Dynamic input from the membership is needed if supervisory leadership is to be rejuvenated and if a balance is to be restored between the curricular and the supervisory emphases of the Association.

The 1943 merger of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study produced ASCD (officially titled in 1946), an organization which facilitates educational improvement through better instruction and supervision. The fact that ASCD is indeed the major organization for supervisors and curriculum personnel is readily accepted. That ASCD provides the necessary leadership for supervisors has, in recent years, been subject to debate. Admittedly not many voices have been raised; nevertheless some facts exist which give credence to the concerns of those few willing to be heard.

A 1969 survey by Muriel Crosby1 revealed that of the articles published in Educational Leadership, 1960-68, sixty were related to supervision, an average of less than 7 per year. She concluded that few, if any, articles used either research or practical bases. Moreover, most had little or no utilitarian value to the actual supervisor in the field.

In 1970 Robert R. Leeper reported that in the period 1943 to 1971 ASCD publications favored curriculum, instruction, and media over supervision and professionalization. A comparison of these categories is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum, Instruction, and Media</th>
<th>Supervision and Professionalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of ASCD yearbooks and booklets</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of monthly and yearly themes of <em>Educational Leadership</em></td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Analysis of ASCD Yearbook, Booklet, and Journal Themes, 1943-1971.2
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In a more recent study of publications, Ronald Comfort, Larry Bowen, and Bruce Gansneder noted that in the 1972-73 issues of Educational Leadership, Phi Delta Kappan, Today's Education, NASSP Bulletin, and Harvard Educational Review (1971-73), the curriculum/supervision article ratio was approximately 7:1. More specifically, 14 percent of the articles dealt with curriculum, while only 2 percent dealt with supervision. The authors asked, “What kind of impact can these journals have on educators if few of the articles are related to educational practices or to curriculum, and almost none of them deal with supervision, human development, or learning?”

“Clinical supervision is the support mechanism which if effected properly should eventually leave the teacher more self-sufficient in implementing curricular changes and better able analytically to improve his or her own teaching behavior.”

Increased concern with the above findings encouraged this author to conduct a quantitative examination of the 1971-75 ASCD annual conference guides to study priority emphases on the following items: (a) annual conference themes, (b) action labs, (c) special sessions, (d) team action labs (1971), (e) thematic sessions and team workshops (1972), and (f) seminars (1973). Major topic priorities were categorized as listed and defined in the Comfort, Bowen, and Gansneder article (see Table 2).

The above conference priority items were then placed into one of the 8 respective categories: research, foundations, human development and learning, curriculum, instruction, supervision, administration-management-organization, and community

---

4 Ibid., p. 667.
and education. Coding was first independently effected by each of 4 coders then re-evaluated by consensus. Consensus percentages were then computed on each category for each priority, 1971-75.

The themes for each year were:
1971—Dare To Care/Dare To Act
1972—From the Kerner Report to the Year 2000: Action for the 70's
1973—Curriculum for Individuality
1974—Creating Curricula for Human Futures
1975—Curriculum Action for a Crisis Society

A cursory glance at each conference program indicates more focus on curriculum than supervision; a closer examination clearly confirms this fact. Table 3 provides a comprehensive analysis of the conference activities for the past 5 years. For example, a comparison of action lab priorities, curriculum vs. supervision reveals:
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Similarly, a comparison of special sessions priorities shows:

Team action labs in 1971 were 27% curriculum, 0% supervision; in 1972 thematic sessions were 15% curriculum, 10% supervision and team workshops were 30% curriculum, 10% supervision; and seminars in 1973 were 20% curriculum, 13% supervision. All indicate similar patterns to those of action labs and special sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Curriculum (%)</th>
<th>Supervision (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Curriculum (%)</th>
<th>Supervision (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implications

To those administrators, teachers, students, and supervisors concerned with supervision/clinical supervision, the results of this analysis are painfully clear. From conference themes through special sessions, curriculum has taken priority over supervision consistently. Perhaps a warning shot should be fired now as there is imminent danger to all if this trend continues. Morris Cogan showed foresight in 1973 when he noted that the millions of dollars expended on new curricular and instructional materials were to little or no avail, for teachers can call on practically no one for clinical supervision to help rid them of old, inappropriate teaching methods.6

Clinical supervision is the support mechanism which if effected properly, should eventually leave the teacher more self-sufficient in implementing curricular changes and better able analytically to improve his or her own teaching behavior.

---

Research: The attitudes, skills, techniques, or processes that relate to the planning, implementation, and evaluation of research.

Foundations: The analysis of educationally related phenomena from historical, philosophical, sociological, anthropological, or comparative educational perspectives.

Human Development and Learning: The knowledge and implications of knowledge about learning; and the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of human beings.

Curriculum: Curriculum development projects, processes, procedures, and products; and the role of curriculum in schooling.

Instruction: Instructional projects, products, processes, or procedures; and the role and preparation of teachers.

Supervision: Techniques or processes of supervision and the role and preparation of supervisors.

Administration—Management—Organization: Processes or techniques of managing schools, the problems that face schools as units; and the problems and decisions that relate to the organization of the school for instruction.

Community and Education: The role and influence of communities and community groups on schools and the role of government agencies in schooling.

---

Table 2. Definitions


---

Teachers need support in implementing new curricular changes. To acquaint teachers with new curricula or to provide them with the curricular materials is necessary but certainly not sufficient. ASCD has given needed attention to curriculum, as shown by the studies enumerated. At the same time, however, it has not provided the necessary leadership in developing supervisory programs which complement those developed for curricula.

At this point we can now relate to the previously mentioned imminent danger, that is, unless ASCD is willing to provide the necessary leadership by offering those services which will allow supervisory leadership to surface, the over-emphasis on curriculum will eventually lead to the demise of innovative changes in both curriculum and clinical supervision.

Recommendations

Administrators, supervisors, teachers, university professors, and others engaged in supervisory endeavors need supervisory leadership from ASCD. In future conferences and publications, ASCD needs both to recognize the need of and allow for the concomitant development of supervision and curricular programs. What is suggested is not the swing of the pendulum from AsCD to AScD but rather to ASCD. It is not to be supposed that this can or should be accomplished solely by the staff of ASCD.

To suggest that the ASCD staff be responsible for such a directional or priority move would be an organizational cop-out. Rather, what is needed is dynamic input from the membership. An indication of such dynamism has appeared. Ben Harris called an informal meeting of professors of instructional supervision from around the country at the 1975 ASCD Annual Conference in New Orleans. At this meeting, problems were laid on the line, needs and desires were voiced, and enthusiasm partially rekindled. There is no time to falter now; present indicators look promising for putting the S back into ASCD.