

## Instructional Supervision Procedures: Frequency of Use by Educational Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in Kenya

Tom Moku Kabage<sup>1</sup>, Michael Okwara<sup>2</sup>, Jack Ajowi<sup>3</sup>

Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology,  
KENYA.

<sup>1</sup> [kabageto@gmail.com](mailto:kabageto@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

*The procedures used in carrying out instructional supervision in Kenya are comprehensive and elaborate as given out by the ministry of education. But sometimes the Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) don't follow the procedures when they are doing instructional supervision in schools. This has compromised the quality of the supervision these officers offer. This study therefore tried to find out the frequency of use of these procedures by the QASOs when doing instructional supervision in schools. The study was carried out in Kisii County, Kenya using descriptive survey research design. Stratified, saturated and random sampling techniques were used to sample 113 respondents (7 Sub County Education Officers (SCEOs), 7 Sub county QASOs and 99 principals) out of a study population of 7 SCEOs, 7 SCQASOs & 330 Principals. Questionnaires and interview schedules were the main instruments for data collection. Quantitative data was analysed quantitatively and presented in a table where frequency counts, means and ranks were used in the analysis. Qualitative data was analysed quantitatively and reported verbatim. The following findings emerged from the study: Frequency of use of the procedure was below average, they were not ready to follow the procedures and there were no follow up visits made to find out whether the teachers implemented the advice they were given. The study concludes that QASOs were not interested in the procedures and heavily relied on using the old methods of instructional supervision. The study therefore recommends that: The Ministry of Education Science and Technology to organize an in-service training programme to train the current educational QASOs on the procedures used in instructional supervision. QASOs to be encouraged and enabled to make follow-up visits to find out if the teachers have improved on their performance following the advice given during early visits. Guidance and counselling sessions to be offered to QASOs to change their negative attitudes towards instructional supervision.*

**Keywords:** Instructional supervision, Quality Assurance, Procedures and QASOs

### INTRODUCTION

In the past school inspectors were seen as fault finders, police officers, poor listeners etc. (MoEST, 2006). Wanjohi (2005) observed that most inspectors were accused of being autocratic and authoritarian who always insisted on maintenance and observance of the rules as they were whenever they visited schools. They focused on fault finding instead of advising and encouraging teachers. They caused terror as they looked for teachers' mistakes. They stormed schools to harass and victimize teachers. They could abuse and slap teachers as pupils watched. These serious concerns led to the publication of a Handbook for Inspection of Educational Institutions (Marwanga, 2004), the handbook spelled out uniform approach to inspection of schools, clearly indicating the role of the supervisors, the supervisory procedures, purpose of supervision and the code of conduct for inspectors. These measures

however have not improved much the quality of supervision especially instructional supervisory procedures.

According to Olembo (2008) instructional supervision is a cycle of events going through a number of phases. The success of the exercise majorly depends on the supervisor's skills and attitudes. He identified the following important phases in the supervision exercise: I) Plan with the teacher the date, subject and class of the impending supervision. This helps the teacher to prepare and avail himself for supervision, II) Pre-observation conference. The supervisor should defuse any tension in the teacher by creating good rapport with the teacher, III) Actual observation in class. Analysis of the teaching and learning process, IV) Post – observation conference. Discussion of what took place during observation and the way forward, IV) Report writing. The supervisor should discuss and agree with the teacher on the contents of the supervision report before writing the final report, V) Leave a copy of the supervisory report with the school before leaving.

This cycle of supervision is elaborate and requires well trained supervisors to make the exercise beneficial to the teacher, the learner and other stakeholders. Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (QASOs) therefore need good knowledge, skills and correct attitudes about the process of instructional supervision. They need patience, superior observation skills, interpersonal skills, planning and report writing skills in order to make the exercise meaningful and helpful. Ajuoga et al (2010) found out that QASOs were not following the guideline given on how to do instructional supervision. The study advocated for training of these officers so as to change this scenario and make the instructional supervision beneficial to the teachers, learners and the schools in general. This study therefore tried to find out how frequent QASOs use these aspects in the instructional supervisory procedure and what needs to be done to improve it. This study therefore sought to find out how frequent the QASOs followed the following elements in the supervisory procedure: Planning with the teacher, pre-observation conference, enquiring about the characteristics of the learners before observation, considering the views of the teacher in post observation conference, giving a copy of the supervisory report to the teacher and the school and making up follow up supervision to find out the progress made.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study used descriptive survey research design to document the frequency of use of the supervisory procedures. According to Orodho (2005), descriptive survey is a research design which involves collecting information by way of interviewing and administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. The study was carried out in Kisii County. The county is divided into 9 Sub county administrative units; which made it ideal for the generation of adequate sample which yielded reasonable data for analysis. This study targeted all the 9 SCEO, 9 SCQASOs in charge of secondary schools in the county and 330 principals in 330 secondary schools in the county.

Stratified, saturated and random sampling was used to sample the respondents yielding a study sample of 7 Sub County Education Officers (SCEOs), 7 Sub County Quality Assurance and Standards Officers (SCQASOs) and 30% of 330 principals which translated to 99 principals. Questionnaires and interview guides were used as the main instruments for data collection. The quantitative data which was derived from the SCQASOs' and Principals' questionnaires was presented majorly in the form of tables and analysed quantitatively using frequency counts, means, ranks and percentages. Qualitative data was analysed qualitatively and reported verbatim.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The approach that QASOs use in carrying out instructional supervision is key to the success of the exercise. It was therefore considered important to find out from the study, the extent to which QASOs were using the established instructional supervision criteria. The elements of the procedure which were considered in the study were:

1. Planning with the teacher in terms of the Subject, the Lesson and the Class to be observed.
2. Establishing rapport with the teacher during the pre-observation conference  
Enquiring about the Characteristics of the learners before observation
3. Considering the teachers views during post observation conference.
4. Making the teacher aware Of the contents of the supervisory report before the QASO leaves the station.
5. Giving a copy of the supervisory report to the principal before leaving the station.  
Making a follow-up supervision to find out the progress of the teacher

**Table 1. QASOs' Supervisory procedures' frequency of use**

Skills/Knowledge	QASOs' Response						Principal's Response						Overall	
	1	2	3	4	5	M	1	2	3	4	5	M	(M)	(R)
Planning with the teacher in terms of the Subject, the Lesson and the Class to be observed.	1	3	2	1	0	2.43	11	29	37	1	0	2.35	2.40	5
Establishing rapport with the teacher during the Pre-observation conference	0	2	4	1	0	2.86	23	41	14	0	0	1.88	2.37	6
enquiring about the Characteristics of the learners before observation	3	2	1	1	0	2.29	6	29	23	20	0	2.73	2.51	4
Considering the teachers Views during post observation conference.	2	4	0	1	0	2.00	0	49	22	7	0	2.46	2.23	7
Making the teacher aware of the contents of the supervisory report before Leaving.	0	5	2	0	0	2.29	0	21	40	18	0	3.00	2.61	3
Giving a copy of the supervisory report to the principal before leaving	0	0	0	4	2	3.71	0	12	37	29	0	3.22	3.47	1
Making a follow-up supervision to find out the progress of the teacher	3	3	1	0	0	1.71	28	50	0	0	0	1.64	1.68	8
<i>Overall Mean</i>						2.54						2.51	2.53	

Key: 5= Always; 4= Frequently; 3= Sometimes; 2= Seldom; 1= Never M= mean; (M)= Overall mean; M= Mean

Frequency counts were first worked out for the data collected through the Likert scale questionnaire. Mean scores of the respondents on each item of the Likert scale were then worked out. The statements on the Likert scale were scored as follows: Always (A) = 5 points; Frequently (F) = 4 points; Sometimes (S) = 3 points; Seldom (SL) = 2 points and Never (N) = 1 point. In the interpretation of the scores, a mean score of above 3.5 denoted a good rate use, a mean score of between 2.5 and 3.5 denoted a satisfactory level of use and a mean score of below 2.5 denoted an unacceptable level of use. Table 1 shows that QASOs' competence in approaching instructional supervision was below average as revealed by an overall mean of 2.53. The QASOs could not effectively establish rapport with teachers (mean = 2.37), Could not plan with the teacher on the class, lesson and the time when supervision should be done (Mean = 2.75). Most QASOs (mean = 2.61) did not make the teachers aware of the supervisory report before leaving. They frequently give such a report to the principals (mean = 3.47). It has also been established that they hardly make up a follow up visit to find out the progress of the teacher (mean = 1.68). This means that they were never interested whether the teachers improved their performance after the supervision or not. From the interviews conducted, one principal said that:

*QASOs normally visit the principal's office and then pop into any class where they spot a teacher. Once in class they harass the teacher demanding to see the professional documents and welcoming no explanation when it is found that some are missing. After the lesson they tell the teacher how disorganized he is and after which they go to seclusion to write a report, then they are seen going to the principal's office most probably to leave a copy of the supervisory report with the principal and then go away.*

When asked how they do their instructional supervision, the QASOs were indicating that even though they were aware of the professional steps that should be followed in instructional supervision, they didn't follow them always. They gave varied reasons in explaining this scenario. One of them said:

*These teachers need to be put on toes so as to work. Tell me....! If you agree with them everything including when they should be supervised, can they work? Remember they are supposed to be ready all the time. If you inform them in advance on when they are going to be inspected, they will prepare well for the sake of the supervision and then slid back to normal practice when the inspection is over. This will not improve the quality of teaching in our schools.*

This is a clear testimony that QASOs are not ready to follow these procedures in supervision even if they are aware of them. They are still using the old methods in supervision and their attitudes have not changed.

The QASOs competence in instructional supervision can therefore be said to be below average as they were still applying traditional supervisory approaches which are autocratic in nature and cannot stand the test of time (Wanzare, 2006). In autocratic style there is no room for dialogue between the leaders and the followers. This confirms what was found out by Ajuogo et al (2010) that QASOs competence is below average with a mean of 2.97 in the way they approached instructional supervision. This situation seemingly has not improved, instead it has deteriorated a bit to a mean of 2.53; a scenario which needs immediate attention.

It has also been seen that QASOs hardly make a follow up visit to find out the progress which has been made after the supervision. This compromises the essence of supervision which according to Wanjohi (2005) and Kinaiya (2010) is to help the teachers to improve in the weak areas. How can they check on whether an improvement has been made or not if they do not make a follow up supervisions?

The current QASOs in Kisii County therefore need training in this competence area of instructional supervision so as to change their attitude and enhance their skills in instructional supervision.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in Kenya do not generally follow the procedures outlined in the instructional supervision manual. This may either be because of ignorance or sheer negligence.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

From the main findings of this study, the conclusions that have been the following recommendations are made:

The Ministry of Education Science and Technology to organize an in-service training programme to train the current educational QASOs on the procedures used in instructional supervision, QASOs to be encouraged and empower to make follow up visits to find out if the teachers on the aspects advised on during early visits and guidance and counselling to QASOs to change their negative attitudes towards instructional supervision.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ajuogo, M. A., Indoshi, F. C. & Agak J. O. (2010). Perceptions of quality assurance and standards about their competence: Implications for training. *International Research Journals: Education Research*, 1(4), 112-117.
- [2] Kinaiya, D. S. (2010). *Secondary school teachers' perception towards supervision by Quality Assurance and Standards Officers in Narok District*. Unpublished M. Ed Thesis, University of Nairobi.
- [3] Marwanga, F. K (2004). *A study of instructional supervisory practices of school inspectors in secondary schools in Nakuru District*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nairobi.
- [4] MoEST. (2006). *Sessional Paper 1 of 2005: Policy Framework for Education, Manpower Training and Research*. Nairobi: Government printer.
- [5] Olembo, W. (2008). *Instructional supervision*. Nairobi: Nairobi University Press.
- [6] Orodho, J. A (2005). *Techniques of Writing Research Proposals and Reports in Education and Social Sciences*. Nairobi: Kanezja H.P Enterprises.
- [7] Wanjohi, K. (2005). *Perceptions of the Teacher Counselor in Secondary Schools in Nyeri*. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- [8] Wanzare, Z. O. (2006). *Rethinking School Inspection in the Third World*. Retrieved November 10, 2011, from <http://www.valberta.ca.ckreberpaperzak.utm>