this article is a practical vehicle to accomplish that end. It is a useful framework for synthesizing and then using the contemporary theory and research on classroom management, effective instruction, teacher and student motivation, the teaching task, and the ecology of the classroom. It encourages improvement of instruction through professional self-study and change.

Notes
1. This paper draws heavily from Wayne K. Hoy and Patrick B. Forsyth. Effective Supervision: Theory into Practice (New York: Random House, 1986), especially chapters 1,2,3.
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