Order Number 9130329

Strategies and dilemmas in child welfare supervision: A case study

Kane, Dianne, D.S.W.

City University of New York, 1991

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A

STRATEGIES AND DILEMMAS IN CHILD WELFARE SUPERVISION: A CASE STUDY

BY

DIANNE KANE

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Welfare, The City University of New York.

1991

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare.

4-23-91
Date

Mildred D. Mailick
Chair of Examining Committee

4/23/91
Date

Executive Officer

Mildred Mailick

Roselle Kurland

Michael Smith

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

STRATEGIES AND DILEMMAS IN CHILD WELFARE SUPERVISION: A CASE STUDY

by

Dianne Kane

Adviser: Dr. Mildred Mailick

This descriptive study of supervision in child welfare was undertaken to obtain data for use in the development of a supervisory approach designed to better meet the needs of a field of practice staffed primarily by workers without professional social work education. It sought to identify supervisory dilemmas and strategies in order to recommend modifications.

A review of the literature revealed that supervisors continue to serve as the primary professional role models of novice caseworkers. However, most of the writing in this area does not address the unique needs of this level of staff. Therefore an exploratory study was undertaken to improve our understanding of supervisory practices with this particular population of workers.

Focusing on one voluntary child welfare agency in New York City, the study utilized focus group technology and individual

interviews to articulate the dilemmas and practices of front line supervisors working with novice, BA level staff. Qualitative, descriptive data were generated and, based on these, recommendations for a supervisory approach targeted to meet the needs of novice staff working within this complex and highly regulated field of practice were offered.

The data suggested that traditional models of supervision continue to be utilized to varying degrees and that their use needs to be re-examined. The study indicated that a variety of supervisory strategies and techniques are being utilized with some consistency. These included: informal, on the spot supervision, direct client intervention on the part of the supervisor and some form of group supervision. All project participants utilized the above techniques however, the purpose for which each was utilized and the time allocated to each, varied. Several continua were identified which appear to influence the mix of supervisory strategies employed.

Worker empowerment and supervisory support were identified as important elements in the successful supervision of novice, child welfare workers in this urban, voluntary agency. A collaborative model utilizing the full professional resources of the agency and especially the expertise of staff development personnel was described and recommended.

This work is dedicated to IAN,
whose existence was not even a dream when it began,
and in memory of my mother,
ROSLYN NATANSON MEHLMAN,
who had the potential, but not the opportunity to
become a scholar.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people without whom this project would never have come to fruition. First, I would like to thank the members of my committee for their support and encouragement throughout the process. Dr. Mildred Mailick, my chairperson, shared both her wisdom and her time with enormous generosity. Dr. Michael Smith offered helpful comments and advice, especially with regard to qualitative research methodology. Dr. Roselle Kurland was always available to talk, and in doing so contributed significantly to my thinking. A special thanks to Dr. Harold Weissman, Executive Officer of the doctoral program, for lending his support in many different ways during my entire time in the program.

To Sr. Rita Meaney, Executive Director, and Kathleen O'Kula, Deputy Executive Director, of St. Joseph Children's Services, I offer my sincerest thanks for providing me with the full support and resources of the agency. In addition, I thank them for providing the kind of leadership that creates an organizational climate consistent with the intent of this endeavor. I am particularly grateful to the directors and supervisors who gave unstintingly of their time, sharing thoughts and reflections about the important and often frustrating work they do. Finally, I thank the MIS department for their computer assistance and the members of my staff for

their patience and support during times of distraction and stress.

Special thanks are offered to a number of individuals - colleagues, associates and friends - who offered help, support and insight along the way: Jane Bender, Donna Cassetta, Elizabeth Dane, Roberta Graziano, Janet Kahn, Lucretia Philips, and Andrea Savage. A particular word of gratitude to Ellyn Berman, fellow doctoral student, who has shown me the true value of peer support.

Last, but not least, I wish to thank my husband, Gordon Hawkins, who has always believed that I could do it all!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I: PROBLEM FORMULATION & REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION: The problem

This project was designed to explore supervisory practices in child welfare, a field of practice increasingly staffed by college graduates with no formal, social work training. Social work supervision plays an important role in the quality of services delivered to clients and the quality of life for employees. It is thus an important area related to the complex issue of staff retention. Extraordinary demands are being placed on front line supervisors attempting to develop effective supervisory strategies to meet the needs of this novice child welfare staff. A descriptive study of supervisory practices within this complex service arena will contribute to a better understanding of effective supervisory strategies.

Nature and scope of the problem

Child Welfare services have dramatically changed since the passage of the Child Welfare Reform Act of 1979 and the United States Adoption Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-272). Developed in response to a growing concern that the emotional and financial costs of substitute care were too high and lasted too long, the legislation sought to monitor case activity with an emphasis on family stability and reunification. One result of these changes was an increase in job demands for line workers. Over-regulation and limited

resource allocation, combined with an increase in case volume and complexity, have contributed to high stress, burnout and turn over amongst inexperienced, untrained personnel.

A report issued by a task force of service providers and advocates, convened by the Council of Family and Child Caring Agencies (COFCCA, March 1989), states dramatically that "THE CHILD WELFARE LABOR FORCE IS COLLAPSING."[1]

Described as a system that is increasingly "overstressed and overburdened", the report cites insufficient training, supervision and peer support as well as a lack of sufficient opportunities for professional development, among the reasons for high staff turn over. This in turn contributes to the inability of service providers to meet the needs of children and families in crisis. A 1987 study funded by the Children's Bureau of the United States Department of Health and Human Services indicated that of 25 states responding, none required entry level direct service personnel to have formal, social work education. This represented a worsening of the situation from a study conducted in 1978 which found that one in four public child welfare workers had formal social work training. While New York State was not one of the 25 agencies responding to the survey, it reported a 20% turnover across all public child welfare positions citing low salaries, heavy work loads, and the lack of resources and realistic preparation among the

---

[1] Council of Family and Child Caring Agencies, "Who Will Care For The Children" (March, 1989) p.ii

primary recruitment and retention issues.[2]

Despite major changes in both the professional level of staff and the accountability demands placed on them, most Child Welfare agencies have not significantly altered their methods of operation. While we can assume that a younger, less experienced and non-professionally trained work force will require a higher level of both administrative and educative supervision, little has been done to systematically address this issue. According to Pettes, the supervisor "has the responsibility for seeing that the work of the agency gets done and done well, that services are provided to clients, that workers and students are enabled to improve their ability at any given stage of their development."[3] It is possible that exploring the current practice and experience of child welfare supervisors as they attempt to meet their responsibilities might contribute to the development of more effective supervisory strategies designed to alleviate some of the difficulties described above.

"In good administration the resources to do the job should match the tasks or functions required. We cannot demand highly skilled casework of a worker who has knowingly been employed without the resources of training or experience that

---

[2] NASW News, June 1987 p.1

[3] Dorothy E. Pettes, Supervision in Social Work (London: George Allen & Lenwin Ltd., 1967) pp.21-22.

are requisite for highly skilled casework."[4] Research indicates that child welfare staff who have not had any formal social work training experience the most difficulty in delivering effective services to children and families in care.[5] Often our failure to articulate clear, realistic expectations of the professionally untrained worker leaves us vulnerable to feeling frustrated and disappointed. By continuing to set unrealistic expectations of themselves and their staff, supervisors themselves, become vulnerable to burnout.[6] Left unattended, this situation can only be expected to worsen, thus adding to the already critical staffing situation in Child Welfare.

In order to assist supervisors in this struggle, it is important to understand more clearly how supervision is currently practiced. "To teach the social worker to be able to listen to the client, to be able to decode his messages and develop empathy, will by necessity be a slow process."[7] The

---

[4] Ibid. p.30.

[5] Lenore Olsen & William H. Holmes, "Educating Child Welfare Workers: The Effects of Professional Training on Service Delivery", Journal of Education For Social Work, Vol.18, No.1 (Winter 1982), pp. 94-102.

[6] For information regarding burnout among supervisors see Pauline C. Zischka, "The Effect of Burnout on Permanency Planning and The Middle Management Supervisor in Child Welfare Agencies", Child Welfare (November 1981) pp. 611-616.

[7] Yonata Feldman, "The Supervisory Process: An Experience in Teaching and Learning", in Social Work Supervision - Classic Statements and Critical Issues, Carlton E. Munson (Ed.) 1979,(New York: The Free Press)
pp.363-4.

fact that child welfare is staffed primarily by untrained caseworkers, rather than professionally trained social workers, necessitates that supervisors not only have time for this aspect of supervision but also, access to supervisory methodologies appropriate to this level of staff. This study attempts to explore current methodologies in order to identify strategies effective with this particular workforce.

Role conflict among social work supervisors responsible for both administrative and educative functions is well documented in the literature.[8] A more pressing problem confronting today's child welfare supervisor, is role overload. There is, given the practice arena, simply too much administrative monitoring and teaching to be done. The danger of focusing on administrative monitoring to ensure contract compliance, at the expense of educating for quality casework comes from a multitude of external and internal pressures. In examining how child welfare supervisors attempt to balance this dual function, it is important not to minimize the fact that it is difficult for the average supervisor to know how to begin the process of educating the novice worker.

As a profession, social work has focused more on the need for supervisors to acquire knowledge of organizational theory than learning theory. Recognizing the fact that many

---

[8] See for example: Lucille N. Austin, "An Evaluation of Supervision", Social Casework, 37 (October, 1956). Also, Donald A. Devis, "Teaching and Administrative Functions In Supervision", Social Work 10 (April, 1965). And, Francis H. Shertz, "A Concept Of Supervision Based On Definitions Of Job Responsibility", Social Casework, 39 (October, 1958).

supervisors are promoted into their position, role transition has been stressed in the literature.[9] However, in order to more fully address the differences between being a good caseworker and teaching casework practice to another, knowledge and skills directly related to teaching and learning are needed. While most field instructors are required to undergo formal training for student supervision, emphasizing the educative role, few agencies demand the same of staff supervisors. Similarly, it is the field instruction literature in contrast to the social work supervision literature, that emphasizes learning theory and teaching methodologies.

One response to the dual pressures of turn over and novice workers has been an acknowledgement of staff training and development as a necessary agency function.[10] Training very rapidly came to be seen as the 'quick fix' solution to many long standing systemic problems. Much of the literature on staff development in child welfare can be reduced to a statement of need, followed by multiple lists of the knowledge necessary for child welfare workers to acquire.[11] Similarly,

---

[9] See Pettes (Op. Cit.) 1967. Also, Florence W. Kaslow, "Group Supervision", In Issues In Human Services. Florence W. Kaslow and Associates (Eds.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972. pp.115-141.

[10] See for example, Judith S. Rycus, "Essentials of In-Service Training For Child Welfare Workers", Child Welfare (June,1978).

[11] See for example, Anthony Maluccio. "Staff Development in Child Welfare" Child and Youth Services, May/June 1977 (New York: Hawthorne Press); and Dianne Vinokur-Kaplan. The View From The Agency:Supervisors and Workers Look At In-Service Training For Child Welfare. (Ann Arbor, Michigan: National Child Welfare Training Center, The University of Michigan Training Center, University of Michigan School of Social Work) 1983.

most child welfare training programs consist of single or multiple session workshops developed to impart knowledge in the identified areas. This narrow interpretation of the training function ignores the fact that despite the additional assistance offered via centralized training departments, supervisors remain the primary teachers of their staff. For the most part training departments have been slow to identify and respond to the needs of supervisory personnel, especially as regards their educational role.[12] A broader interpretation of the staff development function, including the potential collaboration of training and supervisory personnel for the benefit of both clients and staff has not yet been fully explored.[13]

Child Welfare policy context

Federal Law 96-272, the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act and New York State Child Welfare Reform Act of 1979 are the basis of current child welfare policy. In re-examining how child welfare services were to be delivered and funds allocated, one outcome of the legislation was an increasingly extensive and complicated accountability system.

---

[12] Child Welfare Administration/Voluntary Agency Recruitment and Retention Steering Committee. "Staff Development Survey Of Voluntary Agencies (Unpublished survey), June 1990.

[13] For a partial exploration of this issue see: Kenneth W. Watson, "Differential Supervision", Social Work (November1973). Also, Dorothy V. Harris & Elizabeth Keith Allison, "Performance Management And Professional Development As Separate Functions Of Supervision", Health And Social Work 7 (4) 1982.

The concept of Permanency Planning provided the foundation for the new child welfare system. It outlined a systematic "process of carrying out within a brief time limited period, a set of activities which will help children live in families that offer continuity of relationships with nurturing parents or caretakers and the opportunity to establish lifetime relationships."[14] The new system was designed to ensure that a permanent plan for each child be developed "in a timely manner" ensuring return to biological parent, family member or, if not possible, freedom for adoption. The steps to ensure the delivery of service were enumerated in great detail and monitored by the state with heavy involvement of the family court system.

In New York City, this system is complicated yet further by the contractual relationship of some fifty seven private, voluntary child welfare agencies with the city's Child Welfare Administration which retains legal responsibility for the children. The voluntary agencies receive city, state and federal funds for the services they provide and the city most often, imposes a secondary level of accountability over and above that required by the state. While ongoing, detailed documentation of services attempted and delivered is clearly important, and judicial review a potentially effective way to ensure accountability, even local monitoring agents tend to

---

[14] Edith Fein, et al. "After Foster Care: Outcomes of Permanency Planning for Children," Child Welfare (November/December 1983) p.486.

acknowledge that the level of bureaucracy created is inefficient and ineffective. According to one Family Court judge, the child welfare system is overwhelmed and "in need of help at every single level".[15]

While few professionals are in disagreement with the intent of the permanency planning iniative, some attribute its structural constraints on practice to be related to the fleeing of professional, MSW staff. "Caught in the maelstrom of all these changes are child welfare supervisors and workers, the front-line practitioners and providers of services to children and their families. Ultimately, it is they who are charged with directly implementing such goals as delivering more in-home services, enhancing the functioning of troubled families to prevent placement, and sustaining placements for special-needs children. And increasingly, they are required to substantiate their recommendations in court testimony, as compared to less formal procedures of the past, thus leading to a model of practice that must also be accountable in a court of law."[16] It is unfortunate, but not surprising in such a climate, that the documentation of work often receives as much emphasis as the service delivery itself.

The need to increase professional staffing within child

---

[15] "A System Overloaded: The Foster-Care Crisis" New York Times, Sunday March 15, 1987 p.32.

[16] Dianne Vinokur-Kaplan & Ann Hartman."A National Profile of Child Welfare Workers And Supervisors", Child Welfare (July-August, 1986) p.325.

welfare has begun to be addressed politically. Bills proposing tuition reimbursement and loan forgiveness have been initiated and supported at both the federal and state levels.[17] The federal initiative is particularly comprehensive and includes efforts aimed at improving staff recruitment, retention, competence and training. Unfortunately while well received, neither of these efforts has yet been allocated funds due to budget deficits especially at the state and local level.

It goes without saying that while continuing to advocate on the macro level, changes need to be initiated in response to the current staffing crisis. Novice staff recruited to provide services to children and families must receive the training and support they need to do the best job possible. Likewise supervisors, often entering their positions soon after earning their MSW, also need assistance in discovering and developing the skills and techniques that are most effective in enabling novice staff to deliver quality service to clients. It is possible that an examination of the supervisory practices within one child welfare agency may help to clarify important dimensions and illuminate the dilemmas faced by supervisors in working with novice staff. It may enable us to identify the techniques and strategies which assist supervisors in balancing their administrative and

---

[17] For a discussion of the federal omnibus bill see NASW NEWS, June 1990. On the state level a proposal known as the Child Welfare Service Corps initiative has been proposed by the Council of Family and Child Caring Agencies for the past two years.

educative responsibilities.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Historical perspective

Supervision in social work is as old as the profession itself. Originally a means of overseeing organizations, supervision began to focus on the individual case method as the need for professional social work process became more apparent. While the extent of case supervision offered to the friendly visitor during the early days of the Charity Organization Society is somewhat disputed, it is clear that a model of providing case supervision to volunteer and other untrained staff, primarily on a one to one basis, began to emerge along with the recognition that understanding client needs necessitated more than good intentions. Case material and case recording were the major tools utilized in this early educational, supervisory process.[18] [19]

It is important in relation to the concerns which initiated the current study to recognize that social work supervision began in order to meet the needs of non-

---

[18] For a review of historical material see: Mary Richmond. Social Diagnosis (New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1917. Also, Jeffrey R. Brackett (1903), "Training For Work" and the Millford Conference Report (1929),"Social Work Generic and Specific", both in Carlton E. Munson (Ed.) 1979 (Op. Cit.).

[19] For a more comprehensive history of social work supervision see Alfred Kadushin, Supervision In Social Work, 2nd Edition, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985) pp. 1-45.

professionally trained service providers. The educational, tutorial model which developed at that time continued even after the majority of staff began to enter the agency with professional education and training.[20] Very little of the literature relates to the supervision of non-trained workers. Most focuses on the supervision of social work interns enrolled in formal academic training or of professionally trained staff.

In 1936, Virginia Robinson wrote, "The word supervision has become a technical term in social work with a usage not defined in any dictionary. Supervisors in a social agency are responsible for 'overseeing' the job in the generally understood meaning of the word but they have, in addition, a second function of teaching or training workers under their supervision."[21] Similarly, in 1963, Charlotte Towle defined supervision as "an administrative process in the conduct of which staff development is a major concern."[22]

It is, in fact, the dual nature of social work supervision that renders it unique. Gradually however, as agency growth necessitated greater administrative controls,

---

[20] See for example, Lucille N. Austin, 1956 (Op. Cit.);also, Alfred J. Kutzik. "The Social Work Field"in Supervision, Consultation And Staff Training In The Helping Professions. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates (Eds.)(San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,1979) pp. 25-60.

[21] Virginia P. Robinson. Supervision In Social Casework. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1936) p.xi.

[22] Charlotte Towle, "The Place of Help in Supervision" Social Service Review, (37)4, 1963, pp.405-415.

the failure to differentiate between organizational and professional purpose became increasingly problematic. The resulting tension between administrative and educative functions is reflected throughout the literature on social work supervision. Emphasis has shifted over time, based on the economic and accountability climate, changing practice theory and work force considerations. (See Table I)

TABLE I : AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TRENDS IN SUPERVISION

TIME PERIOD	CONCERN	FOCUS
1920-1930	Professional Development	Educational Supervision
1950-early 1960s	Growth & Diversification	Administrative Supervision
mid 1970s-1980	Accountability Burnout	Supportive Supervision
1980-present	Diversification Resource Scarcity	Differential Model Development

A more contemporary view is expressed by Irving Miller in the 18th edition of the Encyclopedia of Social Work: "although supervisors usually carry out several functions, the particular styles, content and techniques associated with supervision grow out of the social context of the service to be delivered and the nature of the service itself"[23] This is

[23] Irving Miller, "Supervision in Social Work". In R. Morris et al (Eds.) Encyclopedia of Social Work, 18th Issue (New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1987) p.749.

an important perspective for the study a hand, as it emphasizes the need to examine supervision based on considerations of the particular work force, organizational context and service delivery system and to develop a model based on these considerations.

Supervisory functions

In his classic textbook on supervision, Kadushin (1985), identifies three primary functions of supervision while Middleman and Rhodes (1985), in a somewhat more complex model, enumerate nine supervisory functions. (For an elaboration of these functions see Table II) For both, administrative tasks relate to those that have an organizational purpose or objective. Administrative supervision is "related to the organization's need for efficiency and accountability." Administering is "related to activities of planning, decision making and workload management as demanded by the service delivery system"[24] In contrast to this, educative supervision is concerned with "enhancing the professional development of the practitioner." Teaching involves "devising and conveying to others, information that will increase their knowledge and skills."[25]

---

[24] Ruth R. Middleman & Gary B. Rhodes, Competent Supervision: Making Imaginative Judgements. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1985) p.168.

[25] Ibid. p.146.

TABLE II: SUPERVISION[26]

KADUSHIN	MIDDLEMAN & RHODES
ADMINISTRATION	ADMINISERING ADVOCATING CHANGING (linkage functions)
EDUCATION	TEACHING CAREER SOCIALIZING EVALUATING (service delivery functions)
SUPPORT	CATALIZING HUMANIZING MANAGING TENSION (integrative functions)

In discussing these two supervisory functions, Kadushin states, "educational supervision is designed to increase the effectiveness of administrative supervision".[27] If the goal of supervision is to increase the quality of service to clients, educational supervision is the vehicle designed to enable staff to do so. The tools utilized to carry out these two supervisory functions are often the same, however the focus of attention is different. For example, "In administrative supervision, case records, worker's reports, and other forms are reviewed for evidence of services rendered in compliance with agency procedure; in educational supervision the same records are reviewed for evidence of

[26] Alfred Kadushin, 1985 (Op.Cit.) and Ruth R. Middleman and Gary B. Rhodes, 1985 (Op.Cit.).

[27] Alfred Kadushin, 1985 (Op. Cit.) p.142.

deficiencies in performance which require training."[28] Unfortunately, as discussed above, most often the two functions compete for scarce organizational time and other resources. In the end, it is generally educational supervision which suffers.

Middleman and Rhodes, believe that the educational function has already lost ground: "From our review, we think this educative function has been greatly diminished during the past twenty years, and that it is drifting towards extinction...*the literature*... continues to idealize educational traditional supervision,...*however*....there is a gap between this and the realities of today's service delivery world (one which features a 20 percent turnover among first-level workers yearly)".[29]

Since educational supervision is critical to imparting both organizational and professional values, its loss would be particularly troubling in child welfare where much of the service delivery is in the hands of the BA level worker, greatly in need of this professional socialization.

An equally compelling argument in favor of the educational focus is the area of job satisfaction. Kadushin (1974) reports that helping supervisees grow and develop as professionals is a major source of job satisfaction for supervisors. Similarly, supervisees find satisfaction in receiving this assistance.

---

[28] Ibid. p.187.

[29] Ruth R. Middleman & Gary B. Rhodes, 1985 (Op. Cit.) p.27.

Chernis in studying job satisfaction within human service organizations identified the area of 'perceived competence ' as a critical variable. Motivated by a desire to help, human service workers perceive their competence in relationship to goals set and expectations of goal achievement. How the supervisor assists the novice worker in defining goals and expectations is thus critical to job satisfaction and retention.[30]

A study by Diane Vinokur-Kaplan and Ann Hartman conducted within the child welfare arena confirms both the need and desire for an educational focus. This study as well as one by Shyne and Schroeder (1978) points to the complexity of tasks that child welfare workers encounter on a daily basis, their limited professional social work education and their clear desire for further professional development. Workers reported spending too much of their time involved with paperwork, routine tasks, and unpredictable emergencies. They expressed a desire to spend more time working with children and families as well as in developing their own professional skills. The authors recommend a review of job task allocations, job restructuring and better utilization of technology. Staff development and training were clearly indicated as an areas

---

[30] Cary Cherniss, Professional Burn-out in Human Service Organizations. (New York: Praeger,1980). Similarly, Cary Chernis and E. Egnatios, "Clinical Supervision in Community Mental Health" Social Work, 23(3) 1978.

for further development. [31]

Clearly, the challenge for child welfare is in creating supervisory strategies which facilitate staff development by demanding qualitative as well as quantitative excellence. The difficulty of doing so is further demonstrated by Kadushin who in his 1974 study of supervision, cautions that the role performance model of supervision most common to agency based practice, tends to evaluate role performance based on bureaucratic, accountability standards without regard for the quality of professional development of staff. Guarding against this and ensuring the inclusion of qualitative, competency standards in the development of an internal agency procedure is in keeping with Levy's discussion of the ethical aspects of supervision. "...the ethical issue is not better service (although that is certainly an important administrative issue), but the supervisors's obligations to the supervisee. The supervisee's growth on the job, whether or not it benefits the agency and its clientele, is the supervisors legitimate concern."[32]

Education will not be a supervisory function that goes without a struggle,"the ideology runs deep, despite lack of personnel, time and other resources. A diversified approach to supervision and to teaching and learning seems to be required

---

[31] Dianne Vinokur-Kaplan & Ann Hartman, 1986 (Op.Cit.).

[32] Charles S. Levy, "The Ethics of Supervision" in Carlton E. Munson (Ed.), 1979 (Op. Cit.) p.223.

to meet today's agency realities."[33]

Supervisory methods and models

The literature on supervision has been criticized for focusing on identifying the functions of supervision at the expense of developing models to organize and implement these functions.[34] Supervision in social work has for the most part mirrored social work practice. It is largely and historically therefore, based on a casework or, one to one model. The importance of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee is stressed throughout the literature as the arena for learning the "art" of social work practice. The existence of a parallel process in which the interaction between client and worker will be reflected in the relationship between supervisor and supervisee is well documented in the literature.[35] Perhaps more important for our purposes is the reverse process in which the relationship between supervisor and supervisee will be reflected in the worker's relationship with the client. Thus, if a supervisor utilizes a directive, dominating approach in supervision it is likely to reflect itself in the way in which the worker

---

[33] Ruth Middleman & Gary Rhodes, 1985 (Op.Cit.) p.30.

[34] See Carlton E. Munson "Authority and Social Work Supervision: An Emerging Model", in Carlton E. Munson (Ed.),1979 (Op.Cit) p.344. Similarly, Middleman and Rhodes, 1985 (Op.Cit.) p.29.

[35] Kadushin, 1985 (Op. Cit.) p.204-5. Also, Eva M. Kahn, "The Parallel Process in Social Work Treatment and Supervision" The Journal of Contemporary Social Work November, 1979. pp.521-529.

approaches the client. Similarly, if the supervisor works to empower and support the worker, so too will this be reflected in work with clients.

The importance of the organizational context on the delivery of service and supervision is highlighted in two of the relatively few empirical studies on supervision. Scott[36] described reactions to supervision within the heteronomous, or overly regulated, organization. Of relevance to the development of a model of supervision within child welfare, (clearly a service arena characterized by too little professional autonomy), is the finding that the majority of untrained staff preferred a bureaucratic, as compared to a professional orientation to supervision. The preference for a task oriented, directive approach was in marked contrast to professionally trained workers. At the same time, it is consistent with Lewis'[37] description of the preprofessional or technician level of skill in which rules and directives are called for. An additional finding which has bearing on the current study was that untrained workers reported supervisors and directors to be their major source of professional identification. Thus, a supervisory model for this population must somehow balance the need and preference for structure and

---

[36] W. Richard Scott, "Reactions To Supervision In A Heteronomous Organiation", Administration Science Quarterly, June 1965, pp.65-81.

[37] Harold Lewis. The Intellectual Base of Social Work Practice: Tools for Thought In a Helping Profession (New York: Silberman Fund and Hawthorne Press,1982).

direction with the responsibility of providing adequate professional socialization. In addition, the importance of modeling as a supervisory technique is implicit.

The difficulty in maintaining a professional model of service in a bureaucratic, child welfare system, was the focus of a longitudinal study by Wasserman (1970). Concluding that the knowledge, skills and values of professional social work are "essentially of little use in a work situation in which structural constraints dictate the decision making process, Wasserman asks "what are the facilitating conditions under which professional social work can be practiced?" Among the criticisms of the bureaucracy in which the professionals studied operated, were the "absence of formal group consultation, case analysis and the collection of and analysis of data."[38] While not specifically mentioned, these relate to supervisory/staff development activities and can be controlled to a great degree by the individual agency. Such educative elements must then be a part of the 'facilitating conditions' provided by the agency to the nonprofessional being asked to do a professional job.

The need to explore new models of supervision emerges in the literature post 1960, primarily motivated by the desire for increased autonomy on the part of supervisees and the need

---

[38] Harry Wasserman, "Early Careers of Professional Social Workers In A Public Child Welfare Agency", Social Work (July, 1970) pp.283-4.

to increase the status of the profession.[39] Supervisory innovations for the most part, paralleled innovations in practice which occurred during this time. Family and group interventions more frequently utilized co-therapists as well as video tape and one way mirrors. The expanded use of these technologies provided greater opportunity for supervisor and supervisee to directly observe one another in work with clients.[40] In addition, group modalities offered expanded learning opportunities while offering a great deal of flexibility to both group supervisors and members.

While the motivation for seeking new models of supervision in child welfare is not to increase autonomy and decrease control, given deprofessionalization, the innovations of the 1960s are not irrelevant to current concerns. Techniques which utilize direct observation, peer support and increased flexibility have applicability as we seek to increase the professional supports and socialization available to untrained staff.

In 1971, Ruth Young, looking at models of supervision asked "how can we enlarge the supervisory armamentarium of intervention strategies, teaching, accountability and enabling

---

[39] Carlton E.Munson, (Ed.) 1979 (Op. Cit.) Part III pp.108-178.

[40] See for example: Paul A. Abels, "On The Nature Of Supervision: The Medium Is The Group" Child Welfare (June 1970) also Vernon C. Rickert & John E.Turner, "Through The Looking Glass: Supervision in Family Therapy", Social Casework 59 (March 1978).

staff to get the job done?"[41] In fact, there is considerably more written about what the supervisor has to do, than how he/she is to do it. In addition, there is little descriptive literature from supervisors themselves as to how they go about performing and integrating their supervisory functions on a daily basis.

Newer approaches to supervision aim at modeling behavior, exploring assumptions and values, refining observations, enhancing self-perceptions, and stimulating creativity.[42] Cotherapy, direct observation and feedback are suggested as effective means of supervision and training especially with novice staff.[43] Current methodologies focus on learning through action and observation more than reflection, discussion, and gradual insight development. In general, they aim to speed up the learning process and to extend it beyond the one-to-one format.

While we understand that an integrative approach to learning utilizing thinking, feeling and doing is necessary for maximum integration of material, few supervisors are able to provide this, given personal and/or organizational

---

[41] Ruth H. Young, "Supervision: Challenges For The Future" (1971), In Carlton E. Munson (Ed.) 1979 (Op. Cit.) pp.330-1.

[42] Florence W. Kaslow, "Training of Marital and Family Therapists," Florence W. Kaslow & Associates (Eds.) 1977 (Op.Cit.).

[43] For more discussion on this see Gene M. Abroms, "Supervision As Metatherapy" and Stanley L. Brodsky, "Criminal Justice Settings" both in Florence W. Kaslow & Associates (Eds.) 1979 (Op.Cit.) pp.81-99 and 254-267.

constraints.[44] How realistic is it to expect today's child welfare supervisor to possess, acquire or master this diversity of educational theory and technology? How can we assist the child welfare supervisor in preserving an educational focus? What supports does the supervisor need? What agency resources can be brought to bear?

The evidence suggests that even with a more traditional interpretation of educational supervision, with the exception of Bertha Reynolds (1945/65), relatively little attention has been given to the techniques and knowledge necessary to implement this educative role. While several authors have more recently addressed the incorporation of learning theory into social work supervision, the realities of today's practice arena indicate that little time is available for supervisors to learn and utilize such techniques.[45] Models of educational diagnosis or assessment, planning, contracting, and instruction, utilizing verbal, observational and behavioral techniques are of little value if they are not incorporated into agency practice.

Perhaps the technology for learning and growing has

---

[44] Zvi Eiskovits & Edna Guttman,"Towards A Practice Theory Of Learning Through Experience In Social Work Supervision" The Clinical Supervisor, Vol.1 (1) (Spring, 1983) pp.51-63.

[45] Authors writing in this area include: Thomas D. Morton & P. David Kurtz, "Educational Supervision: A Learning Theory Approach" Social Casework, April 1980; Louis Lowy, "Social Work Supervision: From Models Towards Theory" Journal of Education For Social Work, Spring, 1983; Alex Gitterman, "Comparison Of Educational Models and Their Influence On Supervision" in Florence W. Kaslow & Associates (Eds.) 1972 (Op.Cit.); Raymond Fox, "Contracting In Supervision: A Goal-Oriented Process" The Clinical Supervisor Vol. 1 (1) Spring, 1983.

expanded beyond traditional one to one, or even group supervision. Perhaps it is more realistic to broaden the concept of educative supervision and examine it within the context of staff training and development. Perhaps it is in fact more accurate to identify much of the current knowledge base and technology as falling more within the realm of training as compared to supervision.[46]

Staff training and development

The boundaries between the various activities intended to improve staff performance are often unclear and confusing. Kaslow, attempting to differentiate between supervision, consultation and staff training, states: "Sometimes the techniques utilized in one process are quite similar to those used in another process; they are definitely not discrete, and at times the separation is only arbitrary, made for the purpose of achieving clarity. They are all based on imparting information, attitudes and values and on improving skills, but they differ regarding elements of authority, accountability, and the nature and purpose of the relationship. Each is a process or set of activities shaped by the desired end point or objective and the setting in which it occurs. "[47]
While staff training is usually the most structured and cognitive process, and supervision the most focused on

---

[46] Ruth R. Middleman and Gary B. Rhodes, 1985 (Op. Cit.) p.24.

[47] Florence W. Kaslow and Associates, 1977 (Op. Cit.) p.xv.

individual performance, Kaslow leaves room for the organization to define the way in which each of these processes is defined and developed.

Another term often fraught with confusion is **staff development**. Authors tend to vary as to how comprehensively staff development activities are to be viewed. Some, for example, distinguish between **training** to improve job skills and **development** to promote professional growth and career enhancement. Others differentiate between activities designed to enhance worker capabilities from those targeted to improve organizational functioning.[48] Clegg defines staff development broadly as "any process or program whereby an agency seeks to improve staff performance "[49] Similarly, Kadushin includes in-service training and educational supervision within the staff development umbrella.[50]

After a comprehensive review of the literature on staff development in child welfare, Maluccio, concludes that "supervision continues to be the principle method of staff development. Other methods seem to be viewed as supplementary opportunities."[51] The child welfare, staff development

---

[48] See for example, Howard J. Doueck & Michael J. Austin "Improving Agency Functioning Through Staff Development" Administration in Social Work, Vol.10 (2), Summer 1986.

[49] R.R. Clegg, The Administrator in Public Welfare (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1966) p.107.

[50] Alfred Kadushin, 1985 (Op.cit.) p.140-1.

[51] Anthony Maluccio, 1977 (Op.Cit.) p.4.

literature reads for the most part like a statement of need, followed by multiple lists of the knowledge necessary for child welfare workers to acquire.[52] While important and relevant to the development of a competent child welfare labor force, it offers little assistance to the agency seeking to develop and implement a comprehensive program to meet the developmental needs of novice workers.[53]

We continue to see relatively little evidence of attempts to integrate supervision and other staff development activities. Such a conceptualization could potentially pave the way for a more collaborative approach between supervisors and staff development/training personnel. It offers a more positive view, broadening our perspective on educating contemporary workers by utilizing the additional educational, training and consultation resources that are often available within the agency.

Such a model is not entirely without precedent. Epstein[54] stresses the fact that group supervision supports the utilization of consultation from both peers and other supervisory and administrative staff. By seeking input from multiple sources, group supervision provides an important

---

[52] Ibid. In addition see Dianne Vinokur-Kaplan, 1983 (Op.Cit.)

[53] For an exception to this, see Judith S. Rycus, 1978 (Op.Cit.)

[54] Laura Epstein, "Is Autonomous Practice Possible?" Social Work 18, March 1973.

example of a more collaborative approaches to supervision. Kadushin stresses the fact that modeling extends beyond the relationship with the individual supervisor involving a variety of teaching technologies and personnel.[55] In a rare case illustration, McFadden demonstrates how a creative combination of supervision/consultation assisted a BA worker with a background in education in offering play therapy to a child faced with multiple separations.[56]

On an organizational level, Harris and Allison (1982) explored alternative or "differential " models of supervision within a hospital setting. They defined traditional supervision as an administrative and planning function and developed a range of educational opportunities in the form of group supervision and training workshops. Based on individual and organizational goals, this model is a good example of shared educational supervision, albeit targeted for a vastly different staff population. Of particular note is the underlying philosophy that "all professionals in an agency play important roles in the teaching and helping functions of supervision"[57]

Middleman and Rhodes (1985) often in the forefront of

---

[55] Alfred Kadushin, 1985 (Op. Cit.) p.191.

[56] Emily Jean McFadden, "Helping the Inexperienced Worker in the Public Child Welfare Agency: A Case Study" Child Welfare LIV Number 5, May 1975.

[57] Dorothy V. Harris & Elizabeth Keith Allison. 1982 (Op.Cit.) p.284.

thinking regarding the changing role of supervisors, clearly conceptualize the educative role as a shared function stating: "the supervisor of the 1980s is mainly an *administrator of the learning experience*-planner, coordinator, and sometimes teacher."[58]

Watson in "Differential Supervision" (1973) offers guidance on how to proceed with the process of developing a model of supervision within a particular organizational context. Most important is the development of a conceptual framework which articulates the goals and functions of social work supervision for the organization. By clarifying the essential functions in the traditional, one to one model, the agency can be certain that all supervisory functions are handled in the alternative systems or models selected.[59] It is important that "each alternative has been clearly defined and all are used differentially in response to the needs of the staff and the agency. It is also important that the agency supplement each system to provide externally those elements that are missing or not emphasized"[60]. Thus, by examining the realities of current supervisory practices within a particular setting, one can seek to meet staff needs and organizational goals through the development of supplementary educational

---

[58] Ruth R. Middleman & Gary B. Rhodes, 1985 (Op.Cit.) p.226.

[59] Kenneth W. Watson, "Differential Supervision" Social Work, November, 1973. p.80.

[60] Ibid. pp.86-7.

opportunities.

SUMMARY

In the foregoing, the dimensions of child welfare practice in the 1990s which have contributed to the current crisis in staffing and service delivery have been explored. Supervision, training and staff development have been identified as important aspects related to staff retention, development and the delivery of quality services to clients. A review of the relevant literature reveals that while social work supervision is quite old, relatively little attention has been paid to identifying the strategies and techniques which are most applicable to particular populations of staff, in this case, novice workers without formal social work training. While skill development and competency are known indicators of job satisfaction and staff retention, bureaucratic pressures within child welfare make it increasing difficult to sustain an educative model of supervision. The literature demonstrates that training and staff development can be defined broadly enough to incorporate more traditional educative supervision. By more clearly understanding what actually occurs between supervisor and supervisee we can begin to identify the strengths and needs of both groups of staff. Subsequently, by more broadly defining the staff development function we can attempt to make additional personnel available to assist both staff and supervisors. The study presented herein, utilizes

this approach within one child welfare agency, in the hopes of identifying key concepts that may have applicability in other similar, child welfare settings.

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY AND PROGRAM DESIGN

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will describe the nature of the research and the setting in which it occurred. Methods of data collection will be described and the rationale for their selection will be articulated. The characteristics of the sample and the organizational context will be explained.

Purpose of the research

This descriptive, exploratory study of supervision in child welfare was undertaken to obtain data to be used in the development of a supervisory approach designed to better meet the needs and demands of a field of practice staffed primarily by workers without professional social work education. As reflected in the literature review above, most of the material on social work supervision does not address the unique needs of this level of staff. The project was designed as an exploratory study in order to improve our understanding of current supervisory practice with this particular staff. Qualitative, descriptive data were generated from professionals currently engaged in supervising child welfare staff, in order to recommend modifications.

AGENCY SETTING

ST. Joseph Children's Services (SJCS) is the oldest Catholic child caring agency in Brooklyn. It was originally founded by the Sisters of Charity in 1828. Initially developed as an orphan asylum, institutional services were phased out beginning in 1965 based on a commitment to providing a more 'family like' atmosphere to children in care. This marked the beginning of the current service delivery system of both foster boarding homes and small group residences. (See agency history appendix I)

The agency now offers the full spectrum of child welfare services, organized into the following direct service departments:

INTAKE & EMERGENCY FOSTER BOARDING HOMES

LONG TERM FOSTER BOARDING HOMES

ADOPTION SERVICES

GROUP RESIDENCES

COMMUNITY BASED PREVENTIVE AND FAMILY DAY CARE SERVICES

Support Departments Include:

ADOLESCENT AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICE

LEGAL SERVICES

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SERVICES

MEDICAL SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

PERSONNEL SERVICES

TRAINING & STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Currently serving over two thousand (2,000) children per day in both Brooklyn and Queens, St. Joseph's has nearly doubled in size over the last two years in response to the crisis in child welfare in New York City. The agency operates as a voluntary, not for profit agency and contracts with the Child Welfare Administration of the City of New York to care for children in its custody. It is because of its long history of responsive change and commitment to upgrading service to children and families that St. Joseph's was seen as a receptive site for the study described. The agency has a strong commitment to staff development as evidenced by the establishment of the Department of Training and Staff Development in 1986. In addition, staff training is listed among the top five priorities in the Mission Statement of the agency. (See appendix II)

Agency staffing

Despite this commitment and fine tradition, St. Joseph's has experienced problems of staff recruitment and retention along with the other voluntary, child welfare agencies in New York City. No longer able to attract MSW staff, the majority of its over eighty (80+) caseworkers hold a Bachelor of Arts degree in a field outside of social work. Motivated primarily by a desire to "help people and children" the majority enter the agency with little or no experience with working with people. An analysis of agency exit interview data places

supervision along with salary and tuition reimbursement as the overriding reasons for caseworker resignations.

In contrast to the direct service staff, over ninety percent (90%) of the casework supervisors hold an MSW plus many years of experience in the field. Those who do not, have a related MA and most often, direct child welfare experience. Agency trends, however, do show an increased difficulty in replacing supervisors, especially within foster care services. This has led to a beginning relaxation of degree and/or experience requirements. This trend is of significant concern to agency administrators and may relate in part to the organizational interest in this study.

At the time of the study, the agency had approximately twenty two casework supervisors and program directors with direct line supervisory responsibility. Reporting to a Department Director, each was responsible for between four and seven caseworkers (BA) and assistant caseworkers (non-BA). Caseloads for workers varied between fifteen (preventive services) and twenty five (undercare services) with twenty representing the agency goal. Thus, in all departments, each supervisor had responsibility for somewhere between eighty and one hundred fifty cases.

Within St. Joseph Children's Services, at the time of the study there was no consistent framework within which supervisors were expected to operate. Job descriptions which varied across departments, and the accountability requirements

of city and state regulatory bodies, which are mostly quantitative in nature, provided the primary guidelines for supervisory practice. Little attention was given to the teaching function of supervisors, although the quality of service delivery was clearly identified as a major agency concern.

Training and staff development

The author of this paper has served as the Director of Training and Staff Development since the inception of the department in 1986. From 1986-1989 there were no additional personnel responsible for staff training although an additional member of the department was responsible for the Foster Parent Training program. Since January 1989, there has been one additional full time person involved in planning and implementing the staff training program.

For the most part, centralized training has focused on the orientation and training of newly hired, novice caseworkers in response to pressures felt by supervisory personnel of needing to "constantly train new staff". This ten week program concentrates on the development of beginning casework skills and the acquisition of basic knowledge of the child welfare system's accountability demands. More recently, along with the expansion of the training department, additional in-service programs have been developed in areas identified as priority by agency personnel. This has included one to four session

modules in the areas of case assessment and recording, child development, child abuse dynamics and prevention. Additional training has been offered by consultants as needs are identified and resources made available.

Particular training needs identified within individual departments are planned and implemented by the training department in conjunction with individual department directors. There is currently no ongoing training program for supervisors, although individual management workshops have, and continue to be, offered. Agency personnel at all levels are encouraged to attend outside workshops within budgetary constraints. While the agency offers no tuition reimbursement, it does encourage staff to pursue formal education in social work by accommodating most work study arrangements.

Implications of organizational structure for current study

The expansion of the training department raised questions in the mind of the department director as to how to best utilize this additional senior professional staff. The gap between the training of direct service staff and follow up during supervision had long been a source of concern within the agency. Issues raised during staff training sessions made the inconsistency in supervisory practices apparent, especially the differential emphasis on educational versus administrative functions. This observation and concern was reinforced by discussions with Training Directors from other

voluntary, child welfare agencies.

Several opportunities for dialogue with other child welfare professionals concerned with the issue of staff recruitment and retention existed. Historically a Training Directors Committee had been sponsored under the auspices of the Council of Family and Child Caring Agencies (COFCCA). During this time issues related to the quality of training and the possibility of cooperative, inter-agency training ventures were addressed. As COFCCA became less able to offer staff support to this group, and as training personnel changed within individual agencies, the group gradually disbanded. During this time, a group of Brooklyn based training directors affiliated with the Archdiocese of Brooklyn and Queens began to meet on a monthly basis. Concurrently, the Child Welfare Administration (CWA), became aware that voluntary agencies contracting with the city were increasingly unable to deliver services due to staffing shortages. In response, a CWA/Voluntary Agency Recruitment and Retention Steering Committee was established. Participation in these forums afforded an opportunity to confirm that the issues identified within St. Joseph's Childrens Services appeared to be systemic in nature.

Particularly apparent during inter-agency discussions concerning the needs of direct service staff was how rapidly they would segue into discussions about casework supervision. There was a period of time during which the focus of these

discussions tended to place blame on direct line supervisors, intimating that they somehow were not meeting their responsibility to monitor and instruct casework staff. The initial response on the part of many agencies attempting to address the needs of supervisors, was to focus on administrative functions. Support in the form of time and stress management workshops were frequent offerings. Repeatedly the educational role of supervision was mentioned by training personnel but not addressed systematically.

Interagency dialogue also emphasized the fact that across all the agencies, many well qualified and highly experienced individuals held supervisory positions. It appeared that even amongst this group of supervisors there were gaps in the educational supervision provided to novice staff. The question of how to balance and support supervisory strengths and expertise thus became an important area for consideration. While there was a strong sense that offering additional in-service training workshops for line staff was not the most effective means of addressing the staff development issue, more information was needed from supervisors themselves as to current practices and needs. This served as a major impetus for the design of the study at hand.

PROJECT CONCEPTUALIZATION

As Director of Training and Staff Development, the author had long been concerned with issues of staff retention and

career development. It was only after identifying the role of supervision as critical to the staff development process as well as the important role which staff development personnel play in the supervisory system, that the current project began to take shape. Suppose for example that instead of being critical of current supervisory practice, one became merely curious? Suppose supervisors were not neglecting their responsibility to provide formal supervision in a traditional style but rather had discovered this to be legitimately ineffective? And finally, suppose the role of a centralized department of training and staff development were reconceptualized to better meet the needs of supervisors as they struggled to meet the needs of casework staff? It was with these ideas in mind that the exploratory study described herein was undertaken.

Project implementation

Bringing the issues addressed above to a discussion with agency executive staff was well within the purview of the Director of Training and Staff Development. This position reports to the Deputy Executive Director, a professional social worker concerned with the quality of service delivery. These issues had served as the basis of much organizational discussion and planning and consistent with this, the idea of undertaking a more formal approach to studying supervisory practices within the agency was received with much enthusiasm.

The steps taken prior to the implementation of the project itself were designed primarily to communicate administrative support for the project in order to ensure participation at all levels.

The author discussed the proposed project with the Deputy Executive Director as early as June 1989, well in advance of the submission of a formal doctoral proposal. These early discussions lasted throughout the summer of 1989 and elicited input from agency administration which could be incorporated into the project design. As a result, when the final proposal was submitted and accepted by the doctoral committee in September 1989, it was clear that the project could move forward as planned.

In October 1989 the Deputy Executive Director sent a memorandum to all agency directors informing them about the project. (See appendix III) At the same time a meeting was held with the Executive Director reviewing the proposal and eliciting her support. Subsequent to this a meeting was held with the remaining executive staff consisting of two Assistant Executive Directors and the Medical Director. An opportunity was provided for these individuals to review the proposal in its entirety, raise questions, concerns etc. This step in the process was critical as the staff involved in the project reported directly to these individuals. Following this, in November 1989, the author had an opportunity to present the plan for the study to all Department Directors at a monthly

Executive Director's meeting. (See presentation outline appendix IV)

The above steps ensured that there was widespread knowledge of the project as well as its administrative support, prior to the project directors initial request for voluntary participation of supervisors in late November and early December, 1989. (See letters of invitation appendix V) This undoubtedly contributed to the high rate of participation in the first phase of the project during a time of year that is particularly stressful for staff.

PROJECT METHODOLOGY

In order to identify critical issues in the supervision of child welfare staff, focus groups were held with department directors and front line supervisors during phase one of the study. Material generated during the focus group discussions was later analyzed and the results utilized in the development of a framework for inquiry during individual interviews. Eight participants were selected for individual interviews based on their input during focus group discussions. The interviews were utilized to deepen the focus group discussion and generate illustrative material of the major supervisory methodologies.

Focus group technology

The selection of focus groups as the method of initial data collection was based on the fact that they are particularly helpful in generating qualitative data from individuals who share some particular characteristic, in this case supervisors of non professionally trained child welfare workers. Recognizing that the traditional model of supervision no longer seemed effective, there was interest in discovering from supervisors what they were doing to respond to the demands of current child welfare practice. Focus groups were considered an ideal methodology for this as they work well in determining the "perceptions, feelings and manner of thinking" of a particular group of individuals.[1]

Focus group technology utilizes an inductive process which derives understanding based on the discussion itself, rather than by testing out a preconceived hypothesis. Focus groups can be used alone or can be combined with other methods of data collection. When used in combination, the discussions can be used to stimulate interest and thinking in a particular area prior to developing an interview schedule or questionnaire.

Focus groups as a technique fall somewhere between participant observation and individual interviews, being more controlled than the former and less controlled than the

---

[1] For more information see Richard A. Krueger, Focus Groups A Practical Guide for Applied Research (Sage Publications: Newbury Park California, 1988) p.29.

latter. Focus groups "are better suited to topics of attitudes and cognition while participant observation is better when studying roles and organizations"[2] This was an important consideration in method selection. While examining organizational roles, the study at hand was primarily interested in exploring the attitudes and cognition about a particular organizational role held by those directly involved. According to the literature, focus groups are "useful in uncovering what participants think but excellent in uncovering why they think as they do"[3] The technology thus helps participants focus on their motivation and experiences rather than their opinions.

Focus groups traditionally involve participants not known to one another. Therefore the methodology had to be explored as to its applicability within a particular organization. According to the literature, focus groups are considered to be highly adaptable while able to continue to yield useful and significant results. Krueger states that "caution should be exercised when conducting focus groups within organizations, especially among people who have regular contact with one another....and may be responding based on past experiences, events or discussion..(Also that) familiarity tends to inhibit

---

[2] David L. Morgan, Focus Groups As Qualitative Research (Sage Publications, Newbury Park, California 1988) p12.

[3] Ibid p.25.

disclosure"[4] Although "internal moderators are more likely to be familiar with the organization, ... they will have the challenge of engendering the confidence and trust of the participants "[5] Most important, when adapting focus group technology to a specific situation the facilitator must continue to listen and learn, primarily by posing open ended questions to the group. This primary purpose must remain central throughout all adaptations.

Project focus groups

In considering these issues, it was decided that the benefits of the technology for the current project, outweighed the limitations. The issues raised above appeared to be more related to the process of data analysis and the results obtained, than the procedures or discussion process itself. Therefore, project focus groups were organized based on standard focus group methodology with modifications to address the particular conditions of the current study. For example, group size was determined by the study sample which equaled the number of individuals occupying a particular organizational role. Standard focus group technology advises against mixing role categories as this is felt to restrict or inhibit discussion. Axelrod advises that one select those population segments likely to provide the most meaningful

[4] Richard A. Krueger, 1988 (Op. Cit.) p.28.

[5] Ibid. p.167.

information.[6] Since the primary area of investigation was social work supervision, only supervisors possessing an MSW were included in the focus group sample. In addition groups were organized based on organizational structure with department directors invited to a focus group separate from supervisors. This generated three focus groups, one for direct service department directors, a maximum sample of eight (the supervisors of the supervisors) and two for direct line supervisors, a combined potential sample of sixteen.[7] (For details of focus group participants see Tables III-VI)

TABLE III: DESCRIPTIVE DATA - DEPARTMENT DIRECTORS FOCUS GROUP

# Yrs. post MSW	17	7	21	11	13	12	31
Major Method	CW	CW	CW	ADM	CW/GW	GW	CW
# Yrs. as Adm.	8	1	1	6	>3	4	5
# Yrs. as Sup.	12	>3	13	8	7	3	16
# Yrs. CW Sup.	5	>3	1	8	5	3	16

[6] For a discussion of group formation see David L. Morgan, 1988 (Op. Cit.) p.44-48.

[7] The Supervisor groups contained individuals holding the title of either *supervisor* or *program director* within the organization. These job categories were combined as they hold almost identical supervisory responsibilities and with only one exception bear no hierarchial relationship to one another. Thus for the purposes of this research they were treated as one population.

TABLE IV: SUMMARY OF FACTS (TABLES V AND VI)

# Yrs. post MSW	from <1 - 36 years ago
Major Method	10 of 13 casework majors administration 2nd most common
# Yrs. as Sup.	from 2 months - 31 years
# Yrs. CW Sup.	from 2 months - 15 years
Post Masters Trg. In Sup.	all but least experienced had some post masters training in supervision-most commonly workshops rather than certificate programs

TABLE V: DESCRIPTIVE DATA - SUPERVISORS - FOCUS GROUP

# Yrs. post MSW	36	35	11	7	1	5	26
Major method	CW	CW	ADM	ADM	CW	CW	CW
# Yrs. as Sup.	20	31	10	3	>1	3	6
# Yrs. as CW Sup.	15	2	7	3	>1	<1	4
Post MSW Trg. In Sup.	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y

TABLE VI: DESCRIPTIVE DATA - SUPERVISORS - FOCUS GROUP II

# Yrs. post MSW	10	2	10	10	4	8
Major Method	GRP	CW	CW	C/A	CW	CW
# Yrs. as Sup.	5	>1	4	13	<3	4
# Yrs. CW Sup.	5	>1	>1	13	<3	3
Post MSW Trg. In Sup.	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Focus Groups were run for two hours and followed a predetermined questioning pattern. (See appendix VI) The intent of the focus groups was to hear from supervisors about what they do, what they find effective and the dilemmas they face, given the inexperience of staff and the over-regulation of the field. Their efforts to manage both the administrative and educative (teaching) functions of their supervisory role was a major area of interest based on an impression that role overload often created an imbalance in these aspects of supervision. Since the project ultimately sought to develop and recommend alternative approaches to the supervision of novice, child welfare staff it was important to generate discussion on current strategies and techniques, both effective and problematic. Also, if additional resources were to be brought to bear, supervisory attitudes about shared responsibility for staff development had to be explored. These areas were thus reflected in the focus group questions.

The level of moderator involvement followed a continuum from initially low, as is recommended for exploratory research in which maximum participant ideas are to be generated, to higher involvement in order to probe particular areas of interest. Each group began with a brief description of what a focus group is and how the group would proceed. Participants were encouraged to describe their experiences without reaching for consensus. The role of the project leader as facilitator

rather than participant was discussed as was the issue of confidentiality. As participants were familiar with one another to differing degrees, there was a brief go around where participants were asked to introduce themselves stating the area in which they work, the number and educational background of their supervisees. This was followed by the first focus question being posed to the group. The protocols in appendix VI describe the introductory remarks and the focus questions for each group.

Focus groups are generally tape recorded however, given the concerns regarding utilization of this technique within an organization with participants known to one another, a decision was made to limit data collection to written notes kept without identification of speaker. It was felt that this would create the least possible inhibition while still providing full and accurate information. To facilitate accuracy of this recording, one participant in each group was asked to take notes in addition to the group facilitator. This served as a check and balance that all information was recorded accurately.

Individual interviews

As previously discussed, focus groups were utilized in the development of a framework for inquiry for use during individual interviews since they are less controlled and thought to generate more participant centered information. By

asking supervisors to talk about their approach to supervision the facilitator was able to identify similarities and differences along several continua. Select individual interviews were then conducted to deepen the understanding of the trends identified. In particular, individual supervisors were asked to offer specific examples and illustrations of the supervisory strategies and techniques discussed in the focus groups. They were asked not only to give detailed descriptions and illustrations of what they do but also to discuss the thinking behind their actions. Why they supervised as they did, their motivation and rationale was considered an important area of investigation during this phase of the project research. Since it was likely that the supervisory techniques identified during focus group discussion would not be entirely new, the way in which, and reason for which, they were employed was thought to be of both interest and import to the investigation.

Interview sample

A total of eight supervisors were interviewed individually. This included supervisors from both undercare and community programs. Their experience varied along the lines of the general focus group population (See Tables IV-VI) Given the overall project design, individuals were selected for interviews based on the author's perception of their ability to conceptualize their supervisory practice. This was based on

their participation during focus group discussions as well as other opportunities for discussion of supervisory issues which may have occurred within the normal course of agency life. Within this broad criteria, efforts were made to identify and select supervisors reflecting a range of different ideas, methodologies and values.

Interview structure

The interviews were relatively unstructured. They varied in length but averaged approximately one and one half to two hours. They each began with the interviewer summarizing the major supervisory techniques identified during focus group discussions and asking the interviewee to comment on their utilization of these methods providing illustrations as possible. The methods presented included: **traditional one to one supervision; group supervision; maintaining an open door policy; direct client involvement and review of paperwork.** As the interviewee described his/her practice, the interviewer reached for the underlying thinking that explained the action. For example, supervisors were asked to think about why they used the techniques they did, whether this was driven primarily by them, the supervisee and/or the organizational context. Developmental and differential aspects of their work were queried. Supervisors thoughts and feelings about current child welfare staff and practice were elicited at every opportunity.

Data collection

Recognizing from the focus group data that supervisors differed in their approach and emphasis the individual interviews were, as noted above, relatively unstructured. This enabled a given supervisor to highlight those aspects of supervision which he/she considered most important. Detailed notes were taken during each of the individual interviews including numerous quotes illustrating particular aspects of supervisory practice. Following each interview, case studies were written and themes identified. Four of these case illustrations are included in the Findings Chapter below.

CHAPTER III: FINDINGS

This chapter will first describe the results of focus group interviews which were conducted to provide a framework for inquiry during individual interviews. Following this, the framework will be articulated and the data from the individual interviews will be presented.

Three focus group were held. One for department directors, the supervisors of the direct line supervisors; and two for direct line supervisors. Each group will be described based on its composition and process, followed by the content discussed by the group. The content of the directors group will be handled separately. However, since the supervisors groups were self selected and yielded similar data, the content of these two groups will be handled together.

Following the above, the analysis of focus group data and its impact on the development of a framework for individual interviews, the second method of data collection, will be discussed. Finally, the data from the individual interviews will be presented and analyzed.

FOCUS GROUP - DIRECTORS

Seven of eight directors invited attended the group. Each of the directors is in charge of a direct service area, i.e., Prevention; Family Day Care; Intake; Foster Care; Adoption; Group Homes. Each director supervises from one to five direct

line supervisors. Thus it is their supervisees who are included in the remaining focus groups and whose work is the primary focus of this study.

The group was somewhat late and slow getting organized but this appeared to be more of the prevailing organizational climate than anything particular to this group. The ambiance of the group was relaxed and friendly. People seemed genuinely interested in participating. It is important to note that this is a group who are largely comfortable with one another and accustomed to meeting and working together in various combinations.

The protocol of focus group questions was primarily the same for all three groups (See appendix vi). Given the difference in job function, the directors moved at times between discussion of their supervision of the supervisors and the primary focus of the supervision of direct care workers. In all focus groups there were three primary areas of investigation: differentiation of administrative and educative supervisory roles; the actual structure of supervision as it is currently practiced within the agency; issues of support for supervisors especially greater collaborative and team approaches to supervision within the agency.

Administrative and educative functions

Discussion of the dual function of supervision understandably, could not be separated from the service arena in which the directors and their supervisors operated. Primarily the directors focused upon the ill fit between the realities of practice, the complexity of the client population and the lack of formal social work education of the vast majority of the line staff.

> " You are starting at a very basic level. You need a different model of supervision because you have a different level of skill."
>
> "Our supervisors provide supervision to non MSWs...this is different from what we did...not exactly social work supervision...it is different because staff is different."

This situation is complicated for them by a very strong professional, ethical responsibility which the directors expressed feeling towards clients. They emphasized that the cases required a great deal of skill.

> "You have very young workers being hit with things that are difficult...problems they just can't handle. Often the supervisor must handle cases directly because the workers do not have the knowledge or skill to handle them."
>
> "The level of client dysfunction requires the exact opposite of what we have. We need the most experienced..."

This creates frustration for the supervisor...

> "How do you deal with this family, given your caseworker? There is an expectation in the system that we are going to deal with this family...to work with this client. You can see why the focus

> might shift to accountability rather than the underlying issues, at least there you can do what's expected."

In addition to the issues of worker skill, the bureaucratic nature of Child Welfare practice makes it difficult for supervisors to attend to the practice of teaching. Now, more than ever before, attention must be given to the administrative practicalities and accountability issues.

> "So many things need to get done...we become task focused...supervision becomes monitoring..."

> "When you cannot deal with the client/caseworker match, you do what you can with the tasks. You focus on the accountability demands."

It was felt that the service arena, including the staffing pattern encourages a task and accountability focus in order for supervisors to experience some degree of satisfaction and accomplishment in meeting identified goals. In order to accomplish more than this, the directors felt that their supervisors, as the only trained professionals, must be more directly involved with clients.

The directors all experienced an ongoing tension between getting the work out and education, but varied in their opinion as to the degree to which we have given up on educational supervision.

> "The myth may be that we have not given up, however, in day to day operations, maybe we have. We often have not afforded the supervisor the opportunity to do more..."

In relationship to this, they did acknowledge that it is their responsibility as directors, to require an educational focus of their supervisors. That it is they, who set the tone for encouraging or discouraging education within their department. For believing or not that it is possible....

> "Skill building is also the directors job. You model with supervisors and they then model to staff."
>
> "We set the tone...some days I may be very management oriented and other days more dealing with the underlying issues..."

Structure/techniques

Many methods of supervision were identified as currently utilized within the departments. It is important to recognize that the span of control of the directors ranged from one to five supervisors. Thus in some departments there is one model of supervision while in others, depending upon the degree of autonomy granted to supervisors, there may be a variety of models utilized.

There was amongst the directors, a great appreciation of the difficulty and complexity of the direct line supervisor's job. While most agreed that some type of formal, consistent supervisory structure is important to address the personal and professional growth of workers, their consensus was that supervisors must incorporate other methods of supervision into a model that best fits with current Child Welfare practice.

> "A set hourly time develops the person...their career, professional sense of self, etc. The walk in model does not do this..."
>
> "A supervisor can turn morale around by working more intensively with staff...by providing this structure. It may not be weekly...but it must be there."
>
> "We must teach them what supervision is...to do this, we must be clear ourselves!"

However important one to one supervision was, most felt that their supervisors were developing other methods out of necessity.

> "Using groups can enhance individual support...also supervisors going out with the worker...doing joint interviews...role modeling."
>
> "They must have an open door policy, to deal with the crisis as it occurs on a daily basis."

The less traditional, more hands on methods of supervision seemed to the directors to be among the most effective. All agreed that the supervisor's direct involvement with clients did not necessarily represent role confusion stemming from the supervisor's reluctance to step out of direct service, as is often the case in more traditional social work settings. At the same time, this possibility was thought to exist depending upon the way in which direct client involvement is utilized by the supervisor.

Directors varied in tone as to whether the caseworker or the supervisor was empowered to provide services to clients. More exploration of this is necessary to determine if the top

down message to supervisors is that they must be directly involved with clients as well as constantly available to workers and thus involved in moment to moment case activity and decision making. For example, one director stated:

> "Time management is a big issue. There is no time to review paperwork adequately because most work time is taken up intervening in crisis..."

And another:

> "If the workers could handle casework issues, the supervisor would be free to handle supervision..."

These comments do imply that there may be an administrative expectation that supervisors handle casework issues in the absence of a more professionally trained casework staff. If true, this has many implications in terms of both direct practice and supervision.

Support/collaboration

Directors comments in other areas included a belief that the agency needs a clearer philosophy regarding supervisory practice. This would help to clarify expectations of the supervisor role and assist in establishing a better balance between administrative and educative functions.

> "We don't set up the structure to help our supervisors address development with staff. It's mentioned in the Mission Statement and then there is no follow through. This needs to be developed. A part of our expectations of our supervisors is that they will work on staff development. This is philosophically based in social work and that's why it must be part of the agency philosophy of

> supervision...that you help someone to do the job but also to develop professionally."

The directors as a group felt that there are organizational issues which distract from an educational focus. One aspect of this was identified as the need for clear policies and procedures around administrative matters in order to allow supervisors and directors to focus more time and energy on other service delivery issues. The directors felt that they did not utilize their own clinical skills enough and in this way, as managerial role models, pass this on to their supervisors.

The directors were quite open regarding possible collaboration with other staff in the area of supervision. They were particularly supportive of efforts to utilize various "internal consultants" to help individual staff with specific issues.

> "If you begin to identify areas of development with staff, the supervisors job is to help identify resources to help with this, not to do it all herself.."

> "Staff need training but we are always struggling with the pressure of workload demands when trying to find time for training. Other methods of supervision such as utilizing training time to work directly with a caseworker and client, could help with this."

The directors were interested in exploring a variety of action models of supervision, including expanded use of video tape, one way mirror rooms etc. They were quite open to others,

i.e., training department staff, taking the lead in developing this type of supervisory model and making it available to all appropriate staff. Similarly, in discussing group supervision, they felt that this did not necessarily need to be contained within a particular unit.

> "Group leaders do not necessarily need to be the same as the individual supervisor. You don't always have to run group supervision yourself in order for your staff to participate."

All of these comments contain useful hints for the development of a more collaborative approach to supervision and also speak well for the receptivity to such a model once proposed.

FOCUS GROUPS - SUPERVISORS

As mentioned previously, two Focus Groups were held with supervisors. These groups were self selected and will first be described separately and then, because of their similarity, the content will be handled together. As with the directors, the three general areas of inquiry included, administrative and educative roles; structure of supervision currently utilized; ideas related to collaborative approaches.

In the first group, seven out of eight supervisors who registered, attended. There was some last minute registration amongst this group and some sense that several may have felt obligated to attend. This however, was less evident the day of the group than prior to it. By and large the group was interested, attentive, and wanted to participate.

The time delay in getting started was very close to that

of the directors group and, as mentioned previously, is consistent with organizational culture. Most of the group members knew one another although not necessarily very well, and thus, there was a need for introductions, explanation of area of practice, span of control etc. It was interesting to note that in asking this group to talk about whom they supervised, despite orientation to the group and subject matter, they included their supervision of clerical and other non-professional staff. This may have been lack of clear instruction or perhaps may be some indication of the degree to which they do not differentiate social work supervision from general, administrative supervision.

In the second supervisors group, six of seven who registered were present. This group differed from the first in its ability to maintain focus and manage time. For reasons not entirely clear to the investigator, this group seemed to bring with it more organizational baggage including a more oppositional stance towards administration. One other factor which may have influenced this group was that it was the only group held in the late afternoon. This perhaps in turn affected the amount of cumulative stress of the workday which participants brought with them. Despite these differences, the major content discussed in this group was consistent with that of the first, and therefore for purposes of analysis, the content of the two groups will be handled together.

Administrative/educative finctions

Most of the supervisors agreed that it is increasingly difficult to keep an educative focus when defined as "education for social work practice" rather than educating on "procedures and forms" One very experienced supervisor stated:

> "You have to supervise more by the job description. Essentially this means that it is more important to teach them how to do a UCR (Uniform Case Record) and get it out on time, than to understand adolescents. You try to integrate both, but that does not happen very often."

Agreement with this uncovered the degree of guilt and tension which many supervisors have about this. While the intention, desire, plan etc. to do more consistent, formal, educative supervision exists, this too often goes by the wayside in favor of on the spot, crisis intervention.

> "I do crisis intervention all the time. I constantly think of ways to do casework supervision...I set up weekly schedules...it does not work because I am in some kind of crisis situation with something else..."

> "Education loses out. I feel guilty that I have not provided staff with the education they need to do the job. Often at the end of the day I feel that I assumed a worker knew how to do something that came up. I can't do that...we ask a lot of staff. For the level of responsibility, we need a different level of staff."

As a group, the supervisors experience workers as being quite dependent. In combination with high turnover, they find it extremely difficult to move away from this sense of need to be constantly available to staff. The need to focus continually

on the very basics in turn makes it difficult to attend to the needs of the slightly more experienced, or at least tenured, worker.

> "You must take them by the hand...teach the basics...it makes me crazy. You have to hold their hands. They need to be empowered."

Supervisors were able to identify a parallel process that occurs between their work with caseworkers and the caseworkers intervention with clients:

> "If you are judgmental, parental etc. they will be that way with clients. Empowerment is important. Everything we do is modeling, perhaps more so than with MSWs."

> "Workers feel the hierarchy. They do the work. They need to feel empowered...that we help them."

A constant theme and problem in focusing on the educational supervision of workers related back to the overall inexperience of workers entering the agency. This ranged from inexperience in child welfare and social work to inexperience in the world of work. This inexperience leads to a drain not only on the educational aspect of supervision but the administrative as well. Supervisors felt that even the most routine work could not be skimmed but rather needed to be examined in every detail. Very strong feelings were expressed about the fact that one could not readily assume that basic work habits were in place.

> "The problem is that people who know nothing are allowed to work here."
>
> "You can only do a good job if you have quality to work with."
>
> "After six months you have half a caseworker..."

All the supervisors agreed that if you had a basically competent and intelligent person you could try to move beyond some of the basics. However, as one supervisor put it:

> "It is overwhelming to try and deal with both the compliance (administrative) and clinical aspects of the cases with untrained staff."

The supervisors felt that the casework job, particularly in foster care, was very task oriented. To move a plan ahead necessitated a very task oriented focus on the part of both the caseworker and supervisor. One implication of this is how to begin to conceptualize teaching and learning around the task so that issues of relationship are incorporated into a task focus.

> "The question is how to get the most mileage out of supervision. Ultimately it is the supervisor who is accountable, not the caseworker or director. The job is to be organized and to help the worker be organized."
>
> "You can't expect a BA worker to do clinical counseling. There are many issues...separation, abuse...that are not really understood for a long time. For many this is their first job...they need a lot of assistance."

Some supervisors more than others expressed the need to develop a sense of personal growth in the worker. They felt

strongly that only by emphasizing the importance of this could one ensure its place in the supervisory relationship. While no one openly disputed this, some felt that while this was theoretically a good idea it really was difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. There may have been differences in this regard based on the area of practice and agency setting along with differences based on supervisory style and values.

> "Supervision is education, administration is accountability. I go back and forth between the two depending upon who is in my office and what we are looking at."

> "There is very little that is more important to me than teaching...You have to play with the system, with deadlines...to be smart about organization. If you learn what can wait and what can't there is room for education...that cannot wait!"

Structure/techniques

How supervisors went about the task of assisting the novice worker in developing necessary knowledge and skills did vary, although through the discussion certain basic strategies emerged. These were in fact consistent with those identified by their directors. As noted above, expectations about learning and growing varied. Some supervisors utilized and/or required reading materials and mini projects for staff involving researching and reporting on an area of practice. Others rarely, if ever, utilized such "academic" activities.

One of the major variations was the degree to which supervisors stuck to, or carried out their plan to offer one

to one, **individual supervision** on a regular basis. Some supervisors were committed to maintaining a reserved time during which the individual learning needs of the worker could be focused on in a consistent, developmental manner.

> "I see people once a week individually. Sometimes they tape record a contact, even a home visit and then we listen together during supervision. We might use the hour to meet together with a client. I find many workers open to this kind of thing."

While some supervisors like the one quoted above felt that they were able to consistently meet individually with staff, others combined individual weekly or bi-weekly sessions with some type of group meeting of the same frequency. Still others stated that they had moved away from a plan to meet individually with staff as even an ideal.

> "I have moved away from individual supervision. Quite frankly I'm not sure how you manage to continue to look forward to meeting with them for 1 1/2 hours per week..."

All supervisors identified some form of **direct client involvement** which they engaged in together with their supervisees. This involvement ranged from those who felt that they always arranged to meet each client together with the worker, to those who did this only during an identified crisis in a case. For those who met with clients routinely, their stated objective was to gain a more direct, first hand assessment of the client. Some supervisors stated their own love of clinical work and desire to see clients directly, as

their primary motivation for joining workers in seeing clients. These supervisors felt that this involvement provided an opportune method of teaching via direct modeling.

> "I love direct practice. At first I started to see clients just to put a face to a name then I realized it really helped me teach the worker..."
>
> "After one month I invite the client in...it helps both the worker and me to see what is going on."
>
> "I arrange a meeting with the worker, client and myself when I feel there are obstacles to carrying out the service plan..."
>
> "Hands on work may get too involved...workers may get dependent on this..."

Some supervisors practiced a team approach to service delivery in which more than one worker shared responsibility for each case. These supervisors felt that they have a great deal of first hand involvement and knowledge of clients in an ongoing way, which offered them many opportunities to intervene for the purpose of "clinical supervision".

> "I know all the players...have direct daily involvement both clinically and technically. The first time they meet the client, I am there."
>
> "The team allows for clinical supervision on a daily basis."

It is important to note that the span of control for supervisors utilizing the team approach, and their overall team caseload, is significantly lower than that of supervisors working in the more traditional, unit model.

Throughout, supervisors felt that their direct involvement represented a connection for clients to something more permanent than the individual caseworker. Particularly in light of high turnover, this was seen as an important dynamic. This is in marked contrast to a more professionally staffed setting, where direct involvement of the supervisor is frequently seen as a potential undermining of the worker.

Another major area of supervisory involvement was the review of **written work**. There are a number of different ways in which this is handled and overlaps both the administrative and educative functions. Most supervisors felt that they were so involved in paperwork overload, including the correction of very basic errors in content, along with basic language deficits, that time did not permit much utilization of paper work for the teaching of casework from a conceptual or psychodynamic perspective. A few supervisors stressed their focus on differentiating between corrections of writing style and intervention strategy. All agreed that it was from reading Progress Notes on an ongoing basis that they were able to follow case developments. However, this process might be under utilized for ongoing teaching and learning. Very often, supervisors reported that they handled paperwork outside of regular working hours in order to make time for other supervisory activity i.e., teaching.

Utilization of the **open door** for supervisor/caseworker contact was another major method of supervision utilized to

varying degrees by all supervisors. They spoke of this as ongoing and constant, occurring any time and any place. While seen as crisis intervention, most agreed that the definition of crisis was vague and often situations responded to in this way could indeed wait. With slight variation, supervisors felt that they had to be available all of the time for their workers, to answer questions, set direction and lend support.

Some supervisors spoke of the double bind created by this type of availability in terms of worker autonomy and empowerment and have begun to set limits on this type of activity. Others however, felt that it was something that could not realistically be curtailed without seriously affecting the work.

> "It is difficult to say no...to set boundaries. Even when my door is closed, it is open. If I close it, they think I'm not interested. That I hide in my office..."
>
> "I try and help staff to identify what is or is not a crisis or emergency...to develop judgement in the worker."
>
> "At first I thought I'd be organized...no way!...the vents of the day still interfere, it's impossible for them not to."

Most supervisors mentioned the utilization of some type of group forum for addressing the educational and/or supervisory needs of staff. This varied from what might technically be considered group supervision, to unit or team meetings. Peer sharing and common learning needs on both a clinical and

procedural issues were identified most commonly as factors contributing to the success of group strategies.

Support/collaboration

The final area of inquiry related to the utilization of more collaborative, shared resources for educational supervision. There was a great sense of sharing and cooperation as opposed to turfdom, in response to this idea.

> "We need ways to integrate what workers learn in training with what we are doing in supervision with individual cases."
>
> "More individualized orientation and training would help."
>
> "We need to identify internal experts/consultants.. utilize them in conferences or in supervising on a particular case."

Not surprisingly, concerns about boundaries when discussing the involvement of others in case supervision did emerge to some degree.

> "Supervisors see cases differently. In the ideal model, you would be there if another supervisor was meeting/consulting with your caseworker."
>
> "You could also do it for a block of cases in your unit that have a common issue..then invite someone to meet with the group"

Overall, it seems that an awareness of the scope of what needs to be accomplished has fostered an appreciation of any help offered.

"We can use people to come in and give us a hand"

"We need to be creative in getting training for our staff."

The importance of a clear administrative message regarding the importance of educational supervision was felt by all to be a necessary incentive that at present was not always communicated.There was a strong feeling expressed that supervisors did not have ample opportunities to get together as peers outside of their department to share their own vast resources and to lend support to one another. Developing such opportunities clearly lends support to the development of more collaborative models.

FRAMEWORK FOR INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

An analysis of the focus group data indicated that supervisors appear to be utilizing several supervisory techniques or strategies in various combinations in order to address the needs of novice staff working in a complex service arena. These represented both formal and informal methods including:

-Traditional one to one supervision

-Direct Client Involvement

-Open Door

-Group Supervision

-Paper Work Review

The utilization of these techniques varied across supervisors with some stressing one method over another. All the supervisors who participated in the focus groups were attempting to address worker inexperience, dependency and turnover in their particular choice of technique and strategy mix.

Individual interviews were utilized to gain a greater understanding of each of these methods and how they addressed the identified problems. The examiner was particularly interested in understanding why a given method was selected for use and how it contributed to the development of the worker and/or delivery of effective services to clients. In other words, what were the primary considerations in choosing a supervisory mix and what interfered with supervisors implementing their ideal model?

Each of the individual interviews began by outlining for the supervisor the supervisory techniques which emerged from the focus group discussions as outlined above. Each supervisor was asked to discuss his/her utilization of these techniques.

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW - DATA ANALYSIS

In analyzing data from the individual interviews there were certain dimensions which emerged that appear to influence the way in which supervision is practiced within this child

welfare agency. Each dimension represented a continuum, the polar ends of which are identified below. These included:

1. Conceptualization of supervisory role:

   Overseer/Administrator <---------> Educator/Teacher.

2. Posture towards workers:

   Control <------------------------> Empowerment.

3. Goal of supervision:

   Remedial <------------------------> Developmental.

4. Structure of supervision:

   Informal <------------------------> Formal.

Underlying all that a supervisor does, including his/her utilization of the various supervisory techniques discussed above, is a belief system that varies as to whether or not the novice, BA level worker, can in fact intervene effectively with clients beyond a simple task/accountability focus. This belief system affects the basic conceptualization of both the worker and supervisor role. Where each supervisor falls along this continuum permeates all that is said and done and in this way, influences all of the other dimensions.

Regardless of the particular mix of supervisory techniques favored by an individual supervisor, the belief system affects how each technique is utilized. It impacts not only what is done, but why...both purpose and motivation. For example, when utilizing on the spot strategies, such as the open door, a supervisor might be involved primarily in

administrative control, teaching and/or offering support. While at times all supervisors may be involved in any of the above activities, there were definite patterns which emerged based on this very basic concept.

Individual interviews revealed that traditional one to one supervision remained the method of choice for some supervisors. Those who believed in this method, seemed able to hold to some regular format and utilized it as an opportunity to focus on more in depth case dynamics and issues. Those who held regular individual supervisory sessions but regarded them as more pro forma reported that the supervisory sessions take on more of an accountability and monitoring function. Not surprisingly, this ceases to be fun for either supervisor or supervisee. This experience tends to confirm for this latter group of supervisors their underlying belief that educational supervision in a more professional manner is just not possible with this staff in this service arena.

The above concepts are best illustrated by taking a look at some specific examples of supervisors who fall at different points along these continua. Despite some variation related to the particular aspect of child welfare service, e.g., prevention versus foster care, what one hears in these interviews is the degree to which the individual supervisor feels able to empower and enable caseworkers to deliver services to clients. It is important to remember that supervisors are drawing essentially from the same pool of

applicants and thus differences in how staff are perceived are more indicative of supervisor perception as well as their preferences in hiring.

EXAMPLE ONE-ALICE

Alice received her MSW approximately ten years ago as a casework major. She has been a supervisor of both BA and MSW staff for more than four years primarily in the area of mental health. Prior to coming to the agency she had completed a certificate program in supervision and had advanced clinical training. At the time of the study she had been with SJCS for about eighteen months.

When presented with the various techniques of supervision which emerged from the focus group discussions, Alice stated that while she utilized all the methods discussed her primary method was traditional one to one supervision. What follows are excerpts from the interview with Alice in which she discusses her ability to practice this type of supervision with BA workers in an undercare department.

> "The understanding between myself and the worker is to the best degree possible we leave this time free. It's a time we try to keep sacred as far as interruptions are concerned. This is established at the point of hire between the caseworker and myself. Within my department it is left to the supervisor to decide on a method, there is no format determined by the director."

I asked Alice if she was able to meet this ideal and if so how.

> "It would get a little tricky, not so much with phone calls but with other interruptions, foster mother X might show up unexpectedly, the secretary would buzz..those situations called for some judgement. There were times when before the worker went out to see the foster mother, I would ask what was going on. If it was not just administrative but a problem in the case we would first talk about it in the supervision session. I believed that the client or foster mother could wait a bit...that supervision was important. Other interruptions might be crises and you might have to forego...it depended."

Also of interest was the content of these individual supervisory sessions. How did this particular supervisor socialize novice workers into a somewhat more professional supervisory model?

> "Workers knew this was their time and that they were free to bring anything...case related or personal. They knew they had the floor; not a written agenda but they usually came with notes about things they wanted to discuss. I might ask 'how would you like to begin today?' then the agenda was theirs. Any type of problem that came to me I tried to first get the worker to think on their own about it. I didn't always follow this but I tried to....to empower them...to not just give an answer. At times I did that, due to time pressure or whatever but there was that commitment. After a while I think workers came to expect that if they came and said they were having a problem with something, they knew after a while to talk about that, that they were expected to talk about a problem they were having...that I would ask what they had tried, what worked and what didn't. What workers presented varied...a worker might inform me of some issue on a case and we would brainstorm a solution or at times we might discuss interviewing style. Typically this was when things were going smoothly, almost like there was room for that. I don't think that's the right way to do it, but that typically is what would happen. If I met the worker and she said things were going OK, that nothing much was up that she wanted to talk about I would say then maybe we could take some time to

> talk about counseling or some other topic. Most of my staff were receptive to this."

The above excerpt illustrates this supervisors belief in the empowerment of novice staff. It speaks to a developmental model of supervision which differentiates the new from the more experienced worker. Time management and setting of priorities is an issue even within the supervisory session...

> "Even if we were doing extensive work with one case, there was always time to go over other cases. With more experienced workers we might only get to two cases...usually not the whole caseload. Logistically this was not possible, with a caseload of 20+. If you talk about all you might just as well not talk about any. It becomes a quality sacrifice. This was rarely a problem... you would talk about different cases each week... with these workers you had the luxury of spending more time with fewer cases. It was different with new workers. It was understood that you had to focus on more administrative things, go over most cases... as a supervisor you have to be more pro active. I would try to get a sense of what they were learning and not learning...did they know about certain forms, policies, etc.? There was more checking along these lines...also how were they doing and feeling? New workers did not yet know how to put a name to a problem...it takes a while for a new worker to even say he/she is having trouble getting through to a client. They experience a difficulty without yet defining it...they don't yet know what to expect from clients...how you are supposed to interact. All of this takes time. I think my model of supervision generated independence and that my workers knew that. I was there to help but I trusted them and expected them to struggle with autonomous thinking...that it was okay for them to take risks and make mistakes. For those who stayed there was development. I don't think that for those who did not stay long that this push for autonomy was the issue."

Hearing Alice talk about her relatively successful utilization of a traditional one to one supervisory model I was interested in how the other techniques discussed during the focus groups worked in conjunction with this. How were action models such as direct client involvement and informal techniques such as the open door, incorporated into her system?

> "I knew the cases very well. I read all progress notes and UCRs...but also from seeing the clients in the department. I made an effort to meet all the clients...sometimes I did this at a transfer conference or if I wanted to know a case better, I'd ask the worker to arrange for us to meet with them. Most often I would do a piece of work..the workers felt fine about this. Some cases there was more active involvement than others. This was based on client need, it was often clinical...it might be that the worker was having difficulty for whatever reason so we would do a session together. I never saw a client alone."

This supervisor's use of direct client involvement seems to flow from and support her method of individual supervision. Clients are seen to support workers in the work they are doing and to assist the supervisor in teaching and empowering the worker. Listen too as Alice talks of her implementation of an open door policy and the way in which it continues to encourage worker autonomy.

> "The issues of boundaries, judgement and discretion were important to me. This was one of my trademarks in contrast to my director who was open door to an extreme. My workers were told to use discretion. If they saw me with a client or someone, they were not to interrupt. At times they did, we would discuss it afterwards, sometimes it was appropriate, other times not. I tried to use each situation to help them differentiate...I hope it was a learning experience..if it wasn't, it could have been. If I

> was at my desk I would stop most of the time. Staff were mostly looking for directives and at those moments it was quicker to given them than to try and tease it out. I just did not have the time...I might say we can discuss it more in supervision or that it could wait . At times I would have them tell the client to wait, there were two reasons for that...either I literally could not think that fast on my feet or if I really thought it was worth spending time on, I would suggest we discuss it later and get back to the client even if I did have an answer in my head. This was really to encourage and help the worker think it through. This kind of utilization of the open door was fairly regular. There was some reduction over time...people got more autonomous and confident in their decision making."

The degree to which the above demonstrates a major focus and emphasis on development of staff over and above monitoring and directing is noteworthy. Informal supervisory techniques are utilized, but clearly it is the supervisor who remains in control of when and how information is transmitted.

> "We worked in very close proximity. There was ongoing conversation almost all of the time talking about how things were going...what had occurred. It was very fluid, 'I spoke to so and so'...I might have a brief conversation then or I might suggest that we talk about it at another time. This might or might not be regular supervision time. It never really felt like checking up. This is likely to be my style..to convey interest in case developments rather than watching over their shoulders."

While it appears from the above that this supervisor had no difficulty incorporating informal and action techniques into a method which was largely dependent upon a traditional one to one model, she reported considerably less success in attempting to introduce group supervision on a regular basis.

It is important to note that group supervision for this staff was a department wide initiative. Thus leadership was divided and the group consisted of Alice and her five caseworkers as well as another team of workers. While Alice retained clinical leadership of the group, administrative tasks were handled by the director. While obviously these factors prohibit any clear analysis of this aspect of her supervisory style, some of Alice's observations about her workers in relationship to this group are worth noting.

> "There was some attempt to help staff with how you respond to case situations. We tried to move beyond, 'did you try ' to suggesting that workers base their suggestions on something. We were asking them to think about why they were saying or suggesting a particular thing. Some did not, or could not, do this. They did not really appreciate the difference in what we were suggesting. For me personally, I had to face the music of who I was working with. Some said it made sense to them but others said, 'why do I have to do this?' It was not real hostility but more like we were always trying to make them work more, to complicate things..."

For Alice this was related to the larger issue of the Child Welfare service arena and its professional culture.

> "I was accustomed to working in other places, not necessarily in Child Welfare. Staff was a higher level, it was absolutely looked forward to that you would have a block of time for in-service training or discussion...a time everyone looked forward to. I'm not just talking about one place...I can think of a number of different places. Time was etched out...maybe 2-4 hours of training or case consultation...people looked forward to it. Not so here...I was struck by that. Even when given permission to be there, even when workloads were lightened ...it went beyond that. Not just that they felt pressure to get back to their desks, that

> was a lot of it, but it went beyond that. It was different in one to one, there was some resistance on the part of some workers but this was different. Workers had a certain concreteness about them. It was difficult for them to get interested if it wasn't their case. At a certain level you crave this give and take, this was not there yet..."

This latter point regarding the degree to which workers are able to conceptualize practice at a more abstract level is critical to the development of new models of supervision. The workers ability to participate fully in learning forums where the focus of attention may be work other than their own is a necessary ingredient in collaborative efforts including group supervision.

EXAMPLE TWO-VINCENT

Vincent completed his MSW three and one half years prior to his participation in the study. He was employed as a supervisor at that time. His experience is primarily in child welfare and he has supervised paraprofessionals, BA level staff and most recently, MSW students.

The following excerpts are taken from an interview with Vincent, a supervisor in Preventive services operating out of a decentralized office. Accountability demands in this service segment are often considered to be less overwhelming and caseloads are somewhat lower. It is important to note that most staff in this office are bilingual while this particular supervisor is not. Particular attention should be paid to this supervisors focus on empowerment and education.

"Of the types of supervision outlined, the informal, on the fly, is the one I have the most reaction to. The grabs in the hallway as soon as you walk in the door....Originally my idea was to let the caseworker feel the utmost support; that their questions were important enough to give them attention; that their concerns were real. ..I began by being 100% available. It started to make me feel scattered....out of control. I might not remember that I gave a particular answer to something, later they would remind me...it led to some bad feelings. When I did begin to cut back on this availability, they reacted. They said they felt I was aloof; rejecting them...I did it by saying that we'd be meeting tomorrow...that I trusted their judgement...mistakes were okay. This has worked to some extent but they are still very dependent. BA workers are not like MSWs...they are just not equipped to deal with the work. The families are very entrenched...difficult to deal with. The workers bring all kinds of concerns which they want answered on the spot. It might relate to family violence and whether or not we should report it or it might be a failed appointment. I encourage a quick decision...not to spend a lot of time in this way. Often I ask if it really is a crisis. I really try and develop decision making skills in my workers. My main goal is worker independence. This is for me. In the beginning I got something out of having this group of dependent people all seeing me as the expert...then I got exhausted. I wasn't managing my time and my work. This was a difficult time for all of us. The workers kept saying that I had changed...that I was different...I guess they were right."

It is interesting in the above to note the degree to which the impetus to focus on worker empowerment begins with the supervisors need to limit his own availability rather than a plan to develop workers. This aspect of role clarification and boundary setting is not unique to this supervisor and appears to serve both workers and supervisors equally well. (See Karen below).

In the case of Vincent, his interest in education and focus on staff development is most evident when he discusses his utilization of traditional one to one supervision.

> "I would schedule 1 1/2 - 2 hours per week and try and reschedule if something came up and we had to cancel. I mainly tried to get them to recognize the patterns and concepts in their work...and to give these things names. I would look things up in books with them right there in my office...use the dictionary...show them I too was learning. I spend a lot of time in individual supervision discoursing. If a worker presents a family where there is incest, I might spend 45 minutes talking about the dynamics of incest. It's like a mini-training. I take the teachable moment. This may not always be good..I don't wait and bring it to the group so I may do the same thing several times."

Similar to Alice, Vincent talks about a developmental model of supervision that begins to take shape even during the hiring process.

> "I use supervision as a selling point in the hiring interview. I talk about it as what I will give the worker..that it is good and extensive. It really is developmental, early on they report every little thing. It's almost like a verbal process recording. I try and keep the focus to what is and is not important...the message even then is that I trust you on regular details. It's shaping and modeling. I show them what I take from what they say to make a concept...what I choose from the jigsaw puzzle that is the case. I try and help them take the pieces and make a picture. Over time I show them how I do it...they ask questions, listen and eventually it begins to take shape. Usually a good people person can also learn the rest of the job...they go together. The person who is always late is also the one who has trouble relating to the clients....you can't separate the two, the paper goes with understanding the work, they have to be learned together."

This supervisor appears to utilize individual supervision as a teaching forum and supplements this with direct client involvement and group learning opportunities as described below.

> "I do a lot of direct client work. My policy is that if they reach a point with their most difficult clients where they don't know what to do, they can bring me into it. I try hard not to take over, but to support them in the session. I try to convey that the caseworker represents a team working with and for the client. Modeling is important, I demonstrate a way to intervene and then give it back to them. At times I might see a family bi-weekly with the caseworker. Others I see once a month or many are just one shot deals. At times the worker just wants me to lay down the law especially regarding the potential removal of children. This often helps to get things moving on a case."

Note in the above the clear distinction between when direct client intervention is utilized as an administrative versus educative function.

> "Planning conferences operate much like group supervision. No clients attend just all the staff. We might spend all morning discussing 5-6 cases on a bi-weekly basis. The model is a group of people putting their heads together on a case. It is my opportunity to expand on a case being presented. I love to teach. It is different from a unit meeting where more administrative issues are handled. This is entirely clinical...a chance to look at case dynamics all together."

About himself as a supervisor, Vincent had the following to say:

> "I'm a good staff manager and developer. I have low staff turnover and high development. Many workers

> return to school. I put a lot into them...it's no accident that they stay. To be there for clients, the supervisor has to be there for the worker. It's bad if the worker does not feel that the agency is behind them. I'm the kind of supervisor I would want. I developed this by thinking about what I have had as a worker...both good and pretty bad. It's easy for me to connect back to myself as a worker, I use this when I deal with my staff."

EXAMPLE THREE-KENNETH

Kenneth holds an MSW with a concentration in research which he received more than ten years ago. He has over seven years of supervisory experience primarily in child welfare. During this time he has supervised both staff and students on a BA and MSW level. Kenneth has attended numerous workshops on supervision and at the time of the study had been employed by SJCS for over three years.

In contrast to the two supervisors described above, this example illustrates a supervisor who falls at a different point along the continua especially regarding formal versus informal supervisory strategies. Note the difference in the way this supervisor talks about staff development; the difference in language when discussing responsibility, empowerment etc.

> "The paper work has to get done, and you need to work out a system to do that. All the pieces connect like a puzzle to achieve permanency. It took me a long time to realize this and then to help workers with it. Workers need to understand why they are doing something..not just be told what to do. I feel guilty about supervision...that I should be able to see staff regularly. I can't..I'm doing what I need to do and I can't. I'm a

> perfectionist, I want quality turned out of my office so I spend a lot of time reviewing paperwork, UCRs etc. Checking everything is what stops me from meeting with staff. I used to set up weekly meetings, seeing people bi-weekly was really my goal. Now I don't even do that. Most of my staff does not look forward to one to one supervision. When I do individual supervision it tends to end up being more case monitoring and correcting not educating. Most staff have to be spoon fed, they don't participate much. The rewards are not there , I don't enjoy it and neither do they."

In place of a regular individual supervisory model, Kenneth described a model of more informal, on the spot supervisory contacts as well as a rather extensive utilization of the open door policy. In describing each of these, as well as in the excerpt above, note the emphasis on administrative control as differentiated from educative teaching.

> "Review of paperwork is a major effort. I use this to intervene with workers...as a jumping off point for supervision. This is strictly casework. I read something and if I have questions I call the worker in and we talk about what is going on...another way to handle it....we might role play. I try to get them to talk about it rather than tell them what to do. If others could benefit from this I might bring it to the group when it meets."

While the intent is "strictly casework", the impact of calling a worker in to raise questions about work submitted for review as compared to offering the worker an opportunity to think about such feedback prior to discussion in individual supervision is worth noting.

> "I feel I have an obligation to be there for the people who work for me when they want me. I do all my paperwork before and after regular office hours,

> on my own time. This is my choice, I need to concentrate without interruptions and feel I cannot do this when staff is present. If my door is open, and it usually is, they can come in. They bring things that need to be resolved now. Questions that need to be answered in order to complete a task that has been assigned. It may just be a need for clarification. They know that I want my finger in everything. I want to know about and see everything before it goes out. Otherwise, I'm afraid that mistakes would be made, information given in phone calls might not be correct. I would agree that most of this is not really an emergency or crisis but to me it is important. I might see a client with a worker if necessary. I see this as trouble shooting not really working with clients. Most often it would be a foster parent, I almost never would see a bio parent."

Not surprisingly this supervisor who describes little room for risk taking and a low tolerance for mistakes is also struggling with his recognition that his unit consists of a number of loyal employees who are able to complete tasks as assigned but show little talent in the area of creative involvement with clients. It is these same employees whom he described as not being fun to supervise on an individual basis. In recognition of this, Kenneth talked about his interest in group supervision, team models and collaborative efforts.

> " Group supervision has been most rewarding for me. We take a case and discuss it or role play some aspect of it. This used to be part of our overall staff meeting where I would pick something I had reviewed that week that seemed important for everyone. Now we have some team cases, where everyone is involved. The team meets without me, they tear the case apart and develop a plan. Then I meet with them as a group and we talk about the dynamics of the case. What's going on with the clients. It's is more educative, there is some

> attempt to discuss theory. Mostly it's intervention focused. Still the same problem about who participates. Having an MSW and experience as a caseworker does not automatically make me a supervisor or teacher. We all need skills and tools. Currently there is a good deal of sharing amongst the foster care supervisors each of whom has different strengths. This is very good.... something I'd like to see more of."

EXAMPLE FOUR-KAREN

Karen received her MSW with a major in casework one year prior to joining SJCS as a supervisor, a position she held for only a few months at the time of the study. She has supervised BA/BSW staff and students and had no post masters training in supervision.

The following example illustrates the conscious and deliberate attempt on the part of a supervisor to change her approach to supervision as she began with a new staff. Perhaps Karen, more than anyone, illustrates the degree to which the supervisors belief system, as discussed earlier in this chapter, influences their approach to the supervision of staff.

> "What is most helpful to me, what works best, is helping the workers to take responsibility. I have given them the clinical and the paperwork. I don't do their work anymore. This allows us all to be free and more creative. In the past I would learn their work...interact with other departments for them...I did not enjoy it, it took all my time. I thought I would burn out. Now I empower them to do this...they learn things without me. I keep track of who is learning what and then they teach each other as needed or at a unit meeting. This gives them a sense of accomplishment."

I was particularly interested in why this shift had come about. What had influenced the change and why did it appear so successful?

> "Initially I did their work because I am very conscientious. I had a terrible staff when I arrived. I could not stand what I saw happening to the caseloads. Kids were in care because work was not getting done...nothing clinical and nothing administrative. I started to do all the work I saw needed to be done. Finally, I thought I either had to leave or hire a staff who could know what their job was and do it. I looked for a change and believed it was possible. I tend to be over responsible...this was not helping. Now I have empowered them. There is nothing related to the paperwork and accountability system that cannot be learned by a college graduate...I really believe this."

Similar to the other supervisors, Karen reported that she utilized all of the techniques discussed during the focus group sessions. Her own particular blend and application of these supervisory strategies continues to demonstrate her emphasis on empowering her staff while maintaining a high level of organization and involvement.

> "I maintain an open door policy, seven hours a day, five days a week. Mostly the workers use it for clinical questions. Something comes up and they have a need to talk about it. It might be a phone call...a need to calm down an upset foster mother to avoid a disruption...something like that....they will get the lady off the phone and come to me for immediate assistance. I ask 'how do you want to handle it, on the phone, in person, alone, with me?' This goes on all the time. There is a need to consult all day long. It's informal, usually five or ten minutes mostly on how to deal with people. If I really am busy I might ask them to pretend I'm not in and then let them know a time later in the day when they can feel free to drop in."

Karen indicated that in addition to the open door policy described above, she also scheduled individual time with each worker on a weekly basis. In listening to her talk about this aspect of her supervision, the difference in her utilization of one to one in contrast to that described by Alice or Vincent, was striking.

> "I see each worker for one hour per week. This is rescheduled if it must be canceled. It is very structured, I work with the caseload assignment sheet and our accountability tracking forms...we talk about what happened that week with each case. We just go through alphabetically, I take notes. If I remember something from reading the Progress Notes I tell them to move on. Progress Notes are very important. If I get good notes I don't have to go over two million things in supervision. I can go over things briefly, ask questions and have time for more clinical discussion. I get all notes on Friday. They cannot be late. I read them Friday afternoon or Monday morning...they are the main focus for the week. I tell staff that the case reviews are for me. I want to be informed. My goal is to learn about all the cases. When something special comes up we meet again to discuss it. We might schedule an appointment for later in the week or we might build it into our informal supervision time...deliberately decide to discuss it all week as the situation unfolds. "

In discussing her direct involvement with clients, Karen indicated that she experienced a real shift as she began to emphasize the empowerment of her staff.

> "I still meet all the clients. I want to observe, to see what is going on. The change is that I used to meet all the new clients right away. Now I tell the worker to see the client once or twice before I meet with them. This way they can do their own assessment. It's part of the empowerment of the worker. If their job is to empower the client, I have to empower them. They finally confronted me

> saying that I showed confidence in them but did not let them handle the interviews when we met together with clients. They were right. I had to learn to sit back..it was very hard for me. I have to remember it's not my case. I'm a consultant to them..a guide. Despite this agreement to be more of a passive consultant, I will take over in an interview if I think it's necessary . Then I just explain to the worker why I felt it was necessary and we talk about the interview. "

Along with a strong focus on worker empowerment, Karen also stressed the importance of team work among her staff.

> "Unit meetings also have been changed around. it's more of a team approach. We meet for two hours every week. We keep the first half hour for administrative matters...as short as possible, then we have one hour for two case presentations. This leaves time to discuss some particular issue which may have come up for someone during the week. This is the part that is not planned ahead..just an open part of the agenda. This is promoting a real sense of teamwork. The workers get to know one another's cases. We use a format which focuses on asking the presenter how the group can help and then checking back at the end to see if help was received. The workers volunteer to present..so far I have not had to ask anyone. What is nice is that we also have started to meet informally most mornings. Someone may bring something to eat and its a more spontaneous sharing of what is going on...visits; schedules etc. It may last from five to thirty minutes depending upon the day. It just sort of began to happen as they started to work more together."

Commenting upon her overall supervisory strategy Karen continued to stress her investment in developing her staff.

> "Staff must be socialized into supervision. I talk about what supervision means to me and what they think they want. After two or three meetings I ask for feedback. This is important, I always ask how it is for them. I think my style is somewhat informal. I don't really teach them theory but we

> do talk about what is behind child abuse or drug addiction or dependency....why people do what they do...the dynamics. We don't really read a lot but especially in the morning group people will bring something they may have seen in the paper or something and we will discuss it. Also I give them positive feedback both personal and professional. This is important!"

SUMMARY

As anticipated, each of the supervisors interviewed utilized a combination of supervisory strategies corresponding to those identified during the focus group discussions. Reliance on the traditional, one to one model of supervision was still prevalent although by no means exclusive. Among those who do continue to meet individually with staff on a regular basis, the purpose varied from administrative review of all cases, to in depth exploration of individual situations. Similarly, while all supervisors interviewed stressed the importance of being available to staff, how they did this and for what primary purpose varied considerably. Also noteworthy was the differential utilization of direct client intervention. While most supervisors reported meeting with clients, this was never approached lightly and each supervisor had a thoughtful, yet somewhat unique perspective on this aspect of supervision. Perhaps most striking is the different expectations which supervisors held for staff and the way in which this influenced their definition and utilization of supervision. As supervisors control hiring for

their unit, this differing expectation may have a significant influence on who is hired and how they develop.

CHAPTER IV: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study of supervisory practice within child welfare was to identify current supervisory dilemmas and strategies in order to articulate an approach to supervision more applicable to staff, who for the most part do not have formal social work training. By examining what supervisors are currently doing in one setting, the study was intended to provide data that could be used as the basis for recommendations of a supervisory approach targeted to meet the needs of novice staff working within this complex and highly regulated field of practice.

While not abandoning efforts to increase the professionalization of child welfare staff it is important that child welfare agencies enable current staff to do the job which is required. As the gatekeepers of professionally based practice and quality service to clients, supervisors can and should be helped to assess the strategies they are currently utilizing in terms of their effectiveness in developing a more competent work force.

This descriptive study utilized both focus group technology and individual interviews to learn more about current supervisory practices within child welfare. Focusing on one voluntary child welfare agency in New York City, the study articulates the dilemmas and practices of front line

supervisors working with novice, BA level staff. Given the descriptive, case study methodology employed, caution should be exercised in attempting to generalize the findings herein to other child welfare settings.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The information gathered through both focus group discussions and individual interviews during the course of this study suggests a need to re-examine the place of the traditional model of supervision in this setting. The data suggests the fact that traditional models of supervision continue to be utilized to varying degrees, but that other forms of supervision are also employed. Most supervisors continue to think they should be adhering to a traditional model consisting of weekly, individual sessions lasting one to one and one half hours and focused on individual case dynamics and interventions, despite the obvious difficulties encountered in doing so. As a result, they experience guilt and tension about what they are not, but believe they should be, doing. Holding oneself accountable in this way tends to reduce the amount of energy available for the effective use of new supervisory models.

The findings presented in the preceding chapter indicate that a variety of supervisory strategies and techniques are currently being utilized by supervisors with some consistency. It is important that these techniques be described so as to

enable supervisors to formulate a consistent, planful approach to the supervision of novice child welfare staff.

In addition to the more traditional one to one supervision the study indicated that the following strategies are widely utilized:

1. **Informal, on the spot supervision exemplified by maintaining an open door policy.**

While varying in degree, supervisors felt that they had to be available to staff to answer questions, set direction and lend support most of the time that they were in the office. Some supervisors consciously sought to limit this on demand availability thereby promoting worker autonomy, others saw it as consistent with the needs of child welfare practice placed in the hands of novice staff.

2. **Direct client intervention on the part of the supervisor.**

All supervisors involved in the study reported meeting directly with clients. Supervisors varied in both the amount of time they spent meeting with clients as well how they viewed their role when doing so. For some, meeting clients was an extension of their educative role, enabling them to make a direct assessment and thereby better assist the caseworker. For others, it was an administrative, trouble shooting function used to assist workers having difficulty with a particular case. While they all agreed that they never met with a client without the caseworker present, the role of the worker within the meeting differed depending upon the

supervisor and how the meeting was viewed.

3. **Some form of group supervision involving peer support and learning.**

Most supervisors met regularly with their caseworkers as a group. These meetings were utilized for peer sharing and support as well as transmission of both clinical and procedural information. The types of group meetings reported varied from informal "coffee klatch" meetings at start of day, to formal case planning conferences and administrative unit meetings. In a few cases a more traditional, group supervision format was approximated.

All supervisors who participated in the study utilized the above techniques. What varied was the time allocated to each of these techniques and the purpose for which each was utilized. Several continua were identified which influence the mix of supervisory strategies employed. These included:

1. Conceptualization of supervisory role:

   Overseer/Administrator <----------->Educator/Teacher.

2. Posture towards workers:

   Control <----------->Empowerment.

3. Goal of supervision:

   Remedial <----------->Developmental.

4. Structure of supervision:

   Informal <----------->Formal.

Supervisors' expectations of staff learning and professional growth varied considerably. This was reflected in the amount of effort spent in developing a sense of professional self in workers. For some supervisors, clarifying the expectation for professional growth and development begins in the initial hiring interview and remains a major focus, while for others more emphasis is placed on the bureaucratic realities of the job. Supervisors had different expectations of the bachelor level employee's ability to deliver a professional level of service to clients which affected the strategies and techniques they employed. Where a supervisor fell on continuum one above, affected their practice along continua two and three. For example, a supervisor stressing professional growth and development and believing this to be possible, views her/himself as educator/teacher. This supervisor works towards the empowerment of staff and views the process of supervision as developmental in nature, whether using a formal or informal supervisory structure.

The issue of worker empowerment emerged as an unanticipated theme throughout the findings. Empowerment was not directly introduced by the examiner in either focus group discussions or individual interviews and yet it was mentioned repeatedly by supervisors as critical to the task at hand. One aspect of this issue related to the supervisor's belief in the workers' ability to do a professional job. An additional issue was the question of supervisor empowerment; a belief in their

own ability as a supervisor/educator.

Supervisors readily agree that they need help and believe that there is room for others to assist them in their work with direct care staff. This is especially true in the area of educational supervision where skills appropriate to the development of novice staff are needed. Such assistance could serve to reduce role overload and might extend into the areas of administrative and supportive supervision as well. An important though incidental finding was that all supervisors studied, regardless of how they defined their role, reported the need to work overtime to get the job done. This is worth noting, for not only can it lead to the burnout of current supervisors but it may also contribute to the difficulty of recruiting new supervisors.

Finally, the absence of opportunity for peer sharing and support was an additional recurring theme. Supervisors report feeling isolated and have little opportunity for lateral involvement outside of their own departments. Beyond its obvious importance as an element in staff retention, this form of lateral sharing and peer support can provide an opportunity for supervisors to learn new strategies and techniques from one another. Such forums can provide the impetus for discussion of worker performance and supervisory expectations. They may assist in the development of the trust necessary to explore and successfully implement more collaborative supervisory models.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The need for new methodologies

In the absence of professionally trained staff, the transmission of professional standards and values to those entrusted with the delivery of child welfare services must be maintained. We must not allow professional standards to diminish as has the demand for professional credentials. As discussed earlier, all available research indicates that supervisors continue to serve as the primary professional role models for novice staff. However, traditional supervision may no longer be the most appropriate or applicable approach for conveying professional knowledge, values and skills within the field of child welfare. Indeed, supervision in the 1990s may need to look different in much the same way as agency based, child welfare practice looks different. New methods and approaches are called for.

The current study indicates that new approaches to supervision, more consistent with contemporary child welfare practice, are emerging. Supervisors must be encouraged to continue to move beyond traditional methodologies and to examine the effectiveness of these departures. New methodologies can and must be developed into a framework which ensures that the educational component of supervision will be preserved and strengthened. The attitudes and beliefs of supervisors vis a vis workers is critical to the development

of a supervisory system. How a supervisor conceptualizes her/his role is instrumental in affecting how workers are treated and supervision conducted. It is important as we continue to develop and evaluate new supervisory strategies that the goals of professional development and worker empowerment be emphasized.

The continua which emerged in this study can assist in clarifying how a supervisor approaches her/his work. Where an individual falls along these continua sets the tone for the experience of the worker. Placement along the continua may affect the way in which supervisory techniques and strategies are selected and utilized. It may perhaps influence who is hired and how long that individual is likely to remain.

The continua speak to both structural and attitudinal aspects of supervision. They are not discrete. For example, while ultimately seeking a balance between the performance of administrative and educative functions, the emphasis a supervisor places along this continuum does affect her/his treatment of workers. An administratively oriented supervisor may approach supervision as a remedial effort, or take a more developmentally oriented approach. The former is more likely to control the worker while the latter is more supportive of worker empowerment. On the other hand, an educationally oriented supervisor will in all likelihood have a developmental goal in mind however, this supervisor must consciously seek to support worker empowerment lest she/he

inadvertently undermine the efforts of workers to develop more autonomy in practice.

Administrative/educative functions

It can be anticipated that as was true of this study sample, any group of supervisors will include individuals who fall at varying points along the continuum of an **administrative <---------> educative** focus. It is likely that the combination of an external environment focused on contract compliance and a service arena under pressure to hire non-MSWs, may tip the scale in the administrative direction. Agency administrators must therefore create a situation which will ensure that the educative component of supervision will be available to all staff. As noted by the Department Directors involved in this study, agencies must work to clarify their philosophy of service and of supervision. A clear, top down message of what is expected is important. If education and development is valued, this must be expressed and communicated throughout the agency via mission statement, job descriptions and performance evaluation mechanisms.

Expectations of college graduates, hired without benefit of professional social work education, must be clear and consistent. Such clarification should enable administrators and supervisors to reflect on the ability of the caseworker to provide quality service to clients as well as the appropriate

role of the supervisor in direct client interaction. Eliminating subtle messages which encourage supervisor rather than caseworker involvement in direct practice would support worker responsibility and empowerment. The issue of empowerment of workers versus their infantilization should be addressed further.

It is recommended that in order to support staff development as a key organizational issue, workers be evaluated in these terms and supervisors judged on their ability to assist in this area. Administrators must clarify the expectation that supervisors take a developmental approach with clear expectations of performance and growth for each individual worker. Tools which can be utilized in formulating an educational diagnosis and plan for individual workers can then be developed, and resources allocated to assist the supervisor with implementation. (See collaborative approaches)

Once we have clarified that supervisors are responsible for the development of their staff we can seek to balance existing agency resources across supervisors. In differentiating those with primary interest and skill in education and/or administration it is important to emphasize the need for supervisors to impart skill in each of these areas to line staff. If the organizational goal of professional development is clearly communicated as encompassing both administrative and educative functions, there can be no subtle sabotage of educational development

efforts in favor of contract compliance. Clear supervisory responsibility for the support of both functions requires that supervisors move beyond the tacit tolerance of staff attending training sessions and expect instead that staff demonstrate growth and learning. In this way all supervisors participate cooperatively by supporting staff development efforts and evaluating progress.

In developing such a system, we must recognize that education and development take time. In order to address this need and simultaneously manage the workload, we must identify and adopt strategies which incorporate learning while doing. (See strategies and techniques)

Empowerment of workers

Empowerment is discussed in the literature as a process rather than an outcome. Assisting others in this process must be based on a belief in the individuals capacity to change. This fundamental principle of social work practice is no less true in the area of social work supervision than in direct practice with clients.

The child welfare system has been described as one which contributes to the disempowerment of both clients and staff.[1] One primary antidote to this organizational condition is the development of an "entrepreneurial spirit" promoting

---

[1] Rebecca L. Hegar and Jeanne M. Hunzeker. "Moving toward Empowerment-Based Practice in Public Child Welfare", Social Work, November-December, 1988. pp.499-502.

initiative, risk taking and opportunities for growth and learning to occur.[2] In attempting to structure such an environment, we must recognize that the development of competence takes both time and practice. It involves more than just the acquisition of skills, often touching on deeply personal issues and self perceptions. Such learning occurs developmentally, over time and in relationship with others.

Each supervisor involved in this study spoke in some way to this issue. Whether optimistic or pessimistic as to outcome, each was aware that enabling novice workers to provide quality services to clients required an intensive, consistent opportunity to engage workers in a more reflective way. This non-directive approach, in and of itself is felt to be important in its ability to teach workers a similar or parallel approach to their work with clients. Vincent clearly talked about the need to stress decision making skills despite worker dependency and the complementary process of needing to convey a sense of trust in the worker's still fragile sense of professional judgement.

In order to empower workers, supervisors must believe that novice workers can be educated and enabled to do the job and that they, the supervisor can assist them in doing so. We have perhaps of late, paid too little attention to the process of social work supervision which operates as an intervening variable between knowledge acquisition (often via training

---

[2] Ibid. p.500.

workshops) and practice performance. The supervisor as the primary person involved in giving feedback and support to staff has an important part to play in the development of the workers feelings of competence and empowerment to do the job. Precisely how the relationship with a supervisor affects the workers judgement of capability, and how a supervisor can best promote worker empowerment, beyond the traditional supportive functions of supervision, remains to be explored. We do know that it must be based on who the individual is and how she/he learns. In order to intervene in this way, supervisors need help in identifying and responding to a range of learning styles.

In contrast to this, when a supervisor does not believe that the worker is capable of developing professional practice skills regardless of help offered, then they will not employ or support any efforts in this direction. Instead, supervision will occur as a monitoring function with the supervisor seeking to control rather than empower the worker. In identifying a worker as a satisfactory employee while not believing she/he capable of delivering professional services to clients, one is defining the child welfare job in bureaucratic as opposed to social work terms. This remains a critical issue for the field. (This struggle is best exemplified in Chapter III by Kenneth.)

In seeking to develop an empowerment based practice of supervision we must utilize all the professional resources of

an agency. This process must begin with a clear statement of the expectations of staff at all levels and emphasize the value placed on professional development throughout the system. Consistent with the concepts of adult learning, we must recognize that novice workers bring many skills that can be applied to their work in child welfare. New employees must be helped to assess life experience in relation to the tasks and demands of this new situation. Given the difficulty of the job, only consistently applied effort, employing different strategies over time, will help the worker to develop the skills needed for the job. Supervisors in such a system must be held accountable for the incorporation of a developmental model which utilizes new and innovative methodologies. Regardless of who, or how many individuals are involved in educating workers, it is the direct supervisor who must, in the final analysis, empower the worker to do the job.

Formal and informal supervisory systems

How one utilizes the informal versus the formal supervisory systems is perhaps one of the most critical choices to be made. Many of the strategies and techniques identified in the current study can be incorporated into either the informal or formal systems. Where supervision falls on this continuum contains important information related to the issue of worker development. It is important in utilizing each strategy that we evaluate its contribution to the overall

professional development of the individual worker.

It is the conclusion of this author that reliance on the open door in the absence of a more formal supervisory strategy works against the development of empowerment based practice. In order for growth to occur, supervisors must engage workers in a relationship which is consistent and developmental. This need not be achieved via the traditional one to one model but can employ a variety of supervisory strategies in varying combinations as described below. It does mean that expectations for learning and growth must be set at point of employment and followed by an initial period of socialization into the process of social work supervision. We must remember that social work supervision is unique in its educational focus. We cannot assume that workers new to the field and without benefit of professional education understand this process. Rather, during the early stages of employment they must be helped to understand that the supervisor will be using their experience with clients for teaching purposes. In setting the climate for educational supervision we must let novice workers know that curiosity about the work is expected as is exposing one's work for supervisory input. In Chapter III, Alice, Vincent and Karen each describe their own unique approach to this socialization process.

When supervision takes place primarily on the run, it is difficult to hold workers accountable for implementing strategies and suggestions discussed. Only in the context of

an ongoing relationship which allows for feedback and evaluation of practice can culture, values and attitudes be explored. How the supervisory relationship is dealt with gives a message to the worker and models important aspects of time management and work with clients. It is important in the way it does or does not set realistic and consistent expectations of availability.

At the same time, we must acknowledge that given the nature of child welfare practice and current staffing patterns, informal techniques of supervision will, as illustrated throughout this study, be relied upon to some degree. Rather than responding solely out of the pressure of the moment, it is important that supervisors think about and establish some framework for the utilization of such techniques. It appears from the data that workers tend to utilize on the spot supervision in accordance with what they perceive to be of primary importance to their supervisor. Thus we see a quite different emphasis between Karen's "need to consult all day" and Kenneth's perception that he needs to be available for "questions that need to be answered in order to complete a task that has been assigned".

Based on the experience of the supervisors interviewed, it is recommended that a framework for informal supervisory contact be related to the development of professional judgement of urgency in the worker. Informal, on the spot supervision need not be solely directive. Choices can be made

which enable the supervisor to consider the individuals learning without withholding the support needed. Supervisor comments made on the fly can be instructive particularly if followed up via the more formal supervisory system. It is here that generalized learning can be drawn from a specific incident perceived as urgent by the worker. Regardless of how it is utilized, the need for on the spot supervision should diminish over time and give evidence of the worker's increased ability to assess the urgency of the situation. In short, it should be developmental with a plan towards the utilization of more formal, theme oriented, conceptually based supervision.

When utilizing on the spot techniques, supervisors must remember that they continue to also serve as a model for workers, giving messages about the availability and empowerment of clients. This aspect of the parallel process must always be in the forefront of the supervisor's thinking. The amount of directing versus teaching must be assessed in relation to the requirements of the issue. Most supervisors interviewed, reported a tendency to direct during an informal supervisory encounter as opposed to a planned one. If we are primarily interested in empowering workers and developing their professional self concept, we must begin to question the mix of formal and informal supervision. Supervisors should ask, Is an answer needed now? Is there learning which carries over to other situations? Will the worker be back upon encountering the same situation with client Y as client X?

How is on the spot supervision being utilized by the worker, as a need to ventilate and express feelings regarding the work with difficult clients or to get an immediate answer to a concrete problem? Does on the spot supervision seem to take away from, or add to the workers ability to conceptualize practice and utilize the more formal supervisory structures?

Strategies and techniques

There was a high degree of consistency in the techniques which supervisors reported utilizing. What varied was the way in which individual techniques were employed and the extent of their use. As discussed earlier, selection and utilization of techniques varied to some degree with placement along the identified continua. Therefore in seeking to develop a supervisory system emphasizing the professional development and empowerment of workers it is necessary to strategically target which techniques to utilize and how.

Direct client involvement

The degree to which supervisors reported being involved directly with clients was striking as was their supervisors (the directors) expectation that they do so. On reflection, this is perhaps less surprising given the limited direct practice experience of workers and teaching experience of supervisors. In acknowledging the extent of supervisory

involvement with clients it is important that we bear in mind the potential effectiveness of learning via direct modeling. This combination makes direct client involvement a potentially valuable supervisory technique. The way in which supervisors utilize their professional assessment and intervention skills directly with clients is a critical aspect of supervision which relates to the issues of professional development and worker empowerment. What is important is that supervisors be encouraged to ask themselves when they become involved directly with clients, why they are choosing to do so at that particular time and how they define their role and that of the caseworker during the intervention.

A model which seeks to structure such involvement in a deliberate and planful attempt to address the professional development of staff is quite different from one which utilizes direct client involvement randomly based on the initiative of worker or client. This is not to say that direct client involvement always occurs at the initiative of the supervisor but rather that its occurrence be structured by the supervisor to maximize its learning potential. If this is done, learning will occur regardless of whether the initial intention of the meeting was instructional or administrative. Whether observing an intake/assessment or the supervisor/authority figure, "laying down the law" in a problematic client situation, the worker is present in order to learn by example and observation. Her/his role in the

interview may be more or less active but this can be based on an assessment of worker needs and ability. As a developmental tool, this technique seeks to empower the worker and promote autonomy.

There are several advantages to teaching via direct modeling especially for staff having difficulty conceptualizing practice and supervisors having difficulty helping them to do so. Whether part of the planned or informal supervisory system, workers are empowered when models demonstrate more effective ways of doing things. Discussion following such demonstration is critical to learning. Workers must be helped to identify what they have observed and how it might affect their own interventions with clients. They must be encouraged to reflect on and critique these observational opportunities. Questions must be raised and answered following which practice opportunities should be provided.(See observational and action techniques below).

Supervisors reported that it is often easier and more accurate to formulate an assessment of a client or client system based on direct observation especially if the workers assessment skills are not well developed. Given the realities of time and professional resources, direct client involvement becomes a potentially efficient way to promote opportunities for clients to be seen by more skilled agency practitioners (primarily supervisors and training personnel) while simultaneously offering opportunities for staff to observe the

practice of more senior personnel. Finally, for some supervisors, the opportunity to legitimately be involved in some aspect of direct client intervention is an important dimension of their job. This may be increasingly true of new MSWs encouraged to move into supervisory positions before they feel entirely ready to leave direct service.

Observational techniques and action strategies

While opportunities for staff to observe supervisors are important, caseworkers also need opportunities to practice their skills and receive feedback and evaluation on them. Actual observation of worker client interaction is critical to a developmental model. Simulations such as role play activities and recounts of worker client interactions, whether verbal or written in the form of process recording, can only go so far in illuminating practice skills. In-vivo experiences are needed yet appear to be under-utilized by the supervisors in this study.

Opportunities for observation and feedback can occur in a variety of ways. It is felt that expanding supervisory methodology to include the use of video, one way mirrors, and joint interviews can greatly enhance educational supervision without necessarily adding to time allocated. Broadening the use of direct client involvement to incorporate more planned joint interviewing experiences, for example, has been used effectively to offer both worker and supervisor the

opportunity to observe one another's practice. Whatever time is reserved for meeting with a worker in a given week can be devoted to any of the above activities. Since benefit is derived only if time for discussion is allocated, client meetings should be scheduled to accommodate this. This should not be viewed as "short-changing the client" who now has the benefit of two sets of eyes and ears. These strategies and techniques are not unique to the individual supervisory system and fit as well with the subsequent discussions of group supervision and collaborative approaches.

Group supervision

Opportunities to learn as part of a group of peers was considered by most to be a critical aspect of child welfare supervision. The types of group meetings which supervisors reported being involved in with staff varied from informal "coffee klatch" meetings which start the day, to formal case planning conferences and administrative unit meetings.

Learning in groups is entirely consistent with the development of empowerment which is promoted by peer learning. The literature reports that the more similar one perceives role models to be, the more likely they are to affect the perception of one's ability to succeed. Whom we perceive to be similar to ourselves often relates not to our judgement of the individuals performance ability but rather to areas of personal characteristics, including gender, age, race and

culture.[3] Given the diversity of child welfare staff this is an important factor in support of developing peer group interaction. The value of a positive peer culture where standards are maintained and professional growth acknowledged cannot be overemphasized.

Along with this broad based support, concerns were raised during both focus group discussions and individual interviews about the effectiveness of group strategies. Some supervisors questioned the ability of novice workers to effectively transfer knowledge from one case to another especially when not confined to their own individual caseload. It is recommended that these concerns be addressed by offering a consistent group experience where trust can be developed and where emphasis is placed on this aspect of learning. It is important therefore that supervisors involved as group leaders be given the training necessary to develop their group work skills. Consistent with this, the development of a successful model for group supervision does not necessarily depend on all supervisors participating in the role of group facilitator. Similarly, it is not necessary that workers be grouped according to their particular work unit, in fact it may be advantageous to group them in other ways. What is important is that novice workers have an opportunity to reflect on the work they do within an environment that supports risk taking and

---

[3] For fuller discussion see Albert Bandura, Social Foundation of Thought and Action - A Social Cognitive Theory, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-HAll, Inc., 1986) p.404.

learning. This type of model can best be developed within a supervisory system that supports a shared/partnership or collaborative effort utilizing all the professional resources of the agency.

The development of "learning communities" in which all staff participate, is one example of such a collaborative effort. Learning communities would offer all staff the opportunity to participate in a consistent on-going forum in which case related issues would be examined, intervention skills practiced and professional development stressed. Communities could be organized randomly or homogeneously based on various criteria: level of skill, career goal etc. They would incorporate members from several different areas of the agency, including members of different work teams in order to broaden the novice workers exposure to child welfare practice. They in turn would bring this expanded knowledge back to their individual work teams.

This format would enable supervisors and other agency professionals with skill in group work, and strength in the educative component of supervision, to be available to staff in the role of learning community facilitator. Learning community facilitators might themselves constitute a learning community offering opportunity for peer sharing and support. Critical to its success, is professional respect and collectively embracing the organizational goal of professional development.

There are a number of potential group forums required by the regulatory system involving case planning and case review which should not go unmentioned. The consistent utilization of these forums for educational purposes as well as quality assurance needs to be enhanced. Conferences offer an ideal opportunity for novice workers to practice their conceptualization skills; both verbal and written. Opportunities to observe and participate in problem solving sessions with professional social workers can be a critical learning experience. Creatively utilized mandated conferences can also incorporate many of the action strategies described above. In short, an agency system of conferences can enhance the educational role of professional social workers by having them serve as conference consultants, while simultaneously expanding the learning opportunities available to staff. The benefits of such a system to clients should not be overlooked.

Collaborative approaches and support for supervisors

In order for change to occur we must put emphasis on supervisors themselves. As demonstrated by the current research, all supervisors, even those most comfortable with a developmental model of educational supervision, need assistance. Time and systemic pressures will invariably interfere with the intention to provide professional development opportunities to staff. If as the findings indicate, supervisors need to empower novice staff, then

assistance is needed in the identification and development of skills and strategies to do so. There is more than one way to address this issue within an agency, depending on the interest and strength of its supervisors. For example, intervention can be targeted to the supervisors, giving them strategies and techniques to utilize directly with staff, or mechanisms can be developed offering help directly to line workers by utilizing additional professional agency resources.

It is not recommended that this be viewed as an either/or choice. Rather, we are seeking a more creative division of labor based on an individual assessment of supervisor interest and ability. Through the development of opportunities for professional development and differential use of self among this important category of staff, we would hope to prevent burnout and improve supervisor retention. This philosophy can also enable directors to utilize their expertise in teaching and enabling, thus sending an organizational message about utilizing administrative time in a more qualitative manner. It must be remembered that modeling begins at the top!

Regardless of who is involved, the strategies and techniques identified during this study must continue to be examined as to applicability and effectiveness. Supervisors need training and support in utilizing techniques with which they are not familiar. The ability to develop a thoughtful mix of supervisory techniques tailored to the strengths of the supervisor and the needs and learning style of the individual

worker will not be easy. The study indicates the need to develop mechanisms which teach the task and the process in tandem. In order to do this the allocation of supervisory and educational time needs to be made explicit. Just as workers may be assigned to groups or learning communities in a more centralized fashion, so too might professionals other than direct line supervisors be involved in addressing individualized learning needs. Whether through the use of individual and/or group supervision the study indicates that workers must be helped to consistently focus on select cases in order to begin to integrate basic social work knowledge, skills and values.

The role of training and staff development

Most large child welfare agencies employ a centralized staff training department to augment the development of staff. Personnel employed in this department have the expertise and skill to promote empowerment based child welfare practice. They are in a key organizational position to develop and promote competency and empowerment in both line and supervisory staff. The creative use of this staff as collaborators and supporters of supervisory personnel can ensure that all line staff have an equal opportunity for the development of professional skills.

Training personnel can assist individual supervisors in the development of an individualized development plan (IDP)

for each worker. They are in the position to develop the framework and tools for the IDP and to assist and ensure their implementation. In the early phases of the development of such a system, staff development personnel can carry the bulk of responsibility for facilitating an examination of job expectations, identification of competencies and the assurance that development and professional skills are part of the performance evaluation system. By engaging supervisors in this process, the groundwork for supervisor involvement is begun.

Through this process, different supports can be offered to individual supervisors depending upon need. Serving as the base of quality control, the department of training and staff development can provide necessary skills in education to supervisors interested and in need of this aspect of professional development. Supervisors who see and value their own professional development in clinical and educative areas would be offered development opportunities through participation as learning community facilitators or other in-service training projects. The development and implementation of the learning community system described above illustrates the potential of this collaborative effort. By meeting regularly with learning community leaders staff development personnel can ensure that group skills are developed and honed, that there is necessary conformity across communities and that common themes and issues receive agency wide attention via the more traditional in-service training

mechanisms.

Those less interested in their educational role but valued for their administrative and systems contributions can be encouraged to assist staff and peers in these areas (an important yet different educational function) while also supporting worker participation in the professional development activities offered by others.

It is important that staff development personnel, often lateral to supervisors in the organizational hierarchy, not place themselves above supervisors regarding practice wisdom and experience, but clarify their collaborative goal and ability to lend time and support to supervisory efforts. It is critical that the individual supervisor in this system remains as the manager of the staff development function for the employees reporting directly to her/him.[4] While not expected to do it all, the supervisor is responsible for coordinating, overseeing and establishing the expectation that professional development will occur. Such a model bears a great deal of resemblance to current child welfare practice where the caseworker serves as the case manager for the clients she/he serves. The modeling potential is thus an important educational component of this supervisory system.

Finally, the staff development department can also serve as the catalyst for supervisor forums, offering opportunities

---

[4] For a fuller discussion see Middleman and Rhodes, 1985 (Op.Cit.) p226. Also Harris and Allison, 1982 (Op.Cit.).

for professional exchange on a wide variety of subjects. Forums offering supervisors opportunities to discuss and develop strategies to address the concerns raised throughout this dissertation are an important antidote to reports of isolation amongst this level of middle management. The supports necessary to enable supervisors to develop and sustain peer support groups should be offered freely. As supervisors are encouraged and enabled to take on specific professional assignments consistent with their own professional goals, they can be grouped with like-minded peers for the purpose of sharing, learning and support. Such a model has already worked well with field instructors of agency work study students. As supervisors share their dilemmas and strategies with one another they will begin to identify and directly experience the strengths and needs of peers. This is turn will contribute to the development of the trust and creativity necessary to further collaborative efforts and expand supervisory resources.

THE LARGER ISSUE

It is clear that a model of supervision for child welfare practice in the 1990s must be broad enough to encompass the wide range of individuals working within the field. As evidenced in the current study, numerous supervisory strategies are being utilized in an effort to get the job done. What is needed is not a supervisory formula for all to

follow but rather the identification of the requirements of a supervisory mix which can ensure that all novice staff have an equal opportunity for professional development and all clients equal access to quality service.

As noted above, it is important that we continue to study more specifically the application and effectiveness of the strategies and techniques identified during this preliminary descriptive study. Such efforts might include focus group discussions with workers as well as a close examination of individual applications of the techniques described herein. Particular thought should be given to a study which would specifically focus on supervisors known for their excellence in selecting, developing and retaining novice workers.

It is most important as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, that we continue to advocate at the macro level for the professional education of child welfare staff. This includes both opportunities for current staff to continue their education via loan forgiveness and tuition assistance programs, as well as the creation of jobs and salaries attractive to existing professionals. Universities must be helped to recognize the realities of child welfare, agency based practice in the 1990s and realistically prepare workers for this challenge. New MSWs will often be faced with the challenge of being the most credentialed, if not experienced, member of a child welfare work team. The idea of new graduates taking a job "offering good supervision" may for some, need to

be adjusted to taking a job and "offering good supervision" to others. In these situations, young professionals must be helped to use their knowledge and skill in a leadership capacity while continuing to learn and grow on the job. Training in supervision must be offered and mentorship programs offering the support of more experienced supervisors should be explored. It should not be forgotten that this group of supervisors may have limited experience in direct practice subsequent to completing their professional education and opportunities to continue to master these skills should be offered and supported.

As administrators continue to feel pressure to hire non-MSW supervisors they must question the job they are asking these individuals to do. Does it encompass the educative functions of supervision? If so, what does this say about our definition of the child welfare casework position? If not, how are caseworkers assigned to non-MSW supervisors being educated in social work practice and values?

Amongst our greatest challenges is finding a way to support the above initiatives without undermining the contribution of current bachelor level staff. Future professionals frequently receive their first introduction to social work practice within chid welfare agencies. It is critical to the future of professional child welfare practice that they be helped to see the creative potential available within this area of social work. The way in which we orient,

support and educate this group of employees greatly affects not only their future but the future of child welfare. If the most talented pre-professionals return to school as a means of moving beyond child welfare rather than as a means of enhancing their practice within child welfare, we have failed both them and the field.

Our ability to take novice workers and guide them into a future professional workforce for child welfare is dependent on our ability to develop doable jobs in which novice workers can experience feelings of competency and empowerment at the hands of skilled supervisors. It is through identification with experienced child welfare professionals that workers will grow and develop, aspire to professional education and remain committed to this vital area of social work practice. If our efforts are successful we must have the educational and financial resources to back them up. We must recognize the fact that competency combined with "environmental unresponsiveness generate(s) resentment, protest and collective efforts to change existing practices. Should change be hard to achieve, given suitable alternatives, people will desert environments that are unresponsive to their efforts and peruse their activities elsewhere."[5] In the final analysis we must ensure that this is not the fate of child welfare.

---

[5] Bandura, 1986 (Op. Cit.) p.446.

Appendix I

HISTORY OF ST. JOSEPH CHILDREN'S SERVICES

1826 The Sisters of Charity were asked to come to Emmitsburg, Maryland, to care for Brooklyn's dependent children who were orphaned as a result of epidemics which took their parents' lives. Three sisters arrived in (1828). The first home occupied was a farm house fronting Fulton Street, now the terminus of the Brooklyn Bridge.

1830 The Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum Society was founded under the leadership of Peter Turner.

1832 The home transferred to Jay Street, site of the present rectory of St. James Cathedral.

1834 The Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum Society (now the Catholic Child Care Society) was officially incorporated in the city of Brooklyn.

1850 & 1856 Additions were made at the Jay Street location to provide for increasing numbers of children.

1860 Over 300 school age children were in residence at the orphanage known as St. Paul's Asylum on Congress Street.

1863 Sister Mary Constantia Hull purchased 48 lots on the corner of Willoughby Avenue and Yates Street, now Sumner Avenue.

1873 St. Joseph Orphan Asylum, later St. Joseph's Home, and St. Joseph's Hall, was founded by Sister Constantia to relieve overcrowded conditions in St. Paul's Asylum At this time 315 younger children were transferred to St. Joseph's, leaving 217 older girls at St. Paul's.

1908 Expansion of the building on Willoughby Avenue. A five story fireproof structure was built to relieve overcrowded conditions in the institution which housed more than 600 children.

1933 St. Joseph's was given use of diocesan owned property at Shoram for summer vacations for the children.

1947-1952 Large dormitories accommodating 120 children were broken up into smaller units for 40 children, each having its own social room, dining room and kitchenette.

1952-1958 High school living units were partitioned into bedrooms that accommodated from one to four girls.

1965 Establishment of Foster Boarding Home Department. First child was placed from the institution to a foster home. Pre-school boys admitted to the institution for the first time (siblings of girls in care).

1966 Head Start Program started for 120 children from the neighborhood.

1968 St. Joseph's first group home for ten adolescent girls was opened at Linden Blvd. The Group Home takes the child out of the institutional environment and allows her to live in a formal neighborhood situation during her most sensitive years.

1968 Family Day Care Program began. Nineteen neighborhood children placed by the agency in seven families while their parents work or pursue education calculated to improve their economic situation.

1969 Second group home was opened to accommodate two large family groups involving about ten children at Mexico building of Lefrak City.

1970 Stanford Research Institute examines present resources and organization structure of Sisters of Charity Community. Decision made to phase out the institutional program through the use of group homes, agency operated boarding homes and foster homes. The suggestion was made to establish small residential treatment center to provide care for special children.

1970-1971 Development of group homes and A.O.B.H.s. Recruitment and expansion of foster homes.

1971 Phasing out of institutional program on WIlloughby Avenue. New Administration offices opened at 345 Adams Street.

1972 Establishment of Adoption and Medical Department.

1973 Williamsburg Reception Center opens as a diagnostic center for 20 boys and girls.

1975 The Pisani Apartment for handicapped girls opened at One Plaza Street.

1976 First Prevention Program in Williamsburg opened on Harrison Avenue later moved to Broadway.

1977 Establishment of Emergency Foster Boarding Home Program.

1979 Development Department was formed.

1980 Opening of the Smith A.O.B.H. for three handicapped boys on Eastern Parkway.

1981 Crown Heights office for Family Day Care on Nostrand Avenue was opened.

1982 Establishment of M.I.S. Department.

1983-1984 Agency awarded contracts for Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Programs in Williamsburg and Bushwick.

1984 Bed-Stuy office for Foster Homes and Family Day Care opened in the Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation.

1985 Family Day Care and Prevention Programs in Williamsburg moved to Williamsburg Savings Bank.

1986 Training and Staff Development and Personnel Departments established.

1987 Legal Services Department established.
Crown Heights F.D.C.program relocated to Dean Street.
Queens office opened in Jamaica.

1988 Homefinding Department established.
Expansion of Bed-Stuy Restoration Corp. Programs.

1989 Central Intake Department established.
Independent Living A.O.B.H. opened in St. Albans.

1990 Department of Adolescent and Educational Services established.
New headquarters at 540 Atlantic Avenue opened.

1991 Agency name changed to St. Joseph Services for Children and Families.

Appendix II

ST. JOSEPH CHILDREN'S SERVICES : MISSION STATEMENT

St. Joseph Children's Services is an agency founded in the Christian tradition of service, an agency dedicated to the ideals of family life for all. We have a commitment to helping families maintain stability so that they may keep and nurture their children with security and support. We are especially committed to working with families who are threatened with disruption because of the potential of child abuse and neglect or who run a high risk of having their children placed in another home or residence. We will provide care for those children who must be placed in settings other than their homes and will strive to assure that all of our group living facilities and our foster homes are sensitive healing places for these young people. When such placement occurs, we attempt our best to engage and sustain their parents in a process that will help them to assume their children back into their homes or to become able to free the children so that they may be adopted into a welcoming family. With all youth in our care we will offer the services and support they need to develop skills to live as independent, productive and well-adjusted adults. The principles of permanency, stability and quality of life will guide all of our work with families and the young.

Believing in the value of communities and neighborhoods for the development of local support systems, SJCS will encourage the growth of specialized programs that target the needs of young families who are beginning to develop their own strengths. SJCS will work to gather people who are committed to the agency's goals, i.e., foster parents, adoptive parents, persons who provide any services such as day care, and volunteers of all kinds in order to augment our ability to serve and to encourage the people of Brooklyn and Queens to care for those who need their help.

AGENCY PRIORITIES

With all our efforts, we will strive to:

1. Nurture human potential at every possible occasion.
2. Develop creative means of helping people meet their needs in areas closest to where they live.
3. Develop service techniques and practices suited to the needs of those who come to us for assistance.
4. Be accountable for a high quality of care and programming.
5. Train staff in order for them to grow professionally and develop leadership abilities.
6. Maintain a cooperative working relationship with the City and State of New York.

SJCS maintains as its highest aspiration the generation of a society of caring people who will nurture the future by prioritizing the children of today. We will work on an advocacy level at every opportunity to speak for those whose voices may not be heard but whose presence among us resonates within and causes us to work for justice with love for the people we serve.

Appendix III

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: AGENCY DIRECTORS

FROM:
DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

DATE: OCTOBER 13, 1989

RE: SUPERVISORS IN DIRECT CARE IN THE AGENCY

Dianne Kane will be setting up a study of supervisors in direct service provision in the agency. Specifically, social work supervisors. The study will attempt to determine needs dictated by client service requirements, current staffing issues and the impact of these on supervisors. Further, the study will explore a differential model of supervision to more adequately address these issues.

Dianne will be setting up focus groups to get input from directors and supervisors and will be conducting some individual interviews as well.

The study will further our goals for development and "nurturing the human potential". I urge you to give her your cooperation in every aspect of this endeavor.

Thank you.

Appendix IV

PRESENTATION TO EXECUTIVE STAFF - NOVEMBER 14, 1989

PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED:

Changes in Child Welfare Practice Arena
- *Staff less experienced
- *Families more disorganized
- *Accountability demands greater & quantitative

Responses
- *Focus on direct care workers
- *Focus on administrative and accountability systems
- *Minimal attention to supervisory practices

However, this key organizational position is where policy becomes practice

SUPERVISION:

Longstanding history in the profession
- *Tutorial model- untrained volunteers and student interns
- *Current models- professionally trained staff
- *Dual role-administrative and educational (supportive)

Preparation for supervision
- *Few trained as educators
- *Administrative/management skills more stressed
- *Experience as practitioners

Role and function
- *Administrative demands are great
- *Educational demands are compelling
- *Minimal clarification of priorities

(organizational rewards often favor administrative role)
- *Supervise the case or the caseworker?

Questions:
- *How to educate and supervise today's work force?
- *Who should/could be involved and in what ways?

RESEARCH:

Deductive
*From theory to practice

Inductive
*Action research and qualitative research
*Begin with practice in an attempt to codify and eventually build model and theory for practice
*Begin with what is
*Utilize literature from both research and practice

PROJECT:

Inductive
*Begins by exploring what supervisory practice at SJCS looks like from perspective of participants
*Based on this develop a protocol/guidelines for effective agency based supervisory practices

Areas of Exploration
*Role and function-balancing administrative and educative functions

*Structure and modalities-techniques and strategies

*Supports needed by supervisors including possible collaboration and teamwork for supervisors-evaluating who is involved and how?

METHODOLOGY:

Focus groups
*Directors
*Supervisors/program directors

Individual interviews
*Selected participants of focus groups

Follow-up questionarire if needed

Administrative dialogue
*Beginning today and on-going as needed

Appendix V

November 27, 1989

Dear _____,

I am pleased to invite you to participate in a Focus Group Discussion on Social Work Supervision. As discussed at the Executive Director's meeting on 11/16/89, this will be an opportunity to share your perceptions and experiences of supervision within Child Welfare in general, and SJCS, in particular.

I appreciate how busy your schedule is, and have tried to find a mutually convenient time. Refreshments will be served beginning at 10:45.

Please join me on:
Friday, December 8, 1989
11:00 A.M.- 1:00 P.M. (PLEASE BE PROMPT)
BOARDROOM - ADAMS STREET

Thank you.....

(Please detach and return)

Name:_____

I will_____ will not _____ attend the Focus Group on 12/8/89.

November 28, 1989

Dear _____,

No one knows better than you that the changes in Child Welfare over the last number of years: a decrease in professional staffing, an increase in case volume and complexity, and an increase in accountability demands have dramatically affected your job. While we are aware of this as an agency and as a field of practice, little systematic attention has been paid to the details of how the supervisor's job has been affected and how it might be better supported.

In an effort to remedy this situation, I am initiating a project within the agency which seeks to examine/explore the role of the direct service supervisor in Child Welfare today. Based on this exploration we will then begin, during the coming year, to identify strategies and techniques that will enhance agency supervision.

Soon you will be hearing from me about the first steps in this project. This exploration will take many forms and many of you
will be invited to participate in Focus Group discussions and/or
individual interviews. Obviously, without your direct input, this exploration is less complete and therefore less valuable to the ongoing work of the agency.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation!

Dianne Kane
Director Training
& Staff Development

December 1, 1989

Dear _____,

As a follow up to my letter of November 28, I would like to invite you to participate in a Focus Group discussion on Supervision. This will be an opportunity to share your perceptions and experiences as a supervisor in child welfare with a group of your peers.

Please join me on one of the following dates:

Wednesday, December 13	or	Monday, December 18
10:00 A.M.-12:00 NOON		2:00 P.M.-4:00 P.M.
(refreshments at 9:45)		(refreshments at 1:45)

Both Groups will be held in the Boardroom at Adams Street, Please be prompt!

Thank you.....

(Please detach and return)

Name:_____

I will_____ will not_____ attend

Preferred date:_____

Appendix VI

PROTOCOL FOR FOCUS GROUPS

INTRODUCTION: Many of you know that in addition to the development of a model of supervision for use at SJCS, this project will also serve as the basis of my dissertation research. For your cooperation in that effort, I thank you! The only way in which that impacts the process we are involved in is that at times it may be a bit more formal than what we might otherwise do at the agency. For today, that means I will ask you to take a few extra moments and complete a Participant Information Form. The purpose of this is to describe the participants in the study as a group, particularly as regards your supervisory (administrative) experience.

FOCUS GROUP TECHNOLOGY: I want to say a few things about the structure of today's focus group. A Focus Group is somewhat different from other groups we generally participate in. *A Focus Group is intended to generate perceptions and experiences. There are no right and wrong answers...rather different points of view. Please share your point of view even if it differs.*

Focus Groups are not intended to:

develop consensus
arrive at a plan
make decisions on a course of action

PLEASE ANSWER BASED ON YOUR SPECIFIC SITUATION AND EXPERIENCE

MY ROLE: Facilitator, observer, listener. I will try not to share my ideas beliefs etc. I may interrupt to refocus the group. I will ask questions and may push for more detail. A refocus does not necessarily mean that what you are saying is not interesting and it may be something I ask you to talk more about at a later time in the group or individually.

NOTE TAKING: Often Focus Groups are tape recorded. This is not being done today for reasons of confidentiality. I will be taking notes and have also asked a group member to take notes for me. These notes will not contain any names. I am interested in ideas not names. The notes are for me and eventually will be consolidated into issues and themes before any discussion with administration.

TIME: The group will last for two hours. It will end at _____. I will stop you before time to allow for a final go around.

LET'S BEGIN WITH AN INTRODUCTORY GO AROUND..WHO YOU ARE...WHERE YOU WORK..WHO YOU SUPERVISE BY TITLE AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS*

1a. Social Work supervision has traditionally been defined as an administrative and educative process. Please discuss how this dual function applies to your job as a supervisor of child welfare caseworkers?

possible probes:
Clarity of definition - is there agreement on what constitutes administrative versus. educative supervision? Where do the two areas overlap? Which tasks belong where? Which function dominates and why? How does this relate to the educational background of staff? The background and interest of supervisor? The bureaucratic demands of the field? How do you balance your time ?

1b. What skills do workers bring? What skills do they need? How do you attempt to bridge the gap?

2a. How do you structure supervision in your unit?

possible probes: Which modalities do you use? Individual? Group? Mix? Other? How frequent is supervision? How formal or informal? Which techniques do you utilize that seem particularly helpful to your staff? How much do you get directly involved with clients? Is that crisis or planned? Is paperwork review a helpful educative techniques or simply administrative?

2b. Which three activities occupy most of your time?

possible probe: Is this your preference? Whose priority does it reflect? How might it be different?

3. Are there ways in which other professionals in the agency can/should be involved in casework supervision? (educational supervision)

possible probes: What would this look like? Who gets involved in educating staff and how? Are there other/better ways to utilize professional resources within the agency for benefit of staff and clients? Where does a department of training and staff development fit in this schema?

4. Conclusion..final go around with any summary or additional comments not mentioned.

* wording in some cases was adjusted for directors group to reflect their status as once removed from the supervision of caseworkers. They were asked to talk about the supervision their supervisees are providing to caseworkers.

Department Directors

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Name_____

MSW completed 19_____

Major concentration: Casework_____ Groupwork_____

Administration_____ Community Organization_____

Other (specify)_____

I have been an agency administrator for _____years.

I have been a supervisor for _____ years. Of this, _____ years have been directly in Child Welfare.

During this time I have supervised (check all that apply)

_____MSW _____BSW _____BA _____Para-Pro

_____MSW students _____BA/BSW students.

In addition to supervision, I have also worked as a:

_____ Teacher

_____ Trainer

Supervisor

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Name_____

MSW completed 19_____

Major concentration: Casework_____ Groupwork_____

Administration_____ Community Organization_____

Other (specify)_____

I have been a supervisor for _____ years. Of this, _____ years have been directly in Child Welfare.

During this time I have supervised (check all that apply)

_____MSW _____BSW _____BA _____Para-Pro

_____MSW students _____BA/BSW students.

Have you had any Post-Masters training in supervision?

_____Yes _____ No

(If yes, check all that apply)

_____ Workshop(s)

_____ Certificate Program

_____ Other (specify)

In addition to supervision, I have also worked as a:

_____ Teacher

_____ Trainer

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abels, Paul A. "On the Nature of Supervision: The Medium Is The Group." Child Welfare (June, 1970) : 304-311.

2. _____. New Practice of Supervision and Staff Development. New York: Association Press, 1977.

3. _____. "Group Supervision of Students and Staff." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training in the Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow, 175-198. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

4. Abroms, Gene M. "Supervision As Metatherapy." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training in the Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow, 81-99. San Francisco: Jossey -Bass, 1979.

5. Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980. (P.L. 96-272) Federal Register. (31 December 1980).

6. Austin, Lucille N. "Basic Principles of Supervision." Social Casework 33 (December 1952) : 411-419.

7. _____. "An Evaluation of Supervision." Social Casework 37 (October 1956) : 375-382.

8. _____. "The Changing Role of the Supervisor." Smith College Studies in Social Work 31 (June 1961) : 179-195.

9. Austin, Michael J., Dianne Brannon and Peter J. Recora. Managing Staff Behavior Problems In Human Service Agencies. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1984.

10. Bandura, Albert. Social Foundation of Thought and Action - A Social Cognitive Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1986.

11. Berl, Fred. "An Attempt To Construct A Conceptual Framework For Supervision." Social Casework 41 (7) 1960 : 339-346.

12. Brackett, Jeffrey R. "Training For Work." In Social Work Supervision - Classic Statements And Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 6-17. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

13. Brodsky, Stanley L. "Criminal Justice Settings." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training In the Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates, 254-267. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1979.

14. Cherniss, Cary. Professional Burn-Out In Human Service Organizations. New York: Prayer, 1980.

15. _____ and E. Egnatios. "Clinical Suprvision in Community Mental Health." Social Work (23) 1978 : 219-223.

16. Child Welfare Administration/Volunatrary Agency Recruitment Retention Steering Committee. "Staff Development Survey of Voluntary Agencies". Unpublished survey funded by the N.Y.C. Child Welfare Administration.

17. Clegg, R. R. The Administrator in Public Welfare. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1966.

18. Community Council of Greater New York. "An Approach To The Shortage Of Social Service Personnel In New York City Child Care Agencies." Final Report Of The Pre-Professional Training Project. January 1959 - April 1961.

19. Council Of Family And Child Caring Agencies (COFCCA). "Who Will Care For The Children? - A Report On The Work Force Crisis In Child Welfare." March, 1989.

20. Devis, Donald A. "Teaching And Administrative Functions In Supervision." Social Work 10 (April 1965) : 83-89.

21. Doeker, Richard E., Jr. and Patricia A. Lynett. "Strategies In Staff Development: An Ecological Approach." Social Work (September/ October 1983) : 380-384.

22. Doueck, Howard J. and Michael J. Austin. "Improving Agency Functioning Through Staff Development." Administration In Social Work 10 (Summer 1986) : 27-36 .

23. Eiskovits, Zvi and Edna Guttmen. "Toward A Practice Theory Of Learning Through Experience In Social Work Supervision." The Clinical Supervisor 1 (Spring 1983) : 51-63.

24. Eldridge, William D. "Coping With Accountability: Guidelines For Supervisors." Social Casework, 1982 : 489-496.

25. Epstein, Laura. "Differential Use Of Staff: A Method To Expand Social Services." Social Work 7 (October 1962) : 66-72.

26. _____. "Is Autonomous Practice Possible?" Social Work 18 (March 1973) : 5-12.

27. Fein, Edith, et al. "After Foster Care: Outcomes of Permanency Planning for Children." Child Welfare (November/December 1983).

28. Feldman, Yonata. "The Supervisory Process: An Experience In Teaching and Learning." In Supervision In Social Work - Classic Statements and Critical Issues, ed., Carlton E. Munson, 360-366. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

29. Fox, Raymond. "Supervision By Contract." Social Casework 55 (1974) : 247-251.

30. _____. "Contracting In Supervision: A Goal-Oriented Process." The Clinical Supervisor 1 (Spring 1983) : 37-49.

31. Getzel, George S., Jack R. Goldberg and Robert Salmon. "Supervising In Groups As A Model For Today." Social Casework (March 1971) : 154-163.

32. _____ and Robert Salmon. "Group Supervision: An Organizational Approach." Clinical Supervision 3 (Spring 1985) : 27-43.

33. Gitterman, Alex. "Comparison of Educational Models And Their Influence On Supervision." In Issues In Human Services, ed. Florence W. Kaslow and Associates, 18-38. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass 1972.

34. _____ and Irving Miller. "Supervisors As Educators." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training In The Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates, 100-114. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

35. Glendenning, John M. "Supervision Through Conferences on Specific Cases." Family 4 (1923) : 7-10.

36. Harris, Dorothy V., and Elizabeth Keith Allison. "Performance Management And Professional Development As Separate Functions Of Supervision." Health And Social Work 7 (4) 1982 : 283-291.

37. Hegar, Rebecca L. and Jeanne M. Hunzeker. "Moving Toward Empowerment-Based Practice in Public Child Welfare." Social Work (November-December, 1988) : 499-502.

38. Hutchinson, Dorothy. "Supervision In Social Casework." In Social Work Supervision: Classic Statements and Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 35-40. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

39. Kahn, Eva M. "The Parallel Process in Social Work Treatment and Supervision." Social Casework (November 1979) : 521-528.

40. Kadushin, Alfred. "Supervisor-Supervisee: A Survey." Social Work 19 (May 1974) : 288-298.

41. _____. Supervision In Social Work, 2nd Edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

42. Kaslow, Florence W. "Group Supervision." In Issues In Human Services, ed. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates, 115-141. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

43. _____. "Future Trends." In Consultation And Staff Training In The Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates, 302-312. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

44. _____. Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training in the Helping Professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

45. _____. "Training of Marital and Family Therapists." In Consultation and Staff Training in The Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates. San francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

46. Krueger, Richard A. Focus Groups A Practical Guide for Applied Research. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1988.

47. Kutzik, Alfred J. "The Social Work Field." In Supervision, Consultation and Staff Training In The Helping Professions, ed. Florence W. Kaslow & Associates, 25-60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

48. Leader, Arthur W. "New Directors In Supervision." Social Casework 38 (1968) : 462-468.

49. Lee, Porter. "A Study In Social Treatment." Family 4 (1923) : 191-199.

50. Levy, Charles S. "The Ethics of Supervision." In Social Work Supervision - Classic Statements and Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 216-226. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

51. Lewis, Harold. "The Intellectual Base of Social Work Practice: Tools for Thought In a Helping Profession. New York: Silberman Fund and Hawthorne Press, 1982.

52. Lowy, Louis. "Social Work Supervision: From Models Toward Theory." Journal Of Education For Social Work 19 (Spring 1983): 55-62.

53. Madison, Bernice Q. and Michael Shapiro. New Perspective In Child Welfare. San Francisco, 1973.

54. Maluccio, Anthony N. "Staff Development In Child Welfare: A Review Of The Literature." Child & Youth Services 1 (No. 3, 1977) : 1-9.

55. Mandell, Betty. "The Equality Revolution and Supervision." In Social Work Supervision: Classic Statements And Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 311-326. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

56. McFadden, Emily Jean. "Helping the Inexperienced Worker in the Public Child Welfare Agency: A Case Study." Child Welfare 54 (May 1975) : 319-330.

57. Meyer, Carole H. Staff Development In Public Welfare Agencies. New York: Colombia University Press, 1966.

58. Milford Conference Report. "Social Work: Generic And Specific." New York: American Association Of Social Workers 1929. In Social Work Supervision: Classic Statements And Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 29-34. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

59. Miller, Irving. "Supervision In Social Work." In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 18th Issue, ed. J.R. Morris, et. al., 748-756. New York: National Association Of Social Workers, 1987.

60. Morgan, David L. Focus Groups As Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1988.

61. Morton, Thomas D. and P. David Kurtz. "Educational Supervision: A Learning Theory Approach." Social Casework (April 1980) : 240-246.

62. Munson, Carlton E. "Authority And Social Work Supervision: An Agency Model" In Social Work Supervision: Classic Statements And Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 336-346. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

63._____. "Style And Structure In Supervision." Journal Of Education For Social Work 17 (Winter 1981) : 65-72.

64. NASW News."Study Shows Minimal Standards For Child Welfare Agency Jobs." June, 1987.

65. NASW News. "On Capitol Hill". June, 1990.

66. Olsen, Lenore and William H. Holmes. "Educating Child Welfare Workers: The Effects of Professional Training On Service Delivery." Journal Of Education For Social Work 18 (Winter 1982) : 94-102.

67. Oreskes, Michael. "A System Overloaded: The Foster-Care Crisis." New York Times, Sunday March 15, 1987 : 32.

68. Parad, Howard J. "Social Work Training For Child Welfare: Some Key Issues." Child Welfare (January, 1961) : 1-7.

69. Pettes, Dorothy E. Supervision In Social Work: A Method Of Student Training & Staff Development. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1967.

70. Reynolds, Bertha Learning And Teaching In The Practice Of Social Work. New York: Russell & Russell, NASW Classic Series 1965 Edition.

71. Richmond, Mary. Social Diagnosis. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. 1917.

72. Rickert, Vernon C. and John E. Turner. "Through The Looking Glass: Supervision In Family Therapy." Social Casework 59 (March 1978) : 131-137.

73. Robinson, Virginia P. Supervision In Social Casework. Chapel Hill: University Of North Carolina Press, 1936.

74. Rowley, Carl M. and Eugene J. Faux. "The Team Approach To Supervision." Mental Hygiene 50 (1966) : 60-65.

75. Rycus, Judith S. "Essentials Of In-Service Training For Child Welfare Workers." Child Welfare (June 1978) : 346-354.

76. Scott, Richard W. "Reactions To Supervision In A Heteronomous Professional Organization." Administrative Science Quarterly (June 1965) : 65-81.

77. Sharpe, Ann W.and Anita Schroeder. National Study Of Social Sciences To Children And Their Families - Overview. Rockville, Md.: Westat, 1978.

78. Shertz, Francis H. "A Concept Of Supervision Based On Definitions Of Job Responsibility." Social Casework 39 (October, 1958) : 435-442.

79. Shulman, Lawrence. Skills Of Supervision And Staff Management. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, 1982.

80. Stiles, Evelyn. "Supervision In Perspective." Social Casework 44 (1963) : 19-25.

81. Sui, Sau Fong and Patricia Turner-Hogan. "Public Child Welfare For Clinical Social Work." Social Work (September 1989) : 423-430.

82. Towle, Charlotte. "The Place Of Help In Supervision." Social Service Review 37 (4) 1963 : 405-415.

83. Vinokur-Kaplan, Dianne. The View From The Agency: Supervisors And Workers Look At In-Service Training For Child Welfare. Ann Arbor, Michigan: National Child Welfare Training Center, The University Of Michigan School Of Social Work, 1983.

84. _____ and Ann Hartman. "A National Profile Of Child Welfare Workers And Supervisors." Child Welfare (July/August 1986) : 323-335.

85. Wasserman, Harry. "Early Careers Of Professional Social Workers In A Public Child Welfare Agency." Social Work (July 1970) : 93-101.

86. Watson, Kenneth W. "Differential Supervision." Social Work (November 1973) : 80-88.

87. _____. "The Manpower Team In A Child Welfare Agency Setting." Child Welfare (October 1968) : 446-454.

88. Wax, John. "The Pros And Cons Of Group Supervision." Social Casework 40 (June 1959) : 307-313.

89. _____. "Time-Limited Supervision." Social Work 8 (July 1963) : 37-43.

90. Young, Ruth H. "Supervision: Challenges For The Future." In Social Work Supervision -Classic Statements and Critical Issues, ed. Carlton E. Munson, 330-331. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

91. Zetzel, Elizabeth. "The Dynamics Base Of Supervision." Social Casework 34 (1953) : 143-149.

92. Zischka, Pauline C. "The Effect Of Burnout Of Permanency Planning And Middle Management Supervisors In Child Welfare Agencies." Child Welfare (November, 1981) : 611-616.