

LETTERS

Dear Editor:

In a recent edition of *Educational Leadership*, the editors of "News Notes" used the phrase "Women's Lib" to describe a portion of an interdisciplinary course which dealt, in part, with women's roles (*News Notes*. "Core Course on the 'Contemporary Person'" 35(8):592; April 1978.) Since I wrote this section of the course and have since expanded it into a semester class, I feel it necessary to object to the use of an opprobrious term to describe a viable social movement. The significance of language and the use of sexist language are important issues to be dealt with by educators, not to be used in the propagation of less-than-desirable attitudes regarding the women's movement.

Patricia Gallagher
St. Theresa's Academy
Kansas City, Missouri

Dear Editor:

For those of us who mourned the passing of A. S. Neill and were concerned about the future of his school, Daniel Bock's article "Summerhill: It's Alive and Well" (*Educational Leadership* 35 (5):380-83; February 1978) was most welcome.

There had been considerable speculation over the years as to whether Summerhill was a one-man operation. To discover that Neill's wife and stepson are carrying on the tradition and operation of this great experimental school is quite gratifying. *Educational Leadership* has performed an important service by printing this status report. Sincere thanks.

Harold W. Sobel
Assistant Professor
Queens College
City University of New York

Dear Editor:

In the May 1978 issue of *Educational Leadership* (*News Notes*. "Assistance to Failing Students

in Toledo Schools." p. 678), credit for SQ3R is given to Nicholas Rombes, a counselor at Rogers High School in Toledo.

The SQ3R (survey, question, read, recite, review) was developed by Dr. Francis P. Robinson at the Ohio State University in the 1930s and 1940s. This method was used during this time, throughout the years, and up to the present to teach effective study skills, and has a reputation for increasing a student's grade point average substantially.

From a counselor in this program in 1942.

Mrs. Janice Jones Ressegger
Director of Guidance Services
Guilford County
Greensboro, North Carolina

Dear Editor:

Some puzzling errors of fact occur in Charles A. Reavis' article in the April 1978 issue of *Educational Leadership*, pp. 580-84. The first is his astounding claim that "clinical supervision was developed in the late 1950s by Morris Cogan, Robert Goldhammer, and Robert Anderson" (p. 581). We must first note that Robert H. Anderson, now Dean of Education at Texas Tech University, had, to my knowledge, no significant role in the development of the central ideas of clinical supervision, nor had Goldhammer before 1962.

Some sort of low point in Reavis' non-scholarly attributions concerning who did what in the development of clinical supervision may well be the first sentence of the first issue of "Clinical Supervision News," September 1976 (Charles A. Reavis, editor):

Developed in the late 1950's and early 1960's by Morris Cogan and Robert Goldhammer, clinical supervision has been rediscovered (*sic*) by a new generation of supervisors, elementary and secondary principals and Directors of Instruction.

Goldhammer's own testimony underscores the errors in Reavis's article: Goldhammer writes in the "Preface" to his book: "My own commit-

ment to the education of supervisors began to take shape in the Harvard-Lexington Summer Program of 1962, where I had the good fortune to discover 'clinical supervision' which at that time was becoming developed largely by the efforts of Professor Morris L. Cogan, who directed an institute for supervisors in that setting. . . . I am indebted to Morris L. Cogan for the basic ideas from which clinical supervision emerged. . . ."¹

Reavis piles error on error when he writes that "The dominant pattern (in the operations of clinical supervision) that has emerged appears to be the five-step process proposed by Goldhammer . . ."² The error of attribution in this statement is directly contradicted by Goldhammer in his "Preface," and in Robert Anderson's "Foreword" to Goldhammer's book:

The five-stage sequence on which (Goldhammer's) prototypical (*sic*) model is based, and around which

he has designed his material, is one he first encountered in the 1962 Harvard-Lexington Summer Program, where Morris L. Cogan and others were engaged in the exciting but demanding task of building a new training mechanism for principals, supervisors, and teachers . . .

In the Harvard-Newton Summer Program on which the Harvard-Lexington was partially modeled, Cogan and his colleagues had six or seven years previously been engaged in the development of this model.³

The weaknesses of Reavis' research are thrown into strong relief in a letter that Anderson
(continued on page 44)

¹ R. Goldhammer. *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969. pp. viii, xi.

² Charles Reavis. "Research in Review/Clinical Supervision: A Review of the Research." *Educational Leadership* 35(7):580-84; April 1978.

³ See: Robert H. Anderson. Foreword to Goldhammer, *op. cit.*, pp. iii and iv.

MATERIALS FOR EDUCATORS

from Procter & Gamble



Film

Is Anybody Listening?

Home Economics Teaching Units

Learning About Laundering

Caring For A Home

Food Preparation

Personal Care

Frying and Baking Fundamentals

Consumer Education Teaching Kits

Consumer Advertising

Consumer Choice

Professional Aid

Public Relations Guide

Classroom Ideas and Innovations
for Consumer Education

write to: Procter & Gamble

**EDUCATIONAL
SERVICES**

P.O. Box 14009 Cincinnati, Ohio 45214

4. Review future predictions in subject.
5. Identify major content, format, and processes to be used.

6. Make plans for revision.

7. Make appropriate budget and submit.

Year 2. Revising

1. Delete materials that are inappropriate.

2. Add materials needed.

3. Further develop weak areas (rewrite).

4. Update all activities and identify resources.

5. Add skills in content, thinking, study, and career areas.

6. Create new curriculum areas and courses as need requires.

7. Prepare working drafts for piloting.

Year 3. Piloting

1. Select pilot sites at each instructional level. [E]

LETTERS

(continued from page 6)

sent to me, in which he writes: "I've just received some copies of Bob Goldhammer's book, *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers*, and in re-reading my foreword I was suddenly reminded of the tremendous investment that you have in the ideas Goldhammer has presented." (Dated January 12, 1970.)

In all the welter of Reavis' research on the development of clinical supervision, the strangest may be the omission of any mention of my 1973 model (*Clinical Supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company) which sets out in detail the rationale and processes of his 8-phase cycle of clinical supervision, which superseded his 5-phase model.

Morris L. Cogan
Brooklyn College

2. Orient pilot teachers to pilot process, evaluation form, and so on.

3. Visit to each site by coordinator or resource teacher during pilot process.

4. Collect piloted materials, review suggestions, and make appropriate changes and refinements.

5. Prepare all curricula for printing and distribution to all schools.

6. Identify basic resources needed, and distribute copies to all schools so that resources can be on hand for implementation.

7. Plan with staff development department and supervisory staffs appropriate experiences to orient staffs to revised curriculum.

Year 4. Implementing

1. Orient all leadership teams, department chairmen, and principals to new curriculum.

2. Distribute curriculum guides.

3. Work with staff development department and supervisory staffs to plan further support experiences for school staffs as particular needs are identified.

4. Keep a running file on suggestions, questions, and identified needs that merit further refinement.

5. Identify minimum skills to be accomplished at all levels of instruction in subject areas being implemented.

6. Identify indicators for each minimum skill, which will be accepted as evidence that competence is present.

7. Identify high school courses in each subject being implemented that will be required for graduation.

The middle level of management typified by the supervisory-development staff must see that all school personnel are fully aware that curricu-

Future ASCD Annual Conferences

1979	March 3-7	Detroit	Cobo Hall
1980	March 29-April 2	Atlanta	Georgia World Congress Center
1981	March 7-11	St. Louis	Congress Center
1982	March 20-24	Anaheim	Convention Center

Copyright © 1978 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.