

https://dspace.org/

The role of the field work consultant in social work education

Hare, Isadora

2015-04-30
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/17596

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

regarding certain prerequisites in the selection of supervisors this is an effective means of "reducing misunderstandings among agencies as to qualifications needed for the field instruction responsibility."[2] When an agency is being selected to act as a field instruction centre for the first time, a thorough study of the setting is required. Sidney Kramer has described the processes involved in developing a field placement programme[3] while Schubert and Pettes in a joint article published in 1958 also addressed themselves to this subject. They pointed out that the school must have a clear picture of the objectives of the field work course but even when this is so the agency may have "a different perception of professional education, which (in addition to such incontrovertible facts as office space and size of intake) may affect its willingness to be used as a training centre."[4] These issues need to be clarified and made explicit in negotiations between the FWC and the Agency Executive. Brown and Gloyne describe ways and means of expanding field work opportunities for students in Britain. In their view, some difficulties in the choice of agencies would be eased if there e more knowledge available about agencies and staff qualifications. y event personal discussion is essential between FWC's and y executives if a meaningful partnership is to be established maintained.[5]

The social worker selected to act as supervisor may be at the field level or the supervisory level in the agency hierarchy or may be the agency executive himself. However as Edwards states "whatever the position of the student supervisor in the agency, and however frequently she meets with the tutor, it is clear that in the interests of the course the tutor must meet the head of the agency periodically." Edwards adds that, on the whole, "it would be wise for tutors to visit agencies for this purpose about twice a year."[6] If possible the student's supervisor, and if appropriate,

his supervisor, should be present at the meeting. In any event, he or they should be fully informed that the meeting is to take place and what its purpose is. Such communications are represented in Figure 3 by the lines linking elements A, X, X1 and Y (see page 37).

Such meetings have various purposes, the main underlying goal being to ensure that the executive remains involved in the field instruction programme. The FWC should report on what is currently happening in the school and ask for co-operation where necessary. From time to time, agency executives and supervisors should be asked to contribute their comments and suggestions about the theoretical aspects of the course, either individually or at joint meetings.

Although detailed discussions of the student's progress in her work is a matter primarily for the supervisor, the head of the agency should be given the opportunity to comment on the students and how they are fitting into the organization. Often, too, according to Edwards, the chief executive may take the opportunity of consulting the FWC about "matters of general agency policy, especially where this affects students."[7]*

The FWC may also use the meeting to give information to the executive about seminars at the school which members of the agency's staff may attend. Students are affected by relationships with staff other than the supervisor in the agency, as the results of the tutorial analysis confirmed, and staff in turn are affected by the student's presence. As Woodcock points out, some staff may be glad of the stimulus a student is expected to provide and be helpful in suggesting ways of enriching the student's time in the agency. Others may see the student as someone who will question accepted habits and procedures and threaten their own

* Such communications are depicted in Figure 3 by the line Y ⟶ A

equilibrium. Others again who contribute cases to the student's case load will also be involved with the student. To quote Woodcock: "It is not unknown for a precarious adjustment among personnel to be upset by a student's advent, regardless of who the student is or what he does."[8] The supervisor must be aware of these factors, but the School through the FWC must also assume responsibility for creating the type of climate in the agency conducive to productive field instruction. The FWC should visit the agency to "meet the staff" both professional, and administrative and clerical. Young confirms the finding in the present study that "clerical and administrative staff who are willing to be involved can do much to help a new student settle into the agency."[9] The FWC could perhaps join the staff informally at tea, or give a brief address at a staff meeting in order to introduce herself and the field instruction programme. Congenial personal relationships between the FWC and all members of the staff can make an important contribution to field instruction for students. In other words, the lines of communication appearing in the model of the field work system should be A $\longrightarrow$ X $\longrightarrow$ W, and not merely A $\longrightarrow$ X and/or A $\longrightarrow$ Y. Professional staff at field instruction centres should be afforded the opportunity of attending seminars at the University apart from those designed specifically for supervisors, for example, seminars given by visiting lecturers, controversial debates and similar events which could be of interest. The aim of all these measures is to assist the integration of the student into the agency, in the interests not only of the student but also the client (element V in the field work system). This is particularly important in a concurrent system of field instruction. On the days the student is at the University the agency must make adequate arrangements for the supervisor to deal with the student's cases should the need arise. (See X $\longrightarrow$ V in model of field work system.) Other staff must be fully aware of these arrangements, that is, this information must flow along the channel X $\longrightarrow$ W in the field

work system. If not, the matter can be handled in a manner detrimental to the clients concerned.

To sum up the FWC's role with Agency executives and staff the following is a quotation from the CSWE's publication "The Future for Field Instruction: Agency-School Commitment and Communication". An agency executive stated:

> Many agency executives are far more ready to co-operate closely in the planning as well as the carrying out of training programmes than school people think they are.... The deans of the schools, with their appropriate faculty, (should) meet with (administrators) periodically on a planned basis* ... to talk about our mutual responsibilities and opportunities for the development of professional personnel. Then, as the programme developed, we would suggest that the relationships be not only with the field guides in the agencies and field work instructors from the schools, but with administrative and case supervisory personnel as well .... If we were involved in this kind of relationship, many of the ... problems mentioned in discussions on agency-school relationships would be solved.[10]

The FWC's role with the agency as a whole should not stop with the executive and the staff. As Fred Berl has pointed out each of the segments of an agency, that is board members, administrators, supervisors and practitioners, may play a part in determining standards of supervision. The board as the policy making body of the organisation should not be ignored in negotiations between the School and the Agency. It must be remembered that as Berl states "the supervisor's role and responsibilities are defined by the norms and structure of the agency" and that this must be taken into account when the school specifies its requirements.[11] Rita McGuire writing in the United States in 1968 stated that "schools universally report a lag in working

---

* This is represented by channels B ⟶ Y and B ⟶ A ⟶ Y in the model.

with agency administrators and regard this as a serious problem."[12] It should be part of the FWC's role to eliminate this lag as far as possible. Therefore, in Figure 3, A ⟶ Z has been inserted as a suggested new channel of communication.

> Katherine Kendall pointed out in 1965 that
>
> in some situations the faculties and staffs of schools and agencies alike seem to feel that ... board members should be protected from the painful realization that an educational function involves allocations of facilities, funds, and staff talent and time to a purpose of service to agency clientele.

However, this is clearly detrimental in the long run as an effective partnership requires in Kendall's words "commitment, communication and co-operation." Effective commitment to educational goals cannot occur without continuing communication between schools and agencies, and here, states Kendall, "the burden of responsibility falls primarily on the schools. ...Communication, like commitment, must begin and continue at the top of school and agency administration and flow down and up."[13] There are many possible forms such communication could take. The School could decide that the FWC should address Board members on the purposes and requirements of a field instruction programme, and/or contact could be facilitated between the higher echelons of each organisation (or sub-system) by the Professor of the School communicating directly with the Chairman of the Board. This should occur not only through correspondence but also perhaps in meetings, or in an annual luncheon at which the University administration can join with the School in acknowledging the contribution made by the agency to its educational enterprise. (See C ⟶ Z as suggested new channels of communication.)

Helen Cassidy has summed up this aspect of the FWC's role in these terms:

> There is an on-going function of the school, as represented in the role of co-ordinator of field instruction, which goes under the sometimes dubious title of "public relations." The term is used here in its best sense: keeping the public informed and assuring that channels of communication are open for a two-way flow of information. A community is responsive to a school and its progress, provided the community is made partner to both. The following activities may be useful here: a co-ordinating committee made up of key people from the social work community to serve as liaison between school and community; a large, school-sponsored gathering once or twice annually that brings together agency executives collaborating with the school for a joint social-educational experience (e.g. reports may be given by the school on recent or prospective activities to keep the practice domain abreast of educational developments); .... Regardless of its prowess or educational standing, a school cannot progress in a healthy manner unless the social work community supports it. The co-ordinator of field instruction must assume responsibility for doing this work in the name of the school as a key part of her function.[14]

13.2 The FWC's Role within the University

The FWC herself is part of a sub-system, the University sub-system, and she has role relationships with the elements of this sub-system as part of her function of attempting to keep the field work system balanced in order to perform its function.

Her lecturer colleagues have an important role to play in the system, as represented in the model by the flow of information between elements D and A. Many of the activities which she is responsible for organising, require, or are enriched by, the participation of the lecturing staff. In supervisors' seminars, for example, they should be active in interpreting the curriculum content of their courses and how supervisors could integrate this into field teaching. (See channels D $\rightleftarrows$ A $\not\rightleftarrows$ X) They should participate fully in other School-Agency functions

too, such as meetings, conferences, institutes or workshops, whether these involve supervisors, executives, board members or all three. (See Channels D ⇄ A ⇄ X ⇄ Y ⇄ Z in Figure 3.) The task of helping students integrate theory and practice should also be shared by all staff members at the School. The fact that students have regular consultations with the FWC does not of course preclude them from having what Clare Morris has called "subject tutorials" with other teachers.[15]

The full academic staff of the School has a more fundamental role to play in the field work system however. Together they must formulate the objectives of the curriculum as a whole, and as a corollary, the specific objectives of the field instruction programme. These should be specified in the field work guide circulated to agencies, and while the writing of this document may be the responsibility of the FWC, it should represent the combined thinking and philosophy of the staff members of the School.

Significant information about agencies and about students should also be shared by all members of the academic staff when appropriate. As Sherman Merle wrote:

> Schools should provide through their formal structures, the opportunity for advisers to share with each other, with other faculty, and with the administration the generalized reactions of students to the total educational experience as well as to particular parts of the programme.[16]

The opposite should also apply. Lecturers should supply the FWC with any pertinent information about the class performance of students who might be experiencing difficulties of one sort or another.

In the words of Tybel Bloom:

> The system of relationships necessary to maintain the educational base of field work involves the total school, the total agency, and the total student ... (This means) that the curriculum is enriched and vitalized as content from the field experience of the student is brought for examination and study into classes in all of the curriculum areas ... It means that all members of the faculty ... must be related to and have a respect for the integrity of the agency and its primary purpose. They must have an understanding of the meaning to an agency of participating in an educational programme, especially under these conditions where so many aspects of an agency's services and practices are constantly drawn into the purview of the school.[17]

It is part of the FWC's task to stimulate her colleagues' awareness of these aspects of the field work partnership.

The FWC should also have frequent and full communication with the head of the school or department of social work, keeping him informed of trends or difficulties in the field work programme.* She acts as the agent of the School in negotiations with field instruction centres, but the authority remains his, and correspondence dealing with basic issues should go out from the school under his signature. It is self evident that he should be involved in major decision making, such as whether to terminate a field placement and withdraw from a relationship with a co-operating agency.

In Charlotte Towle's words:

> The student, as he spins his connecting lines between classroom, field and administration, needs to find the school an organic whole. There must be sufficient unity that he will get a sense of one relationship in which the specific relationships may vary in importance from time to time. This sense of oneness will be obtained to the extent that the student in all his contacts with faculty in school and field consistently finds the same attitudes toward people.[18]

---

* Channel A ⟶ B

The school of social work is however not an entity complete in itself. It is part of the University as a whole, and as Charles Levy has stated in his article "A Framework for Planning and Evaluating Social Work Education":

> Although the university may allocate much autonomy to the school of social work ... the school is still required to abide by the university's academic and administrative standards, rules, and prescriptions .... In short, the programme and practices of the school of social work are bounded by the university.[19]

This was written of schools of social work in the United States and probably applies to an even greater extent to departments of social work at South African Universities. The University administration therefore (element C in Diagram 3 of the Field Work System) is one of the participants in the social work education process and is therefore involved in the role relationships of the FWC. The responsibility for the direct negotiations with the University administration usually, if not exclusively, resides with the head of the school or department, (Channels B $\rightleftharpoons$ C) but there should be close liaison between him and the FWC in this regard. (Channels C $\rightleftharpoons$ B $\rightleftharpoons$ A)

The issue of the regulations pertaining to field work in the curriculum is involved here. There must be congruence between the practices of the school and the regulations for the degree as laid down in the University calendar.

Another vital issue is the matter of cost, the costs associated with the field instruction of social work students. Brown and Gloyne mentioned this in their study[20] and it has featured also in many United States publications for example, articles and papers by Merrifield, Mark Hale, Katherine Kendall, and Bess Dana and various other participants in meetings of the

Council on Social Work Education. The matter was also raised at the Conference on the Field Instruction of Students in Social Work held in Pretoria in June, 1971. In his summing up of the conference proceedings Professor I.J.J. van Rooyen stated as follows:

> Die vraagstuk van die finansiële laste in verband met praktykopleiding en die verantwoordelikheid van elke vennoot, bly 'n probleem wat aandag sal moet geniet.[21]

The subject of financing field instruction for social work merits a full study of its own and what is presented here is merely a brief resumé of some salient points. Katherine Kendall has perhaps expressed herself most crisply on the subject. In one article she states,

> This question (namely, who pays for what in field instruction?) touches on hard realities on both sides of the partnership, and there is understandable hesitancy about delving too deeply into it. Yet, silence about costs may be the most self-defeating manoeuvre employed by schools and agencies.[22]

Elsewhere she wrote as follows:

> Universities accept the fact that professional education is expensive. They recognize that clinical instruction, whether provided in university-run facilities or in outside agencies, accounts in large part for the high per capita cost of student training. Social work has a particular problem in this regard .... Studies ... indicate that the costs of social work education are in the upper range for all professional schools. On the other hand, many universities place schools of social work in a twilight zone between the traditional professional schools, e.g., medicine or law, and the graduate departments of the various social sciences. ... The ... pertinent question as to why the annual per capita cost of educating the social work student is considerably less than the corresponding cost

> for a medical student is not asked and would even be regarded in some quarters as impertinent. The fact that the social work community shares a significant part of the expense of educating a social worker is not sufficiently understood or appreciated by many universities.[23]

Chapter Four of the present study canvassed this issue historically at the University of the Witwatersrand. It showed that in the late 1960's this question received attention at this University. However, whether the present financial provisions are adequate perhaps deserves further attention. Mrs. Eska Dowling, Director of the South African National Council for Child Welfare, and member of the Social Work Commission established in terms of the National Welfare Act of 1965, stated bluntly at the 1971 Conference on Field Instruction in South Africa, that in her opinion

> welfare organizations should be relieved completely of all expenses in connection with field instruction. If their services are required, and I think this is inevitable if students are to be suitably educated, the universities should purchase these services from the agencies at the current market price.[24]

The finding of social welfare and education poses many difficulties. Mrs. Dowling expressed the opinion that "the public will be averse to contribute money to welfare agencies if they become aware that money is being used for the education of social workers."[25] However, the present writer cannot agree with this view. Social welfare services cannot be fully effective without the input of professional social work. What is required is the interpretation to the general public of the need for adequate educational facilities for social workers. The FWC should work closely with National Councils and State Departments in this connection, as well as with professional associations of social workers. Kindelsperger wrote of the United States scene

in 1966:"government and the professional association are major influences on social work education today."[26] South African schools of social work should explore ways in which these bodies could be involved to a greater extent in the financial support of social work education and/or in the interpretation of the significance of such education. As Professor Erika Theron stated at the 1971 Conference on Field Instruction „Grondwette ... kan gewysig word, en die Staat en die publiek kan opgevoed word!"[27] Through such public relations work, private sources of funds such as foundations as well as governmental sources could possibly be tapped to finance the costs associated with professional field instruction of the desired standard.

However, there are other ways in which the University administration could indirectly support field instruction and at the same time afford greater status to agency-employed field instructors contributing to the University's educational programme. The privileges afforded to medical practitioners holding joint appointments on the staff of provincial hospitals and universities could serve as precedents. Some of these could possibly be extended to agency field instructors. Possibilities are the part remission of University fees for the children of such individuals, allowing them the use of university library and sports facilities, together with according them the honour of including their names in the University Calendar. The FWC should interpret to the University administration the importance of these or similar measures in expressing the University's recognition of their contribution. This could assist in fostering the type of climate required if agencies are to provide field instruction of the type described in the present study.

At present at the University of the Witwatersrand, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University entertains agency

executives and student supervisors to lun· once a year to express the University's appreciation to them. (Existing Channel C ⟶ Y ⟶ X) Perhaps from time to time similar contact should be established between the University and the Boards of field instruction centres; in other words, some channels of communication should be established between elements C and Z of the Field Work System (Diagram 3). This could take the form of an annual letter of appreciation from the Principal of the University to the Chairman of Boards or the Heads of Departments providing field instruction to social work students, and/or social functions on significant occasions. It is interesting to note that Katherine Kendall made the following remarks (which will be quoted as concluding thoughts on this Chapter) in 1958 at a fiftieth anniversary dinner honouring social agencies which had participated in the field work programme of the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration:

> Can we, as we work on problems of field instruction, create a more splendid image of what is needed for the education of personnel for our exacting and highly responsible field of service? Can we confer special prestige as training centres upon agencies which truly function as educational partners in the professional preparation of social workers? Can we accord to field instructors, who truly teach, the status and privileges of rank which serve as recognition of merit in the university?[28]

NOTES TO CHAPTER 13

1. M. Elizabeth Edwards. "A Study of the Social Work Tutor's Expectations of Fieldwork Agencies and his Responsibilities Towards Them." Social Work, 23: 22, 1966.

2. C.S.W.E., 1958, Content of Field Teaching, p.9.

3. Sidney Kramer. "Developing a Field Placement Programme." Social Casework, 42: 456-60, 1961.

4. M. Schubert and D. Pettes. "Selection of Field Settings for Casework Students." Social Service Review, 32: 362, 1958.

5. S. Clement Brown and E.R. Gloyne, The Field Training of Social Workers, p.61.

6. Edwards, op. cit., p.25.

7. Edwards, op. cit., p.24.

8. G.D.C. Woodcock. "Tutor, Supervisor and student: An evaluation of roles in social work training, with especial reference to new courses." British Journal of Psychiatric Social Work, 8 no. 3: 58, 1966.

9. P. Young, The Student and Supervision in Social Work Education, p.37.

10. C.S.W.E. 1963, The Future for Field Instruction: Agency-School Commitment and Communication, p.12.

11. Fred Berl. "An Attempt to Construct a Conceptual Framework for Supervision." Social Casework, 41: 341, 1960.

12. Rita McGuire. "Forecasting the Future of Field Learning and Teaching." Betty Lacy Jones (ed.) Current Patterns in Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education, p.19.

13. Katherine Kendall. "Commitment, Communication, and Co-operation: The Essence of School-Agency Relations." Social Casework, 48: 34-35, 1967.

14. Helen Cassidy, "Role and Function of the Co-Ordinator or Director of Field Instruction." Betty Lacy Jones (ed.), op. cit., p.155.

15. Clare Morris, "Individual Tutorials." Social Work Today, 3 no. 6: 9, 1972.

16. Sherman Merle. "Student Advising." Social Work Education Reporter, XVII No. 2: 53, 1969.

17. C.S.W.E. 1963, op. cit., pp.4-5.

18. Charlotte Towle, The Learner in Education for the Professions, p.140.

19. Charles Levy. "A Fromework for Planning and Evaluating Social Work Education." Journal of Education for Social Work, 8 no. 2: 43, 1972.

20. Brown and Gloyne, op. cit., pp.117-118.

21. I.J.J. van Rooyen. „Samevatting van Konferensieverrigtinge." Republic of South Africa, Department of Social Welfare and Pensions, Report: Conference on the Field Instruction of Students in Social Work, p.39.

22. Kendall, op. cit., p.36.

23. Katherine Kendall, "Selected Issues in Field Instruction in Education for Social Work." C.S.W.E., Field Instruction, p.7.

24. Eska Dowling. "An Evaluation of the Present System of Field Instruction of Students in South Africa" Republic of South Africa, Department of Social Welfare and Pensions, op. cit., p.21.

25. I.J.J. van Rooyen, op. cit., p.41.

26. Walter Kindelsperger "Responsible Entry into the Profession - Some Current Issues." Journal of Education for Social Work, 2 no. 1: 50, 1966.

27. E. Theron. „Riglyne vir die Toekoms." Republic of South Africa. Department of Social Welfare and Pensions, op. cit., p.27.

28. Kendall, ibid., p.9.

PART V

Conclusion

CHAPTER 14

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

14.1 The present Study : A Summary

The present study was designed to explore the role of the field work consultant in social work education. The instruction of students within the field of social work practice forms an integral part of professional education for social work, a vital adjunct to theoretical preparation in the classroom. Many patterns of field instruction are possible but the traditional pattern has involved the placement of students in welfare organisations in the community with the purpose of enabling them to develop skill in one or more methods of social work practice under the supervision of an agency-employed field instructor or supervisor.

These organisations are independent of the university but for various reasons they undertake to co-operate with it in providing field instruction for students. They thereby enter into a partnership with the university in the education of its social work students. Within this learning-teaching-practice partnership, it is the university which awards the final qualification for practice and it is the university therefore which must retain the final responsibility for the nature and quality of field instruction provided to its students by field instruction centres. The relationship between the university and the agencies participating in its field instruction programme is therefore a complicated one requiring skilled management. The "field work consultant" is defined as that member of the academic staff of a university school or department of social work to whom is delegated the responsibility for organising and co-ordinating the field work programme and ipso facto the relationships with the co-operating field instruction centres. The use of this term in preference to other terms such as tutor, adviser or field work official (veldwerkbeampte) was

motivated in the present study.

Because of the complexities of the field instruction situation and the numerous participants involved, it is submitted that systems theory is relevant to an understanding of the phenomena involved in the field instruction process. The field work situation was conceptualised as a social system involving two main sub-systems, the agency and the university, with the student viewed as an element belonging in part to both systems although primarily part of the University sub-system. The role of each element in a social system is determined by its interaction with other elements, and the role of the field work consultant was conceptualised in terms of her relationships with the other elements of the field work system. The exposition of this concept of the role of the field work consultant in Chapter 2 of the present study therefore fulfilled the first aim of the study described in Chapter 1, namely, "To develop the concept of the role of the Field Work Consultant in terms of systems theory." It is submitted that the conceptualisation of the role of the field work consultant in terms of a field work system illuminates understanding of the field instruction situation and facilitates the implementation of a satisfactory and productive field instruction programme.

The study focused on data from the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. While this may be regarded as a limitation, each School of Social Work implements both general principles of social work education and its own specific philosophy based partly on its local conditions. There are many precedents in the social work literature of studies based on the practices of particular schools which nevertheless have relevance for social work educators elsewhere. It is hoped that the present study may make a contribution in this regard.

As Sir John Denham wrote in the 17th Century, "we may our ends by our beginnings know"[1] and Part II of the present study therefore explored the role of the field work consultant in historical perspective. Initially, the development of the social work curriculum in general at the University of the Witwatersrand was sketched, and this was followed by an analysis of trends in the field work area in particular. The themes explored were as follows:

i. The University's recognition of field work as reflected in its regulations and published syllabuses.

ii. The creation by the University of specific posts for persons to act as field work consultants.

iii. Financial aspects of the relationship between the University and field instruction centres.

iv. The Field Work Consultant's practices and procedures in relation to field instruction centres.

v. The field work consultant's practices and procedures in relation to students undergoing field instruction.

Part Two of the dissertation therefore fulfilled the second aim of the study as described in Chapter I, page 11.

For purposes of developing the concept of the role of the field work consultant in the present study, the traditional pattern of field instruction was adopted as a model. This pattern, involving as it does a partnership between school and agency with regard to educational practice, was described in the Journal of Education for Social Work in the United States in 1971 as "a most complicated, controversial and troublesome area of mutual concern."[2] Many authorities in that country are concerned about this model and are experimenting with new patterns involving for example the use of service centres or teaching centres. As Dr. Jan de Jongh, eminent social work educationalist from the Netherlands, wrote in

1953, "in the United States ... being new seems to give a thing an immediate lead in the always lively competition; something new starts with the supposition of its being better. The opposite is true in Europe."[3] South African social work education in 1973 probably lies somewhere between these two positions, interested in new developments but requiring evidence of their value before experimenting with them. The traditional model still predominates in this country and certainly at the University of the Witwatersrand.

It is submitted that this is not because of reluctance to innovate per se, but because the traditional pattern has certain intrinsic advantages. While the appointment of school-based supervisors for example may in some ways reduce the dilemma between the service and educational goals within community field instruction centres, in other ways it may serve to "increase the distance between practice and education."[4] In any event, even in the United States it seems that the experimental projects are likely to be supplementary to, rather than replacements for, the traditional forms of field instruction.

The present study concentrated on exploring the role of the field work consultant within the field work programme of the final (fourth) year of study for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Social Work at the University of the Witwatersrand. This involves students in concurrent placements in field instruction centres for two days per week from the commencement of the academic year in late February until a total of four hundred hours have been accumulated, about seven months later.

The heart of the field instruction experience is the relationship between the student and the social worker within the agency who is assigned responsibility for organising the student's field instruction placement and crystallizing it for her through

supervision, a process with administrative, teaching and helping components. Supervisor, student and the field work consultant who brings them together, comprise the field work triad in social work education, the core of the field work system. In terms of systems theory, the relationship between supervisor and student will be a vital determinant of the field work consultant's role and two projects were therefore undertaken to gather empirical data on selected aspects of the field placements in general and supervision in particular.

These projects were fully described in Part III of the present study. The inclusion of each aspect of field instruction investigated was motivated on the basis of models derived from the social work literature and the writer's experience; the empirical data derived were reported and discussed, and the implications of the findings for the evolving role of the field work consultant were considered. Consequently Part III fulfilled the third aim of the study as presented in Chapter 1, Section 3, namely:

To formulate a model of certain aspects of field instruction and the supervisor-student relationship in social work education; to ascertain relevant facts relating to these specific features of field instruction at the University of the Witwatersrand; and further to identify the implications of the findings for the evolving role of the field work consultant.

Part IV expanded upon the themes developed earlier. If the participants in the social work educational process were viewed as elements in a social system, and if specific aspects of field instruction were desirable so that efforts should be made to achieve their implementation, in what ways should the FWC operate within the field work system in order to achieve the goals outlined in Part III? Part IV therefore detailed the role relationships in

which the FWC should be involved by virtue of her position in the field work system.

These embraced relationships with supervisors, students, agency executives and boards, and elements within the university sub-system.

Part IV of the present study therefore fulfilled the fourth aim of the study, namely,

> "On the basis of a study of available literature, engagement in the activities associated with the role of field work consultant, and empirical research, to explore the functions and responsibilities of the field work consultant and to conceptualise the role relationships between the field work consultant and the other participants in the social work educational process conceived of as elements in a social system."

Five hypotheses were formulated at the commencement of the present study.

The second and third hypotheses related to features of the field instruction programmes in the student placements studied. In terms of the second hypothesis, it was anticipated that field instruction centres would differ with respect to the pattern of field instruction they provided and in particular with regard to the amount and type of supervision offered. The results of the annual projects in 1968 and 1969 and the supplementary, weekly project in 1969 confirm this hypothesis. The ten field instruction centres utilised over the two year period did in fact differ in terms of aspects of the field instruction they offered, while the seven field instruction centres operating as such in 1969 displayed wide variation in the amount and type of supervision they provided.

The third hypothesis related to the content of the supervisory sessions conducted at field instruction centres and was divided

into two parts. In terms of the first sub-section it was anticipated that discussions related to the objective aspects of the case, or case management, would occur more frequently than the discussion of subjective factors or the emotional aspects of the situation. The empirical data in part confirmed this hypothesis, and in part indicated that it was false. Student responses to the annual questionnaire in 1968 and 1969 revealed that "objective action" was discussed frequently in approximately 80% of placements while the topic "subjective aspects" was discussed frequently in 45% of placements. However, student responses to the weekly questionnaire in the supplementary project in 1969 indicated that "objective action" was discussed during formal supervision in an average of 50% of the total number of weeks in which students worked in field instruction centres, while "subjective aspects" featured in 54% of field work weeks. While this finding must lead to the rejection of hypothesis III(i) it is noteworthy that both the percentages derived from the data are low. The discussion of subjective aspects of social work as defined in the present study is central to the student's learning and should feature during supervision in the large majority of the weeks which make up a student's concurrent placement in an agency.

Hypothesis III(ii) stated that"discussions involving the integration of theory and practice would occur infrequently" and the results of both projects substantiated this view.

The fourth hypothesis related to one aspect of the field work consultant's role in relation to supervisors. It was anticipated that a series of seminars on supervision conducted by the field work consultant for supervisors would be positively evaluated by the participants. The data reported in Chapter 11 showed that this hypothesis was correct, while the results of the analysis of the tutorials conducted by the field work consultant

for the eleven final-year students at the University of the Witwatersrand School of Social Work in 1969 confirm the fifth hypothesis, namely, that

> it would be demonstrated that there is a need for regular consultations between the field work consultant and students participating in the field instruction programme.

It is further submitted that the study as a whole, the empirical data and the documentation from the social work literature, indicates that the first hypothesis stated in Chapter 1, Section 6, has validity. This hypothesis stated as follows:

> the position "field work consultant" involves certain identifiable role responsibilities which would make it a strategically important post on the establishment of a university school or department of social work.

It would appear from the present study that the field work consultant has a strategic role to play in initating and stimulating action which has the effect of keeping the field work system in a state of relative equilibrium so that a productive field instruction programme can be maintained.

14.2 Recommendations arising from the Present Study

In the light of all the relevant findings obtained in the present study, the following recommendations have been formulated.

I General

(i) It is suggested that the term "field work consultant "be adopted in preference to other possible terms at present in use, as this describes most appropriately the nature of the functions associated with the position.

(ii) In view of the important role which the field work consultant plays as a catalyst within the field instruction programme, it is recommended that universities make provision for posts of "field work consultants" on the establishment of their schools or departments of social work in sufficient numbers so that the staff-student ratio remain low enough to enable each incumbent to perform her role adequately.

(iii) The posts "field work consultants" should be accorded full academic status in the same way as lecturing posts. As Sherman Merle wrote in the American context:

> Advisement as a functional responsibility should be seen as a specialized function.... I suggest that the importance of the advising function should encourage the development of special skills in this area and that schools should recognise and accredit this specialization as they accredit teaching and research. Student advisement should not be thought of as something anyone can do with his left hand.[5]

To paraphrase this in South African terms, it may be said that universities should acknowledge that specialised knowledge and skill are required of those members of the academic staff who are delegated the responsibility of organising and co-ordinating the field work programme, and that staff members performing these tasks should be given credit for the expertise demanded of them.

(iv) It is submitted that the role of the FWC should be viewed as a blend of social worker and educationalist. It represents one form of expression of the professional practice of social work and should therefore be based on social work principles. However, it is primarily an educational role, and the FWC should therefore be acquainted with principles developed within the field of educational theory and practice. Within the performance of her role, the FWC should express her own personality with genuineness and authenticity. She should also operate with flexibility within the defined structure of the educational system, and individualise students as far as possible

II Recommendations emerging from the historical survey

(i) The status of the degree Bachelor of Arts in Social Work at the University of the Witwatersrand requires further clarification. As graduates who have achieved an academically acceptable standard can proceed directly to the degree of Master of Arts in Social Work at the same University, but not necessarily at other South African Universities, the School of Social Work should request the University further to investigate ways in which such students could receive official recognition that their Bachelor's degree is of honours status. Possibly the introduction of a dual curriculum in the fourth year of study and the selection of students for the different branches of that curriculum at the end of the third year of study, could be explored.

(ii) It would seem that a fitting culmination to the professional preparation of social work students at the University, in the classroom and in the field, would be for graduands to take an oath similar to the Hippocratic Oath or the oath taken by students who receive the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Speech and Hearing Therapy. Such an innovation was proposed at the University of the Witwatersrand in 1954, when the following form of declaration was suggested.

> As a graduate in Social Work of the University of the Witwatersrand, I do solemnly declare:
>
> THAT I shall exercise my profession to the best of my knowledge and ability for the social welfare of my clients:
>
> THAT I shall not improperly divulge anything I have learned in my professional capacity;
>
> THAT in my relations with clients and colleagues I shall conduct myself as becomes a member of the honourable profession of social work.[6]

III The role of the field work consultant in relation to the field instruction programme at the University of the Witwatersrand in general, and in relation to supervision in particular

(a) As a general principle, the field work

consultant with her colleagues in the School of Social Work must define the objectives and essential content of the field instruction programme. These definitions should be clearly formulated in a written Guide to Field Instruction Centres, and communicated to the agencies concerned through the Guide and through discussion. In the words of a publication issued by the Council on Social Work Education in the United States, this serves the purpose of leaving "field instructors freer to do a more creative job than they can with present uncertainties about what they are expected to teach."[7]

(b) The following are specific recommendations relating to aspects of field instruction:

(i) The field work consultant must interpret to agencies more fully than at present, that they and the student supervisors they appoint undertake an educational commitment when they accept students for field instruction. This should embrace the appointment of one, clearly-designated supervisor for the duration of the student's placement, with a deputy who can supervise the student on those occasions when the supervisor has to be absent from the agency for unavoidable reasons.

(ii) Supervisors should be relieved of part of their workloads when they are assigned responsibility for supervising students, and the field work consultant should negotiate with agencies in this connection.

(iii) The field work consultant should be imaginative in the selection of field placements for students, and flexible in the implementation of school-made rules relating to field instruction. Potentially beneficial or interesting placements should not be automatically rejected because no social work supervisor is available if a talented member of another, related profession could provide the student with a valuable learning experience in consultation with the field work consultant.

Each instance should be considered on its individual merits.

(iv) Agencies should be further encouraged to formulate a clear policy regarding the manner in which students should introduce themselves to clients. Supervisors must inform their students and other agency staff members of this policy. In the Guide to Field Instruction Centres and in verbal discussions the field work consultant should emphasise the importance of clear, unambiguous communication between supervisors, students and staff about agency policy on this and other issues.

(v) The approximate number of cases which is desirable for inclusion in a student's case load is twelve, and ideally these should comprise both short-term and long-term cases. There should be consultation between the field work consultant and supervisors regarding the selection of cases for students.

(vi) Supervisors need to be encouraged to increase the administrative component in field instruction by arranging for students to attend meetings of the board or other administrative committees in the agency.

(vii) Visits of observation should feature as part of field instruction in all placements and this is another area which requires emphasis in negotiations between the field work consultant and field instruction centres.

(c) The following are specific recommendations relating to the supervisory process:

(i) The field work consultant should assist field instruction centres to understand the vital role played by formal supervision in field instruction, and to develop their resources to provide such supervision as far as is practicable. She should aim through her activities to increase the proportion of field work weeks in which students receive formal supervision.

(ii) In work with field instruction centres, the field work consultant should concentrate on providing a detailed exposition of the other features which should characterise formal supervision of the required standard, for example, the need for scheduled appointments at a regular time, initiated by the Supervisor, the desirability of the session being of one to two hours duration, and the use of process records as a basis for discussion.

(iii) As the results indicated that different patterns of supervision existed in different field instruction centres, it is clear that the field work consultant must individualise field instruction centres and direct her activities in each case according to the specific circumstances and needs of the situation existing in each agency.

(iv) Informal supervision also serves an important function in field instruction. It is recommended therefore that there should be a more explicit definition by the field work consultant of the role of this type of supervision in the field work programme. This should be mentioned in the Guide to Field Instruction Centres and interpreted in discussions with supervisors.

(v) With reference to the content of supervisory sessions, the field work consultant must enable supervisors to concentrate to a greater extent particularly on the discussion of the following topics as defined in the present study:

subjective aspects of social work;
the integration of theory and practice;
policy and administration of the agency.

(vi) The more extensive use of group supervision should be explored in agencies providing placements to two or more students at a time.

(vii) Evaluation discussions between supervisor and student should take place periodically during placements, and particularly towards the end of every placement.

IV The Role of the Field Work Consultant in Relation to the Field Work System

(i) The field work consultant must initiate and facilitate appropriate and well-timed communication between all the elements of the field work system, and particularly within the field work triad, supervisor, student and field work consultant.

(ii) In relation to supervisors, the field work consultant should fultil three types of function: administrative, educational and consultative. The educational function should be aimed at cultivating within supervisors the same concept of social work education in general and field instruction in particular which is held by the School of Social Work. If supervisors understand these concepts and identify with the School's approach the foundation will have been laid for the administrative and consultative functions of the field work consultant, who will then be able to avoid the image of an overseer, an "expert" to be feared and resented. Her image should rather be that of an authoritative colleague participating in a co-operative enterprise in which mutual consultation can occur.

(iii) The educational function can be fulfilled by means of written guides of manuals on field work, prepared outlines for students' evaluation reports, orientation and assessment meetings, and courses for supervisors. On-going seminars for supervisors should be an integral part of the university's field work programme.

(iv) To give credence to the concept of partnership, it is recommended that supervisors play some part in curriculum

planning. As an initial step, an annual meeting could be held to communicate to field teachers full details of the theoretical curriculum and to ascertain their views and suggestions about it. This could lead in time to the formation of curriculum committees with representatives from both school and agencies.

(v) To aid the field work consultant in selecting suitable agencies and supervisors for field instruction, it is suggested that the co-operation of National Councils and Professional Associations of Social Workers be enlisted as sources of information in this connection.

(vi) Social work education involves the emotions as well as the intellect, and consequently there is a need for the individualisation of the student at the school in order to assist her to integrate her theoretical and field learning. It important therefore for the field work consultant to have regular, scheduled consultations or tutorials with all students. In this connection, the field work consultant's role should be mainly though not exclusively, to aid students in the integration of their field work into their total educational experience.

(vii) In relation to the agency sub-system it is recommended that the field work consultant communicate not only with the supervisor, but also with the executive director. In addition, she should have some direct contact with the staff group as a whole and the board. It is suggested that she should attend meetings of these groups within the agency from time to time in order to interpret to them the purposes and methods of field instruction. Agency executives as well as supervisors should in their turn attend meetings at the university periodically to discuss social work education in general and field instruction in particular, and other significant issues in social welfare.

(viii) Within the University sub-system the FWC should maintain close relationships with the Head of the

Department and her colleagues, who have an important role in defining the objectives of field instruction as part of an integrated curriculum and in contributing to the educational programme for supervisors.

(ix) The school or department of social work is however not an independent entity and the role of the university administration needs to be considered in an examination of the functioning of the field work system as a whole.

(x) The question of the costs of field instruction in particular needs to be fully canvassed. The creation of joint appointments for supervisors financed by both the university and field instruction centres, could possibly be explored in detail. Even if this would be impracticable at the present time the university should be encouraged to afford added recognition to the contribution made by field instruction centres to its courses. This could be done by including the names of co-operating agencies and supervisors in the university calendar, and other more tangible methods.

(xi) The university administration should also be encouraged to establish some form of direct communication with the boards of field instruction centres, whether this be an annual letter of appreciation from the Vice-Chancellor of the University to the Chairman of the Board or the head of a government department, or whether it be the organisation of social functions for agency officials on appropriate occasions.

14.3 Conclusion

It is hoped that the present study has made a contribution towards the goal of improved and enriched field instruction for social work students, both within the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, and in other South African Universities. Hopefully its content may assist in the specialised preparation of university

staff members appointed to act as field work consultants. As Dr. Victoria Olds stated in Soffen's book "The Social Work Educator."

> As new faculty members are helped to develop and to become more competent as teachers benefits will accrue in the form of higher levels in the quality of teaching and in the professional growth of students, to the advantage of an improved social work practice in all areas.[8]

Yet continuous questioning and re-examination of role responsibilities in social work education will always be necessary. Circumstances are constantly changing and ideals difficult to attain. The present study will conclude with the words of Charlotte Towle:

> In so far as we are motivated by something akin to divine discontent with conditions of practice in social work and in education, we will progressively set our aims to determine the direction of our striving, even though they may not measure our current attainment.[9]

NOTES TO CHAPTER 14

1. Sir John Denham. "Of Prudence," quoted in Kathleen Woodroofe From Charity to Social Work in England and the United States, p.2.

2. Arthur L. Leader, "An Agency's View Toward Education for Practice". Journal of Education for Social Work, 7 no.3: 27, 1971.

3. Jan de Jongh, "A European Experiment in Casework Teaching." Social Casework, 34: 15, 1953.

4. Bess Dana. "The Role of National Agencies in Stimulating the Improvement and Expansion of Field Instruction Resources: Conference Highlights." C.S.W.E. Field Instruction in Graduate Social Work Education: Old Problems and New Proposals, p.62.

5. Sherman Merle, "Student Advising." Social Work Education Reporter, XVII no. 2: 53, 1969.

6. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Document No. Misc. F.A.S./163A/74, page 2.

7. Council on Social Work Education, Content of Field Teaching, p.21.

8. Victoria Olds, "Orientation of New Faculty." Soffen (ed.) The Social Work Educator, p.76.

9. Charlotte Towle. The Learner in Education for the Professions p.411.

APPENDIX 1

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

QUESTIONNAIRE RELATING TO FIELD INSTRUCTION (PRACTICAL TRAINING) OF SOCIAL WORK IV STUDENTS : CONCURRENT PLACEMENT MARCH - SEPTEMBER 1968/1969

Throughout the questionnaire the word "student" refers to the student from the University of the Witwatersrand, School of Social Work, who was placed with your Agency for Field Instruction every Thursday and Friday for 25 weeks from the end February till September 1968/1969. For the purpose of simplicity the student is referred to as "she".

This questionnaire should be completed by the individual member of the social work staff who was assigned to supervise the student during the placement.

Where alternative answers to questions are provided, place a cross (X) in the square opposite that statement which most closely represents your answer.

Thank you for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire. Data secured from the responses to all the questionnaires will be combined and included in a research dissertation. Individual answers will be treated in the strictest confidence.

1. How many cases and/or groups did the student work with during her placement? _____

2. On what basis were they selected for inclusion in the student's work load? _____

_____

3. Did you inform the student as to the manner in which she should introduce herself to clients?

YES ☐
NO ☐

4. If YES to Question 3, was the student instructed to introduce herself

AS A STUDENT ☐
AS A STAFF MEMBER ☐
IN A NON-SPECIFIC WAY, E.G. "Miss Jones from Agency X" ☐
OTHER (please specify) _____

5. Was any instruction given to the telephonist/receptionist of the Agency as to how the status of the student in the Agency should be indicated to clients?

YES ☐
NO ☐

6. If YES to Question 5, was the telephonist/receptionist instructed to refer to the student

AS A STUDENT ☐
AS A STAFF MEMBER ☐
IN AN EVASIVE WAY ☐

OTHER (please specify) _____

7. Did the student attend any meetings of the Board and/or other committees concerned with the Administration of the service offered by the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

8. Did the student pay any visits of observation to organizations and services whose work is related to the work of your Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

9. Was the student required to draft any letters on behalf of the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

10. Was the student required to make any telephone calls in connection with the work of the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

11. Estimate how much of your time per week was occupied in supervising the student, both in informal discussions and/or formal supervisory sessions.

1 - 59 minutes	☐
60 - 119 minutes	☐
120 - 239 minutes	☐
240 minutes or more	☐

12. Please read the following list of topics and indicate in the appropriate square whether or not each one was included for discussion during supervision of student.

a. Objective action taken in the case - what has been done and what must be done next

YES ☐
NO ☐

b. Subjective aspects of the case i.e. dynamics of the interview; the student's feelings and reactions; the student's role in the interview; process of interaction between student and client.

YES ☐
NO ☐

c. Integration of theory and practice i.e. relationship between theoretical concepts and events in the interview or case, and/or recommendations of reading matter relevant to case.

YES ☐
NO ☐

d. Policy and administration of agency i.e. procedure relating to translation of policy into service.

YES ☐
NO ☐

e. Office procedures such as keeping of records, content and style of letters, reports

YES ☐
NO ☐

f. Other topics included (please specify) _____

_____

13. a. Did your supervision of the student include formal supervisory discussions by appointment with the student?

YES ☐
NO ☐

b. Did your supervision include spontaneous informal discussion with the student as circumstances permitted?

NO ☐

c. If both formal and informal sessions took place on which did the emphasis fall?

FORMAL SESSIONS ☐
INFORMAL SESSIONS ☐

14. If formal supervisory sessions were held:

a. How often did these occur on the average during the duration of the placement?

WEEKLY ☐
FORTNIGHTLY ☐
AT IRREGULAR INTERVALS WHENEVER TIME WAS AVAILABLE ☐

OTHER (please specify) _____

b. How long did each last, on average?

1 - 30 minutes ☐
31 - 60 minutes ☐
61 minutes or more ☐

c. Did you give the student individual supervisory sessions?

YES ☐
NO ☐

d. Did you include more than one student in the supervisory sessions?

YES ☐
NO ☐

e. If both individual and group sessions were provided, which type predominated?

INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS ☐
GROUP SESSIONS ☐

15. Was the student required to present process records of interviews for purposes of supervision? (A process record is defined as a verbatim record of an interview)

YES ☐
NO ☐

16. Did more than one professional staff member have formal responsibility for the supervision of the student at any one time during the placement?

YES ☐
NO ☐

17. If you answered YES to Question 16, please indicate how many staff members in addition to yourself? _____

18. List their names and position in the Agency:

for example: Miss A. Smith Case Secretary

	NAME	DESIGNATION
1.		
2.		
3.		

19. Before the student left the Agency did you discuss with her an evaluation of her placement with you?

YES ☐
NO ☐

20. Were you relieved of any part of your case load to make up for the time you devoted to supervising the student?

YES ☐
NO ☐

21. Would you kindly supply the following information about yourself:

a. Academic qualifications _____

b. Number of years of Social Work practice since graduation _____

c. Position in Agency:

Administrator ☐
Supervisor ☐
Caseworker ☐

22. Please make any general comments on the placement or the programme of field instruction: _____

APPENDIX 2

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

QUESTIONNAIRE RELATING TO CONCURRENT PLACEMENT IN SOCIAL WORK AGENCY FOR FIELD INSTRUCTION : MARCH - SEPTEMBER 1968/1969

To be completed by Students of Social Work IV 1968/1969

Where alternative answers to questions are provided, place a cross (X) in the square opposite that statement which most clearly represents your answer.

Thank you for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire. Data secured from the responses to all the questionnaires will be combined and included in a research disseration.

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

NAME OF AGENCY: _____

PERIOD OF PLACEMENT; FROM _____ TO _____

1. How many cases and/or groups did you work with during your placement? _____

2. Did you participate in the decision to include specific case./groups in your work load?

YES ☐
NO ☐

3. At the commencement of the placement, were you informed as to the manner in which you should introduce yourself to clients?

YES ☐
NO ☐

4. If you answered YES to Question 3, were you instructed to introduce yourself

AS A STUDENT ☐
AS A STAFF MEMBER ☐
IN A NON-SPECIFIC WAY e.g. "Miss Jones from Agency X" ☐

5. Was any instruction given to the telephonist/receptionist of the Agency as to how the status of the student in the Agency should be indicated to clients?

YES ☐
NO ☐

6. If YES to Question 5, was the telephonist/receptionist instructed to refer to the student

AS A STUDENT ☐
AS A STAFF MEMBER ☐
IN AN EVASIVE WAY ☐

OTHER (Please specify) _____

7. Did you attend any meetings of the Board and/or other committees concerned with the administration of the service offered by the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

8. Did you pay any visits of observation to organizations and services whose work is related to the work of the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

9. Were you required to draft any letters on behalf of the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

10. Were you required to make any telephone calls in connection with the work of the Agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

11. State the name(s) and designation of members of staff who supervised you within the agency during the period of your placement. Please also state the time period during which they supervised you.

For example: Miss A. Jones Case Secretary March-May
Mrs. J. Smith Senior Social Worker June-September

NAME	DESIGNATION	TIME PERIOD

12. Did more than one professional staff member have formal responsibility for your supervision at any one time during the placement?

YES ☐
NO ☐

13. If you answered YES to Question 14, please indicate how many staff members _____

14. List their names and position in the Agency:

For example: Miss A. Smith Case Secretary

NAME	DESIGNATION
1.	
2.	
3.	

15. Estimate how much time per week was devoted to your supervision, both in informal discussions and/or formal supervisory sessions.

1	- 59 minutes	☐
60	- 119 minutes	☐
120	- 239 minutes	☐
240 minutes or more		☐

16. Please read the following list of topics and indicate in the appropriate square whether or not each one was included for discussion during supervision sessions:

a. Objective situation taken in the case - what has been done and what must be done next

YES, FREQUENTLY	☐
YES, INFREQUENTLY	☐
NO	☐

b. Subjective aspects of the case i.e. dynamics of the interview; the student's feelings and reactions; the student's role in the interview; process of interaction between student and client.

YES, FREQUENTLY	☐
YES, INFREQUENTLY	☐
NO	☐

c. Integration of theory and practice i.e. relationship between theoretical concepts and events in the interview or case, and/or recommendations of reading matter relevant to case.

YES, FREQUENTLY	☐
YES, INFREQUENTLY	☐
NO	☐

d. Policy and administration of agency i.e. procedure relating to translation of policy into service.

YES, FREQUENTLY ☐
YES, INFREQUENTLY ☐
NO ☐

e. Office procedures such as keeping of records, content and style of letters, reports

YES, FREQUENTLY ☐
YES, INFREQUENTLY ☐
NO ☐

f. Other topics included (please specify) _____

17.a. Did your supervision include formal supervisory sessions by appointment with your supervisor?

YES ☐
NO ☐

b. Did your supervision include spontaneous informal discussion with your supervisor as his/her work circumstances permitted?

YES ☐
NO ☐

c. If both formal and informal sessions took place on which did the emphasis fall?

FORMAL SESSIONS ☐
INFORMAL SESSIONS ☐

18. If formal supervisory sessions were held:

a. How often did these occur on average during the duration of your placement?

WEEKLY ☐
FORTNIGHTLY ☐
AT IRREGULAR INTERVALS WHENEVER TIME WAS AVAILABLE ☐
OTHER (please specify) _____

b. How long did each session last, on average?

1 - 30 MINUTES ☐
31 - 60 MINUTES ☐
61 MINUTES OR MORE ☐

c. Were other students included in your sessions?

YES ☐
NO ☐

d. Did you have individual supervisory sessions?

YES ☐
NO ☐

e. If both individual and group sessions were provided, which type predominated?

INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS ☐
GROUP SESSIONS ☐

19. Were you required to present process records of interviews for purposes of supervision? (A process record is defined as a verbatim record of an interview)

YES ☐
NO ☐

20. Before you left the Agency did your supervisor discuss with you an evaluation of your placement with the agency?

YES ☐
NO ☐

21. Please make any general comments on the placement or the programme of field instruction: _____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX 3

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND - SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Weekly Supervision Record Sheets Relating to Concurrent Placement in Social Work Agency for Field Instruction - Social Work IV students, 1969

Where alternative answers to questions are provided, please place a cross (X) in the square opposite that statement which most clearly represents your answer.

Thank you for your co-operation in completing this questionnaire. Data secured from the responses to all the questionnaires will be combined and included in a research dissertation.

Students Please Note: You are required to work two days per week for 25 weeks. A week is defined as the two days, Thursday and Friday, worked in the agency. Kindly number the weeks you work consecutively from 1 to 25, and note that the two days, 27th and 28th February 1969, constituted week number one (1).

* * * * * * * * *

Name of Student:

Name of Agency:

Number of Week:

Dates of Days Worked:

1. How many individual formal supervisory sessions did you have at the agency this week? ("Formal" is defined as a pre-arranged supervisory session in which a student and a social worker sit down together with the purpose of discussing the student's work)

☐ None

☐ One

☐ Two

IF YOU ANSWERED "None" TO QUESTION 1, PLEASE OMIT QUESTIONS 2 - 6.

2. What is the name of the social worker who conducted the formal supervisory session with you?.....

3. Was this individual, formal supervisory session:

☐ YES Pre-arranged on the initiative of the social worker?

☐ NO

☐ YES Pre-arranged at your request?

☐ NO

4. How long did the individual, formal supervisory sessions last? .....HOURS .....MINUTES

5. At what time did they commence?

First Session: DAY ..... TIME.....

Second Session: DAY ..... TIME.....

6. Was any process record written by you used as a basis for discussion during the individual, formal supervisory session?

☐ YES

☐ NO

7. Estimate how much time was devoted to your supervision in the agency this week, OTHER THAN in individual, formal supervisory sessions recorded in Question 4 above:

☐ No time

☐ Less than 1 hour

☐ From 1 to 2 hours

☐ More than 2 hours, up to 4 hours

☐ More than 4 hours

8. Did you have any formal supervisory sessions in a <u>group</u> with another student or students during this week?

☐ YES

☐ NO

9. The following is a list of topics which can be discussed during supervisory sessions.

Please place a cross (X) opposite those topics discussed during your supervision this week:

		Individual formal supervisory session
a)	Objective action taken in the case; what has been done and what must be done next	▱
b)	Subjective aspects of the case; dynamics of the interview; the student's role in the interview; process of interaction between student and client.	▱
c)	Integration of theory and practice: relationship between theoretical concepts and events in the interview or case, and/or recommendation of reading matter relevant to the case	▱
d)	Policy and administration of agency: procedure relating to translation of policy into service	▱
e)	Office procedures such as keeping of records, content and style of letters, reports	▱
f)	Other topics included (Please specify)	

.....

.....

10. Have you any special comments to make on your supervision this week? If so, please comment:

Signature of Student: .....

Number of Week: .....

APPENDIX 4

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

FIELD INSTRUCTION IN SOCIAL WORK FOR SENIOR STUDENTS

GUIDE TO FIELD INSTRUCTION CENTRES

Please note: For purposes of simplified reading, the student is referred to in the feminine, and agency personnel in the masculine.

INTRODUCTION:

1. Field Instruction forms an integral part of the professional education of social workers. Its aim is to enable the student to relate theory and practice, gain skill in social work practice and develop self awareness. To achieve these objectives, the field instruction of students is a shared responsibility between the School of Social Work and the field instruction centres in the community.

2. In the third year of study the student is expected to make a thorough theoretical study of social casework as one of the methods of social work, and to receive in addition preliminary field instruction in community organisation.

3. In the fourth year of study, field instruction is aimed at enabling the student develop her skill in social casework, or in certain instances, in social group work or community organisation.

4. It is also regarded as important for a student to receive field instruction in the secondary processes of social work, viz. social work administration and social work research during the course of her learning one or more of the primary methods.

FIELD WORK REQUIREMENTS

5. In the third year of study the student is required to do 320 hours (8 weeks) of field work during University vacations. Two to three weeks shall be spent doing field work in the mid-year winter vacation, and the remainder in the summer vacation at the end of the year. No concurrent field work is done for purposes of the third year of study.

6. In the fourth year of study the student is required to do 400 hours of concurrent field work during University terms. This is done at the rate of two days per week (Thursdays and Fridays) for 25 weeks throughout the academic year commencing on the first week of the academic year and excluding the mid-year University vacation. Students by arrangement with their Agencies, may or may not work during the short April vacation.

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

7. A Field Instruction Centre is an organisation or social welfare agency in the community, which by arrangement with the School of Social Work provides facilities for social work students to gain practical experience in social work.

8. The term "block placement" refers to the full-time attendance of a student at an agency for the purposes of receiving field instruction. This takes place during University vacations and the phrase corresponds to the term "vacation practical" as used by the Department of Social Welfare and Pensions.

9. The term "concurrent placement" refers to the part-time attendance of a student at an agency for the purposes of receiving field instruction. This takes place during University terms while the student is concurrently attending lectures, and the term is the equivalent of "continuous practical" as used by the Department of Social Welfare and Pensions.

10. The term "field instructor" is assigned to that member of staff of the School of Social Work who is responsible for the organisation of the field instruction programme.

11. The term "supervisor" is used to designate the particular member of staff assigned by the agency/organisation to assume the day to day responsibility for the student's learning experience in the agency.

PRINCIPLES OF THE FIELD INSTRUCTION PROGRAMME

12. The programme of field instruction is the joint responsibility of the School of Social Work and the field instruction centre concerned.

13. The Board of Management of the registered welfare organisation, or in the case of a government or provincial department, the Head Office, is the body responsible for the instructional programme of the student at the field instruction centre. All arrangements pertaining to the programme will be made between the School and the Executive Officer as representative of the Board or Head Office.

14. As from the commencement of the academic year on 24th February, 1969, a fee of R1.00 per student per day is payable by the University of the Witwatersrand, in respect of students placed at field instruction centres.

15. The responsibility for the day to day supervision of students rests with the supervisor in the field instruction centre. However, the responsibility for the student's <u>total</u> learning experience during the period of placement rests with the organisation as a whole.

16. The field instructor of the School of Social Work is responsible for liaison between the School, the organisation providing field instruction, the Executive Officer, the supervisor and the student.

17. Although the student may sometimes serve temporarily as a member of staff, the primary focus of each placement remains education, i.e making the work a learning experience for the student.

18. Students come to field instruction centres initially equipped with limited theoretical knowledge. This expands during the course of their studies at the School but the supervisor is responsible for teaching the student certain practical aspects of the work. (The theoretical syllabus of the School is attached - See Appendix 1).

19. As field instruction placements are a learning experience, students are not remunerated for their work. It is suggested, however, that if students are required to travel on behalf of the organisation, such transport costs should be refunded to the student by the organisation. If the organisation has its own means of transport, students should where possible be permitted to use this.

THE ROLE OF THE FIELD INSTRUCTION CENTRE:

20. In the procedure set out below, it is assumed that arrangements will be made with the executive officer who will, as representative of the board of management or head office of the department, keep the board or head office informed of all arrangements pertaining to the field instruction programme.

21. The field instructor initiates arrangements with the executive officer of the field instruction centre (subject to the approval of his organisation) in relation to:

    a. the form the programme should take;
    b. The assignment of a member of staff as supervisor;
    c. the selection of students.

22. To ensure the smooth running of the field instruction programme, close co-operation between the organisation and the School of Social Work is essential at all times.

23. If possible it is desirable for the field instruction centre to accommodate at least two students simultaneously particularly for concurrent field work in the fourth year of study. This is advantageous from the educational point of view.

24. The field instruction centre shall formulate a policy with regard to how the student should introduce herself to clients. This

policy decision shall be communicated to the student and to all other members of staff, both professional and clerical.

25. It is desirable that the centre make provision as far as possible for the following facilities:

a. working accommodation for the students (e.g. an office, or table and chair, or chair and desk drawer);
b. access to records;
c. regular supervision sessions. These are an essential part of the field instruction programme. The supervisors normal duties and workload may require some adjustment in order to allow time for such supervisory sessions.

26. The Executive Officer is required to submit to the School of Social Work progress and evaluation reports drawn up in conjunction with the supervisor after discussions with the student.

27. The field instructor discussed with the supervisor and executive officer any difficulties or suggested improvements in regard to procedures relating to the field instruction programme. Where necessary, the executive officer may consult with the Director of Studies of the School of Social Work directly.

28. The final arrangements to give effect to the above proposals will be subject to confirmation by the School of Social Work in consultation with the Board of Management of the Welfare Organisation or Senior Official of the Department.

29. Field instruction centres are requested not to employ registered students of the School by private arrangement without prior consultation with the School.

Dissertation:

30. Fourth year students are required to present to the School in September of each year a dissertation based on a modest research project. It is advisable though not essential that the research be conducted in the agency or organisation where the student is receiving field instruction.

31. The student may consult the executive officer and/or supervisor with regard to the selection of a topic which would be of interest and use to both agency and student, but the student may not continue such consultation with regard to the details of the research. The supervision of the dissertation is the responsibility of a member of the lecturing staff of the School.

32. Where the topic selected is related to the work of the Field Instruction Centre, the agency must approve the topic selected

and the agency executive's written permission to conduct the research project must be obtained by the student and presented to the School not later than the 1st May.

33. Time designated for field instruction in the agency may not be utilised by the student for the pursuance of the research project for the dissertation.

THE SUPERVISOR:

34. The liaison between the University and the field instruction centre is maintained by the field instructor and the supervisor in co-operation. These two have separate areas of responsibility but there is some overlap, e.g. the assessment of the student's progress, strengths and weaknesses. They share the aim of providing the student with a constructive learning experience.

35. To this end, the School of Social Work undertakes to hold seminars for supervisors.

36. Ideally the supervisor should be a social worker with a minimum of two years experience after graduation and should have been a member of staff at the agency for a minimum period of six months.

37. The supervisor is responsible for drawing up the programme of field instruction for the student.

38. The supervisor undertakes the responsibility for the day to day supervision of the student in the field instruction centre.

39. The supervisor shall be responsible for the selection of cases for the student. The main criterion for selection of assignments for the students should be their educational value in accordance with the student's current stage of learning. Assignments should also be selected with the aim of acquainting the student with the various services offered by the agency.

40. Regular supervisory sessions are essential. Supervisors should strive towards giving each student individually an hour supervision at the same time each week. Group sessions may be held in addition. The supervisor is able to guide the student and assess her progress by means of the supervisory conference.

41. The supervision of students includes giving help and support both in relation to the work the student is doing and to the feelings the student may have about doing such work.

42. The supervisor may also do some direct teaching related to the integration of theory and practice and/or the use of community resources.

43. It is desirable for supervision to include discussion based on process records presented by the student to the supervisor.

44. The supervisor reports regularly to the chief executive on the progress of the field programme.

45. The supervisor is required to bring to the notice of the field instructor any difficulties pertaining to the student's placement in the field instruction centre, and/or any changes in the programme such as a change of supervisor.

46. Periodically the field instructor and the supervisor review the student's progress in the organisation.

47. At the end of the student's placement the supervisor is required to submit a written evaluation report on the student. The supervisor discusses the report with the student prior to submission (Suggested outlines for reports on third- and fourth-year students are attached. See Appendix II).

THE PROGRAMME OF FIELD INSTRUCTION:

48. The programme of field instruction includes the operations of the whole organization as well as the direct services which constitute the student's work assignment.

49. The programme includes the following elements;

The student's introduction to the organisation;
Observation by the student of the organisation's range of services;
Student delivery of social work service;
Evaluation of student's performance.

50. These elements are described separately in the paragraphs below but it should be noted that in actual practice they do not follow upon one another in strict order and indeed may occur simultaneously in the instructional process.

Introduction to the Organisation;

51. The student's introduction to the organisation includes:

a. Making the acquaintance of the supervisor and other members of the staff. It is desirable that the student meet one of the top level executives and one of the Board members of the organisation soon after the commencement of the placement.

b Undertaking a tour of the organisation under the direction of the supervisor including short visits to the administrative as well as the service divisions of the organisation.

c. Receiving an explanation of structure, policy and functions of the organisation, its administrative and clerical procedures.

d. Studying documents such as the constitution of the organisation, relevant legislation and other publications relating to the service.

Observation:

52. At the commencement of the placement, the supervisor may at his discretion arrange for the student to observe a number of interviews conducted by the supervisor and/or other social workers. In such cases the prior permission of the client should be obtained.

53. The student may write reports on interviews observed and discuss her impressions with the supervisor.

54. The student should spend a short period observing the recording system of the field instruction centre.

55. The student should attend meetings of the Board and/or administrative committees in an observational capacity.

56. The student should be given the opportunity to pay visits of observation to other agencies and institutions in the community whose work is relevant to the services offered by the field instruction centre.

Student's Delivery of Social Work Service:

57. A third year block placement may involve mainly observation, but where possible it is desirable for a student to conduct a few interviews after an initial period of observation.

58. In a fourth year concurrent placement the supervisor assigns to the student responsibility for a small workload.

59. The student should undertake all activities related to the progress of the case, for example, telephone calls, drafing of correspondence and reports.

60. All letters and reports written by the student should be reviewed by the supervisor.

61. The student should fulfil the recording requirements of the agency and in addition should keep process records of cases for presentation at supervisory sessions.

62. The student should attend case conferences and/or meetings of professional staff within the field instruction centre.

63. Appropriate and explicit arrangements should be made as to which staff member will deal with the student's clients if an emergency should arise on the days the student is not at the agency.

Evaluation of Performance:

64. The purpose of evaluating the student's performance is not only to assess her professional capabilities but also to further the student's learning.

65. Before the completion of the period of field instruction the supervisor should have a discussion with the student for the purpose of a joint evaluation of the student's performance.

66 During a concurrent placement, such evaluative discussions should be held periodically.

THE STUDENT:

67. In the third year of study, students are placed with more than one organisation in order to provide them with a varied experience.

68. In the fourth year of study, students are placed with only one organisation for concurrent fieldwork.

69. The latter portion of block field work in the third year of study shall be done in the same agency where the student will receive concurrent field instruction in the fourth year of study.

70. All students have taken an Oath of Confidentiality at the beginning of the second year of study. (Copy attached Appendix III).

71. During their field instruction placements students are answerable to their supervisors for the performance of their work.

72. Students are required to write process records of selected assignments. These should be typewritten in duplicate, one copy being for the organisation and one copy being for their own use. Such reports shall be used for supervision purposes.

73. Students arrange and finance their own transport to and from their field work placements.

74. Students follow the agency's regular work hours on the days they are required to be in field work. The exception is the case of the student who is required to attend courses in either Sociology III or Psychology III in the final year of study. Such a student may be absent from the agency only for the minimum period required to attend lectures in one of these subjects, and should inform the supervisor of the duration of such absences.

75. In the fourth year of study, it is generally expected that students restrict their field work activities to those days each week on which they are assigned to the agency, and to that period of field work prescribed by the University.

76. Occasionally, students may be required by the School to participate in events which have educational significance for them for example, conferences, or special visits of observation. On such days students are excused from attendance at their field instruction centres but the hours spent in such activities will be counted towards field work requirements.

77. Students are required to attend their field instruction centres on a regular basis and are required to notify the supervisor and the field instructor if for any unavoidable reason they are unable to attend on the assigned date and time.

78. To facilitate termination procedures, students in the fourth year of study shall inform their supervisors and the field instructor of the date of termination of their placement when they completed 40 days (or 20 weeks) of their concurrent placement.

79. Students shall have regular, routine discussions with the field instructor throughout the academic year.

GENERAL:

80. This document is a preliminary guide which is subject to modification in the future. Furthermore, in any individual case, arrangements can be adjusted to suit the particular field instruction centre, through joint consultation between the School of Social Work and the field instruction centre.

81. Final arrangements with field instruction centres will be confirmed in writing by the field instructor.

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
March, 1969.

APPENDIX 5

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG - SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

FIELD INSTRUCTION IN SOCIAL WORK FOR FOURTH YEAR STUDENTS

GUIDE TO STUDENTS

Please note: For purposes of simplified reading, the student is referred to in the feminine, and agency personnel in the masculine.

PURPOSE OF FIELD INSTRUCTION

1. Field instruction forms an integral part of the professional education of social workers. Its aim is to enable the student to relate theory and practice, gain skill in social work practice and develop self-awareness. To achieve these objectives, the field instruction of students is the shared responsibility between the School of Social Work and field instruction centres in the community.

2. In the fourth year of study, field instruction is aimed at enabling the student to develop her skill in social work. She may concentrate primarily on social casework, or in certain instances, on social group work or community organisation, yet field instruction should also equip her to use a combination of these primary social work methods.

3. It is also regarded as important for a student to receive field instruction in the secondary processes of social work, viz. social work administration and social work research during the course of her learning one or more of the primary methods.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

4. A Field Instruction Centre is an organisation or social welfare agency in the community, which by arrangement with the School of Social Work provides facilities for social work students to gain practical experience in social work.

5. The term "block placement" refers to the full-time attendance of a student at an agency for the purposes of receiving field instruction. This takes place during University vacations and the phrase corresponds to the term "vacation practical" as used by the Department of Social Welfare and Pensions.

6. The term 'concurrent placement" refers to the part-time attendance of a student at an agency for the purposes of receiving field instruction. This takes place during University terms while the student is concurrently attending lectures, and the term is the equivalent of "continuous practical" as used by the Department of Social Welfare and Pensions.

7. The term "field instructor" is assigned to that member of staff of the School of Social Work who is responsible for the organisation of the field instruction programme.

8. The term "supervisor" is used to designate the particular member of staff assigned by the agency/organisation to assume the day to day responsibility for the student's learning experience in the agency.

FIELD WORK REQUIREMENTS

9. In the fourth year of study the student is required to do 400 hours of concurrent field work during University terms. This is done at the rate of two days per week (Thursday and Friday) for 25 weeks throughout the academic year commencing during the first week of the academic year and excluding the mid-year University vacation. Students by arrangement with their agencies, may or may not work during the short autumn and spring vacations.

10. Students are placed with only one agency for field instruction in the fourth year of study.

11. Students are required to do the latter portion of their block field work in the third year in the same agency where they will receive concurrent field instruction in the fourth year of study.

THE ROLE OF THE STUDENT

12. The Oath of Confidentiality taken by the student at the commencement of the second year of study remains binding on the student. The conscientious application of this solemn undertaking in respect of information gained by students in the course of their field instruction, constitutes not only a personal, professional obligation upon the students themselves, but also serves to protect the organisation which places such information at their disposal.

13. During their field instruction placements, students are answerable to their supervisors for the performance of their work. The supervisor will arrange regular supervisory sessions for discussion with the student. The success of the placement depends to a great extent on the student's close co-operation with the supervisor, with whom she should feel free to discuss any difficulties which she may experience.

14. Students should be aware, however, that it is the Board of Management and the organisation as a whole which is responsible for the student's total learning experience during the period of placement.

15. For the duration of the placement students are urged to preserve the formality of the student-supervisor relationship although the

form of address used should be determined by the supervisor in accordance with the pattern prevailing in the agency between junior and senior staff and in accordance with what the student finds most helpful.

16. The programme of field instruction is concerned with the whole range of the organisation's operations as well as the direct services which constitute the student's work assignment.

17. The programme includes the following elements:

The student's introduction to the organisation;
Observation by the student of the organisation's range of services;
Student delivery of social work service;
Evaluation of the student's performance.

18. After a brief initial period of observation, the supervisor assigns to the student responsibility for a small workload. The accent in the fourth year concurrent placement is on the student's own delivery of social work service rather than on observation.

19. The student should undertake all activities related to the progress of the case, for example, telephone calls, drafting of correspondence and reports.

20. All letters and reports written by the student should be reviewed by the supervisor.

21. The student should fulfil the recording requirements of the agency and in addition she is required to write process records of selected cases. These should be typewritten in duplicate, one copy being for the organisation and one copy being for the student's own use. Such reports will be used for supervisory purposes and/ or case discussions in class.

22. The student should attend case conferences and/or meetings of professional staff within the field instruction centre.

23. The field instruction centre should formulate a policy with regard to how the student should introduce herself to clients. This policy decision should be communicated to the student and to all other members of staff, both professional and clerical.

24. Appropriate and explicit arrangements should be made as to which staff member will deal with the student's clients if an emergency should arise on the days the student is not at the agency.

25. Where possible the student should attend meetings of the Board and/ or administrative committees in an observational capacity.

26. The student should be given the opportunity, where possible, to pay visits of observation to other agencies and institutions in the community whose work is relevant to the services offered by the field instruction centre.

27. Students follow the agency's regular work hours on the days they are required to be in field work. The exception is the case of the student who is required to attend courses in either Sociology III or Psychology III in the final year of study. Such a student may be absent from the agency only for the minimum period required to attend lectures in one of these subjects, and should inform the supervisor of the duration of such absence.

28. Students are required to attend their field instruction centres on a regular basis and are required to notify the supervisor and the secretary of the School of Social Work if for any unavoidable reason they are unable to attend on the assigned date and time.

29. In the fourth year of study, it is generally expected that students restrict their field work activities to those days each week on which they are assigned to the agency, and to that period of field work prescribed by the University.

30. Occasionally, students may be required by the School to participate in events which have educational significance for them, for example, conferences, or special visits of observation. On such days students are excused from attendance at their field instruction centres but the hours spent in such activities will be counted towards field work requirements.

31. Students are required to keep a record of the number of days worked at the agency. The relevant forms to be completed in duplicate by the student may be obtained from the Secretary of the School of Social Work. One copy is to be submitted to the agency and one copy to the School, at the commencement of the July vacation, and again at the termination of the placement.

32. As field instruction placements are a learning experience, students are not remunerated for their work. Furthermore, students are requested <u>not</u> to arrange paid employment in field instruction centres by private arrangement without prior consultation with the School.

33. Students arrange and finance their own transport to and from their field work placements.

34. Students should be prepared to finance their own transport on home visits. However, wherever possible, the School negotiates with field instruction centres so that either the organisation refunds such transport costs to the student, or alternatively allows the student to use the organisation's own vehicles when these are available.

35. During a concurrent placement, evaluation discussions should be held periodically between the supervisor and the student.

36. The purpose of evaluating the student's performance is not only to assess her professional capabilities but also to further the student's learning.

37. Before the completion of the period of field instruction the supervisor should have a discussion with the student for the purpose of a joint evaluation of the student's performance.

38. To facilitate termination procedures, the students in the fourth year of study shall inform their supervisors and the field instructor of the date of termination of their placement when they have completed 40 days (or 20 weeks) of their concurrent placement.

39. After the termination of a placement, students are required to write a letter of thanks to the organisation at which they have been placed, a copy of such letter to be submitted to the field instructor for her information.

40. Students may also be required to submit to the School an essay or report on their placement at the termination of such placement.

41. During the year, the field instructor will arrange routine discussions with students relating to their field instruction. In addition, students should feel free to discuss difficulties with the field instructor at any time.

DISSERTATION

42. Fourth year students are required to present to the School in September of each year a dissertation based on a modest research project. It is advisable though not essential that the research be conducted in the agency or organisation where the student is receiving field instruction.

43. The student may consult the executive officer and/or supervisor with regard to the selection of a topic which would be of interest and use to both agency and student, but the student may not continue such consultation with regard to the details of the research. The supervision of the dissertation is the responsibility of a member of the lecturing staff of the School.

44. Where the topic selected is related to the work of the Field Instruction Centre, the agency must approve the topic selected and the agency executive's written permission to conduct the research project must be obtained by the student and presented to the School.

45. Time designated for field instruction in the agency may not be utilised by the student for the pursuance of the research project for the dissertation.

29:10:69

APPENDIX 6 Social Work Syllabus
University of the Witwatersrand
1957 Calendar p.412-414

Social Work

First Qualifying Course:

(a) Philosophy and scope of social work.

Definitions of social work. The basic processes; social casework; group work; community organisation; social administration; social welfare research and social action. Methods and techniques of social work. Social work and related fields.

(b) History of social work.

The classical periods; early Christianity; the middle ages. The renaissance and reformation periods. The industrial revolution. The child welfare movements. Development of social and labour legislation. History of social welfare in South Africa.

(c) The significance of illness to the individual, the family and the community. Community health services. Hospital services The Public Health Act.

(d) Visits of observation: to selected social welfare agencies in the community.

Second Qualifying Course:

(a) Social legislation.

The meaning of social legislation. History of social legislation in South Africa. Study of the following Acts; Children's Act. Welfare Organisation Act. Mental Disorders Act. Work Colonies Act. Disability Grants Act. Blind Persons Act. Old Age Pensions Act. Special Schools Act. Factories Act. Workmen's Compensation Act. Industrial Conciliation Act. Unemployment Insurance Act. Apprenticeship Act. Housing Act. Rents Act. Law of Persons.

(b) Social welfare and the community.

The social welfare functions of government departments. Municipal welfare departments. Family welfare organisations. Child and youth welfare organisations. Treatment centres for the alcoholic. Care of the aged and the handicapped. Community centres and settlements.

(c) Theory and practice of social case work and group work.

Outline of history of social case work and social group work. Common concepts and objectives in case work. Group work and community organisation. Social case work; principles of diagnosis; the functional approach; directive and non-directive methods of interviewing; indirect and direct methods of treatment; Comparison of case and group work. Casework as a small group service. Casework and group work in relation to the family.

Social group work: group work as a method or process. Democratic, autocratic and laisser-faire leadership. Aims of group work. Programme planning and value of different types of activities. The role of the group leader. Interpersonal relations. Administration and staff relations. Group records and sociograms.

(d) Practical work

Practical work in a group work agency is undertaken on two afternoons a week throughout the year. In addition two weeks full time training is undertaken during one of the long vacations.

Third Qualifying Course

(a) Theory of the interview.

Theory of the interview: the purpose of the interview in the various professional fields: interviews in different social work settings; factors which affect the interview. Basic skills in interviewing; "Directive" and "non-directive" methods of interviewing. The interview as a process. The interview as a medium of treatment.

(b) Application of principles and techniques in interviewing.

Student participation in interviewing and group discussion of the principles and techniques involved form a major part of this course.

(c) Case recording

Purpose of case recording; principles and methods of case recording.

(d) Social welfare administration

Survey of welfare administration in South Africa; functions of national, regional and local co-ordinating bodies; functions of community chests; studies of agency administration. Seminars on concepts of social agency administration, staff relationships, leadership skills, budgetting, annual reports, meetings, etc.

(e) Practical work - social work students

Two months full-time practical training is undertaken in case work agencies during the long vacations.

Fourth Qualifying Course:

(a) Social case work

Comparative study of diagnostic and functional schools of social work. Development of an eclectic approach in social case work. Short term case work. Long-term case work. Case work and psychotherapy.

(b) Social group work

Social group work method as a means of effecting personality growth, change and development; dynamics of group work; extension of group work method to other fields; group work and group therapy.

(c) Case work and group work in relation to the family and contemporary society

Family-centred case; family and marriage counselling; potentialities of group work for strengthening family life.

(d) Evaluation of results in social case work and group work

Aims and methods of evaluative studies; consideration of selected studies in case work and group work evaluation; limitations of present studies and need for further research.

(e) Study of selected fields in social work.

Medical social work; psychiatric social work; school social work; social work in industry; social work with the aged and physically handicapped; probation work.

(f) Practical work

During the fourth year of study students are permitted to select the branch of social work in which they wish to undertake practical training. Throughout the year two days a week are devoted to practical training in either a case work or group work agency. In the discretion of the Supervisor of Field Work, students may be permitted to undertake practical work in more than one agency, and in addition may be required to undertake full-time training during vacations.

APPENDIX 7 — University of the Witwatersrand
Degree of Bachelor of Arts in Social Work
Regulation Pertaining to Oath of Confidentiality
1959 Calendar

A candidate shall be required to subscribe to the following declaration before being admitted to the second year of study:

"As a student of Social Work of the University of the Witwatersrand I do solemnly declare:

That I will not improperly divulge anything which I may learn or which may be disclosed to me in my capacity as a Social Work student;

that during my training as a Social Worker I will conduct myself as becomes a student of the profession of Social Work and uphold its reputation."

APPENDIX 8 — Questions asked in semi-structured interviews with individuals who acted as field work consultants, University of the Witwatersrand 1942-1965

1. (a) What were the dates between which you acted as field work consultant (FWC)?

   (b) What was the title of your post?

   (c) How many other members of staff were there in the Department and how many were responsible for the teaching of Social Work?

   (d) Who arranged the students' field work?

2. What were the field work requirements in all years of study, but particularly the 4th year?

3. (a) How did you select the agencies where you placed students?

   (b) Did you visit agencies before selecting them for the first time as field instruction centres?

   (c) When you placed a student, with whom did you negotiate?

   (d) When you placed a student, was it made explicit who would supervise the student?

4. How were students selected to work at specific agencies? Were students' preferences taken into account?

5. (a) When the student was placed, was any information about her given to the Agency?

   (b) Was any information given to the Agency about the University's requirements regarding practical training?

6. Did you ever visit the agencies to discuss the placements?
   If so, when did these visits occur in relation to the student's placement there, and who attended the discussions?

7. Did you have any contact with the staff group or Board of the Agency?

8. How was the student evaluated?

9. Did you have any discussions with the students about their field work?
   If so, when did these occur and what form did they take?
   e.g. Individual/Class discussions
   Regular/Sporadic.

10. Did you arrange meetings and/or seminars for agency personnel participating in the practical training of students?
    If so, could you please give details.

APPENDIX 9

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG - SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

SERIES OF FIVE SEMINARS FOR SUPERVISORS OF STUDENT FIELD INSTRUCTION IN SOCIAL WORK AGENCIES

APRIL - AUGUST 1969

EVALUATION OF SERIES OF SEMINARS

Please read all the following statements and then place a cross, thus /X/ next to each statement which represents your attitude to the series of seminars. No name or signature is required.

A. ☐ 1. It helped me personally.

☐ 2. I am not taking any new ideas away.

☐ 3. It provided the kind of experience that I can apply to my own situation.

☐ 4. It was one of the most rewarding experiences I have ever had.

☐ 5. I leave dissatisfied.

☐ 6. I think it served its purpose.

☐ 7. It was not exactly what I needed.

☐ 8. I didn't learn a thing.

☐ 9. It didn't hold my interest.

☐ 10. It was much too superficial.

☐ 11. It had some merits.

☐ 12. Exactly what I wanted.

☐ 13. It was too general.

☐ 14. It was very poorly planned.

☐ 15. It was a complete waste of time.

☐ 16. It was fair.

☐ 17. I was mildly disappointed.

☐ 18. It solved some problems for me.

☐ 19. It was neither very good nor very poor.

☐ 20. I hope we can have another one in the near future.

B. Please place a cross, thus /X/, against each of the seminars you attended:-

Please note: May we remind you that in the content of the seminars, extensive use was made of the textbook "The Student and Supervision in Social Work Education," by Priscilla Young: Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1967.

☐ 1. 17th April, 1969 : Introduction and Planning

☐ 2. 8th May, 1969. : Details of Syllabus; Young, Chapters I and II, i.e. "Education for Social Work" and "The Responsibilities of the Student Supervisor."

☐ 3. 12th June, 1969 : Young, Chapters III and IV, i.e. "Structure for Teaching and Learning" and "Selecting Cases for a Student."

☐ 4. 31st July, 1969 : Young, Chapters V and VI, i.e. "Case Records" and "Teaching from a Student's Records": presentation of Social Group Work Record and Supervision of Student concerned.

☐ 5. 21st August, 1969 : Young, Chapter VII, i.e. "Assessing the Student's Work"; evaluation of seminar and future planning.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Author Hare I R
Name of thesis The role of the Field Work Consultant in Social work Education 1973

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.