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ABSTRACT: In this paper the author argues that teachers have hardly ever liberated from their profession. They have been subjects of supervision by headmasters, officials, and inspectors. The development of in-service education of teachers (INSET) and teacher supervision show that teachers are under controlled by the system and administrators in one way or another; teachers have little chance of participation in school decision-making. However, there have been voices speaking for teachers and asking for a democratic approach to teacher professional development and a collegial culture of school development. The recommendation of an ‘active school’ contained in the James Report (DES, 1972) is a good example. Unfortunately, these voices have not been followed seriously. The idea of controlling and ‘fixing’ teachers come back even stronger. Teachers supervision remains a means to preserve the status quo of unequal distribution of school power between the teacher and the administrator. Indeed, even clinical supervision, which is supposed to rectify the defect associated with the traditional practice of teacher supervision, is not a good answer. More has to be done. Some suggestions for future development are described.
Teacher learning and development are big issues for teacher educators, principals or administrators, and practitioners themselves. Teacher professional development springs up from the understanding that teachers like their students must engage themselves in the learning process throughout their career. There are three major aspects. First, no teachers, trained or untrained, can cope with the rapid changing needs of society during their life-time career without further learning and continuous development of professional knowledge. Second, no teacher training program is complete and effective to prepare practitioners for life without further needs for replenishment. Third, ideally, all people, teachers are no exception, should be life-long learners. Teachers must continue to learn all the time. When teachers engage in further education, they are likely to become better professionals. They are more likely to enhance student learning as far as the school context allows. However, successful school development must depend upon successful teacher development. One single most important prerequisite must be fulfilled: “Teachers cannot be developed (passively). They develop (actively). It is vital, therefore, that they are centrally involved in decisions concerning the direction and processes of their own learning” (Day, 1999:2).

In this paper the author argues that teachers have hardly ever liberated from their profession. They have been subjects of supervision by headmasters, officials, and inspectors. Examples taken from the development of in-service education of teachers (INSET), teacher supervision, and coaching of teachers, show that teachers are under controlled by the system and administrators in one way or another; teachers have little chance of participation in school decision-making. There have been voices speaking for teachers and asking for a democratic approach to teacher professional development and a collegial culture of school development. The recommendation of an ‘active school’ contained in the James Report (DES, 1972) is a good example. Unfortunately, these voices have not been followed seriously. Indeed, the idea of controlling and ‘fixing’ teachers comes back even stronger. Teacher supervision remains a means to preserve the status quo of unequal distribution of school power between the teacher and the administrator. Indeed, even clinical supervision, which is supposed to rectify the defect associated with the traditional practice of teacher supervision, is not a good answer. More has to be done. Some suggestions for future development are described.

**Controlling Teachers as Apprenticeship**

There has been a prominent concern about teachers as life long learners (Bridges and Kerry, 1993; Bell and Day, 1991; 1999). The excellence of professional development depends, to a large extent, upon the quality and forms of continuing education and staff development activities following the initial training. The idea is that professional teachers must develop themselves both as persons and as professionals to cope with the changing needs of society. However, from the very beginning of teacher training, teachers were in chains of inspection, appraisal and supervision. Teachers, in most

---

1 Oxford English Dictionary (2nd edition, 1989) defines the word ‘supervise’ as to look over, inspect, survey and to read. The act of ‘supervision’ include various actions of (a) to command a view of, (b) to read through for correction, and (c) to superintend the execution or performance. The need for control and scrutiny is obvious. Unless otherwise stated, supervision in this paper follows the OED’s explanations.
cases, have been ‘subjects’ to be developed and rarely are they given the autonomy to manage their professional development. Surveillance and hierarchical administrative regulations have been part of mechanism of teacher training and staff development throughout the history of teacher education.

Teachers have been subjects of control and surveillance from the early history of teacher training. The Monitorial System introduced in the eighteenth century in the United Kingdom is regarded as a kind of embryonic form of in-service teacher training. It is a primitive form of apprenticeship. Older students were taught to be ‘teachers’ by a headmaster and these students would then go to the classroom to teach the younger ones (Henderson, 1978:22). These young student teachers had to follow their experienced masters. It is their masters who set the standard and prescribed the teaching performance.

Later, the training system was made more systematic. But it also meant more formal ways of control were exercised by the authority. A more systematic form of apprenticeship was introduced in 1846 by Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth. This was the pupil-teacher system. Pupil teachers joining the system had to get the approval and recommendation by inspectors. They had to pass the benchmark set by authority. These students, as young as thirteen, would then undergo a five-year training programme (Maclure, 1965). During the day, these potential young teachers practised ‘school-keeping.’ After school, they were instructed in the prescribed subjects. Learning to teach is practically a prescription and behavioural training rather than an educative and reflective process.

Tighter Control and Surveillance

Meanwhile, the first training college was opened in 1841 by the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in England. By 1845, twenty colleges were established. There were no shortages of measures to check teachers’ performance (Millman and Darling-Hammond, 1990). Increasing control was imposed by the authority. Financial assistance in terms of grants to school was made available to those schools which could meet the minimum requirements on inspection (Henderson, 1978). The intervention was introduced as ‘payment-by-results’ in 1862. Teachers’ performance and salary were set against examination success of their pupils (Education Commission, 1861). This is one of the earliest signs of official intervention in directing practitioners’ professional development. Although the ‘payment-by-results’ practice was abolished altogether, it reappears in many different forms such as performance appraisal which leads to promotion or renewal of contract in Hong Kong.

To protect against the severe evaluation of inspectors, more and more local teachers’ associations were formed around U.K. to protect their own interest. These associations were particularly effective in offering assistance to isolated teachers in need by offering assistance and practical training. On one hand, the ‘payment-by-results’ has made teachers more aware of the pressure from inspection. On the other hand, the pressure of inspection indirectly shaped the initial pattern of in-service education and training, by offering courses which helped teachers to meet the inspection needs (Edmonds, 1967). As far as subsidy was concerned, school boards
had to run courses to upkeep the quality to ensure their teachers’ performance secured the money needed by the school. The measure and pressure gradually dissolved with the introduction of a national salary in 1925. However, more systematic control and regulations were legitimized in terms of teacher appraisal. Systematic control has become a common feature of staff and professional development programs.

**Whose Agenda?**

From the Monitorial System to the ‘payment-by-results’ practice, teachers were under strict scrutiny by their supervisors and the authority. Inspection of teachers and teacher supervision were often top priorities of the teacher training agenda. Although it can be argued that inspection and evaluation is out of necessity for ‘quality control’ associated with the poor training and in-service teacher education system from the early beginning, these practices had set bad examples. The ‘payment-by-results’ is, to say the least, an indication of a ‘low-trust’ attitude of the management towards the teacher. The agenda has been set that the democratic model (Morgan, 1984) of professional development is not agreeable to administration and management. The administrators favour the monitoring of specific tasks by using objective indicators of effectiveness. They consider accountability is based on financial considerations (Morgan, 1984).

Apparently, practitioners at the time were weak in making their voices heard. It was the official agenda that required a prescriptive approach of teacher training and a performance evaluation by inspectors. Nevertheless, the professionals were asking for other things. The inadequacies of the Monitorial System and the pupil-teacher system are self-evident. The former is unsystematic and haphazard. The latter misses the point of training teachers as an educative process. Teaching is a complex task that no one would expect to master the totality of it even in a lifetime. It is also naïve to parallel teaching with other professional expertise. Professional expertise is an uncertain enterprise that will not yield to technical reasoning (Schon, 1983, 1995; Doyle, 1980).

The ‘payment-by-result’ is even a more severe kind of control and detrimental to the development of professional autonomy. It also put professionals in the defensive. Teachers are found effective against the benchmark prescribed by the school. Administrators are there to rate teachers according to their own scale. There is no collegial consultation. Nor is there any mutual trust among colleagues designated to different duties and positions. Performance measures do not represent a wide range of educational outcomes considered valuable by practitioners (OFSTED, 1996). Accountability is compared with monetary values. Educational injustice and uneven distribution of school power are obvious. Teachers who are found deviated from the ‘official’ agenda are considered incompetent and be eliminated from the school altogether. Teachers are not likely to have opportunities to make up the inadequacies by further learning and collegial assistance.

**An Adjustment**

The poverty of early teacher training is indisputable. The system needs much improvement but not tighter control of teachers’ performance. More in-service training
for practising teachers is needed to make up the inadequacy. The Board of Education of United Kingdom admitted such weaknesses and recommended the offering of supplementary courses for in-service education and training (INSET) in 1925. The Board of Education saw the need of strengthening and extending the provision of the existing short vacation courses:

We look forward to a time when supplementary courses will have been formally adopted as a national policy, and when arrangements for all teachers to attend them at regular intervals of a few years will have become part of the national system of education. (Board of Education, 1925)

The extension of inservice training was well accepted and courses like pedagogy, physical education, art and music, were in great demand (Board of Education, 1944). Apparently, teachers welcome opportunities for continuous learning. No doubt, teachers need regular replenishment and re-education throughout their lifetime career.

Nineteen years later, further recommendations of expanding INSET were made by the Board of Education in 1944 for the same purpose. This time the INSET programme was made to better suit the practitioners’ needs:

Our view is ..... that when circumstances make it practicable, every teacher who makes suitable proposals for the use of the period should be allowed a sabbatical term on full pay after five years’ continuous teaching, and that, where the circumstances and proposals of the teacher warrant, the period should be limited to one term. (Board of Education, 1944).

The rapid expansion of INSET does not mean there are fewer measures to check teachers. Nor are there less structural control from the administration. A review of literature will show myriads of strategies (e.g. Dockrell, et al., 1986; Millman and Darling-Hammond, 1990). While the administrators understand that teacher training programme is one of the common means for professional development, more opportunities of INSET have to be provided for teachers. They hardly realize that professionals cannot be pushed or drawn to work by extrinsic rewards or sanction (Morris, 1990:24). The inadequacy of teacher training programme in some extent strengthens their belief that quality teacher must be prescribed and control in the hand of the supervisors. They believe that there are objective criteria to assess good teaching (Winter, 1989).

School-focussed INSET

There was a time when some good opportunity opened up for teachers to have better share of the school power. Teachers were given a significant role to play in school development. It is the time when INSET shifted to become more school-focussed (Bolam, 1982).

The increasing demand of INSET from the sixties onward has led to a re-think about the purpose and relevance of those programmes. Teachers and principals began to ask questions, for instance, about INSET (Bolam, 1982):
1. How can INSET programmes be more successful to meet the day to day practical needs of the teachers?
2. How can INSET programmes be beneficial to both teachers and the school?
3. What can be done to ensure better skill transfer learned in the INSET programmes?

This was also the time when teachers were demanding greater participation in decision-making about school policy brought about by school-based curriculum development (Skilbeck, 1976). Teachers knew they would have better chances to have their voice heard. School administrators and teachers worked hard to find ways to make INSET more beneficial to the school and professional. The two parties began to question whether courses offered by external agencies (i.e. the employers, teacher education institutions and other bodies) could serve the developing needs of the school and teachers. They asked and sought other alternatives. General programmes which fit all practitioners are now considered not specific enough to meet individual school needs. As a result, the continuation of teacher education has shifted to become school-centered. INSET programmes began to bear the name ‘school-focussed INSET’ (Bolam, 1982). The change of focus has significant implications. The one being obvious is teachers were no longer regarded as mere receivers of INSET programmes but also active initiators (DES, 1978) for school building and professional development. The idea of mutual support from a community of professionals, experts and administrators are apparent.

**Insights of James Report**

The shift of focus put the school at the center for teacher learning and the teacher a share of freedom to make professional decisions in school. A shift that could make school more democratic and less bureaucratic; and a shift that reflects a very basic idea of a school-based management (Gamage, 1996). This core concept is well elaborated in the James Report in support of a school-focussed INSET:

> Inservice training should begin in the school. It is here that learning and teaching take place, curricula and techniques are developed and needs and deficiencies revealed. Every school should regard the continued training of its teachers as an essential part of its task, for which all members of staff share responsibility. An active school is constantly reviewing and reassessing its effectiveness, and is ready to consider new methods, new forms of organization and new ways of dealing with the problems that arise. It will get aside time to explore these questions, as far as it can within its own resources, by arranging for discussion, study, seminars with visiting tutors and visits to other institutions.” (DES, 1972: 2.21)

Accordingly, an active school is a ‘problem-solving school’ and the center of inquiry of educational matters, in which all members of the staff share responsibility. Collaborative learning and collegial support is essential. Outside assistance is needed based on collegial decisions and is welcomed on an equal basis. To achieve these ends, every school should regard regular training of its teachers a necessary and major target for school development. The message is clear. Good schools are dependent of professional staff—both teachers and administrators. It is by cooperation and collaboration of all staff that the school advances and succeeds.
Resource and assistance from outside are welcome whenever needed. The key words are collegiality, collaboration and egalitarian.

The idea suggested in the James Report is insightful in recognizing that school is a community of professionals. Efforts must be put both in empowering them to become better staff working for the school as well as collaborative learners in the school community. Thus, school-focussed INSET must deal with two major aspects of professional development: the collaborative development among fellow colleagues and further professional education of individual practitioners (Taylor, 1975). The former tends to be more oriented to the needs of a school as a community, and, hence, the developing school. The latter is related more to the needs of individual teachers. Professional development for individual teachers and developing the school community are the two sides of the same coin. The individual teachers and fellow colleagues work both independently and inter-dependently for school building.

In this regard, it is important to note the James Report has already directed our attention to the key concepts of future teacher development and developing better schools in the early seventies:

- that Practitioners working inside the school are the major sources for school building (Holly and Southworth, 1989); and
- effective schools depend on good staff working both individually and collaboratively with least organization barriers and administrative pressures.

Two Diverging Roads

It is unfortunate to see that the idea generated in the James Report has hardly fully realized for some obvious reasons. First, there has always been some ungrounded conflicts between the needs of teachers as professional practitioners and the needs of particular administrators. Quite often these problems reflect the conflicts between accountability and professional responsibility (e.g. see Hoyle and John, 1995: 108-113). Second, the expenditure and financial implications on in-service training must be very substantial and demands for control and evaluation have never been less (Hartley, 1992). The latter issue is even more acute as schooling becomes more marketized and teachers are seen as ‘producers’ in the process of human capital (Smyth and Shacklock, 1998: 20). With the rise of ‘production ideology’ (House, 1974), teachers’ performance and effectiveness are measured by their ‘output’ (students’ achievements). Teaching is seen merely as “a technical act focusing exclusively on what individual teachers do” (Smyth, 1991: xi). The ideal, suggested by the James Report, of treating individual school as center of inquiry, with specific culture and needs has become trivial.

Instead, the ‘two sides of the coin’ remains two separate ways. One road develops into creating excellence schools by means of reforms around the concept of management, if not tighter control of teachers (e.g. see Beare, Caldwell and Millikan, 1989; Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). Concepts like leadership, effective organization, school culture, managing change, teacher accountability, and so on are common terminologies. The other road focussed on strengthening the concept of
professionalism and extended professionality (Hoyle, 1974). The two roads remain separate: one is the technocratic view of education while the other is the democratic view of education (Morgan, 1984). One feature remains unchanged, schools are still administrative-led. Professional teachers do not get the respect they should have.

**Two Separate Assumptions**

A brief discussion of Morgan’s (1984) idea on these two separate views is helpful here. The technocratic view assumes the world represented by teaching is rational and standardized. It is predictable and capable to be manipulated. Hence, clear teaching tasks can be set and quantifiable for efficiency check. What a teacher can do or cannot do becomes important. Teacher’s ability is set against the standards of competence achieved. Good administration is systematic organization of all school tasks (target-setting). These tasks (e.g. the allocation of duties, the well-defined channels of communication) are said to be essential to good school management. This is, indeed, bureaucratic management: a well defined hierarchy of authority, a division of labour based on functional specialization, a set of organizational rules, selection and promotion based on technical competence and an impersonal approach to decision making (Hall, 1963:33).

On the contrary, the democratic view emphasizes participation and collegial decision making. It assumes teaching is practical, uncertain, subjective and contingent (Hoyle and John, 1995). It admits diversity of approaches to achieving educational ends. Performance assessment must reflect the subjective and local understanding of practice. The stress is on professional autonomy and diversity. Professionals’ expertise in identifying problems and finding alternatives are appreciated and respected.

The discussion of these two views does not necessarily mean that they are mutually exclusive. But these two views are always in tension with each other. When a nation’s economy is at risk, education is always to blame for the decline of competitiveness in the market. The danger for the managerial view to take over is overwhelming. Conflicts and contradictions are common in schools: “The DES [Department of Education and Science] contradiction is that they are a bureaucracy presiding over a profession whilst the teachers’ contradiction is that they are professional educators operating within a bureaucracy” (Winter, 1989: 50). Indeed, this is one of the major hindrances to both school and professional development.

**Teacher Supervision as Unproblematic**

I have briefly reviewed the history of how INSET has evolved from enriching professional learning to controlling and measuring teacher performance by means of inspection and evaluation. The ‘payment-by-results’, ‘target-setting’ and ‘competence-based’ (Tuxworth, 1982) standards of evaluation. These are various names used to ensure that the prescribed teaching quality is maintained. The status quo of teacher control is preserved. Another example of control over professional is evident in the practice of teacher supervision. Teacher supervision is a form of control which is made even more direct and organized.
Teacher supervision was first introduced with an emphasis on improving teachers’ classroom performance. A supervisor’s role is to advice, direct or oversee so as to maintain order (Stones, 1984: vii). Under the influence of technocratic view, the act of measuring teaching represented by supervision is to be seen as unproblematic. Teaching is rational and can be reduced to numerical representations. The role of the teacher can be described in terms of specific acts and competencies which are observable. The quality of teaching and assessment of teaching could and should be based on the actual performance in the classroom (Hartley, 1992). These simplistic way of teaching implies the act of supervision unproblematic too. Otherwise teacher supervision and evaluation could never be done in such an objective way on a national basis (Stones, 1984).

Teacher supervision is often done to a teacher who is being assessed of the performance of teaching. It is hierarchical because of the differences of the status of the two parties involved. Namely, one is the supervisor and the other is the subordinate. The supervisor, often claimed to be more experienced, brings along with him or her a set of performance indicators to judge the inexperienced. The indicators of performance are said to be objective describing discrete acts of competencies such as, clarity of objectives, concrete presentation of questioning procedures. The observation is done by a superior who is said to be more experienced but dispassionate of the daily routine of teachers. The supervision tasks are common and are predetermined well in advance. The task is to check teachers’ incompetencies against an objective set of performance indicators.

**Improving Teacher Supervision**

It is not surprising for teachers to find the traditional practice of supervision ineffective and unpleasant. (e.g. Reavis, 1978; Whithall and Wood, 1979). The technocratic view in which the teacher supervision model based is flawed. It is over-simplified and adopts a reductionist view (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). From a more interpretive view, researchers and teacher educators would argue that teaching is an intuitive, creative, practical, political and personal act (McNarama and Desforges, 1978; Brown and McIntyre, 1992; Elbaz, 1983; Connelly and Clandinin, 1988; Tom, 1984; Beyer and Apple, 1988). Teacher is hardly predictable, uncertain, and often tacit in practice (Schon, 1983, 1987; Polanyi, 1962). In addition, since teaching is context-specific, it is often difficult to define teacher’s knowledge. As a result, a more rewarding and productive approach of teacher appraisal that benefits both the practitioner and school is called for.

Clinical supervision was proposed to cope with the problems found in traditional supervision (Wilhems, 1973). The approach, distinguished by its systematic and analytical examination of teaching, takes the view human behaviour has a structure and can be controlled. What is new is that the “teacher-supervisor relationship is seen as one of mutuality within a framework of respect for individual autonomy and self-regulated enquiry, analysis, examination and evaluation” (Stones, 1984:33-34). Collegial support and follow-up action are stressed. Clinical supervision is in sharp
contrast with the traditional expert-led approach as being summative, infrequent and the lack of follow-up action. In this way, clinical supervision is meant to address the needs of classroom teachers and individual teacher is regarded as a full and equal partner in the whole process of supervision (Smyth, 1984).

It is said clinical supervision constitutes a new understanding of professional learning (Cogan, 1973). The conceptualization has, in many ways, improved and amended the inadequacies of the previous ineffective practice. It is based on new assumptions and principles:

- That traditional supervision is unpleasant and ineffective because of the fear usually associated with evaluation. The emphasis of collegial partnership is a way of dissolving the suspicious and antagonistic attitude towards superior teaches and evaluates the subordinate teacher (Cogan, 1973:xi)
- That learning to teach is not easy and no one ever masters the totality of the craft. Practitioners are continuously engaged in improving his practice. Thus, clinical supervision adopts a continuous cyclical model (Cogan, 1973:21)
- That one of our greatest enemies in school is the lack of human company in exploring the craft of teaching. There are things teachers have to do together in order to do it well. Teachers benefit from small and large group activities (Cogan, 1973: 22-23). Collaboration and team work are required for professional development.
- “That self-development is more likely to flourish within the mutual support of a partnership or small action team with work scheduled throughout the year on a regular basis” (Flanders, 1970:10; cited in Cogan, 1973).
- That a large part of the teacher’s repertoire is learned on the job. Teacher supervision is best to operate right in the spot (hence ‘clinical’) and depends on direct observation (Wilhelms, 1973:ix). Hence, clinical supervision is a job-embedded and experiential activity.
- That teacher learning is not a unilateral action taken by the administrator and imposed upon the practitioner. Rather it is interactive, democratic and teacher-centered (Cogan, 1973:xi; Acheson and Gall, 1992:9). Teacher supervision works best if it is democratic and reciprocity.
- That practitioners are benefited to receive assistance from supervisory-colleagues who are specially trained for in-class supervision (Cogan, 1973:4).

The Need for Better Model

Clinical supervision is found to be effective in general (Glickman and Bey, 1990:555-557). Good results are found in changing teachers’ attitudes, behaviour and promoting better working relationships between teachers and supervisors (Adams and Glickman, 1984). It is welcomed by practitioners as it is collaborative and non-directive (Humphrey, 1983; Rossicone, 1985; Ngugi, 1984). It optimizes adult learning and promotes supportive and guided reflection based on lived experiences (Knowles, 1978; Sprinthall and Sprinthall, 1980; Bents and Howey, 1978).

However, the inadequacies of clinical supervision gradually emerge. This includes:
1. The partnership is not truly equal. It is a relationship between the trained and the inexperienced. It discourages reciprocity of mutual assistance or learning. Indeed, the unequal status “drastically inhibits the development of collegial dialogue” the model wants to develop (Goldsberry, 1980:12).

2. It is a low trust model in which the less experienced is being treated principally as a learner who has little to contribute to the experienced in the process. It is just a delivery of service to those who need (Smyth, 1986).

3. The word ‘clinical’ projects deficient images on the learner who participates in the supervision.

4. Bureaucratic organizational barriers in schools could impede the development of peer consultation or collegial dialogue. Democratization of the supervisory process in school is not a simple matter (Robinson, 1984:2) and new restructuring of the organization and alterations of working culture to match the new practice are needed (Alfonso and Goldsberry, 1982:103).

5. It is still largely to do with the learning of practical skills, reflecting a limited version of teacher development.

Towards a New Concept of Professionalism

In addition to these inadequacies, the clinical approach works against the democratic assumptions to education: teaching and learning cannot be pre-packaged in a standardized manner and education is political. Further still, clinical supervision is still far from the concept of critical characteristics espoused by Stenhouse: “[T]he capacity for autonomous professional self-development through systematic self-study, through the study of the work of other teachers and through the testing of ideas by classroom research procedures’ (Stenhouse, 1975:144).

What is more is that school is now widely acknowledged as the center for inquiry following the development of school-focused INSET (e.g. Bolam, 1982), school-based curriculum development (e.g. Skilbeck, 1976), school-based management (e.g. Gamage, 1996) and the ‘learning school’ (e.g. Holly and Southworth, 1989). A new concept of professionalism has already been put forward to synchronize with all these developments (McKernan, 1991: 36-38):

- The school community does not include teachers and pupils alone; it includes parents, research workers, inspectors, etc. The community come together to build a new work ethic and tradition of school-based curriculum making.
- Teachers as major members of the community are competent to find out what they need to know to sort out the particular difficulties in the community; not being told or taught what to do.
- Teachers must learn and be able to ask questions, not just to solve problems.
- Teachers must be well-equipped with the skills for inquiry; involve in knowledge-generating process.
The school as a center for inquiry will not support the present artificial division of labour. Curriculum inquiry should be defined by the practitioners. Practitioners should be able to seek help from others on an equal basis.

Curriculum policy is the business of each school and should be worked out by students, staff, and parents in conjunction with other authorities.

All this points out to the fact that promoting teacher development and learning is a business which the whole community is concerned. Teacher development is part of the development of the school community. A community is kept healthy and prosperous if there is true understanding among the members. True understanding is achieved by

- Unconstrained dialogue among teaching staff and other members of the community;
- Liberation of all those who suffer from oppression and organizational injustice;
- Becoming critical to understanding and interpretation of the personal truth and members' belief and ideas.
- Establishing a genuine community based on collaboration and collegiality. Organizational barriers and injustice must be eliminated.

Framing the Future

The above discussion points to the inadequacy of the efforts to promote professional development. Insights from James Report, for instance, were not fully realized. Instead, administrators' efforts were soon directed to construct programs of increasing scrutiny of teachers' work and challenging professional autonomy by means of pre-specified and standardized learning outcomes. These tools proved to be poor efforts to enhance professional learning and the building of a school community. Most of them became unnecessary supervision practices restricting professional growth and undermining teacher's autonomy. What have been learned from these lessons are that mutual trust, support and assistance are important for better development of the education community. No teachers can be developed passively. If there is a better future for performance evaluation and teacher assessment, supervision and appraisal will take new forms and meanings. It needs to transform itself to suit the evolving needs of the teacher and the school community.

In this regards, Sachs's (1999; quoted in Day, 1999: 13) five core values are useful in framing the future development of professionalism:

1. **Learning** in which teachers are seen to practice learning, individually with their colleagues and students.
2. **Participation** in which teachers see themselves as active agents in their own professional worlds.
3. **Collaboration** in which collegiality is exercised within and between internal and external communities.
4. **Co-operation** through which teachers develop a common language and technology for documenting and discussing practice and the outcomes.
5. *Activism* in which teachers engage publicly with issues that relate directly or indirectly to education and schooling, as part of their moral purposes.

To conclude, quality teaching and teacher development must depend upon the teacher’s willingness and commitment to lifelong learning as a person and a professional. Since teaching is a complex process, requiring teachers to response appropriately to context-specific factors such as students’ ability and school culture, teachers, schools and the community at large must collaborate to enhance teachers professional learning and development and school building. Since there can be no curriculum development without teacher development, the teacher must be the central figure in the decision-making process for developing teachers. And the central question remains: *How to facilitate optimum conditions conducive to professional lifelong learning?*
Bibliography:


