

THE GENERIC OF THE SUPERVISORY PROCESS

disciplined use of relationship in helping stems from a worker's experience with a supervisor who is herself able to carry the relationship within its limitations, give with a recognition of and respect for the worker's individual way of learning, be free to end the relationship in accordance with the worker's needs.

The corollary to this is the capacity of the supervisor to help a worker develop in her unique way through helping her to know and preserve her own special quality which constitutes her difference. Helping a worker to know valid difference from the difference which comes as an expression of the worker's fear of changing takes great skill, but it is the only way in which the field will move ahead and workers will be enabled to make their own contributions, rather than live as extensions of their supervisors.

The components of supervision, then, are in themselves generic; they consist of the worker, the supervisor and the specific function of the agency. For the worker, the objective is her personal-professional growth in order to cope sensitively but objectively with another's emotional conflicts and the development of knowledge and skill in order to offer the particular service of the agency. For the supervisor the objective is to represent the purpose of the agency while the worker is learning, to enable the educational and the personal-professional development of the worker, and to see that these serve the best interests of the client. The agency carries the responsibility of deepening its services with maximum clarity and of providing a setting for the supervisor-worker relationship which is most conducive to learning, growth and therefore to client service.

DISCUSSION OF MISS LEVINSON'S PAPER

By FLORENCE SILVERBLATT

MISS Levinson's paper on the Generics of the Supervisory Process highlights two salient factors in supervision. First, she describes supervision as a unique process within case work agencies. Second, she defines supervision as a process having its own form and characteristics, and a known purpose. I agree with Miss Levinson that the form and the purpose of supervision are generic, but the content is specific as it relates to the particular agency and the particular service that agency offers. The generic qualities of supervision are described by Miss Levinson in this statement: "We can arrive at a common goal for all supervision, which is to enable a worker to attain a profound knowledge of and an identification with her agency's service, a psychological understanding of the individual client in relation to that service, and the freedom to use all of this creatively to help the client come to terms with his reality." This, I believe, is the essence of supervision.

Miss Levinson has offered us a challenging portrayal of the generic aspects of the supervisory process. For purposes of discussion, I am going to examine these concepts in relation to the multiple service agency. When I speak of a multiple service agency I am referring to the agency that combines, within one purpose, two distinct functions such as Family Service and Child Placement. I am referring also to the multiple service agency that differentiates these services

by clear structural lines as well as by separate case loads. In this type of agency there is need for deep reflection on common goals of supervision. Although the basic concepts of supervision, as Miss Levinson describes them, are the same in a multiple service agency, there are additional teaching and learning responsibilities. The question which emerges in the agency that has a duality of services within one purpose is whether the teaching of one service enables the worker to achieve an understanding of the agency's general purpose. How does a worker in a multiple service agency learn and know her specific function, and also obtain an identification with her whole agency?

This fundamental query of the multiple service agency is not solved in a pragmatic way. Rather, it places upon the administration and the supervisor, a complex responsibility. The clearer we grow about the structural aspects necessary to enable the learning process to reflect the agency services, the more self conscious we become of the teaching-learning problems in this kind of an agency. The supervisor, in a multiple service agency, who teaches one function may be equipped with all of the attributes necessary for teaching. But she cannot be a responsible supervisor of a multiple service agency unless she has integrated her specific knowledge and skill, with knowledge and understanding of her total agency. It is essential then that the supervisor have,

DISCUSSION OF MISS LEVINSON'S PAPER

in addition to specific skills, a working knowledge of the generic concepts that underlie both services. When the supervisor not only learns and accepts the wholeness of her agency, but also has the inner conviction of the value of teaching and learning through the specific parts, then she is able to utilize her supervisory skills most productively within a multiple service agency.

The worker, then, does have a learning experience in relation to a specific service. From this point of view, supervision in the multiple service agency resembles supervision in any agency. But the goal of supervision is not fully achieved if the worker learns only the one service. For example, the worker in Child Placement is identified with only one part of her agency's purpose. Through the supervisory relationship, she is deepening her understanding of and identification with that service. In another department of the agency, a worker, too, is experiencing this learning process. The agency then must find a way of bringing these two together, to share individual knowledge, and to arrive at a common understanding. It is the responsibility of the Staff meeting to augment individual learning by teaching the general aspects of the agency. Thus the purpose of the Staff meeting is to help the workers come to terms with agency reality.

Learning in relation to the group as a corollary to learning through the supervisory relationship should be an integral part of every worker's agency experience. Just as it is important for a worker to test her developing professional self in the client relationship, so is it vital for her to gauge her professional capacity as an agency member in the group relationship. However, the Staff meeting in a multiple service

agency has additional significance and import. It is here where total agency meets together to share common goals and generic experiences. It is here that the individual worker learns about the other parts of her agency. It is here that a developing understanding of the total purpose of the agency takes place. The way in which the worker relates to the group and uses her own experiences in blending the parts into the whole are tests not only of her learning the specifics, but of her identification with the generic aspects of a multiple service agency. Thus, supervision in the multiple service agency, as in any other, has the task of teaching and learning a particular function and of identifying with a particular service. The group experience is the medium through which a worker learns about the whole agency and through which she finds an identification with the agency's total purpose.

I have been trying to describe an application of the generic concepts of supervision to a specific situation, the multiple service agency. I cannot overestimate the valuable contribution Miss Levinson has made to the whole area of supervision. There are so many facets worthy of discussion, but I think it would be encouraging enough, if we take from this paper, a real appreciation of the progress that we have made in our own learning process. To be able to describe and to define supervision; to recognize its form and its uniqueness, is to declare that supervision has come into its own. As we recognize and accept the unique contribution of supervision to the growth and development of case work services, then we are ready to be more sensitive of our teaching skills. Miss Levinson has given us the direction. May we continue to develop the knowledge and skill to follow it.

THE USE OF A WRITTEN EVALUATION IN SUPERVISION

By GLADYS PATZ WEINBERG

*Jewish Child Care Assn.,
New York, N. Y.*

THIS paper is based on my supervision of a worker in a child care agency. It will focus on the validity of the regular written evaluation as a motivating force in the supervisory process. The first part of the paper is introductory, and will describe the case worker's problem; how I tried to help with this during the year. The main part of the paper deals with the supervisory process around the written evaluation. There were three conferences specifically on the evaluation. I will give the first two, the pre-evaluation and evaluation conferences in some detail. I will summarize the third conference to show the direction in which the case worker was beginning to move.

The worker, Miss Jones, has now had two years' experience in case work, all in our agency. She has been working with me as supervisor for a year and a half. Early in our working together, I realized Miss Jones was a person of unusual capacity. She had intense professional drive. She was ready to give extra time and energy to her work. Her case work showed sensitivity and professional understanding. However, I was also aware of her insecurity. There were indications of this in her case work, but it came out most clearly in her professional relationships, in a submissiveness to other case workers who had status in the district, and in hesitant participation in group meetings. In supervision, she was cautious, watchful of my reaction.

During these first months, I did not realize the subtle complexities of her problem, how deeply her insecurity was based in her personality structure. Sensing her need for dependency, I responded primarily with positive support and assumed that with acceptance of her ability she would gain assurance that would reflect itself in her work. She was eager for my support and leaned on my position in the agency. Through this atmosphere of acceptance, she seemed to gain a new sense of self, a conviction in her own beliefs, in the way she functioned as a case worker. In supervision, she became free in her discussion of her cases, at times sharing more deeply her feelings about herself as worker. She became more related to the staff, secure enough to express her sound thinking and feeling. The staff responded and Miss Jones had enough sensitivity to maintain a nice balance between herself and others. Her position in the agency became one of leadership. All of this made for a deepening development of skill in her case work. Her work was such, that she was given a case load assignment usually given to the more experienced workers. This meant that she was accepted by her supervisor, by the Administration, and by her fellow workers, as an outstanding second year case worker.

At this time, a marked change seemed to take place in Miss Jones' functioning largely in the area of her relation-