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Abstract
The study examined the relationship between instructional inspection and teacher performance in Butaleja Sub County in Butaleja district. The study used a cross-sectional study design using both quantitative and qualitative approaches on a population that included 105 subjects selected from 12 primary schools and district education officials. Self administered structured questionnaires, interview schedules and documentary checklist were designed and administered to obtain the required information. Quantitative data were presented using frequencies and percentages, Pearson's correlation coefficient and regression analysis. The study found a generally low level of instructional supervision less for the primary teachers sometimes assuming responsibility for their own instructional improvement through non-directive supervision and undergoing peer coaching with two or more professional colleagues aimed at improving their instructional capabilities. There was a noticeable poor performance less for the teachers submitting their reports. Instructional supervision had a significant relationship with teacher performance ($r=0.977$ and $p = 0.000$) and it predicted 20.7% of the variance in teacher performance. The study recommended that to achieve the desired teacher performance in poorly PLE performing rural districts of Uganda, the government of Uganda through the MOES, district local government councils related to education service delivery, teachers, school management committees, education NGOs and other stakeholder should ensure that instructional supervision is enhanced and enforced by supervisors engaging teachers to set attributes for classroom presentation observations for improved performance; observing teachers while they taught to assess their performance; giving teacher opportunity to get feedback from their supervisors on their instruction competencies and areas of improvement.
Background of the Study
The government white paper on education envisaged a citizenry which is literate through provisions of systems and processes that ensure access to quality education in the country. To this effect, systems, processes, policies and procedures have been put in place by the government of Uganda to ensure development of human capital through education (UNESCO, 2005). The monitoring of such systems through inspection has attracted a lot of debate for accountability purposes, yet little effort have been undertaken to examine the influence of instructional inspection on teachers’ performance, as perquisites for access to quality education envisaged in the government white paper on education with a focus on the foundation of formal education in the country.

Instructional supervision is a process of improving instruction for the benefit of students (Glickman, 1990). Clinical supervision, a practice that evolved in the 1960s, is widely used in schools. Clinical supervision provides a low risk step-by-step process (Fritz & Miller, 2001). Three supervisor responsibilities that are central to the process of supervision include carrying out observation, giving guidance and support, and giving feedback to the teacher.

The requirements and responsibilities of any job evolve through time by means of various social, political and technological trends. The evolution of instructional supervision is evident throughout history as a reflection of learning theory and social and political influences (Fine, 1997). In colonial New England, the process of instructional supervision was external inspection conducted by appointed citizens who would inspect teachers and students in schools. This “inspection” process of school supervision made judgments about the management of the school and the teacher rather than the teaching or student-learning (Burnham, 1976). This theory of school supervision at this time is known as Administrative Inspection (Lucio & McNeil, 1962). Instructional supervision processes and periods were evolving through the years as the United States population grew and federal and state governments began funding school systems and standardizing the practices of public education (Glanz, 1991).

The formal activity of instructional supervision by professional personnel began in the second half of the nineteenth century as population growth in major cities necessitated the
formation of school systems (Glanz, 1977). Educational reformers Nicholas M. Butler and Andrew S. Draper sought to transform schools into efficiently operated centralized systems in the late nineteenth century (Glanz, 1977). The efforts of early reformers shifted the supervision of schools from bureaucratic and political influences to an individual superintendent in school districts who supervise instruction, and whose primary responsibilities were to expertly control, legislate and supervise the school (Glanz, 1991). The primary role of a superintendent during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was a supervisor of instruction (Glanz, 1977). This process comprised mainly inspection of classroom teaching and the correction of teacher behaviors (Glanz, 1977).

The processes of instructional supervision still relied upon the observation and evaluation process during the late 20th Century in what Gordon (1997) called “control supervision,” that was primarily inspection, oversight, and judgment of classroom instruction. Collaborative approaches to instructional supervision in the form of clinical supervision were emerging in schools during this time where administrators and teachers worked together during the observation process to identify areas of improvement (Goldhammer, Anderson & Krajewski, 1993). Sergiovanni & Starratt (1993) suggested other means of collaboration including peer supervision, self assessment, and action research.

In the last four decades, instructional supervision has taken a multifaceted process that focuses on instruction to provide teachers with information to improve their teaching performance (Glickman et al., 2001). A common characteristic of instruction and supervision is that these processes occur in a face-to-face environment. The process of teaching occurs in a building, in a classroom, and where students and teachers are physically together during the instructional process. Supervision of instruction takes place in a building, in a classroom, mainly through observation and evaluation of the teaching process (Glickman et al., 2001) and is described as Direct Assistance. The goal of instructional supervision is to assist teachers in improving instruction (Zepeda, 2003).

**Statement of the Problem**

The Joint Assessment Framework (2009) noted that the education sector of Uganda faces considerable challenges since 1997 when Universal Primary Education (UPE) was undertaken and delivered free to a constituency of about 7.5 million learners. In 2007,
Universal Secondary Education (USE) followed suit for over one million students. While education access has been steadily increasing as a result of the introduction of these policies, the quality of education, an indicator of teacher performance has suffered, and currently less than a quarter of UPE candidates pass PLE with respectable grades. High failure rates of students who scored grade U has been registered in the districts of Amolator, Bududa, Apac, Butaleja, Iganga, Kaliro, Kayunga and Manafwa (Lirri, 2010). Given these trends therefore, the problem is how far has the Butaleja district addressed primary teachers’ instructional supervision for enhanced teacher performance, which has an implied relationship with student performance? The study is therefore conceived around adequacy of instructional supervision, level of teacher performance and the relationship between primary school teachers’ instructional supervision and teacher performance in districts with PLE high failure rates in Uganda like Butaleja.

Alfonso, Firth & Neville (1981) defined instructional supervision as behaviors designated by the organization that affects teacher’s behavior to facilitate pupil learning and achieve the goals of an organization. Supervision is the cycle of activities between a supervisor and a teacher with the objective of improving classroom performance (Patrick & Dawson, 1985).

Most teacher performance definitions are based on output or throughput (Drucker, 1999) in terms of total output, and output per hour, based on the quantity of goods and services produced per hour of labor input (Huang et al., 2003). Other common referents of employee performance include yield defects, quality of output which is also referred to as product conformity (Montgomery, 1997).

Gordon (1997) tends to give a more process measure of teacher performance and proposes a measure of employee performance that includes: quantity (how much gets done); quality (how well it gets done); timeline (when it gets done); and multiple priorities (how many things can be done at once) by an employee. Malcolm (2001) equally suggested employee performance to be significant in Quantity thus accounts for outputs (quantities) and outcomes (the quantification of qualitative variables like customer and worker satisfaction, etc). Timeliness which accounts for meeting datelines, overtime needed to complete the work and other time related issues; Quality which accounts for how good the work
is and customer satisfaction which accounts for the fact that the employee services need to add value to the customer.

The supervisor’s function in an organization is to oversee an employee’s performance in completing tasks required by the employer. Educational leaders face the same dilemma as leaders of any other organization; to improve the productivity of the teachers they supervise. Patrick and Dawson describe the classroom performance of a teacher as implementing curriculum, planning, classroom management, and instructional techniques. Sergiovanni & Starratt (1993) view supervision as a focus for improving teacher’s knowledge, skills, and abilities to make informal decisions and solve problems effectively. The intent of educational supervision is to assist teachers in improving instruction (Goldhammer, et.al, 1993).

Direct Assistance, or conducting an observation and evaluating teacher’s performance is the primary method administrators use to supervise instruction (Glickman et al., 2001; Brandt et al., 2007). Teacher evaluations should measure and identify behaviors, instructional strategies and delivery that meet district goals and positively impact student learning (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Observation and evaluation derived from the early role of a superintendent in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century’s (Glanz, 1977) is central to current models of supervision that require classroom visits to observe and identify classroom instruction (Zepeda, 2003). Observation and evaluation has supplanted instructional supervision as a quantifiable substitute to meet federal and guidelines for accountability rather than means to improve instruction (Starrat, 1997).

In developmental supervision, the teachers assume responsibility for their own instructional improvement and the instructional supervisor creates reflective and autonomous teachers through non-directive supervision (Glickman et al., 2001). Glickman et al. (2001) continued explaining a developmental model that utilizes collaborative or in some cases directive approaches to improve teacher performance as being dependent upon individual developmental levels. They offered a five step approach to developmental supervision that includes Prerequisites, Function, Tasks, Unification, and a final Product of Improved Student Learning. Instructional supervision in a developmental model relies on three prerequisite skills for the instructional supervisor. These Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. & Krajewski, R. (1993). Clinical
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