From: "Joe Ferguson" <Fergi@Home.com>
To: "Gene Kerfoot" <gkerfoot@ix.netcom.com>
Subject: Draft KA4 Contract
Date: Thu, Jul 5, 2001, 8:27 PM

Gene;

Please review the draft assessment contract for KA4 at http://www.fergi.com/Fielding/Kerfoot/KA4Contract.htm

I believe that I have addressed the questions and contract elements that are included in your Felix posting.

I look forward to hearing from you at your convenience and to meeting you at Summer Session!

Warmly,

Joe Ferguson <http://www.fergi.com/Fielding.htm>

-----Original Message-----
From: gene kerfoot [mailto:gkerfoot@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2001 4:46 PM
To: Fergi@home.com
Cc: gkerfoot@ix.netcom.com
Subject: Re: Draft KA4 Contract

Dear Joe,

Your contract proposal is creative and very interesting, but in some ways doesn¹t fit my approach to KAs too well. I want to share with you details of my way of thinking about individual assessments, and I have some changes to suggest.

In response to your three points:

I. My approach to assessments is to consider them as a whole in terms of my work on them, including my feedback. My practice, which I want to continue in our work together, would be to evaluate the three components of Breadth together after you have finished them all; same thing on Depth. I will provide written feedback to the completed assessment that will appear on your COC form. I do not expect to have you do supplements; this would extend the scope of the assessment contract, which promises to be comprehensive enough as you are proposing it. Joe, the individual Assessment format is not like an ongoing FELIX seminar, for instance, which may extend over time with one part following another to completion.

2. and 3. Breadth specifics: the Breadth component goes beyond mainly description; it should provide more than coverage in syllabus form of the views of theorists identified from each of the three personality areas - Behavioral Cognitive, Psychodynamic, and Humanistic/existential. A syllabus probably would wind up being a kind of abridged exposition and juxtaposition of theorists and their concepts. Rather, I suggest you propose to do something that will involve you in elements of evaluation, synthesis, or perhaps creative conclusions of your own. For instance, you might identify some kind of vehicle around which to center your presentations from the three areas, something that would allow you to form judgments, reach conclusions, etc, For example, (I am not suggesting that you do this, although you could), you might propose to identify principles from various theorists/theories that fit together to make up a coherent approach, or you could critique theories and arrive at one(s) you approve of, indicating why, or you might construct the J. Ferguson theory, or you might identify and evaluate concepts of therapeutic change or gain or whatever the goal of therapy might be for theories of personality. From each of the three areas, or - or - or.

3. Depth is a detailed rather than broad look into some specific issue, concept, theory, etc., so it also fits other than just a syllabus presentation.

4. Covered above.

5. I really like your idea of having an oral in person component to the assessment. How about the following: whatever is finally agreed upon for Depth, you present it orally at one of my Cluster meetings; say take a couple or so hours, including a discussion with the Cluster group? One idea, just for illustration: Present the major concepts of Redecision Therapy, a school of Transactional Analysis. Redecision, interestingly, contains elements of psychodynamic, behavioral-cognitive, humanistic, and even existential, so really lends itself to a Depth format that actually would build on your Breadth work. It has another advantage, it is a theory/therapy model that students can be and are trained in at Fielding in the TART therapist training program. All of these are just possible ideas, and you will find your own. Let's discuss these things at SS. I look forward to seeing you and working with you.

Gene

-----Original Message-----
From: Joe Ferguson [mailto:fergidotcom@netzero.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2001 5:01 PM
To: gene kerfoot
Subject: RE: Draft KA4 Contract

Gene;

I understand your points and I will rework my contract proposal to address them. I guess I was not clear in my intention regarding the syllabus, which is simply the list of books that I intend to read in the course of this assessment. Also, I did not mean to suggest that the breadth papers would be a regurgitation of the books in the syllabus. Certainly those papers will reflect some sort of creative synthesis of the material in each domain.

The one concern I have is in the area of feedback. I have just complete Jack Saporta's Felix seminar in History and Systems without a single input from Jack. The dialogue with the other students has been of some value, but the whole point of working with sophisticated faculty is the get the benefit of their broader scope in reflection. Frankly, the Felix seminar I have just completed could be administered by a clerk to an unlimited number of students now that Jack has written the 8 weekly topical questions that constitute the seminar.

I like the idea of putting together a presentation on the depth topic for your cluster. I am a bit concerned that you are suggesting the only feedback I would receive from you in the course of this KA would be a summary comment on the COC form. Is that what you are suggesting?

Shall we put something on the calendar? I am available any evening but Monday, and any breakfast or lunchtime. I look forward to talking to discussing these things with you at SS!

Warmly,

Joe

-----Original Message-----
From: gene kerfoot [mailto:gkerfoot@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2001 1:40 PM
To: Fergi@home.com
Cc: gkerfoot@ix.netcom.com
Subject: ka 4

Dear Joe,

Your Breadth is ambitious and follows my examples rather closely; they were not designed to direct your selection, just give some guidelines, but since they seem to suit you, the Breadth is fine with me - just do not write War and Peace - 50-75 pages, more or less will be plenty. Your Depth also is ambitious and creative, and coupled with an interactive presentation in cluster will make for an interesting session. So, I accept the proposal, and we are in business.

One suggestion, not requirement: include some material on TA and Redecision: Berne, Goulding and Goulding, and C. Lennox are good introductions to this approach, which has elements of all 3 schools in it.

As per my previous comments, Joe, I want you to hold onto your work until you have completed it all, Breadth and Depth, then send it all to me at once for evaluation. In the unlikely event that the product does not come up to an A level, I will be in touch with recommendations for upgrading the product and of course will give you detailed feedback in a COC letter. We can schedule time at a Cluster session in the spring for you to lead an interactive discussion of the Depth. Friday, April 19 is clear for us. Let me know if that suits you.

If all of this is ok with you, sign the contract form and email it plus the contract back to me for my signature or put it on hard copy; I'll forward it to SB. I am looking forward to reading your work.

Best, Gene

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Joe Ferguson [mailto:Fergi@Home.com]
Sent: Saturday, August 04, 2001 5:25 PM
To: Gene Kerfoot
Subject: Depth Presentation To Kerfoot Cluster
When: Friday, April 19, 2002 10:00 AM-2:00 PM (GMT-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada); Tijuana.
Where: Carmel

Gene;

Greetings!

Yes, I was happy with your suggested questions for the Breadth. They cover the waterfront and provide plenty of latitude.

I want to check to make sure you are kidding about 50-75 pages for the breadth paper. In my former life I would routinely return documents of that length unread with instructions to consider which third of the words were really necessary. I really have no idea how many pages my comparative analysis of the three major schools of psychology will take; I will have to write it to see. If you don't think it clearly demonstrates breadth I will make it better or longer, if that is what is called for. Is that OK with you?

What mailing address should I send the contract to?

Warmly, Joe