

A HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

1929 - 1954

by

JOHN DONALD MACQUEEN BLISS

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

in the School of Social Work

Accepted as conforming to the standard
required for the degree of
Master of Social Work

School of Social Work

1954

The University of British Columbia

ABSTRACT

Instruction in social work has been offered at the University of British Columbia for twenty-five years. From the beginning in 1929, until 1942, the training has been vocational and the emphasis has been on method. In 1943 the first full time Director was appointed and under her guidance the Course became a Department and finally a School of Social Work in 1950. The emphasis has been changed from method to the development of the professional person. This is the first time that a history of this evolution has been recorded.

The history of the School of Social Work is important because in the struggle to raise standards for education for social work, an equally strenuous struggle went on to encourage and help social agencies raise their standards of practice. The important common link between the two periods in the development of the Course to a School, was in the general training or "generic" idea.

In using the historical method of research, it was discovered that the minutes of Faculty meetings from 1929 to 1942 no longer existed. A few letters, a few excerpts from the minutes of the Faculty, the minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Minutes of the Senate, together with the recollection of two or three pioneers in the early development of the School, were the chief sources of information. Minutes of the Alumni Association of the Social Service Graduates also provided valuable information from 1935 onward.

This study indicates that the School of Social Work has been largely responsible for the relatively high standards in social welfare in British Columbia. It is a Canadian School with Canadian emphasis, and its standards are progressive. As significant trends in the field of social work are observed, changes may be made in the curriculum to anticipate their realization, providing the change is consistent with high standards of practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

For their kind co-operation in making available to me certain relevant information on the historical development of the School of Social Work, I wish to express my appreciation to Miss Zella Collins, Dr. C. W. Topping, and Miss Marjorie J. Smith. Thanks is also given to Dr. Leonard Marsh for his valuable suggestions and constructive criticisms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1. <u>The Beginning</u>	Page
An outline of the beginning of education for social work in Great Britain, the United States and in Canada. The status of social work in British Columbia in relation to the special needs of the Province. The effect of the "Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Society", and its recommendations with reference to the need for trained professional social workers for British Columbia. The beginning of education for social work at U.B.C. and a summary of some of the efforts to raise standards in Canada and in the United States.....	1
Chapter 2. <u>The Vocational Training Stage 1929-1942</u>	
The problem of administration with its implications for Faculty, financing, curriculum building and the necessity to make the best of available resources. An outline of the development of the curriculum including field work. The use of Summer Schools to help in raising standards. The Alumni Association and other professional organizations' efforts to help raise standards.....	25
Chapter 3. <u>The Professional Education Stage 1943 - 1954</u>	
The transition from Vocational Training to Professional education under the guidance of the new full-time Director. Anticipating needs and preparing the ground for raising standards and increasing enrolment. The development of the curriculum and means used to help integrate field work with the course content given in class. Student screening and student problems with regard to financing, training, etc. The Department becomes a School and the responsibility for administration divided into committees. Some of the principles upon which the course has been rebuilt.....	65
Chapter 4. <u>The Past, the Present, and Future Trends</u>	
A brief recapitulation with some suggestions for the Alumni Association. Some probable trends in the future and the suitability of the School as an International center for education for social work.....	107
Appendices	
A. Bibliography	

TABLES IN THE TEXT

Table 1. The total enrolment for the School from 1929 - 1954.

A HISTORY OF THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
1929 - 1954

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNING

It would be difficult to find a quarter century more filled with extremes than the period from 1929 - 1954. The year 1929 saw the end of one of the greatest "boom" periods in the history of the American continent and the beginning of one of the most distressing and prolonged depressions. The depression did not end until the outbreak of World War Two, and there followed a period of the most devastating destruction of human life and property that the world has yet experienced. With the end of the war the western world once again started to experience a new kind of "boom". It was not confined to material prosperity only but it also found expression in a new era of scientific and social development.

The development of the School of Social Work at the University of British Columbia from a number of courses commencing in 1929 to its present maturity in 1954, was of course not uninfluenced by the more catastrophic world developments. For example, the depression meant loss of revenue to the British Columbia Provincial Government which, in turn, meant curtailed grants to the University of British Columbia. This alone nearly caused the death in infancy of the Social Service Courses. On the other hand, the depression caused all levels of Government to

reconsider methods of administering relief and forced them to develop a new philosophy about the states' responsibility to its citizens. This development led educators in the field of social welfare to bring the study of research, administration and community organization into nearly equal partnership with case work and group work.

The attempt to establish the bounds of professional education for social work still goes on. Perhaps this history, written in the Silver Jubilee of Social Work training at U.B.C., may serve to highlight a few of the problems involved in this attempt. In order to do full justice to the story something should be said about the early beginning of professional education for social work on the North American continent and in Great Britain.

Early Training for Social Work

Before it was a recognized university course, training for social work was carried on for many years by private schools. In England, as well as in America, the Charity Organization Society developed the first training schools for social work in order that men and women would be adequately equipped to carry out its policies. The training in England consisted chiefly of courses on The Poor Law and other lectures which stressed the practical side of charitable work.¹ In America, as the recognition of the complex-

¹ Smith, Marjorie J., Professional Education for Social Work in Great Britain, Published for the Pringle Memorial Fund by The Family Welfare Association, London, 1952, p.15.

ity of family and social problems grew, the social agencies developed institutes and training courses for their salaried workers. By the close of the nineteenth century these salaried workers gradually replaced the voluntary "friendly visitors".¹

One of the earliest available documents on the training of social workers in England was a paper which was read to the Charity Organization Society by Mrs. Dunn Gardner on November 26, 1894. The subject of this paper was the training of volunteers; and in it was mentioned a problem which perhaps still survives in some form: "a student is not to be considered an asset for getting work done, but rather as a learner who must be taught."² Two years later, a Joint Lectures Committee of the Charity Organization Society organized the first course of lectures on "charity and almsgiving."³

In America one of the earlier papers on this subject was read by Mary Richmond in 1897. This paper entitled "The Need of a Training School in Applied Philanthropy", was read at a meeting of the National Conference of Social Work. It is noteworthy in itself, for it indicated that the cliché, "philanthropic effort needs only a kind heart

¹Hollis, Ernest V. and Taylor, Alice L., Social Work Education in the United States, Columbia University Press, New York, 1951, p. 9.

²Smith, Marjorie J., op.cit., p. 12.

³Ibid., p. 15

with some intelligence" had at last become obsolete.¹ A year later the New York Charity Organization established a summer training class which eventually grew into the New York School of Social Work.² These were the first organized attempts to train social workers generally for the field, placing an emphasis upon teaching theoretical methods as well as practical work in agencies.

By the end of the 19th century, advances in industrialization and urbanization created social problems faster than existing agencies could solve them. The growing complexity of the new social order required new methods and new techniques for their solution. At the same time, new areas of knowledge about man as a social being and as an individual were being explored by sociologists, psychologists and others. It became clear that social workers should be trained in a manner that would enable them to assess and apply this new knowledge. To do this, teachers were needed who themselves must have acquired the necessary practical knowledge of the field, combined with certain basic academic qualifications.

Such private schools as provided education for social work found it essential to keep the costs of training personnel as low as possible. At the same time, they were required to train more and more workers to meet the pressing needs of private organizations and welfare agen-

¹Van Kleeck, Mary, "The Professional Organization of Social Work", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, May 1922, p. 160

²Loc. cit.

cies. With few exceptions, the volunteer schools were not equipped to assess and integrate the rapidly accumulating findings of the various branches of the social sciences. One solution to the problem seemed to be schools for social work set up as part of a recognized university.

Both universities and social workers were cautious about accepting this solution without safeguards. Universities were cautious because they wished to maintain standards and also to assure themselves that any new departure in education was scientific in its methods. Universities' authorities wanted to know if there was an adequate body of knowledge that would lend itself to classification and if laws governing the phenomena of the new subject could be developed. Finally, they wanted to know if there was an interest in the new discipline which would warrant their making it a part of their curriculum.¹

Social workers, for their part, were equally jealous of their practical approach to social problems as opposed to the Universities' emphasis on theory in such subjects as economics, sociology, etc. Social workers were unwilling to consider the training of their workers without the inclusion of field work in the curriculum. The problem of integrating theory and practice, despite efforts to resolve it, remains a factor which must be taken into con-

¹ Hagerty, J. E., "The Universities and Training for Public Leadership and Social Work", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, p. 162.

sideration in any comprehensive plan for curriculum revision.

As a result of the apparent dichotomy between theory, as expounded by universities, and practice, as demonstrated by social workers, professional education for social work has had its origin from several directions at the same time. There was the separate school for training social workers independent of the universities. There was the separate school which soon affiliated or merged with a University. And thirdly, there was training for social work which began often enough as a series of loosely integrated and poorly coordinated courses under some Department such as Sociology.

With private agencies sponsoring and directing education for social work in the early schools, it is only natural that they should have exercised considerable influence. This influence extended over the development of schools of social work as well as the determining of objectives, methods, content of professional education. In fact, it was not until the mid-1930's that public agencies began to wield an appreciable influence on professional schools.⁸

Edith Abbott, a famous pioneer in the field of social work and a passionate advocate of higher standards of

¹ Spencer, Sue, Education for Social Work, Social Work Year Book, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1949, p. 175.

education for social workers, outlined her opinion about separate schools and university sponsorship of social work as follows:

One difficulty we have had to face in the past is that colleges and universities usually begin work in our field by delegating it to a representative of one of the older social sciences, and a professor of sociology, or economics, or business, or occasionally government undertakes to 'tack on' to his departmental offerings a few courses given by a subordinate appointed to a position of low academic rank. These courses usually include case work and another subject or two concerned with what our academic friend is likely to call social work 'techniques', and especially a little field work that will enable him to say that the student is prepared for a salaried position in the field. Well, this is neither the science nor the art of our profession.....let me go a step farther and say that I think a good professional school of social welfare not only needs a close connection with a good university where there are strong social science departments of government, economics, sociology and psychology but I venture to suggest that the modern university also needs such a school and that the time will come, and come soon, when social service will be recognized as necessary in every university where the social sciences meet their fullest development.¹

The above criticism is fair enough but one must not overlook the fact, previously mentioned, that at first there were difficulties in relating field work to theories. At that time too, even social workers were not too sure of status of social work as a profession. These were perhaps two reasons why many schools of social work in Canada and the United States were prone to develop in the manner so abhorrent to Miss Abbott.

One of the earliest examples of a separate school for

¹ Abbott, Edith, Social Welfare and Professional Education. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1933, p. 67.

training social workers independent of a university was the School of Sociology which began giving lectures in London, England, in the winter of 1903. Courses of instruction in different branches of social economy were arranged and classes were organized with practical work in connection with a number of District Committees of the Charity Organization Society.¹

In New York the School of Philanthropy which started as a six weeks summer school in 1898 became loosely affiliated with Columbia University in 1904. "This arrangement was not meant to commit the school exclusively to Columbia, and various types of relationships were developed later with other educational institutions. Throughout its history, however, the School has been closer to Columbia University than to any other, resulting finally in the more formal affiliation in 1940!"²

The first real university sponsorship of a school of social work in the United States took place in 1907. In that year the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy affiliated with the University of Chicago.³ In England the amalgamation of the School of Sociology with the London

¹Smith, op. cit., p. 32

²Bernstein, Saul and others, The New York School of Social Work 1898 - 1941, Institute of Welfare Research Community Service Society of New York, pp.15 - 16.

³Hollis and Taylor, op. cit., p. 9

School of Economics in July 1912, marks one of the first sponsorships of a school of social work in that country.¹

In order to meet the critical shortage of trained men and women to carry out the important work of the Red Cross during World War I, Universities and Schools of Philanthropy offered courses in social service. This experience in training for social service in war time led the most progressive universities to offer regular courses for training social workers in time of peace. However, these universities' programs for the training of social workers offered less field work than those offered by the Schools of Philanthropy, and no attempt was made to give a high degree of technical skill to their students by the time of graduation.

In Canada social work has developed professional training largely within the universities. The University of Toronto, stimulated and helped financially by funds raised through the efforts of the Social Workers' Club and the Social Science Study Club, established the first Canadian School in the Autumn of 1914. Since that time seven out of the eight schools of social work in Canada have developed from social science departments in a Canadian university. The eighth, the Maritime School of Social Work, is an example of the independent vocational or technical school which now has moved to affiliate with a university.

¹ Smith, op. cit., p. 39.

Establishing the Need

Like most institutions all of these schools were formed to meet a need. In B.C. the need was scarcely realized until an investigation into an alleged scandal was so widely publicized that the Provincial Government became interested in the matter. In the city of Vancouver poor administrative practices in the Wall Street Children's Home brought unfavorable publicity. A great deal of public indignation was aroused on behalf of the children, so great indeed, that a committee of the Provincial Legislative Assembly headed by Mr. Ian MacKenzie was asked to investigate and report back to the Assembly.

The findings of this committee indicated that the alleged scandal was in reality a case of bad administration on the part of the administrator of the Children's Home. "Upon examination, irregularities of a somewhat serious character were found to exist...Your committee finds that these irregularities were largely attributable to a lack of business training, and a singular incapacity for business organization and business detail on the part of the Secretary..."¹

A strong feeling of responsibility for the welfare of needy children led the members of the Children's Aid Society to have a special committee set up to investigate the whole system. This committee, known as the British

¹Angus, Margaret A., Children's Aid Society of Vancouver, B. C., 1901 - 1951, p. 24.

Columbia Child Welfare Committee, was under the directorship of Mr. Robert E. Mills of Toronto, with Miss Charlotte Whitton as Executive Secretary. The following excerpt from this report shows that the publicity over an alleged scandal and the resultant investigations indicated the need for professionally trained personnel in the field of social welfare in British Columbia:

Irrespective of whether a family placement is in a free or a boarding home, it must be made with the greatest care and consummate skill. The most exhaustive investigation and study of the home offered must be made in order to determine not only its respectability and good intentions, but, what is quite important, its qualities and peculiarities - the subtle and significant characteristics that make it suitable for a particular type of child, or possibly unsuitable for any child...All of this service requires a deal of doing. The constant attention of the worker must be given wholeheartedly to the job. Spasmodic occasional interest and activity is doomed to disappointment in so exacting a task. The worker must be carefully selected for the purpose, of good stock and wholesome social background, well educated and gifted with sound sense. She must, in addition to all this, be specially trained in the social significance of the various factors in her work and in the highly specialized technique that has been developed in this field. She must be to some degree at once a diplomat, a psychologist, a teacher and a sociologist... All of these requirements of child placing apply with equal force to social case work and the workers concerned with the child in his own home. Such trained workers are not at present available in British Columbia. Until such time as facilities for training are developed within the Province it will be necessary to look elsewhere for workers for at least the key positions in social case work and child planning.¹

Miss Whitton's report concluded with three main recommendations. The building of new institutions for the care of

¹ Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Society, Published by the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey Committee, Vancouver, B.C., 1927, p. 18.

children must be replaced by a program of foster home care. Secondly, the report recommended that a Family Service be established. Lastly, the need for trained social workers to carry out these programs was emphasized.

The Children's Aid Society acted upon all of these recommendations and a number of trained workers were brought out from Toronto. Miss Laura Holland led in the task of reorganizing the program of the Children's Aid Society; Miss Mary McPhedran became director of the new Family Welfare Bureau in the fall of 1927, and Miss Zella Collins and Miss Margaret Whitman assisted Miss Holland in her various programs.

These professional social workers formed the nucleus of new staff which, within a year or two, were to become responsible for the training of social workers in British Columbia. At the same time the agencies in which they were employed were to become invaluable as places in which students could receive training. All of these women, as it turned out, were to give years of service and all of them were to become well known figures in the welfare field in British Columbia.

At this time more than fifty percent of the total population of British Columbia lived around the main cities of Vancouver, New Westminster and Victoria. Agricultural land amounted to only 5.7 percent of the total area of the Province's 366,255 square miles, while 700,000 people occupied less than a quarter of it.

The province, because of its administrative jurisdiction over unorganized territory, was compelled to make provision for the care of the destitute, the aged and the sick. By the end of the 1920's the annual expenditures for this purpose were about \$100,000. In 1920 the Mothers' Pension Act was passed and by March 31, 1932 expenditures had reached \$843,000 annually. In 1927 the Old Age Pensions Act added an additional burden to the public assistance system which was already heavily burdened. Sound administrative policies and practices called for administrators professionally trained in public welfare. Few were available. This fact was soon to be brought home when effects of the depression began to be felt.

It is understandable that social problems usually come to the fore in a society where urban communities develop rapidly. The swiftly growing welfare needs of the cities of Vancouver, New Westminster and Victoria, to say nothing of the rural areas throughout the province, could not adequately be met by volunteers and untrained workers. Private and municipal welfare agencies lacked leadership. The coordination of resources and co-operation between agencies was at a primitive level of development. Overlapping of agency services without proper assessment of the total community needs, led to both waste of resources on the one hand and, in a few cases, complete neglect of the needs of families and individuals on the other.

The need for trained professional social workers

at both the provincial and local levels was undisputed. The nearest Canadian source of supply was the University of Toronto nearly two thousand miles to the East. Something had to be done and something was being done by a number of interested people led by Professor S. E. Beckett of the U.B.C. Department of Economics, Sociology and Political Science.

For some time Professor S. E. Beckett had been acting as advisor to the Provincial Government in the field of Public Finance. The recent investigation by a committee in the Legislative Assembly and the resulting survey and report, brought home to members of the Provincial Government the desirability of having properly qualified administrators of the public's money and social services. With this in mind, Professor Beckett wrote letters of enquiry concerning curricula to personal friends of his who were teaching courses in social work and the social sciences at Columbia University and Chicago University. At the same time, a special committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science was set up to report on a proposal to establish a course in "Social Science". This committee was officially called "The Committee on Social Services, Home Economics, and Business Administration Courses."

On November 20th, 1928, the report of the special committee was approved and on December 19, 1928, approval was ratified by the Senate subject to the following amendment: "That the course as outlined in the memorandum be

approved, subject to the insertion of the proper term (Social Service for Social Science.)" From this amendment it would seem that the courses had originally been called, "Courses in Social Science."

Unfortunately Professor Beckett died suddenly and the courses were withdrawn. The following year Professor C. W. Topping arrived from the College of Puget Sound to take Professor Beckett's place. Professor Topping's experience as a lecturer in social service courses at the institution made him a logical one to help implement the new courses. This marked the beginning of professional training for social work at the University of British Columbia, the story of which will be told in subsequent chapters.

Standards

Considered from the standpoint of the education required, two essential characteristics mark a true profession. The first is the existence of a recognized code of ethics.¹ Questions of conduct and feeling growing out of the social worker's four-fold responsibility to clients, to fellow workers, to agency, and to the community arise again and again. In the midst of a dynamic social order, how much emphasis should one give to the right of the individual? How should one proceed in the conflict of youth versus authority, the individual versus tradition? The struggle

¹ Taylor, Ralph W., Distinguishing Attributes of Education for the Professions, Social Work Journal, April, 1952, p. 55.

to establish a recognized code of ethics for social workers has not yet been completed, for it is intimately related to the larger task of raising standards.

The second distinguishing feature of a profession is the basing of its techniques of operation upon principles rather than rule-of-thumb procedures. Social case workers, for example, deal not with specific problems as such, but rather with an individual who has a problem. Each problem is then, in a certain sense, unique and to solve it the worker must be able to draw upon certain basic principles. In order to do this the worker must make an analysis of the particular problem to see what are its unique aspects which will require adaption of the principles. Not only does this process require professional skill on the part of the worker, but it also involves individual judgement and imagination as well. Here, too, a dynamic social order requires the professional worker to constantly cultivate the garden of his mind lest he become static in his thinking and begin to classify his clients in stereotypes rather than see each one as a unique individual.

Both of these essential characteristics which mark a true profession are included in the dynamic process of raising standards. This struggle to raise standards was, and still is, one of the chief drives in the evolution of the courses in social work at the University of British Columbia from 1929 to 1954. The Alumni Association of the B. C. School of Social Work, first formed in October 1934,

the Canadian Association of Social Workers, Agency heads and the faculty who taught the courses were all concerned with the raising of standards both in education for social work as well as in professional practice. Behind the specific struggle to raise standards lies years of spade work by pioneers in the profession. One of these pioneers was Mary Richmond.

From 1910 to 1922 a series of four-week institutes were held annually by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation. "These, and the later Supervisors' Conferences, were under the leadership of Mary Richmond and were for selected case workers, executives, and supervisors from charity organization societies across the country. This outstanding example of early informal education may well be said to have contained the germ of the modern staff concept."¹

An important development which took institutional form at the end of World War I was the Association of Schools of Professional Social Work. With seventeen charter members located for the most part in the Eastern half of the United States, the development of uniform and responsible professional standards for social work moved forward. The following constitution was adopted in June, 1919:

¹ Hollis and Taylor, op. cit., p. 10

Any educational institution, maintaining a full-time course of training for professional social work covering at least one academic year and including a substantial amount of both class instruction and of supervised field work may become a member of the Association upon election by the Executive Committee.¹

As yet no fundamental principles were apparent which could be recognized in an established course in professional social work.

By 1924 the above mentioned Association formulated some more specific requirements which should be in professional education for social work. These were, briefly, an organized curriculum, a responsible administrator, and, for new schools, university affiliation. The Association had by now grown from seventeen members to twenty-five. Of these ten schools were organized on a graduate basis, eleven offered both graduate and undergraduate preparation, four were entirely undergraduate. It appears that there was a wide disparity in the academic standards for admission, the length of courses, etc. Professional preparation, if graduate, seldom comprised more than a full academic year.²

It was not until the 1930's and the next decade that members of the schools in the American Association of Schools of Social Work moved more directly forward toward uniform educational standards. Details concerning the development of the School of Social Work at the University of British Columbia in relation to this general

¹Walker, Sydney, H., Social Work and The Training of Social Workers, The University of North Carolina Press, 1928, p. 162.

²Hollis and Taylor, op. cit., p. 19.

evolution of standards will be given later in subsequent chapters.

In 1932 the Association adopted a minimum curriculum in an effort to secure a greater degree of similarity in method and content of education in the various schools and also to provide a formal basis for accrediting. This minimum curriculum established certain basic groups of subject areas, and it was mandatory that students should have one or more courses in each group in order to assure a well-rounded preparation. The most far-reaching decision of the Association was made in 1937 when it was laid down that professional education for social work was to be offered as graduate study after October 1, 1939.

It was made clear in 1944 that post graduate study was no small undertaking. The subjects of the curriculum were defined and it was apparent that two years were a bare minimum to cover this. Eight areas of study were now required of all properly qualified students. These "basic eight" were: public welfare, social case work, social group work, community organization, social research, medical information, psychiatric information, and social administration.

Two years previously in 1942, lack of agreement with the accrediting policies and practices of the American Association of Schools of Social Work led a group of unaccredited academic departments and divisions of social work to form the "National Association of Schools of Social Work". A difference in opinion on the amount of general

education that should precede the professional program and on the nature of the preprofessional courses were the causes of this cleavage.

The inability of these two over-all accrediting associations to resolve their differences was a primary precipitating cause of the formation of the National Council on Social Work Education. The Council held its first meeting in August, 1946, under the direction of Dr. E. V. Hollis. Dr. Hollis is Chief of College Administration, Division of Higher Education, Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and he is a well-known figure in the field of higher education.

The functions of the Council included the following: To make a long-range study of the content and methods of existing undergraduate and graduate education for social work. To define the content of education for social work so that agreement could be reached among educational organizations and one accrediting program for social work could be developed with the machinery for carrying it forward. To establish machinery for collecting data on personnel needs in social work and on the quantity and distribution of educational facilities, as the basis for action in order to stimulate expansion of educational facilities. Finally, to develop methods of closer co-operation in the activities carried on by the two educational organizations and other interested groups.¹

¹National Council on Social Work Education First Meeting August 1946, Social Work Year Book, 1951.

The findings of the above council have been published by Dr. Hollis and his associates in "Social Work Education in the United States." One immediate result was the formation of the Council on Social Work Education which held its constitutional convention in New York, January 28, 1952. In this Council are united the various professional groups including the American Association of Social Work and the National Association of Schools of Social Work. Broadly speaking, the purpose of the council is "to promote the development of sound programs of social work education in the United States, its territories and possessions, and Canada, through accreditation, consultation, interpretation, research, publications, and through such other special services as may be necessary." This is a far-reaching forward step for education for social work.

This attempt to promote higher standards in professional education in the United States and in Canada has been complemented by the work of professional workers. The search for qualified practitioners, the need to share experiences and the desire on the part of college students to find social work employment, led to the creation of the National Social Workers Exchange in 1916. In 1921 this group was the general professional organization in the field of social work and became known as the American Association of Social Workers. By means of local chapters, an effective system of national committees, and a small paid staff, the Association has developed and promoted

basic professional standards.¹

In Canada a similar professional body was formed and a constitution drawn up in 1926 by 195 workers. Its aims are to bring together social workers, to promote higher standards, to facilitate training programs at various levels and to strengthen public relations. By 1954 the professional organization comprised 1821 members with 23 local branches.

In 1944, the National Committee of Canadian Schools of Social Work was formed at Winnipeg. One of the main functions of the National Committee was to enlist aid from the Federal Government to provide assistance for the Canadian Schools of Social Work. More will be said later about the response of the Federal Government to this appeal as it applies to the development of the School of Social Work at the University of British Columbia.

Today in Britain, training for Social work is undertaken partly by the universities and partly by the profession. By 1951, twenty-three universities offered basic courses in social sciences leading to a degree, certificate or diploma. Many forms of social work training consist of these diplomas or certificate courses generally of two-years' duration for non-graduates, followed by a short period, usually between three to twelve months of specialized training for a specific service.

¹ Hollis and Taylor, op. cit., p. 19.

The Institute of Almoners, the National Association of Girls' Clubs and Mixed Clubs, the Probation Advisory and Training Board are examples of specific services which give post university training. The supply of trained students does not meet the demand. In 1950, 390 students completed the basic certificate or diploma course, 135 men and women took degrees in social science.¹

This over specialization in training reflects what Miss Younghusband calls a "dangerous fragmentation that is taking place in British Social Work. Instead of a generic approach as evolved in the United States and Canada emphasis upon the differences in groups (that is, the ill, the maladjusted, the homeless child, etc.) has been emphasized rather than the far more common similarities."² This trend makes training for social work in Britain more difficult to control from the point of view of raising standards than it is in the United States and Canada.

The process of raising standards in education for social work and in the field of practice, has no ending. The state of development of social work in British Columbia, at the time of the investigations into the Wall Street Children's Home, was still almost in the pioneer stage, and standards were not of the best. The investigation and the

¹ Younghusband, E. L., Social Case Work in Great Britain, A Symposium, Morris Cherry, Editor, Faber & Faber, Ltd., 24 Russell Square, 1950, p. 202.

² Social Work and the Social Workers in Britain, Issued by the Reference Division of the Central Office of Information, London, W.I., October, 1951, p. 8-9.

and the resulting Survey and Report brought light, as it were, to those who felt that a need for improvement existed, but could not see where to start. The actual beginning of education for social work in British Columbia in 1929 marked the first important step in the forward march to higher standards.

The vocational training stage of development extended from 1929 to 1943 and the transition to professional education was marked by the appointment of the first full-time administrator in 1943. Chapter three covers the period from 1943 to 1954 and it has been organized in a fashion which nearly parallels that of Chapter Two. These two chapters cover the important points in the development of administration, curriculum, field work, students and standards. The ~~first~~^{fourth} chapter has summarized some of the previous material and outlines a few of the trends in social work education in Canada.

This thesis does not pretend to cover fully any one of the several aspects of professional education for social work at the University of British Columbia. For example, a full report on all aspects of field work development would, of necessity, involve the historical development of the many agencies used in field work training. This could well be a separate thesis topic in itself. Despite the fact that full details must be omitted in several instances, this thesis provides a reasonably comprehensive outline of the historical development of the School of Social Work from 1929 - 1954.

CHAPTER II
THE VOCATIONAL TRAINING STAGE
1929 - 1943

From its opening in 1914 until the summer of 1925, the University of British Columbia had carried on its work in temporary quarters on part of the site of the General Hospital, Fairview. In the Session 1925-26 the University commenced work in its new quarters in Point Grey. In October 1929 the Course in Social Service was approved by the Board of Governors. A Supplement to the University Calendar for 1929-30 had stated simply, "It is hoped that arrangements may be made in the near future for offering a degree of Bachelor of Commerce in Arts, and for offering a Diploma in Social Service."

Actually, there were eleven students registered for the Course in the Session 1929-30. In addition to these eleven there were ten students who were registered for one or more subjects but still carrying on with their regular employment at an agency.¹ The total number of graduates from the University in the Session ending 1930, not including the Summer Session, was 1,904. In October 1930 the first graduates to receive the diploma in Social Service were Miss Francis M. Fraser, B.A., Miss Dorothy Kennedy, B.A., and Miss Grace Hope.

¹From Class Record Book belonging to Dr. Topping

Administration

The primary interest of teachers and students alike in the early days of the Course was in method. Teaching and learning "how to do" the jobs which were to be entrusted to social workers in specific agencies was the important thing. Vocational training, more comprehensive than training on an apprenticeship basis, was the immediate answer to the need of the period. The tendency to lay emphasis upon method rather than on a sound scientific foundation, was perhaps, indicative in part of the great need for trained workers in the field, and in part a problem relating to administration.

Doctor C. W. Topping, B.A. Queens, M.A. Phd., Columbia University, S.T.D. Wesley College, was in charge of the Course in Social Service. Moreover, as an Associate Professor in the Department of Economics, Sociology and Political Science, Dr. Topping had certain additional responsibilities. For example, he had all the duties and responsibilities of a Professor in the Department, and he gave lectures in sociology and economics to undergraduate students. This was an anomalous situation and one which made effective administration of the Course in Social Service very difficult.

In order to assist Dr. Topping in his administrative duties a committee, composed of part-time lecturers, was established. These part-time lecturers were also heads of

agencies and they had administrative responsibilities of their own. This committee, actually a committee of Faculty, called themselves by the agency term, "The Staff". Members of the committee were: Miss Laura Holland, R.N., a graduate from the School of Social Work, Simmons College, Miss Mary McPhedran, a graduate of the Social Service Department of the University of Toronto, and Miss Edna Pearce, B.S. Knox, Illinois. The agencies represented by these women were respectively: The Children's Aid Society, The Family Welfare Service, and the Young Women's Christian Association.

The Chairman of the committee, Dr. Topping, was assisted by a secretary who was also the Supervisor of field work. For the first two or three years this position was held by Miss Edna Pearce. Meetings were called by the chairman at intervals and they were usually held in the Board Room of the Children's Aid Society. Upon Occasion, however, meetings were held at Dr. Topping's home in an informal and friendly atmosphere. The minutes of these meetings, if they still existed, would constitute an invaluable source of material for this chapter.²

At these meetings matters of policy and changes in courses were discussed. Any changes which were made in

² Excerpts of Minutes for the period 1935-1939 mention the fact that Minutes of (Faculty) meetings 1929-1935, were not to be found. Since that time the 1935-42, minutes have also been lost.

the Course were initiated, in most cases, by the Faculty. From these meetings recommendations were taken by Dr. Topping to the Dean of Arts, Dean Buchanan at that time. If necessary, the recommendations might be taken by Dean Buchanan to the President of the University. Rules and regulations regarding such matters as field work, the acceptance and the rejection of students, etc., were discussed by the Committee. However, Dean Buchanan had the final say in most matters, even to the acceptance or the rejection of students.

Finances

Matters relating to finances in connection with the Course were also subject to the control of the Dean of Arts and Science. There was no separate budget for the Social Service Course until 1945, and this fact made it difficult to do any planning for the future development of the Course. Without a certain degree of financial control it was virtually impossible to feel secure in making plans for future increases in faculty or changes in the curriculum. As a matter of fact, the problem of financing the University during the depression years nearly brought about the extinction of the Course in Social Service in its infancy.

The financial repercussions caused by the depression were to be felt for years, but their initial impact upon Provincial revenues was almost tragic. Revenues dropped rapidly but expenditures increased even more rapidly. The

Provincial Government, hard pressed for money to establish and carry out relief policies, cut the appropriation to the University by approximately fifty percent. Serious consideration even was given to the idea of cutting out the Course in Social Service entirely. However, pressure from Social Service Agencies and Organizations in the community, together with the voluntary request by the part-time faculty that they be permitted to teach without salary, caused the Board of Governors of the University to reconsider the matter.¹ The Course was retained, but for years administration continued to be carried on under difficult conditions.

Accommodation in those days was far from lavish. Dr. Topping's office was actually in the Agricultural building and it was shared with another professor. The Supervisor of field work had the use of Dr. Topping's desk in his absence, or a chair at one end of it if both men were present at the same time. If the Supervisor had much writing to do the usual resource was to find a table in an empty room somewhere in the building. There was no telephone immediately available except in a public booth some distance from this office.

Several years later Dr. Topping moved to the Arts Building where he again shared an office with other professors. For a time Miss Collins, now Field Work supervisor, and also secretary to Dr. Topping, had an "office".

¹Minutes of Board of Governors, Vol.11, p. 1936, and Vol. 12, p. 119.

of her own. It consisted of a partitioned off corner in the Arts stenographer's room. The telephone was shared between them and a hole in the partition enabled them to pass it back and forth as the need arose. This "office" was equipped with a table and two chairs. One filing cabinet, containing all letters and other documents, was kept in Dr. Topping's office across the hall.

When office space again became scarce a further change had to be made. This time the FieldWork Supervisor had a chair and a table in a room on the ground floor of the Arts Building. This room she shared with two lecturers. The only telephone available was one in a public booth on the same floor. Rather than climb two flights of stairs many times a day to reach the filing cabinet in Dr. Topping's office, Miss Collins purchased one at her own expense.

As for stenographic help, it was available to Miss Collins for "emergencies" only. Things which had to be carried out as a matter of routine, such as sending out application forms, giving information to summer lecturers, writing references, etc., were not emergencies. These matters were attended to by a stenographer also hired by Miss Collins at her own expense. In addition she often spent her evenings and Saturday afternoons writing letters on a typewriter at her own agency, the Children's Aid Society.

It was this dogged determination to carry on the important routine day to day duties, without payment in

the early days, and at much personal expenditure of time and money, that helps one to understand why the Course in Social Service continued to exist. Truly these women were "dedicated" to social service in all its aspects. Their personal and professional Code of Ethics placed the community, client, agency or school, first and their own personal feelings and needs last.

Curriculum

A memorandum addressed to President Klinck near the beginning of the 1934-35 session seems to sum up the situation very well. It points out that the course leading to a Diploma of Social Service had made thirty-four graduates available for employment and had made it unnecessary to consider bringing in social workers from elsewhere. The impact of the depression is next referred to and it was pointed out that unemployment meant that there would be increased welfare needs. Rapidly expanding welfare services should have an adequate supply of trained social workers to draw upon, lest untrained personnel be brought in to do the work.

In order to fulfil this general policy, certain immediate steps were suggested. First, the reconstruction of the Course so that candidates holding the B.A. degree could obtain the Diploma in a winter session and the ensuing summer session. Other candidates were to be required to spend three years as from Junior Matriculation or two from Senior Matriculation, in addition to taking certain

other required courses. It was suggested that the above arrangement would bring in more candidates to the course, and one year more fees for those students commencing from Junior Matriculation. Throughout this period under review, every change had to be justified, it seems, by reason of the money it would save the University.

The second recommendation suggested that social workers already in the government service could attend any of the diploma courses as "partial students" if they were adequately prepared. Since, in the above case, Matriculation was not treated as an essential qualification, "adequately prepared" suggests that experience might offset lack of academic preparedness. These partial students could only receive the Diploma if and when they completed all the prerequisites for the Course.

The third proposal referred to students who completed four years of the Combined Course in Nursing and suggested that they be allowed to obtain the Diploma in a winter session and the ensuing summer. It was also suggested that the Faculty of Applied Science might confer the B.A.Sc. degree on students availing themselves of this option. The fourth proposal recommended the appointment of a case work supervisor. This recommendation was carried out about 1937, the cost being shared by the University and the Family Welfare Bureau.

Proposal number five suggested that it might be

possible to place the present "volunteer staff" on a permanent salaried footing if the financial position of the University improved. The final recommendation suggested that a four year course ending in a degree might be set up eventually. Specialization would commence in the last two years of Arts. The two following years would be "in the main technical".

The next record of an active attempt to have changes made in the social service course, was initiated by graduates of the Course in 1934. On October 19, 1934, the first meeting of the Social Service Section of the U.B.C. Alumni was held with eight members present. On February 28, 1935, members of the Alumni outlined changes and additions in the Course. The following is a copy of the Memorandum prepared by the Social Service Alumni for presentation to the Faculty in charge of the Social Service Course:

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

FIRST YEAR

Biology should be required, as it is a necessary basis for the Health Course. Physics or chemistry should not be accepted in place of it. English I is essential for both its cultural and practical value.

SECOND YEAR

Philosophy 9 and Economics 3 should be compulsory. A choice should be offered between Sociology I and Philosophy 8 as given at present.

SOCIAL SERVICE COURSES

Social Service I as given at present overlaps too much with other courses. It should be a general view of the different fields of social work. It should also give an historical resume of social work, an idea of the ethics of social work and the necessity for co-operation. This course should be

given by the field work supervisor when appointed.

Social Service II. It is suggested that the historical background be omitted from this course, as it overlaps with another course. It is also suggested that the terminology is too difficult for students inexperienced in case work, and that simpler terms and more concrete illustrations would be of more value. A detailed study of cases and records would be of greater assistance. These suggestions are made because about half of the class are in agencies not teaching casework, and they find it impossible to get the value out of the course which they know they should get.

Social Service 4 is not necessary.

Social Service 8 should be broadened, and cover the time allotted to Social Service 4.

In the Memorandum from the Social Service Alumni the following suggestions were made:

Social Service students would be allowed to take Dr. Crease's course in Psychiatry, as given to the Public Health Nurses.

It is also suggested that courses be given covering the necessary knowledge for social workers to have regarding infectious diseases, heart disease in children, vaccine therapy, tuberculosis, dermatology, and venereal diseases.

A course of lectures should be included on malnutrition, dietetics, and budgetting.

FIELD WORK

Students intending to enter the Social Service Course should have the opportunity of one month's observation in a case working agency or a longer period of voluntary service.

The procedure followed by the Public Health Department in sending students out for short periods of observation in various agencies is recommended. The graduates have suggested that observation in the Health Agencies would be particularly valuable.

(Here a number of Agencies are suggested)

If the case working agencies are over crowded, and some first year students cannot get any case work, it is suggested that students might be transferred at Christmas in order to distribute the work more evenly.

Partial students should not be placed in case working agencies until all full students are placed.

For part of the field work, students' preferences should be considered. Agencies' preferences should also be considered, as there are certain agencies from which first year students cannot get full benefit.

An opportunity should be given to the students to talk over their problems with the other students and with an experienced worker. The field work seminar should function for this purpose under the field supervisor.

Where there is a personality problem the student should be allowed to transfer to another agency.

The Staff should be the final court of appeal; not any one individual member of it. Students should be given at the end of four months a frank opinion as to their capacity for social work.

In summing up the suggestions given in the above memorandum, the need for the inclusion of psychiatric and medical information, in the course, appeared to be keenly felt. At this time too, there did not appear to be any specific effort to train supervisors so that the way could be prepared to supervise new students in field work placements in qualified agencies. Neither did there seem to be any specific or adequate means of liason between the Faculty and Agencies so that problems relating to the integration of theory and practice could be co-operatively ironed out. Perhaps the most serious lacks suggested by the Memorandum was that of students' Advisors, as well as regular assess-

ments of students' progress, and a students' review committee. Most assuredly there was room for improvement but for several reasons changes in the Course were difficult to make.

Without one member of the Faculty paid for full-time administration of the Course in Social Service, it was administratively almost impossible to carry out many of the desirable changes in the course at that time. Likewise, in order to prevent overlapping of courses and to better relate theory with field work it was necessary to have certain well defined objectives around which a curriculum could be constructed. The main objective, at this time, was teaching and learning "how to do" the jobs and to meet the needs of the field with "qualified" workers.

Administrative difficulties and the need to re-define objectives for the course may well be two important reasons why it was difficult to make changes in the Course. Today it is generally recognized that professional education for social work requires an integrated curriculum in which courses are related to field work. In addition, courses should be in a sequence which will enable the student to broaden his understanding by the accretion of relevant knowledge. A curriculum based upon "a grouping of courses already given" could hardly allow for the degree of integration and sequence of courses required for true professional education. Here, then, one finds another reason why graduates may have had secure ground for ex-

pressing their dissatisfaction with the Course.

The Curriculum was based upon "...such a grouping of courses already given as would call the attention of those interested in the fact that the University is providing substantial basic training of the kind necessary for competent equipment in this field..."¹ Before the new draft of the course was approved in 1935 (recommendation one in the memorandum to President Klinck) the course, for those students who had junior matriculation standing, could be completed in two years. This included two months field work in addition to the supervised field work. Furthermore a graduation essay, "written on some phase of the field work" was a requirement.

The first year student with junior matriculation standing was expected to take the following subjects: English I, Economics I (or 2 preferably), Philosophy 1 (a), Psychology, Biology 1, Personal Hygiene, Social Organization and Case Work Methods, Child Welfare, Field Work (supervised). After the revision in the course in 1935, the first year consisted of Biology 1, Economics 1, English 1, Mathematics 1, and a Language, - Latin, French, German or Greek. The courses in Social Service were now given only in the second and third years.

The Second Year, before the revision, the course

¹Report of the Special Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Science to the Senate, November 20, 1928.

consisted of the following subjects: Social Psychology, Sociology, Economics 3, Social Work General Course, Case Work Methods, Child Welfare, Field Work, Public Health.

After the revision the subjects were: Philosophy 1 (General Psychology), Sociology 1 (General Sociology), Nursing 27 (The Family), Social Service 1, 2, 3, 4, 9 and 12.

The Third Year included Philosophy 9 (Child Psychology), Economics 3 (Labour Problems) or Sociology 3 (urban community), Nursing B 5 (Mental Hygiene), Social Service Subjects 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13.

As mentioned earlier students with Junior Matriculation were now obliged to take three full years to complete the course. On the other hand, students who held a University degree when they registered for social work could complete the course in one Calendar year plus two months, May and June, in the summer. The University Year was referred to as the first year and the extra two months as the second year.

There was no one faculty member paid to devote full time to the Course in Social Service. Dr. Topping gave the introductory course in social service and conducted the field work seminar assisted by Miss Pearce. The courses in personal hygiene and public health were given by Dr. Hill assisted by Miss Kerr, both of the Department of Nursing. Miss Laura Holland, Miss McPhedran and Miss Pearce were part-time lecturers. Miss Pearce was also in charge of the

group workers and her agency, the YWCA, was used for placements in group work.

A list of Faculty members for the 1936-37 Session presents many of the instructors in the Course during the period 1929-43:

- C. W. Topping, M.A., S.T.D. PhD., Associate Professor of Economics and Sociology, Director. Lecturer in Introduction to Social Work.
- Miss Zella Collins (Graduate Toronto School), Supervisor of Field Work and Lecturer in Child Welfare. Manager Children's Aid Society, Vancouver.
- Miss Mabel Blackley, (Y.W.C.A. Training School), General Secretary, Vancouver, Y.W.C.A.
- H. M. Cassidy, M.A., PhD., Director of Social Welfare, Provincial Government, Lecturer in Public Welfare.
- A. L. Crease, M.D., C.M. Provincial Psychiatrist and Superintendent of the Provincial Mental Hospital, Lecturer in Mental Hygiene.
- G. F. Davidson, M.A., PhD., Executive Director, Vancouver Welfare Federation, Lecturer in Administration.
- Miss Laura Holland, C.B.E., R.N., Superintendent of Neglected Children and Director of Provincial Field Services, Lecturer in Child Welfare.
- Miss Margaret E. Kerr, B.A. Sc., M.A., Instructor in Nursing and Health, Lecturer in Hygiene and Public Health.
- Miss Josephine F. Kilburn, R.N., Child Guidance Clinic, Lecturer in Mental Hygiene.
- Miss Elizabeth King, M.A., M.A., Executive Director, Mother's Pension Division, Provincial Government, Lecturer in Social Legislation.
- Miss Mary McPhedran, (Graduate Toronto School), Executive Director Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver, Lecturer in Case Work.

Field Work

Miss Zella Collins took over Miss Pearce's position as Secretary to Dr. Topping and Field Work Supervisor about 1933. In the Session 1935-36 Miss Collins became the first paid Field Work Supervisor.¹ In 1929, nine students were placed in agencies for field work. Six of these placements were case work placements and three were group work placements at the Y.W.C.A. By 1937, twenty students were placed in field work but there were no places for eight other students. This problem, lack of field work placements, led to the appointment of the first paid agency case work supervisor at the Family Welfare Bureau.

Field work as part of the curriculum is equally as important as the academic portion. The administration of field work has always been a perplexing problem. The first schools of social work adopted the practice of turning their students over to social agencies for a period of practical training. It was not surprising that it soon became apparent that the advantages gained by this method were frequently offset by the failure of the agencies to provide practice work of educational value. Students were not always placed under competent supervisors, and the temptation to assign them to easy routine tasks was ever present.

The only proper approach to a solution of this pro-

¹ Minutes of the Board of Governors, Vol. 14, p.400.

blem could be made by keeping in mind that it is not the purpose of professional education to provide the student with work experience. Field work should bear the same relation to training for social work as does the laboratory or clinic to the medical course. In both cases, the chief emphasis is placed upon the scientific studies which the laboratory of the field would help varify and explain. This approach, however, can succeed only in agencies where there are skilled supervisors who will help students to integrate theory with practice.

Skilled field work supervisors in agencies were simply not available when the course in social service commenced in 1929. Attempts were made by the Alumni Association, the Faculty, the Professional Organization and Agencies, to provide special lectures, summer schools and institutes in order to train new supervisors. Notwithstanding the many attempts to remedy this situation, it was almost fifteen years before this problem was attacked on a planned, long-term basis.

A minimum of four months of field work was required to be completed by every diploma student. Two months of this could be taken during the University year and the remaining two were taken during the summer. These placements were in different agencies, the CAS and FWB, alternately during the first few years. In later years, other agencies made their facilities available for training

students, and the time required for field work was increased from twelve hours or three half-days, to sixteen hours or two full eight hour days. This increase made no change in the required two months block field work prior to the opening of the summer session.

For some years the first field work placement would not be made available to students until about the middle of October. The Tuesday and Thursday afternoons were thus available for field trips under the guidance of the Supervisor. These trips usually covered such agencies as the Canadian Institute for the Blind, the Girls' Industrial School, Okalla Prison Farm and the Auxiliary Class of the Public School composed of mentally retarded children. Usually the head of each agency gave a brief talk explaining the function and the practice of the agency. This was often followed by a conducted tour of the agency itself. These trips often ended with a discussion period informally conducted with the aid of cups of tea.

During the first few years a student's progress in field work was evaluated by means of brief mimeographed reports supplied by the University and filled out by his or her supervisor. Later a committee was formed to include the Field Work Supervisor as well as Agency Supervisors. The appraisal of student progress was worked out along somewhat broader lines by this method. Two reports were sent in each year, one in December and one in April. Both reports were marked on a percentage basis at the re-

quest of the University authorities. A student whose field work was not considered satisfactory might thus fail despite satisfactory academic work. Such an event might lead to a request for that student to discontinue further study in the Course at the end of the first term.

In these early years supervision of agency supervisors was not provided. When supervisors met for group discussion of problems in supervision there was no one person available to them at these meetings who could give them direction and leadership. Beginning in 1937, however, an institute on supervision was given by the visiting lecturers at the summer school. Such institutes were open to students and supervisors of agency staff as well. The fee of five dollars was charged and the money collected was given to the lecturer as an honorarium. These institutes were held in the evenings, sometimes in the Board Room of the CAS or at Alexandra Children's Home. One year the Chalet at Grouse Mountain was used on week-ends for this purpose exclusively.

Until the year 1937 students registered in the Summer School for Social Service 5, 6, and 10, but the course was actually offered in May and June while the Summer School opened in July. This arrangement was finally considered unsatisfactory because (1) The period of instruction was too short. Instruction was condensed into two full weeks. (2) The lectures cut into the two months

field work so as to seriously curtail its value. (3) It was felt that pressures on the student became so great that they were frequently too exhausted to do their best in either field work or their studies. (4) Students could register for eighteen units at the beginning of the winter session, take fifteen units in that period, then take three more in May and June without extra cost.

It was therefore suggested that the students be allowed to use May and June for their field work exclusively. They would then be required to re-register for Summer School in July. It was further suggested that an "outstanding social worker" be brought to Summer School to offer the courses previously given in May and June. This idea had not been suggested previously because (1) of the smallness of the classes and (2) of the impossibility of obtaining a local instructor who could give seven weeks to lecturing in the Summer School.

The advantages which would accrue to the University from this suggested arrangement were given as follows:

- (1) Employed social workers could take the courses for credit at the suggested rate of ten dollars per unit.
- (2) Some might even wish to audit the class and these might be allowed to do so at the suggested rate of fifteen dollars for the three units.
- (3) Under this new arrangement all students taking the course would be required to pay the regular Summer Session fee.
- (4) There

would be only one lecturer to pay instead of two. (5) Additional registrations would be brought about by the "prestige" of the lecturer.

Excerpts from a letter to Miss Florence Hollis, Director of Social Service at Byrn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, and author of many pamphlets and books on Social work program, outline the Summer School quite clearly. This letter was an invitation requesting Miss Hollis to be guest lecturer in Summer School:

The dates of summer school are usually from early in July to about August 20th, and the examinations are over by the end of the term. The lecturer has two hours a day, or 70 lectures in all. The remuneration is five hundred dollars with some travelling expenses...

As you probably know, we have been attempting to run a Social Service Department here on the proverbial shoe string, and we have seized upon the summer school as a way of bringing up our standards. The students have only about 20 lectures in case work, and the same number in Child Welfare in the first year. They do about sixteen hours a week field work during their first year, and then they are for two months in some agency before they take summer school. During their first year they have an hour a week with the Supervisor of Field Work, when they frequently discuss individual cases.

Before Summer Schools began to be used in helping to develop qualified field work supervisors, arrangements for placing students in field work were indeed informal. In considering a field work placement for a student the Field Supervisor conferred with the Head of the Agency concerning the student's potential suitability. It was thought to be unnecessary to discuss the placement with the worker

to whom the student was nominally assigned for supervision. And so, in reality, there was little or no supervision of students once they were placed.

Nevertheless students felt free to seek help from the Field Supervisor in her office at the Children's Aid Society at any time. In addition, the Field Work supervisor met the students once a week for an hour of discussion. The discussion might be in relation to a specific problem but usually it centered around a case presented by a student. This weekly meeting was held in the Board Room of the Children's Aid Society and not at the University.

In the beginning these students who had the prerequisites and who were working toward their diploma, went to agencies three half-days a week for their field work. Tuesdays and Thursday afternoons and Saturday mornings, a total of twelve hours was thought to be sufficient at that time. These hours made promptness for reporting for work at the Agencies very difficult.

The Social Service Lectures at the University, for example, did not end until 12 noon. It was several miles from the University to the various agencies, and street car connections were poor, to say the least. Consequently, students were late and field work time fell short of the required twelve hours unless overtime was arranged for. A natural result of rushing to work led to lunches being eaten on street cars. This practice, when brought to the attention of the Faculty, was quickly discouraged.

Students

The desire to maintain certain standards led Agency and Faculty members to exercise other controls. For example, the way a student dressed, smoking on duty, the "abominable habit" of using lipstick and rouge, were areas of concern. It was impressed upon the student that beer parlors were not to be visited at any time. One student who had the use of her father's car was advised by her supervisor to leave it two blocks away from the home she was visiting, lest it influence unfavorably her relationship with her client. The showdown came in a seminar one day when a student asked her Supervisor why she could not use lipstick when her own, the supervisor's, lips were "as red as a cherry".

For some years students and agency workers not only paid their own carfare to and from the agency, but they also paid their fare when visiting clients. It is true that fares were cheaper in those days, but allowances for students and salaries of agency workers were small. The amount required for items of this kind were by no means unimportant in a young student's life. There were few grants and bursaries available and most funds for financing their education came from parents, relatives or personal savings.

Fees and Finances

In 1929 the annual fees were as follows: Sessional \$100.00, Alma Mater \$10.00, Caution money \$5.00. These

amounts made a total of \$115.00 for the winter session. By 1936-37 fees were increased by \$30.00 a year, Registration \$5.00, Sessional first term \$65.00, Alma Mater \$10.00, Caution Money \$5.00, and Sessional second term \$60.00 or a total of \$145.00. The following year the fees were increased to \$153.00.

At this period of social work in British Columbia, the ratio of women to men was about six to one. Salaries were low, primarily as a result of the depression, but also because women were more willing to accept small salaries without protest. Women predominated in the profession and men had to be content with the same salary as that paid to a single woman worker. This was a large factor in keeping men from entering the field of social work, apart from the general opinion that it was a "woman's job".

Even by 1940 the pay of a junior worker was \$80.00 for the first six months in a private agency. By the end of the year this amount might be increased by \$100.00 and remain at the same monthly rate indefinitely. A social worker with the Provincial Government started at \$100.00 a month and remained at that salary level. In addition, Provincial workers were often expected to purchase a car.

In the light of the above salary scale alone it is amazing that 167 diplomas were granted between the years 1930 and 1940. It is even more amazing to find that all but 26 of these 167 diploma graduates held degrees before

they started social work. The B.A. degree was held by 130 students, five held the M.A. degree, three a BSc., and one a B.S.E. Five students who carried on full-time positions in social agencies, were able to obtain their diplomas in periods varying from two to five years. In 1938 four years was set as the limit of time during which prerequisites could be completed for a degree and a diploma in social service.

For the five students who gained degrees and diplomas while being employed full time, the method of obtaining credit for field work was somewhat involved. These students were given credit for two months of field work with their own organization, if they were under the supervision of a case worker for that length of time. If their own Agency did not have a case worker, one from another agency could act as supervisor. For the remaining two months of required field work these students were placed with another agency, either a Family Welfare or the Children's Aid Society. In some cases this involved transfer of workers between agencies so that members could obtain credit for field work while still receiving pay from their own agency.

With reference further to the total of 167 diploma graduates, at the time of graduation twelve were married and 153 were single. There were 153 female graduates and 12 male graduates, but there is nothing to indicate whether married graduates were male or female or some of

each sex. Quite naturally the number of graduates from British Columbia exceeded those from all other provinces, there being 148 in all. There were four students from the province of Saskatchewan, and fifteen from Alberta. From the above it would appear that there were either no students from Manitoba interested in Social Work or else Manitoba students found it more convenient to attend the University of Toronto.

Standards

Perhaps the most significant figure in the above statistical material is that which indicates there were 141 diploma graduates who also held degrees. This fact is significant because the high calibre of these students soon became apparent in the attempts to raise standards of education and standards of agency practice. Both the professional organization, the C.A.S.W., and the Alumni Association began to exert pressure in several ways. Pressure was exerted at the University to have the curriculum revised, integrated and co-ordinated. In the field attempts were made to raise standards of practice by arranging special courses, institute and study groups for workers and potential supervisors.

Dr. Topping and the members of his faculty did their utmost to raise standards. Nevertheless lack of full administrative control, lack of funds and lack of staff paid for full time work on the Course made progress difficult. The Memorandum to President Klinck appears to be the first

attempt to raise standards. This was quickly followed by specific changes in the Curriculum suggested by the Social Service Alumni at their fourth meeting in February, 1935. On April 16, 1935, a committee from the Alumni met with the Faculty and all recommendations were accepted for discussion.

In October 1935, Miss Zella Collins submitted a report to the Social Service Alumni in which she gave some statistics concerning students registered in the Course. In addition, the following information relating to program and curriculum is worth quoting:

Field Visits

Before commencing Field Work with the various agencies the students made the following visits: The offices at 1675 West 10th Ave., School for the Deaf and Blind; Special Classes, Lord Tennyson and Sea View Schools, and Oakalla.

Field Work Seminar

The attached sheet gives a general idea of the work being covered in the Field Work Seminar. Two additions will probably be made as follows:

(1) Miss Matheson of the United Church Home for Girls to discuss the unmarried mother following a presentation of two cases, one an unmarried mother taken in the family group and the other where the baby is made a ward of the CAS and finally adopted.

(2) Mrs. Nelson, formerly of the City Relief Department, to speak of Vancouver's early days in the development of her social services from 1792 to 1919.

While the presentation of the work of different organizations should not perhaps be called a Seminar, it is being tried this year as an experiment, the idea being to give the students objectively a picture of the social work of Vancouver. This sheet does not cover all the agencies but simply representatives of different phases of work as carried on today.

The Course

While the course still leaves many things to be desired, certain changes have been made that are all to the good, as for instance one unit each from Miss Knox and Dr. Cassidy on social legislation and public welfare respectively. By special arrangement the unit in mental hygiene given by Miss Kilburn and Dr. Crease now includes the social service students as well as the Public Health Nurses. In addition to Miss Kerr's lectures, the content of which has been reorganized, Dr. Amyot and Dr. Dolman will give one unit in public health.

The Future

Because of the gradual increase in the number of students entering the Social Service Department the matter of field work becomes more difficult each year, and I am of the opinion that before long it will be compulsory for students to take a portion of their field work in Victoria. Arrangements are now being made whereby it may be possible for three students to take field work in that city during the coming summer if students can be found in a position to avail themselves of this opportunity.

Supervisor of Field Work
For Social Services

October 29th, 1935.

The following field work placements were actually made outside Vancouver. In 1936 a student was placed under the supervision of Dr. Snow of the Mental Hygiene Committee of New York. In 1937 a student was placed at the Children's Aid Society and the Family Welfare Agency in Victoria, B. C. In 1939 a student was placed with each of the same two agencies and another one with the Young Women's Christian Association in Victoria. A fourth student was placed with the Family Agency in Seattle. In that same year a student from the Montreal School of Social Work was placed with the Children's Aid Society

in Victoria.¹

Earlier in 1935 the new draft of the Course in Social Service was approved. While there had been previous minor changes in the course, this was the first major change and it was followed by others. Excerpts of the Minutes of the Faculty meetings show that in 1938 the request was made for a course in statistics to be called Social Service 14. Actually such a course, Economics 8 (Social Statistics) was available as an alternative for undergraduate prerequisites by 1939. This fact is probably the reason why Social Service 20 (Research) was not presented until 1944-45.

Early in 1936 the Executive Committee of the American Association of Schools of Social Work directed their Curriculum Committee to study the problem of prerequisites for admission to schools of social work. A questionnaire was sent to members of fourteen subcommittees which had been studying the content of courses in the professional curriculum. These sub-committees were composed of men and women who directed and taught classes in the social sciences and in social work.

In December 1936, at Eugene, Oregon, the following persons met at luncheon to discuss a sequence of preprofessional courses for social work: George B. Mangold, Department of Social Work, University of Southern Cali-

¹Excerpts of Faculty Minutes 1935-39.

fornia, C. W. Topping, Department of Sociology and Social Work, University of British Columbia, Elon Moore, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Joseph Cohen, Department of Sociology, University of Washington, Arlien Johnson, Secretary, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Washington. This group agreed that certain fields of study were fundamental for any student who desired to prepare for social work as a profession. Certain specific subjects were listed under three general headings, general cultural courses, social sciences, and biological sciences.¹

The fact that the University of British Columbia was represented by Dr. Topping indicates that much thinking was being done about raising the standards for social service. Such changes which may have been implemented to that end seem to have been confined mostly to undergraduate prerequisites for the social service course. Fundamental changes in the Course itself were not made during the period under consideration. Nevertheless, additional subjects to those already in the Curriculum were offered from year to year.

Excerpts from the minutes of the Faculty show that attempts were made to obtain a qualified field work supervisor who would receive pay for full-time services. These attempts were confined to yearly motions, each one

¹From notes in the possession of Dr. Topping

of which failed to become a reality, owing, it seems, to the continuing scarcity of money. Another problem appeared to be that of the University's insistence that any student capable of obtaining a B.A. was eligible to take the Course in Social Work regardless of the fact that she might be several years under twenty-one. In other words, the Faculty did not have complete control of screening processes.

In 1937 the new development in Summer School, mentioned earlier, was an important step toward the raising of standards for students and for supervisors. Previously the Faculty had made attempts to have Supervisors allowed to attend at least one of the subjects given in the course, free of charge. These attempts were apparently not successful. The new arrangement for Summer School offered an excellent opportunity for Supervisors to attend classes at the nominal fee of five dollars a course. In that year ~~alone~~, a letter was sent to Miss Collins by the Social Service Alumni, calling her attention to the poor manners of some of the students and their "unsuitable" attitude toward their work. Ready with constructive criticism as it always was, the Alumni Association of the Social Service was equally ready to spring to the aid of those responsible for the course.

A brief summary of some of the efforts of the Social Service Alumni to raise standards lends emphasis to the

importance of the influence which they managed to wield. Several meetings in 1936-37 dealt with a lack of rapport between social service and public health students taking public health lectures. This problem eventually led to standing committees being set up by the Alumni to deal with problems relating to courses, field work and requirements for entrance.

In 1937-38 the Alumni recommended that the intake of students be limited in order to assure them field work placements at either the Family Welfare Bureau, the Children's Aid Society, or Mother's Pensions. Presumably the standard of supervision at these agencies was considered to be beneficial for students. In the same year a request was made to Dr. Angus, Chairman of the Department, regarding changes in the medical information course. This course was considered to contain much material that was suitable for health nurses but unsuitable for social workers. ~~This~~ A proposed medical information course was outlined by the Alumni and forwarded to the Social Service Faculty for their consideration.

Minutes of the Alumni for November, 1938, mentioned that Dr. Topping had asked the Alumni Club to prepare some data as to the type of Social Work courses they wished to have ultimately at the University. It was also mentioned at this time that the question of a B.A. degree or diploma course and a graduate course in social service would have to be considered. Minutes for March 1939 gave a report on

the reception by the Faculty of the Course report previously submitted by the Alumni.

In January 1940, the following points were stressed by the Alumni as ones requiring immediate attention: (1) There should be two full days field work each week. (2) Prerequisites for the Social Service Course should be stated in the Calendar. (3) A course in biology and statistics should be added. (4) Social Service 1, Sociology 1, 3 and 4 and Nursing 27 should be revised. (5) The nursing course should be taken out of the Faculty of Science and placed in the Faculty of Arts. In addition this course should be conducted by local doctors and social workers should be given some interpretation concerning the treatment of disease.

In February 1940, it was stated in the Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Science that the B.A. would now be required as a prerequisite for Social Work. In addition, the new title Social Work would be used for the Course, instead of Social Service. These decisions were reached after it was learned that the School of Social Work at the University of Toronto had recently been accepted by the American Association of Schools of Social Work.¹

On November 11, 1940, Miss Marion Hathway, Executive Secretary of the American Association of Schools of Social Work, made a brief visit to the University at the request

¹Minutes of Social Service Alumni Association.

of Dr. Topping. The purpose of the visit was to assess the program of social work in relation to its eligibility for application as a Type I Member to the American Association. Secondly, Dr. Topping requested recommendations for the future development of the Course.

Group meetings were held by Miss Hathway and they were attended by Dr. Topping, Dr. Angus, Chairman of the Department, the faculty and some agency representatives. In addition, Miss Hathway had brief interviews with the Case Supervisor, City Social Service Department, Miss Grubb, Supervisor, Family Welfare Association, and Miss Holland, Mother's Allowance Administration.

In December 1940, a letter was received from Miss Hathway in which she stated her reasons for rejecting application for membership to the Association. In the letter it was stated that while the courses and field work conformed in a general way to the basic minimum curriculum, the program fell short in two important respects. (a) There was no separate educational entity which identified the curriculum as a school of social work. (b) Instruction in the program was entirely in the hands of part-time faculty. The recommendations for the future development of the course were given as requested. They are of importance since they formed a blue print for the future reorganization of the Course.

These recommendations are summarized as follows:

(a) A graduate survey course rightly belonged to the

undergraduate Curriculum and should be changed accordingly. (b) Student intake should be governed by field placements available. (c) The appointment of at least one full-time member of the faculty was imperative. This person should have full responsibility for the curriculum and in turn be responsible to Dean Angus, Chairman of the Department.

This person, should, I believe, be equipped to teach in the field of social case work and carry on general over-all supervision of field work. If these responsibilities were in the hands of one person much could be done to effect the integration just discussed...

One of the immediate results of Miss Hathway's report was a grant given by the Provincial Government in 1942. This grant of \$2000, made available through the Department of the Provincial Secretary, was earmarked specifically for "strengthening Social Work in the University". In addition a further grant of \$5,000 to the University vote for the 1943-44 fiscal year was authorized. This grant was to "meet the cost incident to the expansion of this course." The 1942 grant permitted the appointment of Miss Mary C. Gleason, B.A. (Vassar) M.S.S. (Smith) as the first full-time faculty member. Miss Gleason's appointment was for a period of two years from September 1st, 1942.¹

By early 1942 an acute shortage of social workers began to make itself felt. This shortage became a matter

¹ Minutes Board of Governors, Vol. 21, p. 1050-51.

of foremost concern to agencies, the Provincial Association of Social Workers, the Canadian Welfare Council, and Schools of Social Work. In July 1942 a "Brief for Governmental Aid to Professional Education for Social Work" was compiled. This brief requested the Dominion Government to immediately extend the application of the Dominion-Provincial Training Scheme to cover the professional education of social workers. In effect, it was a request that the Dominion Government should match the expenditures which any province would make for the pre-professional or professional education of social workers.

This shortage of social workers was first noted after the commencement of World War II. There were several reasons for it, among which the following are perhaps most important: (1) Many young men and women entered the armed forces. (2) The uncertainty engendered by the possibility of loved ones being sent overseas, greatly increased the number of young graduates getting married. (3) Industrial expansion to meet the demands of war brought about a rapid increased demand for University trained personnel at high rates of pay. On the other hand, there was an increase in the demand for social workers due to three factors - a normal expansion of private social work, the new governmental social security services, and the Dominion Wartime Social Services.

In addition to the brief to the Dominion Government, a Special Committee on Recruiting and Training was set up

by the British Columbia Mainland Branch of the Canadian Association of Social Workers. This Committee was chaired by Dr. A. E. Grauer and members of the Faculty and Agencies were represented on it. Their terms of reference were, "to investigate and study the present shortage of trained social workers and to report on possible ways in which this shortage might be met." The urgency of the present situation was stressed and Dr. Grauer suggested that it would be advisable to hasten this report as fast as possible.

The result of the work of this Special Committee, was a proposal which, it was hoped, would enable fourth year students at the University of British Columbia to complete work for their B.A. and their social service diploma simultaneously by the autumn of 1943. To this end, the following curriculum changes were approved in October 1942 for the Session 1942-43:

- (1) Social Work 1 and Social Work 13 to count as three units toward a B.A. degree.
- (2) Nursing B 27 (1 unit) could be waived if a student were to choose Sociology 4 (3 units) instead.

Nursing B 5 (1 unit) could be waived if Psychology 5 (3 units) were chosen.¹

Social Work 9 and 10 (Field Work) was to be taken in a block between the end of the regular term and the beginning of the summer session with another block suggested for after the summer session.

The above plan was discontinued the following year

¹Minutes of Faculty of Arts and Science, October, 7, 1942.

probably because it meant a lowering of standards at a time when every effort must be made to raise them for the purpose of accreditation. During 1943-44 Session, more changes were made in the curriculum and this point marks the real transition of the Course from its Vocational Training stage to Professional Education for Social Work.

The period from 1929 to 1943 was difficult for individuals and institutions. The depression with the resulting expansion of services to deal with unemployment and its concomitant problems, made expansion of professional training for social work a necessity. At the same time money, so essential for the proper implementation and growth of such a program of education, was reduced to a bare trickle. Problems arose which could have been adequately dealt with by some one individual with full responsibility to make the necessary administrative decisions, yet no one individual was paid full-time to carry this responsibility.

Miss Hathway's report to Dr. Topping pointed out that the admission of students to the professional curriculum needed careful consideration. This was a difficult subject with which to deal because of the University's insistence that all students with adequate academic averages should be admitted. Another aspect of this same problem was the relationship of the number of students admitted to the course to the number who could be placed

in field work under suitable standards of supervision.

While it was generally held advisable to have as many field placements as possible made alternately in the Family Welfare Bureau and the Children's Aid Society, it was not always feasible to do so. It was thought that these agencies provided a wider range of case material than specialized agencies and the problems to be solved were basic to society. The attempt to integrate course content with field work was not satisfactory because part-time instructors, and part-time field work supervisor could not adequately compensate for the lack of trained agency supervisors. In one agency only, the Family Welfare Bureau, was a case work supervisor paid to supervise students. Supervision of students in the group work agencies was even more difficult but students managed to survive the difficulties.

These were only some of the manifestations of growth and of the complexity of the problem of adapting vocational training methods to a university setting. The problem of relating the theoretical content of University courses to practical use in the field of social work has yet to be fully solved. Perhaps the basic difficulty was the lack of "organizing ideas" around which to construct the curriculum. There was dissatisfaction with miscellaneous lectures and the heterogeneity in the grouping of material.

The questions about the curriculum seemed to be somewhat as follows: Was too much attention being given

to "survey" courses and not enough to technical ones? How was one to overcome the duplication of material in the various courses? How to ensure adequate supervision of students at the agencies, and how to improve the field work experience? In the next few years, under a new full-time administrator, much effort went into improving the course, both by enlarging its scope and by integrating its professional content.

CHAPTER III

THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION STAGE 1943 - 1954

In the early days of the Course in Social Service the emphasis had been placed upon method and the training ground, and ultimate employer of Diploma graduates were the private agencies such as the Family Welfare Bureau and the Children's Aid Society. In 1943, the amalgamation of the Government services led to the Field Services becoming the chief employer of Diploma graduates. The emphasis upon method in education for social work gradually changed until, in 1943, with the advent of Miss Marjorie J. Smith, the new full-time administrator, it was focused sharply upon the development of the student as a professional person.

Administration

In her paper, "Report on the Employment and Training of Social Workers", Miss Eileen L. Younghusband outlined some of the important qualities which a qualified administrator should have in order to be elected to start a School of Social Work:

The group of persons so selected should have suitable academic qualifications and considerable standing in their particular branch of social work. They must also have the vision and the driving force, the desire for knowledge and the love of humanity needed to build up and establish the School. The Director in particular would require to possess these qualities in a high degree.¹

¹ Younghusband, Eileen L., Report on the Employment and Training of Social Workers, T. and A. Constable Ltd., Edinburgh, 1947, p. 66.

Miss Smith's academic qualifications and standing in social work may be summarized briefly as follows: She had some years of experience in casework and administration in the U. S. Federal and State welfare programs, as well as in private agencies. In addition, she had taught at Washington State College School of Social Work and Smith College School of Social Work. Besides wide experience in administration and curricula building, Miss Smith had practical experience in helping students relate theory to practice, for she had held the position of Field Work Instructor at the University of Chicago.

A believer in the necessity for building and maintaining ever-widening contacts in all aspects of professional education for social work and the field of practice, Miss Smith was active in Canadian, American and later British professional organizations for social workers. The fact that within a period of less than four years the B.S.W. and M.S.W. degrees from U.B.C. were to be awarded for the first time in Canada to social work students, would appear to indicate that this administrator had more than a little vision and driving force.

The first step in re-organization required that emphasis be placed upon professional, university education rather than vocational training. This involved the advancement of the status of the Course in Social Work to that of graduate training within the University culminating in a Master's Degree in Social Work. It also made necessary the

development of a program of research on a professional level.

At the same time it was vitally important for the Administrator and her faculty to keep in mind the changing needs of the Western Canadian field of social welfare. There was the need for general workers in the provincial field services and early indications of the need for more specialized skilled workers in certain areas. There was also the need to help agencies raise standards so they could provide adequate practical experience for students, and, at the same time, provide advanced training for some workers who would become supervisors.

The availability of teaching personnel was so limited that supervisors and even administrators from agencies had to be called upon to fill the need. This, in turn, reduced the number of immediately available trained supervisors and made necessary more intensive efforts to fill gaps by using existing resources. Administrative planning utilized the existing program while public relations were being established and solidified with a view to future change.

Planning had to be both short term and long term, and it had to have as its aim the development of high standards, increased enrolment, and the promotion of a co-operative working relationship between the Department, other University Faculties, and the social agencies in the City. Many methods had to be employed to achieve steady progress

toward these goals. Some of these methods such as institutes, seminars, radio talks and meetings were very important and widely used. Close collaboration with, and participation in the affairs of the accrediting agencies for professional education for social work in Canada and the United States were also an important part of the program.

On October 14, 1943, Miss Smith was introduced to the re-organization meeting of the Social Service Alumni Club of the University. Here she gave an informal talk on the means by which the Alumni could assist in the work of the local school. It was pointed out that few changes had been made in the present curriculum. The need for a separate Department of Social Work was stressed, first from the aspect of administration and secondly to assist in the move towards raising the standards. Both of these moves were necessary in order that affiliation with the American Association of Schools of Social Work might sooner be accomplished.

As a direct result of this talk, several committees were set up by the Alumni Association to assist in the program of re-organization. A Research Committee was asked to report on "set-up and lines of action of other Schools and Alumni groups in Canada and the United States." The Library Committee compiled a list of the reading material available at the various agencies, with a view to eventually obtaining contributions of books, pamphlets and

periodicals for the use of students. The Legislation Committee was asked to plan for the re-organization of the Social Legislation Course. The recruiting Committee planned a program in High Schools. The Scholarships Committee planned to approach the Dominion and Provincial Governments regarding the provision for Social Service Scholarships in post war plans. A Committee on Curriculum had existed for several years and members offered their services in helping with plans for the future.¹

This was an example of one method by which administrative planning was facilitated and it was an important one. Members of the Alumni were active in the field of social work and they formed a valuable link between Agencies, the University and the Department. Their contribution toward higher standards for the Course in Social Work had been by no means small in the past, and it became extremely valuable at this time of change and re-organization.

The new Administrator was apparently quite clear in her own mind as to the objectives of professional education for social work. She had also a good idea as to how the objectives were to be achieved. The immediate task confronting her required on the one hand that the University and the profession of social work acknowledge that the course was a graduate course. On the other hand, the great need for social workers, due to anticipated post war

¹ Minutes of Social Service Alumni Association

expansion of social services, had to be met without endangering standards for professional education.

As early as 1943, plans were being formulated to prepare for an increase in enrolment to Universities resulting from the Dominion Government's plans to make University training available to qualified veterans of World War II. In December, 1943, Stewart K. Jaffary, Director of the School of Social Work, at the University of Toronto, sent letters to the various training schools for social work, asking for a reply as to their ability to expand to meet this need. The reply from the University of British Columbia expressed complete confidence in the ability of the Department to do so.

In a Memorandum to Dean Buchanan in January 1944, Miss Smith stated a point with regard to standards as follows: "I should like to see the Social Work Course listed as Graduate Course in Social Work rather than Courses leading to the Diploma in Social Work." A letter dated February 1944, mentioned the problem of an official title for the Administrator of the Course in Social Work. These two points were important from the point of view of giving status to the Course for the purpose of recognition and future accreditation. The Course was soon listed as Graduate, and the Administrator was given the official title of Director, in spite of the fact that the Course was neither a Department nor a School at this time.

Enrolment increased as the standards went up and recognition of the new status of social work within the University was given by the Board of Governors. On February 26, 1945, the Board of Governors approved a separate Department of Social Work in the Faculty of Arts and Science. Provisional approval of membership to the American Association of Schools of Social Work was also granted at this time for a period of two years. Re-inspection after this period would be necessary before full membership would be granted.

Much had been accomplished in two years, but there was much more yet to be done. The Course in social work had become a Department, yet the Director continued to direct operations from the same small office in the Arts building. The need for office space, office equipment, and stenographic help was imperative. The Council of Social Agencies provided auxiliary office space, telephone service, and some stenographic help in the Children's Aid Building, but it could not meet the rapidly expanding needs of the new Department.

The need for a full-time office manager-stenographer was met in February 1946, when Miss N. Harrison was taken on the Staff. Miss Harrison proved to be a competent office manager and developed into an efficient executive-assistant to the Director of the School. For some years she carried most of the load alone, but later some professional secretarial assistance was made available to her

and she was able to devote more of her time to the more highly confidential correspondence and other matters relating to administration.

In 1947 the problem of office space was adequately met for the first time. A house just below Union College, known as "the old Barlow House", was left to the University by a well wisher. It was suggested that this house be turned over to the new Department of Social Work. There were several large room on the ground floor which would have made excellent lecture rooms had not zoning regulations prevented the transformation. The problem was solved by selling the property and giving the proceeds to the Department. With this money, at a total cost of \$20,000.00, Hut B.9 was built especially for the Department.

Full-time secretarial help and housing were only two of many administrative problems which had to be solved. There was the important problem of finding the full-time faculty needed to meet the requirements of increased enrolment and the proposed two year graduate course. Administrative policy with regard to faculty was to employ practitioners who had an interest in or had a flair for teaching. With certain technical subjects a teacher might have to be imported from outside the province, or even outside of Canada. Generally speaking, however, the practice was to import faculty only when there were no qualified Canadian personnel available.

From 1943, to 1944, Miss Smith was assisted by Miss

Mary Gleason and most of the former part-time faculty members, including Miss Holland. Dr. Topping was now able to concentrate all his efforts upon teaching Sociology and Economics to undergraduates so that from 1943, until 1945, there were actually only two full-time paid members. Miss Gleason resigned at the end of the two years for which she had engaged in September 1942. Her successor, Miss Katherine Reebel, B.A. (Penn. College for Women), M.A. (Pittsburgh), M.S.S. (Smith College), became Associate Professor and the new Supervisor of Field Work.

The Budget

It was only when it became a Department in its own right in 1945, that the social work course had its own budget. Even then however, there was no accurate measure of what it cost to train a social worker. Agencies often donated the services of workers as supervisors. In many instances the University provided stationery, other office supplies and even some equipment, without the cost being included in a budget for the Department. Despite these and other donations, there never was enough money to make expansion easy nor to provide all the facilities required by the Department.

As early as 1942, a special committee representing the C.A.S.W., the Canadian Welfare Council, and Canadian Schools of Social Work, formulated a brief, "for Governmental Aid to Professional Education for Social Work, using the Dominion-Provincial Youth Training Scheme." In 1944 the

National Committee of Canadian Schools of Social Work was formed at Winnipeg. One of the main functions of the National Committee was to enlist aid from the Federal Government to provide assistance for the Canadian Schools of Social Work.

In May 1946, the Head of the Department was called to Ottawa by the Deputy Minister of Welfare. She, together with other Directors of social work education, helped to form a Technical Advisory Committee on social work training for the Department of National Health and Welfare. At that time it was announced that \$100,000.00 would be made available for Schools of Social Work.

The share of the Department of Social Work at the University of British Columbia amounted to \$8,600.00 for scholarships and bursaries to be awarded on the recommendation of the Head of the Department. The sum of \$7,700.00 was received to aid in a program of administrative expansion. The latter amount was provided primarily to pay for the increased cost of field work supervision. In order to prepare for an enormously increased enrolment, the first quarter of the grant was made available to the Department in August.

The grant, one of several, from the department of National Health and Welfare, put the various Schools on a sound economic footing, and this enabled them to meet the rapid developments in the following years. Other funds

were obtained from the University by means of Comprehensive grants made available by the Federal Government to assist in the general expansion needed to take care of veterans. World War II provided the necessary stimulus for rapid development and especially in the field of social welfare. Without help from Governments, no Department or Schools could have possibly been able to provide for this rapid expansion under normal budgets.

There were several factors which should be considered in order to determine an adequate budget for the normal operation of professional education for social work. For example, (1) The demand for and the turnover of professionally trained welfare personnel in present and potential employment. (2) The capacity of a great variety of public and private agencies to provide adequate supervised field work placements. (3) The availability of teaching and supervisory personnel as well as the facilities necessary to ensure the best quality of teaching for the number of students selected. Later on, through National Health Grants, funds were made available for the expansion of Curriculum in certain specializations, namely, - medical and psychiatric social work.

Curriculum Development

Changes in the Course during the year 1943-44, were few in number. They consisted chiefly in changes in the unit value of some courses. For example, the course in the History of Social Work was cut from two units to one.

Public Welfare was raised from one to two units and the course in Nursing B 27 was waived. Most of the work of the full time faculty members was concentrated upon the raising of the standards of existing field work agencies and giving courses and institutes to train new field work supervisors and help new agencies to become qualified to accept students. For example, in 1944, a five-day institute was given to a group of sixteen agency supervisors. Meetings and institutes were also held at Nelson and Kamloops at the request of the Provincial Secretary's Department.

In order to meet the need for more social workers, the University offered a special modified course in social work for selected individuals who did not have a university degree. Those persons who had met university entrance requirements, and who had shown an aptitude for social work in an agency setting, or in a related field, would be admitted to the special course upon recommendation of a social agency. This modified course actually served a dual purpose. First, it provided the field with desperately needed workers. Secondly, it eliminated the less well prepared from the Diploma course and thus made it easier to raise standards.

The special course lasted eight months and instruction in both class room and field work was given. The class room work was flexible and was arranged somewhat on an individual basis to allow for the differences in the

educational background of the students. In fact, a few individuals were admitted on a part-time basis. Field work consisted of 300 hours work under supervision in an agency. For those individuals who completed this course, and subsequently obtained their bachelor's degree, credit was granted toward the Diploma in Social Work. It was clearly stated that when the shortage of workers became less acute, the modified course would be dropped.

The above plan went far towards meeting the needs of the field and made unnecessary the continued operation of the "Grauer Plan", outlined in the previous chapter. There were actually nine students carried over from this accelerated course into 1945. The decision to discontinue this course came as the result of overwhelming evidence that a combined Arts and professional course in the fourth year was not practicable for it left the student confused and badly trained.

The objectives to be achieved by professional education for social work should be to enable students who are innately suited for the profession, to integrate and enhance their capacities. The end result should be a person educated and active in regard to the society in which he lives, possessing knowledge and skills related to his profession, and an understanding of himself. Furthermore, he should have an impersonal love for his fellows and an understanding of the aims he is pursuing and the methods of so doing.

Even a casual glance at the objectives to be achieved by professional education for social work, and the purpose for which the trained worker develops knowledge, skills and attitudes, gives one an inkling of the vast amount of effort that had to be put forth by the Department and by the Students in order that the objectives might be achieved. Changes in curriculum could not be made in a day or even in a year, but had to be gradually worked out in conjunction with the raising of standards.

Plans for the 1944-45 session were more elaborate and they included plans for a shorter course, changes in curriculum, and an increase in the number of hours of field work. An introductory course to social work was to be made available to undergraduate students, and a seminar in Research was projected. This was in accordance with plans for the development of a two-year course under the Department which would then offer a degree in Social Work. Qualified workers who completed the special course would gain credits which could be applied toward the second year of the degree course.

The granting of credits toward the second year of the degree course was one of the steps taken to protect, as much as possible, the older Diploma graduates. By taking advantage of refresher courses and other opportunities for training, Diploma graduates could work toward their M.S.W. on a part-time basis. In addition to the principle of protecting older graduates, Miss Smith developed her program

on the basis of progressive standards. Starting with immediately available resources in personnel, housing, teaching material, she started her course toward a distant goal. This goal was never rigid or fixed, but flexible and progressive, and at all times adjustable to new growth and development in academic courses, agencies and the field of practice generally.

In 1943, there was little Canadian teaching material available. There was a great need for books and pamphlets written by professional Canadian social workers who had a wide understanding of the field of social work in Canada. There was little or no case work or group work teaching material relating to welfare problems in British Columbia, or Canada for that matter. Not only was there practically no teaching material of Canadian origin, but even qualified teachers with professional Canadian social work background were hard to find. Despite the fact that her background training was American, the new Administrator insisted from the first that a Canadian School of Social Work should be Canadian in emphasis.

In 1944, the American Association of Schools of Social Work directed their members to adopt the generic approach and instructed that the curriculum should be developed upon the "basic eight". In the fall of 1944, an application for membership in the Association was submitted by the Department at U.B.C. In March 1945, Miss Leona

Massoth, Executive Secretary of the Association, paid a visit to the University. Due to wartime conditions, the application did not receive approval until the following fall.

The "basic eight" were eight areas of study comprising social casework, public welfare, social group work, community organization, social research, (statistics, research methods), medical information and psychiatric information (human behavior and psychopathology), and social administration. The generic approach was devised so that all students could build their specialized studies upon a broad foundation of knowledge and techniques common to all social work.

The generic or general training idea had actually been established at U.B.C. by the pioneers who outlined the Course in Social Service in 1929. At that time the founders recognized no specialization of setting or method in training. This fact made it much easier for the Administrator in her efforts to bring the course up to the minimum standards required by the American Association of Schools of Social Work for accreditation. Nevertheless certain courses had to be re-organized in line with the objectives to be achieved by professional education for social work.

Group Work

In 1945, a contribution of \$3,000.00 was made by the Junior League of Vancouver in order to have group work

established as a specialization in the Department of Social Work. This was the first of three such yearly contributions and it enabled the Department to secure the services of a specialist in the field of group work. Miss Elizabeth Thomas, A.B. (Wesleyan College), M.S. (New York School of Social Work), became assistant Professor and the third full-time member of the Faculty.

It is true that a course in group work had been given at the University since the Course in social work commenced in 1929. Nevertheless it was Miss Thomas who initiated group work as a specialization in the Department of Social Work. This marked the first full-fledged training program for group workers in any Canadian School of Social Work. Furthermore, this course was the first in Canada to be accredited by the A.A.G.W. in the group work specialization.

Pre-war group work lectures had been given by volunteer lecturers from the field, and placement of students were made at Alexandra Neighbourhood House, Alexandre Fresh Air Camp, the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. During this period the stipulation that each group worker must have a part of his total placement in a family or children's agency was still in force. With the advent of Miss Thomas, placement facilities for group workers were immediately expanded and the students had both their placements in a group work setting.

Not only was training made possible for those stu-

dents primarily interested in group work, but the curriculum of all social work students was enriched by the inclusion of required courses in group work methods and the organization of community activities. The rapidly developing community centre movement seemed to point to an increasing demand for recreational leaders. This demand could now be met by the influx of returning World War II veterans.

In January 1946, the Department, in co-operation with the Extension Division, sponsored a Community Centre Institute which was attended by over 100 community leaders from all over the province. This was followed by another conference in June by the same group and this time the B. C. Community Centres Association was organized. During the summer the Department assisted the local chapter of the A.A. of G.W. in sponsoring a two-week institute in program skills. As in casework, much needed to be done to help agencies develop field work training opportunities.

Emphasis upon medical and psychiatric social work began during the war years. During the latter part of World War II, a relatively successful program was developed in the Canadian Army under the direction of Lieutenant Colonel Stewart Sutton. In 1945, Colonel Sutton visited most D.V.A. district offices and discussed the need for a social service program with district administrators and senior medical officers. By the time Col. Sutton's report was prepared in September 1945, it was fairly evident that

social workers would be required for both the Treatment Services and the Rehabilitation Branches of the department.¹

By 1946, medical social work began to expand slowly in British Columbia. However, placements were limited for field experience, for it was thought that changes in existing hospital social service departments would have to be effected before adequate training facilities for medical social work would be available in Vancouver. The course in medical and Psychiatric Information was unique in that it drew upon many sources and used many volunteer lecturers. Sometimes between thirty and forty doctors, nurses, social workers and others contributed voluntary lectures or participated in discussions during the year.

On January 28, 1946, the Board of Governors approved the creation of the two Degrees. Full accreditation of the M.S.W. course was given by the American Association of Schools of Social Work in the Spring of 1947. The granting of 38 B.S.W. degrees, and 12 M.S.W. degrees by the University of British Columbia marked another "Canadian first" for the new Department.

The new pattern for professional education for social work at U.B.C. really became clear in the 1946-47 session. The course now consisted of two years of study and field

¹ Woods, Walter S., Rehabilitation, Ottawa, Edmond Clouthier, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P., Printer to the Queen, Most Excellent Majesty, 1953, p. 307-8.

work after the B.A. degree, culminating in the Master of Social Work degree. The training included three different experiences: (1) Class room work consisting of lectures, discussions and seminars. (2) Clinical practice (field work) in the city and nearby rural social agencies and welfare departments. (3) A graduate research work project and the production of a thesis.

There were 14 subjects available to first year students in social work in the 1946-47 session. Two days a week, Tuesdays and Thursdays, were devoted to field work. Lectures in such subjects as Medical and Psychiatric Information, Casework, Group Work, Public Welfare, Child Welfare, Statistics and Research, formed the generic base for future specialization. In the second year the student chose a special field of practice in which to concentrate most of his efforts, although several subjects belonging to the basic curriculum had to be included along with his specialization. Additional courses were taken in theoretical material along with field work and the writing of a thesis. Fourteen subjects including field work were available in the second year.

Field Work

Field work is a form of controlled practical experience which gives students an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to integrate theory with practice. In class a student learns by recalling ideas, by restating them in

his own words and by finding illustrations of them. In field work, for example, the student's client illustrates certain problems which are basic yet unique because they belong to a particular individual. The student must learn to apply his classroom knowledge and technical skills in problem solving. In this problem solving he is protected and his client is protected by reason of the control exercised by the School and by his agency through his Supervisor.

In problem solving a professional social worker works through his client's feelings to stimulate thinking. The student's supervisor, on the other hand, must work through thinking to appraise whether or not the student is developing professional attitudes and feelings. In reality the supervisor imparts skills and appraises attitudes which, because of the narrow attention to program on the part of the student, must be developed in the student by the School. It is the fundamental job of the school to produce a professional person.

Field work must be performed in agencies, and before a student may be placed in a new agency the most careful planning must take place between the School and the Agency. Certain factors must decide the suitability of an agency for field work. First, there must be a sufficient and suitable case-load. That is, there must be actual work available which is practical for teaching progress and suitable for the learner. Secondly, the student supervisor must be adequately trained. Thirdly, the Agency

organization, structure, administrative practice, staff and standards of work must be of sufficiently high professional level to guarantee a sound educational experience to students in training.

In agencies where high standards of practice have been followed for some years, the first and third requirements would be largely the responsibility of the Agency concerned. The School would assist mainly in providing proper supervision. In some cases a School might use only those agencies which had developed the required standards and ignore other agencies. This method might well lead a School to overlook important progressive developments in such an agency, and thereby the School would become the loser in failing to fulfil its duty to keep up with new developments in the field.

It was the practice of the Department of Social Work under Miss Smith to assist every agency that requested help, to raise their standards of practice. Every opportunity for the training of Supervisors was given by the Department through the mediums of summer schools, refresher courses and institutes. The response of the Agencies in Vancouver, Victoria and the surrounding district was positive and a feeling of mutual respect and responsibility for the development of the professional person manifested itself.

Commencing in the Summer Session of 1944, a course

for supervisors and senior case workers was offered. This course, known as Social Work 25, was designed for those workers who were already supervising workers and students, as well as senior workers who were looking forward to becoming supervisors. The course lasted seven weeks and lectures, four hours a week, were held in the Court House Chambers on Tuesdays and Thursdays for the convenience of employed workers. Entrance requirements were the Diploma or the completion of the Course in social work. One and a half units of University credits were given and a fee of \$12.00 per unit was charged.

This course, given by Miss Smith, was attended by 26 supervisors and was thought to be a complete success. The importance of this course lay in the fact that it was the first step toward an advanced curriculum. The training of field supervisors and the help given to agencies toward raising standards was preparatory to increasing student placements. In this connection too, the demand from the field for more training opportunities for social group workers, led to a co-operative arrangement being worked out between the Extension Division of the University and the Vancouver Council of Social Agencies. A two week institute was offered in the summer of 1944. This venture likewise proved to be a success and it was attended by 35 agency staff members and prospective workers.

In June 1944, a one-week institute was put on in Victoria and this was attended by sixteen supervisors from

social agencies. In September the Social Service Department of the Royal Jubilee Hospital in Victoria was used for the first time for the placement of students. Other agencies to be used were the Jewish Family Agency and the Catholic Children's Aid. In addition consideration was being given to sending students to Nelson and Penticton for training with the Provincial Rural Services. The State of Washington Social Service even offered to work out a training program for students at Bellingham.

At the beginning of the year 1943-44, there were places for about twenty students in agencies for field training. By the end of the year, through intensive work in helping agencies to raise standards of work and supervision, there were fifty places for students. In a memorandum to Dean Buchanan, dated January 1944, Miss Smith requested that a requirement of thirty units of class work and 600 hours of field work be required for the diploma. Field work to be 15 hours a week during the University session and 300 hours to be completed during the inter-session "and/or" summer. It was requested, in addition, that a short research study be undertaken for this diploma.

In 1945, it became Miss Reebel's responsibility to supervise field placements. The students were assigned to the various agencies and hospitals for two days a week from the end of September until the end of April. A total of 300 clock hours during the winter session was followed by a block placement of eight or nine weeks. This was

usually in a different agency and the student was thus able to complete another 300 hours. Monthly meetings with agency supervisors, consultation with training supervisors, and regular visits to agencies, were all part of Miss Reebel's duties. The School reserved the right to decide upon which agency would be best suited to a student's capabilities and previous background.

In 1946, an experimental placement of students in the Crippled Children's Hospital was tried during the year and two advanced students were placed in Royal Alexandra Hospital in Edmonton for the Summer. A special grant by the Marshall Field Foundation to the Ryther Child Centre, Seattle, Washington, enabled that agency to expand their psychiatric treatment facilities to emotionally disturbed children. Students of Social Work at U.B.C. who were interested in child welfare were given an unusual opportunity for internship at Ryther Child Centre.

The pattern of field work as it is today also emerged in 1946-47. Beginning in that year, 450 hours or two eight hour days a week were required to be completed by every first year student placed in field work. Second year students continued with the block placement of 300 hours following 300 hours of field work during the term. The block placement was later discontinued and second year students completed 600 hours of field work by working three eight hour days a week, usually Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, at their field work agencies.

Research

Under the new program research became an integral part of the professional training. First year students began with a course in Social Research Methods. In the second year a Thesis Seminar was conducted with the intention of clarifying problems arising in the students' research project and to outline method. The research project was expected to be an original study culminating in a graduate thesis. The graduate thesis together with classroom work and field work completed the three areas in which the M.S.W. student had to prove himself in order to obtain his degree.

The Instruction in Social Research Methods acquainted the students with the nature of all scientific methods (surveys, case studies, statistical method, historical method, etc.) appropriate to social study. Elementary statistical techniques were dealt with, with practical examples. An important feature of the course was to acquaint the students with: (a) the principal sources of Canadian statistical material; (b) the actual dimensions of basic social and economic fundamentals, that is, distribution of income, occupational structure, rural, urban and regional characteristics. Each student in the course was required to undertake a small scale research report.

The Thesis Seminar carried forward this instruction

by group discussion, and by periodical individual presentations of thesis work in progress. The Seminar discussed particularly the planning of research projects, the relation of new investigation to current knowledge, and the technique of thesis writing. The practical value of the project in helping to throw light on the current work of public and private welfare agencies, was and is, a special consideration in the choice of projects. The training value of the project should not be underestimated. It stressed: (1) the need for social studies, and the methods of making original enquiries and obtaining facts which were new; (2) the blending and cross checking of fact and theory; (3) the organization, presentation and writing of reports.

The actual process of deciding on a Thesis topic, assembling facts, checking facts, and the organization and writing of the thesis itself, was required to be completed by the student during the second year. In practice, however, the pressures of studies, the writing of papers required by other courses, the inability of the student to develop a mental "set" because of the interruption of studies by alternate days of field work, all worked against the student completing his project on time. Of course there were exceptions and a study of these exceptions would provide useful material to aid students in the future.

Students

While the Course was under the Department of Economics, screening of student applicants was attempted and carried out to the best of the ability of the field work supervisor and her assistants, all of whom were part-time volunteer lecturers. The student's background and his maturity were the important factors to be considered by these members of the faculty. On the other hand, the Dean of the Department and his advisors placed emphasis on scholastic ability. They believed that a student capable of obtaining a B.A. degree was a fit candidate for social work.

It was not until 1944, that the compromise between scholastic ability and personal suitability was finally resolved. The new Director of the Course assumed the primary responsibility for the selection of students and a more intensive job of screening was undertaken. In order to achieve its aim of limiting the number of applicants for education for social work to those with the best qualifications, it was obviously necessary to have a large number of applicants from which to choose.

By 1946, the shortage of workers in the field seemed likely to be met by ex-service personnel who had completed their B.A. degrees. By September 1946, the officially stated entrance requirements for social work were: First, a B.A. or an equivalent degree, and secondly, personal qualifications for the field of social work. As the pool

of potential candidates for professional education increased, selection methods became more refined.

Many interviews with prospective students and hours of counselling and directing of undergraduates were necessary. It was not only important that the persons entering the field of social work be assessed for suitability for that profession, but it was equally important for those selected to be sure they would be happy in their new profession.

This tightening of the screening process was more than ever necessary now that the department was able to offer the Degrees of B.S.W. and M.S.W. Not only had the rehabilitation program of the D.V.A. stimulated veterans to enter university, but many men and women who wished to change their occupations took advantage of the program and chose social work as their new profession. This great influx of student veterans taxed the facilities of the University and Departments to their limit.

By 1947, enrolment totaled 102, there were seven full-time faculty members and twelve part-time instructors. Self-government by students was encouraged by the University and the maturity of the student veterans was a strong influence for stability at this period of rapid expansion and overcrowding of classroom facilities. An active student group had various committees and sub-committees set up to liaison with both the Department and Professional

organizations. It was difficult, however, for first and second year students to meet together for consultation or recreation. First year students had lectures on the days second year students did their field work at agencies, and first year students did their field work on the days second year students were attending classes at the university.

Pressure of studies was great in both the first and the second years of training. This was partly due to the highly disturbing emotional element encountered in some of the courses such as S.W. 518, Personality Development, and partly due to a break in the continuity of thinking and study by reason of field work practice. In 1947, a student's Advisory system was established whereby it was anticipated that students would bring some of their academic problems and mental blockages to the member of Faculty assigned for this purpose. This system helped many but others failed to take full advantage of it, chiefly because their Advisor was a member of the Faculty.

Student Finances

Whereas in pre-war days financing of education for social work had been done mainly through private resources, post-war financing combined private resources, government grants, scholarships and bursaries. In 1944, there were two scholarships being used by the Social Service Department. The University Women's Club provided a \$100.00 scholarship and the Knights of Columbus one for \$250.00. By 1946 more

scholarships and bursaries were made available to students and the number using private resources alone was very small especially among the men. A large percentage of the students combined government grants with savings or part-time employment. In this period both men and women students made a great deal more use of part-time employment and summer employment.

Findings of the Survey of Graduates revealed that the majority of the men financed their training with D.V.A. credits while the largest proportion of women indicated that they had relied on savings to finance their fifth and sixth years at university. Seventeen per-cent of the respondents to the questionnaire mentioned the use of special resources. Of this group 60 per-cent were married men whose wives helped to "put them through college" by working while their husbands took the course.

In a few instances pensions were listed, and in one instance a combination of inheritance and salary from employment was mentioned. Twenty-nine percent of the sample received either a bursary or a scholarship. Such assistance may be given to students as an aid to the financing of training, and these persons necessarily supplement their income from other sources. The cost of the year's training varied widely. Twenty married men stated that figures for the year ranged from \$600.00 to \$2900.00 and the median expense was \$1400.00.

The cost of training for the single men ranged be-

tween \$600.00 and \$1200.00, with a median cost of \$1000.00: the latter figure was also the median for the single women. No less than 40 per-cent of the total stated that they incurred debts. These ranged from \$100.00 to \$1000.00 with a median figure of \$200.00. Apparently more men than women found themselves in debt at the end of the year. In some instances, no debts were incurred, but there was a large expenditure of savings. Many stated that they had to give up essentials such as medical and dental care, holidays and the purchasing of a home.¹

Standards

Higher standards had been the aim of the founders of the Course in social service. Lack of a full-time administrator, lack of funds and lack of administrative control of the Course were some of the reasons why progress had been so slow from 1929 to 1943. Every move in the development of the Course from 1943, onward had as its aim the raising of standards. A solid foundation upon which to build was already established and Miss Smith made the most of everything she had to work with.

One of the main principles by which she worked toward higher standards required that the Department participate in an ever-widening series of contacts with other professional groups in the field of practice and in education for social work. Commencing at the local level she believed

¹ A Survey of the Graduates of the School of Social Work of the University of British Columbia, a graduate thesis by Henry, Howie and Rutter, 1952.

that these contacts should extend to Provincial, Regional, National and International levels. In putting this principle into practice the scope of her contacts extended beyond this continent into Great Britain and even to Denmark and Finland.

In December 1943, Miss Smith attended a nation-wide conference in Ottawa on the question of the shortage of personnel in social work. In May 1944, she attended the National Conference of Social Work at Cleveland and gave a paper on "Case Work in Public Assistance". This paper was later published in the Proceedings of the Conference. At this time too, she was elected to the Case Work Section Committee of the National Conference for the approaching year. These are but two examples out of a great number, and they are important because this sort of participation in national and international social work affairs did much to hasten the recognition of the Department of Social Work at the University of British Columbia, and to help in the constant effort to raise standards both in education and in the practice of social work.

Faculty, Alumni, the CASW, and others continued to work toward raising the status of the Department to that of a School. In February 1947, the Department sponsored a series of lectures by Dr. Edward Luidman, an outstanding philosopher. During the winter of 1947-48, the Department, in co-operation with the Extension Department, gave two evening classes for employed social workers. During the

During the summer of 1948, the Department offered two courses by leaders in the field of social work. Miss Gordon Hamilton, Professor of Social Work at Columbia University and Mr. Roger Marier, Assistant Director of the School of Social Work at Laval University. A total of seventy-two students were enrolled in these courses.

Members of the Faculty gave more and more of their time to participation in community welfare projects in the Vancouver area, as well as conducting numerous special institutes, and lectures. A list of academic articles, given at local, national, and international conferences by Miss Smith, Dr. L. C. Marsh, Miss M. C. Johnston, Mr. W. G. Dixon and others might well be the subject of another paper. Publications, book reviews, and critical articles written by Faculty members, found wide circulation in Canada and the United States.

The demonstration Housing Survey directed by Leonard C. Marsh, B.Sc.(Econ.) (London), M.A., Ph.D. (McGill), Director of Research for the Department of Social Work, was an outstanding example of participation in community welfare projects. This was a pilot study to exemplify for Vancouver, principles of slum clearance, low-rental housing and neighbourhood unit development, with their implications for town planning and social welfare. A University Advisory Committee was represented by the Departments of Social Work, Economics and Architecture.

The Vancouver Housing Association and the Community Planning Association collaborated in the project. Funds were derived from several sources, amongst which were donations of \$5,000. from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and \$1,000. from the City of Vancouver.

During the year 1947-48, a course S.W. 559, Probation Methods, was added as well as S.W. 572, Behavior Problems of Children. The following year space had become so congested that S.W. 501 Casework had to be given in three sections. Four institutes were given by Miss Smith during the year. They included one on Supervision, given to a group of 40 Supervisors at Vancouver. A second, "Casework in Public Assistance", given to two groups of Provincial Welfare Officers at Regina, Saskatchewan. A third, "Basic Casework", was given at the Oregon State Conference of Social Work, Portland. The fourth, "Casework", was given at the Regional Conference of Social Work at Victoria.

The year 1949-50, saw the largest graduating class in the history of the Department. Candidates for the B.S.W. included 41 men and 64 women, while candidates for the M.S.W. included 24 men and 14 women, a total of 143. On August 18, 1950, the Board of Governors approved the recommendation of the Senate that the Department of Social Work be given the status of a School within the Faculty of Arts and Science.

An important mile-stone had been reached in the comparatively short space of seven years. At this point

the Director put into operation a new policy for the decentralization of administration into the hands of Committees. By this means the Director became the co-ordinator in a program involving wide faculty and student participation with the maximum professional growth of the student still the focal point.

In planning and constructing an educational program, certain objectives must be decided upon. For example, the behavior patterns the school tries to develop in students, that is, knowledge, skills and ways of thinking. The next step is to select learning experiences which will contribute to the objectives. Planning a particular course means providing situations in which students will encounter problems to solve so that they can gain an understanding and develop critical thinking. Since the effective organization of the learning experience involves planning both for sequence and integration, methods of evaluating the effectiveness of the program must be devised.

Such an appraisal must be conducted in terms of all the important educational objectives of the School; knowledge, technical skills, problem solving in professional situations, and the appraisal of professional interests and attitudes. A comprehensive program of evaluation must include written tests, examinations, observations, interviews, reports from field work supervisors and samples of students' work. These appraisals should be spaced strategically throughout the period of the students' training.

Three committees, one on Curriculum, one on Field Work, and one on Research, were now responsible for planning and conducting the educational program. In addition to these three committees, there were five standing committees on administration, student affairs, recruiting and undergraduate counselling, scholarships, and finally, employment. This breakdown of administration and decentralization into committees gave each member of the Faculty a share in administration and a voice in policy making. Furthermore, the group approach helped to iron out biases and to prevent the possibility of discrimination against any student for personal reasons.

An outline of the procedure followed by the committee responsible for admissions may help to illustrate the kind of work this committee was required to do. This committee was composed of four members. The Chairman was appointed by the Director and was empowered to accept or reject students. They also advised applicants concerning plans for entering the Profession. Minutes of all meetings were kept and the members held office for a period of one year.

The terms of admission required that a student take the full program. Personal qualifications included the following: The student must have reached his or her twenty-first birthday and be under forty years of age. Academic qualifications had to be complied with and the student was required to submit to a medical examination. Through a personal interview or interviews, the Committee

tried to assess personality, capacity for professional growth, and the student's interest in the profession.

There were approximately six steps to the procedure for admission and these included: the enquiry by the candidate and the reply by the school, the completion of all application forms and the submission of other relevant information, a personal interview with the candidate by a member of the Committee. This was followed by the processing of the application, the notification of the candidate of the Committee's decision by the Director of the School, and finally, the candidate's acknowledgement of this decision.

The application material on each candidate had to be reviewed by at least three members of the Committee. This review commenced when the following items were in the candidate's file: Correct and complete application form, Medical report, three out of four letters of reference, a transcript of marks, the candidate's photograph and a record of the personal interview. The opinion of the Committee members as to the candidate's suitability had to be expressed in writing and the findings placed in the candidate's file.

The decision of the committee was referred to the Secretary of the School who in turn advised the Director of these decisions. The Committee, at the request of the Director, would review the decision made. All cases

of rejection were reviewed by the Director, and if there was disagreement with the decision of the Committee, that group might be asked to again review their decision. The final decision with these cases rested with the Director. Once a letter had gone out to the candidate announcing the final decision, no further discussion would be given it by the Committee. The candidate or persons asking for a review had to discuss the matter with the Director.

The work of these committees required that Faculty members keep in touch with trends in the field of social work and it was an invaluable aid in Staff development. An important trend in education for social work began in 1952, when, at a meeting in Quebec, the National Committee of Canadian Schools of Social Work, in joint session with official delegates of the Canadian Association of Social Work, the Canadian Welfare Council and the National Conference of Canadian Universities, established a joint steering committee to sponsor a delegates' work-conference to "examine into the prospects and problems of social work education", in order to develop adequate planning for and support of social work education in Canada."

As a result of spade work by a local planning committee, a Workshop on Social Work Education was held at the University of British Columbia on April 2, and 3, 1954. This was one of several such local workshops, and findings would be organized and presented at regional and finally a national conference at later dates. The findings of the

Workshop have been summarized and made available to agencies and others. Perhaps the most important point about this Workshop is the fact that representatives of Public and Private Welfare Agencies, the School of Social Work and lay people, got together under the chairmanship of Miss M. Smith to consider the problem under discussion.

During 1953-54 two Supervisors' Study Groups held regular monthly meetings to study the subject of "Criteria for Evaluation of Students at the end of the First and Second Years". The preliminary findings of these two groups were published in "Joint Report of Field Work Supervisor's Study Groups". This report illustrates the tremendous advances which had taken place since 1943, in the standard of practice and thinking of field work supervisors.

Two important changes, one in the Curriculum and one with regard to the Thesis project required for graduation, were made in 1954. The first was the discontinuation of group work as a specialization. This meant a return to the original generic training approach which the founders of the Course had established in 1929, and which had been temporarily abandoned for group work specialization in 1946.

The second important change had reference to field work and the thesis. Field work remained on the 600 hour basis, but it included a provision for up to four hours a week to be spent on study and research either within the

agency or elsewhere. The calendar for the Second Year students was re-arranged into three terms instead of two as in previous years. Field work continued through Christmas but ended on March 5, 1955. This change has been made in order to give second year students a better opportunity to concentrate upon their theses.

Today the School of Social Work at the University of British Columbia is the second largest school in Canada. The principles adhered to by Miss Smith were so important in the development of social work at U.B.C., from the status of a Course under the Department of Economics, Political Science and Sociology, to a School that a summary of them follows: First, the need to place emphasis upon professional university education rather than vocational training. Secondly, a Canadian School should be Canadian in emphasis and use Canadian teaching material.

Thirdly, it is important for the School to be constantly moving toward higher standards. Standards should be flexible and adjustable to important developments and trends in the field of practice. Fourthly, the general training or generic idea established by the pioneers of education for social work in British Columbia is fundamentally correct. Fifthly, technical skills are of little or no value and may be even dangerous unless they rest upon a foundation of professional attitudes.

Sixthly, in education for social work the develop-

ment of the professional person is of paramount importance. In terms of effective thinking, this means the development of skill in recognizing a professional problem, the analysis of the problem in terms of relevant principles and finally, the working out of a course of action by the application of these principles. In terms of attitudes, professional education for social work aims to develop in the student a warm accepting yet objective attitude toward clients and a sense of self respect for the social contribution of his profession and his own work.

Lastly, if a school is to reach a high standard it must participate in an ever-widening series of contacts with its own and other professional bodies. Commencing at the local level, contacts should extend to the provincial, regional, national and international levels. All of these principles have been put into practice by the Director of the School of Social Work.

CHAPTER IV

THE PAST, THE PRESENT, AND SOME FUTURE TRENDS

This history of the School of Social Work at U.B.C. includes the most important aspects of its development. A complete record of the period from 1929 to 1943 no longer exists and it is thought likely that minutes of faculty meetings, and other letters and documents, may have been inadvertently burned with other papers. A careful selection from a number of scattered documents, articles and minutes of the Alumni of the School of Social Work, and Faculty of Arts and Science, and the Senate have been pieced together. Fortunately these have been supplemented from the recollection of several people who were active in the foundation of the Course. Even so, it is scarcely likely that the picture of the period in question is really complete.

The present Director of the School commenced her administrative duties in 1943, and this latter period, 1943-54, is therefore accurately recorded, although some details have been left out for several reasons. For example, if complete details were given for any one of the areas, administration, curriculum, faculty, students and standards, this paper would be far too long. Then, too, the thesis, "A Survey of Graduates of the School of Social Work of the University of British Columbia", contains a considerable amount of information about the

School and its graduates. A separate paper might also be written on the subject of Field Work alone. However, despite shortcomings in this record, certain facts have made themselves clear.

The Past

The foundation laid by the pioneers was sound but leadership, money and clear-cut goals were lacking. During the vocational training period the emphasis was on method, while the emphasis from the beginning of the professional education period was on the development of the professional person. Some of the ways used to improve the quality of education for social work were: Accrediting, consultations, the formulation of standards and the exchange of thinking with other Schools, professional groups and agencies.

In the early period the administration of the Course was guided, for the most part, by a committee composed largely of volunteer instructors who were also administrators of agencies. This committee lacked full power to make vital administrative decisions and there was no one person available to give full-time direction to the Course. Even had leadership been more powerful, money was so limited during the depression years that the development of the Course could scarcely have proceeded in any other manner than the way in which it did.

The appointment of the full-time Director in 1943, was the real turning point in the transition from

vocational training to professional education for Social Work. During the depression years private agencies had absorbed most of the Diploma graduates. But early in the war years public agencies began to absorb the majority of graduates. With the expansion of government financed social welfare programs, more money became available to aid in a stepped-up program of development in education for social work. Dynamic leadership, a great need for professionally trained social workers, and financial support, combined to make possible the success of this rapid transition.

From a heterogeneous, almost unintegrated series of sometimes unrelated courses leading to a Diploma, the Curriculum was organized into a homogeneous, well-integrated curriculum leading to a M.S.W. degree. One important common link between the two periods was the general training or "generic" idea. It is true that the Group Work specialization commenced in 1945, but this has since been altered and the "generic" program was re-established in 1954.

In the early years field work placements were difficult to obtain. The standards in a few agencies were not very high, trained supervisors of students in the field were not available, and there was no money to pay them if they had been. This was the first area upon which the new Director began to concentrate her

efforts. The new program provided special courses for supervisors and Diploma graduates, and a large scale program of helping agencies to raise standards was commenced. By the time the war had ended, Veterans began to flock to the University of British Columbia to take advantage of the generous training grants under the Department of Veterans Affairs. The Department of Social Work, agencies and supervisors were adequately prepared to meet the heavy demands which were soon to be made upon them.

High professional standards in research did much to strengthen the program. Projects undertaken by members of the Faculty in research, in surveys, and at conferences at various levels also did much to enhance the reputation of the Department. By the time the Department became a School in 1950, its reputation for sound training in theory and in practice was already well established.

All that was best in the old had been carried on into the new stage of development. Even the spirit of the pioneers remained active and it was illustrated by some of the "Canadian firsts" achieved by the School. For example, it was the first School in Canada to grant the M.S.W. degree, the first full-fledged training program for group workers was offered by the Department, and the first group work specialization to be accredited by the A.A. of G.W.

The total enrolment for the School, full-time and partial students, from its beginning until now, has been derived from figures given by "A Survey of Graduates...." However, several additions and corrections to the totals have been made.

TABLE 1:

(a) Diploma and Related Courses

Years	Men	Women	Total	Years	Men	Women	Total
1929-30			21	1938-39	6	47	53
1930-31	1	9	10	1939-40	10	36	46
1931-32	3	33	36	1940-41	25	46	71
1932-33	1	14	15	1941-42	3	19	22
1933-34	1	10	11	1942-43	2	27	29
1934-35	2	12	14	1943-44	4	25	29
1935-36	4	21	25	1944-45	4	23	27
1936-37	7	25	32	1945-46	6	23	29
1937-38	9	36	45				

(b) Degree Course

Years	<u>B.S.W.</u>		<u>M.S.W.</u>		Total
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
1946-47	26	67			93
1947-48	29	49	8	19	105
1948-49	39	69	13	14	135
1949-50	41	64	24	14	143
1950-51	32	44	22	24	122
1951-52	42	30	25	20	117
1952-53	23	38	20	8	89
1953-54	30	28	14	23	95

The total number of graduates from the School up to and including 1952, was found to be 711. Since then there

have been an additional 122 graduates so that on the assumption that the total 711 is correct for 1952, the total as of September 1954 is 833.

The Present

In professional education for social work at U.B.C. certain goals have been achieved, but they are not ultimate goals. For an administrator in education for social work, or for any other profession, to believe that ultimate goals have been reached would be almost the same as saying there is nothing new that can be learned or taught. In a dynamic society ultimate goals must, of necessity, remain always just ahead and just out of reach.

In the past the contribution made to the development of the School by the Alumni Association, members of the C.A.S.W., agencies and others have been invaluable. The contributions of Miss Laura Holland have been partially acknowledged by naming a Social Work Scholarship after her and in the Honourary Doctors Degree which she has been awarded. The contributions made by Miss Zella Collins during her years of faithful service at the school and later as a field work supervisor, have yet to be tangibly acknowledged. The work of these two pioneers has been well done, but the work of the Alumni Association must be continued.

A report of a Special Committee of the Social

Work Alumni Association was completed in 1950, the year the Department became a School. This report itemized many ways in which a strong and active Alumni Association could help the School. Two of these suggestions may serve to illustrate the point. First, the Alumni Association could act as a strong pressure group in obtaining financial assistance from various levels of government for the benefit of the School and its students.

Secondly, the School will eventually need a new and permanent building to take the place of the present temporary structure. A strong Alumni Association could do a great deal to help in the planning of such a building, in soliciting funds for the building program, and eventually in helping with furnishings and equipment. One way in which funds could be solicited is by asking graduates from the School to list the School as a beneficiary in their wills. These are but two of many ways in which the Alumni could carry out its real function now and in the future. Furthermore, the Alumni, with its focus solely upon the School, would in no way overlap with the larger areas of professional social work which are the responsibility of the C.A.S.W.

Future Trends

Generally speaking it is considered that a social worker is not fully trained until he has undertaken two years of post-graduate study at an accredited

school of social work. Nevertheless, there has arisen in the minds of agency administrators a question about the need for employing B.S.W. and M.S.W. degree people for every position other than that of office staff. Are not men and women with B.S.W. and M.S.W. degrees doing work which might be done by someone with lesser qualifications, such as for example, a B.A. degree?

Job analysis and job classification are of course the proper way in which valid answers will have to be found to this question. What the outcome will be remains for the future, but it is possible that certain revisions in the undergraduate curriculum may have to be undertaken at some future date. This might mean the addition of new undergraduate courses relating to public and private welfare. Such courses would have to be set up so that undergraduates going on to graduate work in other professions would likewise derive benefit from them. Another possible solution might be a shortened graduate program for general workers. Such a course could be completed in twelve months or so, with advanced work given in another year.

On the other hand, it is reasonable to anticipate that advanced training beyond that of the M.S.W. will have to be made available to certain graduates who wish to perfect their skills. The University of Toronto now offers a Ph.D. degree in Social Work, and advanced training will ultimately have to be made available to graduates in the western provinces. Two areas in which such

advanced training is necessary are: (1) In preparing fully qualified teachers for teaching in the Faculty of Schools of Social Work; (2) In preparing more, fully qualified, research specialists.

Some schools have undertaken to abolish the B.S.W. degree and to grant only the M.S.W. It also has been felt that the training received by the B.S.W. student should be reinforced by a second year at a later date. Unfortunately, the cost of returning to university for the M.S.W. year has, all too often, caused graduates to delay their return until they have lost their incentive to do so. Some form of financial assistance such as more bursaries and scholarships or other forms of grants should be made available to such students.

A strong trend in this direction has developed by reason of the interest which the Provincial and Federal Governments are now taking in encouraging professional education for social work. For example, the Saskatchewan government now provides funds for tuition and running expenses for certain students who will agree to work for that Government after graduation. The length of service is equated with the financial help given.

This is a major positive trend which may well affect administration and cause emphasis to be laid upon a greater degree of specialization in such areas as medical and psychiatric social work. The great interest which the Federal Government has recently shown in a

positive program for rehabilitation of the physically handicapped, leads credence to such developments. Another indication may be found in the payment as interns of M.S.W. students who do field work at D.V.A. hospitals.

Planning for the future of education for social work must be the responsibility of the profession as a whole. An important step in this direction was made by the Work Shop on Social Work Education held at U.B.C. in April, 1954. This Work Shop clearly indicated that it is possible and desirable for members of the C.A.S.W., the School of Social Work, and Employing Agencies, to plan together. By a mutual assessment of each others problems and needs, ways and means can be found for the School and the profession to continue to raise the standard of professional service to the people they serve, and to mankind in general.

Professional social work has a contribution to make to civilization as a whole, but the extent of that contribution depends upon the way individual graduates live by the Ethics and Principles of their profession. If professional education for social work is to be consistent it must instill in its graduates the idea that the ethics of the individual and the profession should be one and that both should be as universally valid as the general principles upon which professional education for social work is based.

With regard to ethics and principles, should not some recognition be made in social work education of the contributions of Christ and great religious leaders of the past, to the ethics and principles which we hold valid today? Dr. Albert Schweitzer, in "Ethics and Civilization" says: "The essential nature of civilization does not lie in its material achievements, but in the fact that individuals keep in mind the ideals of the perfecting of man, and the improvement of the social and political conditions of peoples, and of mankind as a whole, and that their habit of thought is determined in living and constant fashion by such ideals." ¹

The geographical setting of the University of British Columbia is ideal from the point of view of accessibility by students from other nations. The standards of the School of Social Work are high, and their continuing development is geared to the dynamic development of society as a whole. Facilities for advanced training should be made available in due course. The ethics and principles of Social Work are held to be universally valid. It is therefore up to the individuals who compose the Profession of Social Work in British Columbia to lend their total support to the great enterprise of making the School an International training center for Professional Education for Social Work.

¹ Schweitzer, Albert, Civilization and Ethics, A. and C. Black Ltd., 4, 5 and 6 Soho Square, London, W.I., 1929, p. 2

A P P E N D I X A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(a) General References:

Books:

Higher Education for American Society, John Guy Fowlkes, Editor, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1948.

Reynolds, Bertha Capen, Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work, Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., New York, 1942.

Tufts, James H., Education and Training for Social Work, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1923.

Some Dynamics of Social Agency Administration, Harper and Brothers, London and New York, 1947.

(b) Specific References:

Books:

Abbott, Edith, Social Welfare and Professional Education, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1945.

Bernstein, Saul and Others, The New York School of Social Work, 1898-1941, Institute of Welfare Research, Community Service Society of New York.

Hagerty, J. E., "The Universities and Training for Public Leadership and Social Work", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. CV, 1923.

Hollis, Ernest V., and Taylor, Alice L., Social Work Education in the United States, Columbia University Press, New York, 1951.

Schweitzer, Albert, Civilization and Ethics, A. and C. Black, Ltd., 4, 5 and 6 Soho Square, London, W.1, 1929, p.

Social Work Year Book, American Association of Social Workers, 1951.

Social Work and the Social Workers in Britain, Issued by the Reference Division of the Central Office of Information, London, W.1, October, 1951.

Books (Cont'd.)

- Spencer, Sue, "Education for Social Work", Social Work Year Book, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1949.
- Van Kleeck, Mary, "The Professional Organization of Social Work", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. CI, 1922.
- Walker, Sydnor H., Social Work and the Training of Social Workers, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1928.
- Younghusband, Eileen L., Social Case Work in Great Britain, A Symposium, Morris Cherry, Editor, Faber and Faber Ltd., 24 Russell Square, 1950.
- Younghusband, Eileen L., Report on the Employment and Training of Social Workers, Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, Printed by T. and A. Constable Ltd., 1947.

Articles and Pamphlets:

- Angus, Margaret A., Children's Aid Society of Vancouver, B. C., 1901 - 1951.
- Report of the British Columbia Child Welfare Society, Published by the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey Committee, Vancouver, B. C. 1927.
- Smith, Marjorie J., "Education for Social Work", Canadian Welfare 25th Anniversary Edition, Vol. XXXIV, No. 7 Rungee Press Ltd., Ottawa, January 15, 1949.
- Smith, Marjorie J., Professional Education for Social Work in Great Britain, Published for the Pringle Memorial Fund by the Family Welfare Association, London, 1952.
- Taylor, Ralph W., "Distinctive Attributes of Education for the Professions", Social Work Journal, Vol. XXXIII, April 1952, No. 2.

Unpublished Papers and Minutes:

- Minutes of the Alumni Association of the School of Social Work were used quite freely.
- Excerpts from Minutes of the Faculty of Arts and Science, the Senate, and the Board of Governors were used to help check and varify the chronological order of

Unpublished Papers and Minutes (Cont'd.)

development of the Course.

Certain unpublished papers on several aspects of Professional Education for Social Work were kindly made available to the writer by Miss Marjorie J. Smith.