



OFFICE OF THE VICE-CHANCELLOR

28 August 1998

To: All Social Work Staff

Re: Review of Social Work

FILE

I enclose copies of the Review of the programmes in Social Work. This has previously been distributed to Professor Fulcher, Tamati Cairns, Tricia Laing and the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences with the advice that it was to be checked for matters of factual accuracy only. Some of their responses have been incorporated into what is now the final copy of the Review. You are all now invited to comment on the report. Submissions should be sent to me by 14 September.

It will be apparent that the text of the Review raises grave concerns about the programmes in Social Work. While the previously released Recommendations implied a need for substantial change the comments on the quality of the existing programmes are potentially damaging to the reputation of the Department and the University. Thus while I note the Recommendations, I intend to reserve my position on them until I have your comments and have taken further advice.

In the meantime I believe that it is vital to protect the interests of the students in the programmes and I will expect that for those continuing in the courses there will be substantial changes in the delivery of teaching to ensure that they receive the quality of education to which they are entitled.

I regret that because of my grave concerns about the programmes as a whole I have to direct that there will be no new intake of students in 1999 into the Diploma of Social Work or the MA (Applied) degrees. This will apply to all locations. The Dean must be advised of the mechanisms which will be put in place to ensure that continuing students have their interests protected and are able to complete their qualifications.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael Irving".

Professor Michael Irving
Vice-Chancellor

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF WELLINGTON
Te Whare Wananga o te Upoko o te Ika a Maui



**Review of the Social Work Programmes
of the Department of Applied Social Sciences**

A draft report.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Procedures	1
1.2	Membership of the Review Panel	2
1.3	Terms of Reference	2
2	Executive Summary	4
3	Social Work Education at Victoria University of Wellington	6
3.1	<i>Puao-te-Ata-tu</i> and Developments since 1986	7
4	The Department of Applied Social Science / MA (Applied) Board of Studies	8
5	Relationships within Victoria University of Wellington	9
6	Administration and Management	9
7	Human Resources	11
8	Facilities	12
9	Departmental Development Plans	12
10	Teaching and the Management of Teaching	13
10.1	MA (Applied)	14
10.2	Diploma in Social Work	15
11	Joint Teaching of Diploma / MA (Applied)	15
12	Modular Teaching	16
13	Distance Programmes	16
13.1	Rotorua	17
13.2	Nelson	17
14	Practica / Practice Teaching	18
15	Teaching Quality and Level	19
16	Bicultural Programmes and Cultural Safety	20
17	Professional Training and Relationships with the Profession	21
18	Staff Research	22
19	Conclusions	23
20	Recommendations	29

1 Introduction

1.1 Procedures

The Review of the Social Work programmes of the Department of Applied Social Sciences was undertaken as one of the regular cycle of reviews at Victoria University. The Terms of Reference and membership of the Panel were approved by the Vice-Chancellor in June 1997. The Review was scheduled for 10–14 November.

With the appointment of an Acting Reviews Administrator after the sudden death of Trish Evans in August, a new submissions deadline was set (10 October) and the Review was advertised in the University's *Staff Circular*, and in *The Dominion* and *Evening Post*. Members of Academic Board and other section heads were invited to make submissions, as were heads of related departments at other New Zealand universities.

Submissions were also invited from current and past Social work students (1994-1997 inclusive); current placement providers in Wellington, Rotorua and Nelson; guest lecturers and speakers; and a number of Maori organisations in the Wellington region. In addition, the Chief Executive Officers of the Department of Social Welfare (including Children, Young Persons and Their Families Service), Department of Corrections, Capital Coast Health, Waiariki Polytechnic and Nelson Polytechnic were also invited to respond.

Forty-nine written submissions were received—twenty-nine from external organisations and past students, and twenty-six from University staff and current students (or groups of students). Documentation and written submissions were distributed to the Panel in advance of the Review, and on 20 October the Panel participated in a teleconference.

On Monday 10 November the Panel was welcomed onto the Kelburn campus with a Powhiri given at Te Herenga Waka Marae. They then convened in the Robert Stout Committee Room.

Over four days, twenty-seven group and individual interviews were held: with Social Work programme staff, the Institute of Criminology, the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, practice tutors, current and past students, VUW Students' Association, the Postgraduate Students' Association, general staff of the University and placement providers. Throughout the week members of the Senior Management Group also briefed the Panel.

On Wednesday 12 November the Panel divided into two groups to visit Rotorua (Liz Beddoe, Paul Morris, Ranginui Walker) and Nelson (Druis Barrett, Jan Fook, Leai Schwenke) where social work programmes have been run in conjunction with Waiariki and Nelson Polytechnics, respectively. In both centres they met with staff, tutors, students, support groups, agency providers and representatives of the Polytechnics.

The Panel members who travelled to Nelson returned to Wellington mid-afternoon to visit offices and teaching rooms at Featherston Street, Fairlie Terrace and Kelburn Parade. At the request of Maori members of staff, an informal meeting with the Maori members of the Panel was arranged.

The Panel formulated the recommendations of this report during the Review.

1.2 Panel

Prof Paul Morris (<i>Convener</i>)	Professor of Religious Studies Victoria University of Wellington
Druis Barrett	President, Te Ropu Wahine Maori Toko i te Ora (Maori Women's Welfare League) Wellington
Liz Beddoe	Director, Centre for Social Work Auckland College of Education
Prof Jan Fook	Professor of Social Work Deakin University Australia
Leai Schwenke	Social Worker Children, Young Persons and Their Families Service Wellington
Prof Ranginui Walker	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Maori) The University of Auckland

1.3 Terms of Reference

- 1 To assess the teaching and research of social work in the overall context of the University Charter and Strategic Plan, assessing its effectiveness in meeting its commitments to the discipline, to the University, to its students, to the social work profession and community at large.
- 2 To examine the structure, content, coherence and level of the courses and programmes in social work and to evaluate these in the context of programmes offered by comparable institutions in New Zealand and overseas. To evaluate arrangements in support of supervised practicum papers in social work and the extent to which field practica comply with professional standards.
- 3 To examine the quality of teaching, scholarship and research in social work, including the criminal justice options.

- 4 To examine the management and decision-making processes in the Department and the procedures for the effective implementation of departmental policies and procedures.
- 5 To examine the contribution of social work teaching in fulfilling the University obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi.
- 6 To review the effectiveness of the distance teaching programmes in social work offered through Waiariki and Nelson Polytechnics and to advise on the future of those programmes.
- 7 To examine and comment on the Department's plans for the future development of teaching and research in social work and to advise on those areas of activity which should be given the highest priority, and the resources which might be required to achieve these objectives.

2 Executive Summary

The teleconference that took place on 20 October gave the Panel an opportunity to discuss a range of major issues that had been raised in the written submissions. It was agreed that a number of these would provide the initial focus of the Panel when it convened in Wellington. There was consistency in the pattern of concerns and complaints and the same difficulties experienced by students and agencies over a number of years were reported. A notable number of the submissions were highly critical of the staff and Social Work programmes of the Department of Applied Social Sciences.

Issues raised included:

- the perceived quality deficiencies relating to the content and teaching level of courses
- the reported inadequacies of assessment and the management of student progress
- the difficulties experienced by students resulting from the joint teaching of MA and Diploma courses
- the confusion and anxiety over the clarity and consistency of entry criteria to the programmes
- the concern at the perceived inability of staff to ensure cultural safety and a safe teaching environment
- the difficulties experienced by both graduates of the programmes and agencies in terms of the apparent lack of preparation of graduates for professional life.

The submissions from Social Work and other staff appeared to indicate a breakdown in working relations and communications among Social Work staff within the Department. The departmental and staff submissions also served to highlight the Department's academic and professional isolation with regard to other Victoria departments and social work agencies.

The oral submissions received by the Panel during the Review tended to confirm the existence of many of these reported problem areas. In fact, the greater detail offered by those making submissions in person served to convey an even more serious state of affairs than had been portrayed in the written materials submitted to the Panel.

The seriousness of the complaints and high levels of dissatisfaction reported by staff and students was matched by the extent and range of the submissions. The Panel received submissions from every staff member, including an extended teleconference call with one member of staff in London. The submissions from present and past students, together with the reports from VUWSA and the Postgraduate Students' Association led to the views of more than 100 students, male, female, Diploma, Masters, Maori, Pakeha and Pacific Island, being reported to the Panel.

By Tuesday evening, after having listened to submissions by Social Work staff and students, the Panel discussed with the utmost seriousness what at the time seemed its most likely recommendation, that all social work programmes offered by Victoria be terminated. This issue was returned to on Thursday, following the visits to Rotorua and Nelson. The Panel was convinced that the current programmes, and teaching and administrative arrangements should not be allowed to continue. After extensive deliberation it was finally decided that that the only alternative to the recommendation that Victoria abandon social work education altogether at this time was to recommend a series of radical changes to the Social Work programmes.

This decision was made on the basis of Victoria's history of social work education, the ongoing need for professional social work education in New Zealand, and the possibilities of building on the developments made by the Department in distance and bicultural social work teaching.

The recommendations that follow are the Panel's attempt to outline the minimal changes required in order to ensure that a viable professional social work programme be re-established at Victoria.

3 Social Work Education at Victoria University of Wellington

The School of Social Sciences was established at Victoria University College in 1949 under the leadership of Professor D C Marsh. In the following year, New Zealand's first postgraduate course to train professional social workers was introduced and fourteen students began their studies towards the two-year Diploma of Social Science (DipSocSci). The Diploma course included a supervised practical agency placement. Sociology was introduced as a BA subject at Stage 1 (100) level in 1957 and Stage 2 (200) and 3 (300) levels followed in the early 1960s. The School was renamed in 1969, the Department of Social Administration and Sociology, and offered courses in Sociology, the Diploma in Social Science and the new MA (Social Administration) degree.

The Department was again renamed in 1973 as the Department of Sociology and Social Work, offering courses in Sociology, the DipSocSci, the MA (Social Administration), and a new MA (Social Work). The DipSocSci was reformulated the following year as the Diploma in Social Work (DipSocWk) and it was decided to phase out the MA (Social Administration) with 1974 being the last year of this degree. The final year of the MA (Social Work) followed two years later. At this time two new degree programmes were introduced under the framework of the new MA (Applied) Statute, the MA (Applied) in Recreation Administration (renamed as the MA (Applied) in Recreation and Leisure Studies in 1990), and the MA (Applied) in Social Work.

From 1950 until 1975, Victoria offered the only university course in professional social work education in New Zealand, offering 24 places per year. In 1977 a further qualification in social work was introduced, the Advanced Diploma in Social Work. This second professional qualification was designed for social workers already holding the DipSocWk, or MA (Applied) in Social Work, or equivalent, with at least two years post-qualifying experience. The course was revised in the late 1980s but to date only three students have graduated. During the years 1975 to 1987 between 26 and 30 students per year were admitted to the MA (Applied) in Social Work and Diploma in Social Work courses. Since 1987 Social Work enrolments have significantly increased, nationally and at Victoria, due to government initiatives in 1986 and 1992.

In 1986 a Te Rangihau Maori teaching and research position in social work was established, with the support of the Department of Social Welfare. The next year a Diploma in Social Science Research (DipSocScRes) was introduced, being replaced by the MA (Applied) in Social Science Research in 1992. In 1993 modular teaching was introduced for the Diploma and MA (Applied) courses in Social Work.

In 1995 the Department of Sociology and Social Work was separated into two departments, the Department of Sociology and Social Policy, and the Department of Applied Social Sciences (responsible for the programmes in social work, social science research, recreation and leisure studies, and rehabilitation studies). The

modular teaching programmes for the Diploma and MA (Applied) in Social Work were introduced in Rotorua and Nelson in partnership with Waiariki and Nelson Polytechnics.

The Department of Applied Social Sciences in 1995 introduced a new Diploma in Rehabilitation Studies (DipRehbStud) under an agreement with Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC). The University after consultation with ACC ended this programme in 1997.

In 1996 the University suspended the new intake of Social Work students at Nelson in order to allow a number of concerns to be addressed. A new cohort of students was admitted to the Nelson programme for the following academic year, 1997. In mid-1997 the University decided that due to a number of course and administrative difficulties there would be no new intake to the Waiariki programme for 1998. The University's stated intention is to resume admitting new students to the programme in 1999, bearing in mind the recommendations of the Review.

3.1 *Puao-te-Ata-tu* and Developments since 1986

The Department of Sociology and Social Work appointed a new professor to lead the Social Work programmes in 1986. Following the publication of *Puao-te-Ata-tu: Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare* a new curriculum for social work education was introduced. The new curriculum was understood by the staff involved as reflecting the recommendations of *Puao-te-Ata-tu*, in particular the need for more Maori to undertake social work education and for all social work education to include significant bicultural perspectives.

At Victoria these issues were addressed by developing new criteria for the Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) for mature students, with the intention of developing a dual entry system to social work training. The stated aim was to consciously bridge the gap in social profile between social workers and their clients by admitting graduate students to the MA (Applied) programme and those with social or welfare work experience but little formal academic training to the Diploma programme. The departmental submission characterises the first of these student groups as predominantly middle-class and Pakeha, and the latter as lower class and mainly from Maori and Pacific Island communities.

The departmental submission also claims that the rationale for the joint teaching of MA (Applied) and Diploma students is RPL and the fostering of the principles and practices of cross cultural communication.

Until 1993-94 most students taking social work courses at Victoria were granted leave on full pay for two years by their employers. In 1993 modular teaching was introduced in order to allow a wider range of students to gain access to the programmes. The extension of the modular teaching programme to Nelson and Rotorua served to increase access to students in these areas. The Department has successfully recruited, in relation to the

University as a whole, comparatively high numbers of Maori and Pacific Island students.

In response to a request from the then Department of Justice, Probation Service (later renamed, the Department of Corrections, Community Corrections) and in conjunction with Victoria's Institute of Criminology, a criminal justice option was introduced to the Diploma in Social Work in 1995. This option entailed replacing one of the first year and two second year Social Work Diploma papers with criminal justice papers taught by the Institute of Criminology. The Institute has reservations about quality controls, the level of student academic skills, and a number of other concerns. The Social Work departmental submission also reports dissatisfaction with the focus of these courses in relation to qualifying social work education. The arrangement with the Institute of Criminology ends this year and will not be continued in 1998. The Panel considers that no new students should be admitted to the criminal justice option at this time.

4 The Department of Applied Social Sciences / MA (Applied) Board of Studies

The Department of Applied Social Sciences was established in 1995. The new department, under the chairmanship of Professor Fulcher, was responsible for the research and teaching programmes in social work, social science research, recreation and leisure studies, and rehabilitation studies. The argument for this combination of subject areas at the time was all three principal areas taught mature students, were governed by the MA (Applied) regulations, and that complementary research interests would potentially lead to synergies and fruitful collaborative research initiatives. The staff concerned report that these promised benefits have largely failed to materialise and that non-Social Work staff perceive themselves to be marginal to the larger social work area.

The Panel could see no clear benefits from the continuance of the current departmental structure.

The MA (Applied) Board of Studies appears not to have met for some time and seems to have collapsed. The Board's areas of responsibility are largely undertaken directly by the different departments concerned. Quality control mechanisms and the collective Human Ethics Committee no longer appear to function effectively. Staff in a number of the other departments report that disquiet about developments in the social work area are one of the factors involved.

5 Relationships within Victoria University of Wellington

The interdisciplinary nature of university social work education in a small social work section necessitates drawing on expertise from other departments of the University. The Social Work programme at Victoria does not draw on such expertise in public or social policy and the arrangements with Faculty of Law ended in 1995 and with the Institute of Criminology at the end of 1997.

A number of the Social Work staff submissions reported their perception that their programmes were not supported by the 'University administration' and portrayed a sort of 'siege mentality', understanding the Department as existing within an environment hostile to them and their programmes. It was apparent to the Panel that staff members seemed poorly informed about the administrative and managerial processes and procedures that operate in the University.

The departmental submission raised a number of issues, past and present, reporting that decisions by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (formerly, the Faculty of Arts) and the University senior management were prejudicial to the Department and had thwarted developments initiated by the Department. The relationships between the Department and the University, at the Faculty and central levels, appeared to be difficult and fraught. The submissions by the Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences and other senior University administrative staff confirmed that there were tensions between the administration and the Department.

The Panel considered that the poor working relations between the Social Work section of the Department of Applied Social Sciences and other Victoria departments and within the University as a whole has had a negative impact on the quality and range of the interdisciplinary nature of the Social Work programmes. Further, a great deal of energy and time had been expended on a series of 'battles' with the administration rather than on addressing the pressing issues concerning the quality of the Social Work programmes themselves. The forging of new relationships with other departments at Victoria should be a priority, in particular with the Faculty of Law, and the Institute of Criminology.

6 Administration and Management

Staff and student submissions highlight the difficulties within the Department in terms of management and administration. At the most basic level there appear to be an absence of functioning administrative systems, record keeping (see, below), and normal procedures and processes for handling the day-to-day work of an academic department. These difficulties have been increased by the fact that the main departmental office has been staffed by a series of temporary agency secretaries. The Panel considered that the appointment of a full-time permanent office manager would address these issues. Further problems have arisen due to

there being two departmental offices, one on campus and another in Featherston Street, with problematic coordination and communication between them. A number of submissions described the administrative arrangements as 'chaotic'. There also appears to be a lack of accountability when problems arise. The morale of members of staff appeared low.

The internal management structures do not appear to function well in terms of clearly delineated responsibilities. Meetings are irregular (on an 'as necessary basis') and decisions appear to be made outside of the established procedures. The assignment of teaching and other duties in some cases appears to be ad hoc and not part of a planned programme of such duties. There appear to be difficulties with medium- and long-term planning in terms of workloads, teaching and other duties and the assignment of specific responsibilities.

The complaints and grievance procedures in the Department do not appear to function effectively. One of the collective student submissions noted that complaints were received but not resolved. The same submission reported that a variety of complaints about different issues ranging from concern about particular lecturers, the content of courses, and staff confidentiality, were understood as 'bicultural' and 'cultural issues'.

The Chair of the University Disciplinary Committee reported to the Panel that the committee was 'alarmed' at the number and proportion of the total University cases that involved the Social Work programmes.

Different camps have developed within the Department along ethnic and gender lines and in some cases the tensions between such factions appears to have been fostered to a point beyond which working relations appear possible. These internal disputes seem to have impacted negatively on students and the teaching and research in the Department. There are numerous instances where the poor relationships between staff appear to have led to disputes having been taken into the student arena. Of particular concern to a number of staff and a significant number of students who made submissions was the reported lack of confidentiality in the Department.

A climate of fear appears to operate in the Department with a significant number of staff and students reporting their anxieties about retribution as a result of making submissions to the Panel. The environment in the Department, as it was reported to the Panel during the review, cannot be considered conducive to the teaching or learning of staff or students.

Staff reported that financial and other decision-making was not transparent. Staff members also reported that communication in the Department was a major problem with University information not disseminated and staff left 'in the dark' over a number of important issues.

In summary, the Department seem to be deeply divided on almost every major issue. These disputes include the very rationale for the current programme structure in terms of the appropriateness of the ways in which RPL and determinations about the ability of students are evaluated. The lack of trust between staff members makes the effective running of the Department impossible and has affected the progress of students. The culture of the Department seems to

be at odds with the professional ethos of the culture of the University in terms of staff and student representation and participation.

The difficulties in the management and administration of the Social Work programmes led the Panel to consider that the development of acceptable management procedures was essential. These should include transparent and equitable decision-making, professionally responsible modes of communication between members of staff and students, clear guidelines as to complaints and other procedures, and a system of monitoring such developments.

7 Human Resources

A number of submissions raised the issues of Social Work staff turnover and the procedures by which staff had been appointed. There was a lack of clarity on the part of staff as to the precise status of Social Work staff. Members of staff are regularly asked to teach on courses outside of their particular areas of expertise and there was seemingly a dearth of clarity and consistency about the precise nature of what constituted a reasonable teaching and administrative load. There appears to have been little planning in relation to teaching loads and teaching assignments have been frequently changed, sometimes with inadequate notice.

The human resource policy of the Department, or lack thereof, has led to the appointment of staff with minimal or no professional qualifications. More seriously some members of staff have been appointed at both the lecturer and senior lecturer level without university degrees at all. A number of the members of the current Social Work staff have had no university or university teaching experience and yet are teaching at the postgraduate level. The Department has failed to attract staff with appropriate qualifications and experience. The Panel considers that a schedule of the minimum qualifications necessary to teach social work at a university level be established. Every effort must be made to identify practitioners in the community with appropriate qualifications and academic backgrounds. The concern for equity in workloads must be extended to staff members under short-term contracts. Reservations were also voiced about the comparatively high turnover of women staff in the Department, five or six since 1992.

A number of staff reported inequities in teaching loads and inconsistency in the ways in which such loads were determined. The Department needs to develop an equitable, transparent and agreed system for assigning teaching and administrative duties.

The reported high level of teaching in the Social Work programmes raised difficulties for staff development. A number of staff in their submissions referred to the policy on staff development as 'non-existent'. Members of staff who had enrolled in courses have made little progress due to other pressures. Members of staff need to regularly update their knowledge of curriculum areas. There is an

urgent need for a policy on staff development integrated into longer-term planning of teaching and other duties.

8 Facilities

The facilities that are available for use in the teaching of the Social Work programmes are criticised in the departmental submission and the hope expressed that a purpose-built complex be developed for Social Work teaching and staff. A number of the student submissions contended that having staff offices and teaching split between the Victoria campus and central Wellington made access to staff more difficult and rendered their experience, as students in the Department, fragmentary. This split seems in part responsible for some of the communication difficulties between staff and the lack of a collective sense of themselves as a department. In addition students reported that the separation from the University and in particular the Library was problematic.

The Panel received a report on the computing facilities in the Department by a member of staff who was concerned about the lack of basic computing skills of Social Work students and some Social Work staff. This submission included details of the 12 machines available in Featherston Street and additional computers on campus although it was also reported that the Department had failed to integrate basic training within the Social Work programmes and that the available computers were under used. A similar comment was made regarding the video and other facilities that are available for the use of staff and students.

The Panel considers that a single site for social work education is required.

9 Departmental Development Plans

The departmental submission offers a detailed programme for future developments. The Panel considered a number of these proposals to be significant, including the need for a second professional qualification (see, Recommendation Seven below) and the location of the social work education and facilities on a single site. Given the Panel's recommendations that a comprehensive restructuring of the existing programmes be undertaken the Panel recommends that this development plan be consulted by the Social Work Planning Committee (see, below).

10 Teaching and the Management of Teaching

The Diploma in Social Work and MA (Applied) in Social Work share a basic eight-course structure, including two supervised placements. The entry criteria as implemented are unclear and some students report their confusion about which of the two qualifications they could have applied for and the differences between them. Students were unsure of the relationship between the two qualifications (a perplexity shared by some University staff). For example, why were the two courses so similar in structure and yet for official purposes the Diploma appeared to be valued as the equivalent of only 72 unspecified points at 100 level, as part of a 360-point BA degree? Most courses are double labelled (Diploma and MA) and jointly taught. Formally there are different assessment criteria for MA students although there is a lack of clarity about what this actually involves. A significant number of students reported the gap between the course outlines and information in the handbook and the realities of what was actually taught.

The complaint made in the majority of submissions by students was the 'last minute' organisation of courses. Course times were changed, venues altered, and classes cancelled without adequate notice, or staff just didn't turn up. Assignment details and deadlines were also changed and reading and course materials were often available later than promised. One reported case involved the flying up of the entire Nelson class to attend a module different from the one advertised or expected. Although there are such changes in every department, the Panel considered that the frequency with which this issue was raised in the submissions suggested a situation beyond that of the normal requirements to respond to untoward events.

A related issue was the heavy reliance on a particular mode of teaching. The interactive, 'action learning' model and small group and role-play exercises were used in the majority of courses. Many students, both Diploma and MA, felt that while this teaching method was useful it was overused at the expense of other methods and was not suited to in-depth work in a particular area. In addition the interactive/small group method was reliant on tight coordination and supervision and many small group sessions were unsupervised or inadequately supervised. A great deal of module time appears to have been spent attempting to resolve personal conflicts that arose as the result of students being encouraged to express their own initial views. Many interactive sessions were perceived as unproductive, inconclusive and inadequately structured and were described as little more than poorly focussed, open-class discussions.

A third issue was that of extensive repetition of exercises in different courses and years of study. For example, the whole module on strengths perspectives was repeated in both years of study, as was the active listening exercise, and the interpersonal skills self-assessment exercise. Students report that the same exercises and even video clips were repeated in different courses and that exercises were repeated with minor variations, as in the case of the 'social work land' exercise followed later by the 'community land' exercise. The Panel was informed that while these exercises were deemed useful first time round,

subsequent repetitions were not, and reduced the time available for the learning of new material.

The submissions also raised the assessment of assignments. Students complained that expectations were not clearly communicated and that there were inconsistencies across modules and within them. The regular late return of assignments was raised again and again, with reports of essays being returned after the end of modules. The quality and usefulness of staff feedback was also questioned. The Panel was presented with examples of marked work to examine. The Panel agreed with the students concerned that it did appear as if the markers' comments were of limited value and that no real justification had been given for the mark assigned.

The Panel considered that there was an urgent need for the establishment of a system for keeping student files; records of student progress; and, records of meetings of staff and students, particularly concerning complaints.

The Panel in their consideration of these concerns felt that a broader range of teaching methods could be utilised and that if the interactive teaching mode was to continue to be used then additional staff training would be necessary. An examination of the course materials led the Panel to conclude that the courses do not draw on the best international or national practices or literature and that the Victoria teaching materials were dated and required revision and updating.

Finally in this regard the Panel considered that more should be done to encourage academic excellence on the part of students.

10.1 MA (Applied)

The submissions from MA (Applied) students and the Postgraduate Students' Association focussed on the level of the courses. The majority of the MA students, past and present, contended that the work was not at graduate level. Many of these students have already completed first degrees and reported that the academic rigour and content level of the MA was lower than their first degree courses. Students reported that the courses were not intellectually demanding and were just too easy. Other issues raised include the requirements for more sophisticated theoretical approaches to social work and the desire for the inclusion of other perspectives and subject areas, such as gender issues. Many submissions stressed the lack of integration between the different required courses. The one exception to this was the research paper.

Complaints were made about the frequent changing of course times and locations; the ways in which courses do not follow the prospectus; and, the generally chaotic organisation of courses. For example, MA students wanted to know why the research module was taught on the Marae. Students seemed to be particularly concerned about the levels of preparation of some lecturing staff and their evident lack of expertise or up-to-date knowledge in some areas. The unclear nature of the specific and different criteria for the assessment of their work was an issue for many MA students. It was also reported to the Panel that students were anxious about the neutrality of markers.

Many students complained about a learning environment that they viewed as non-constructive and in a significant number of cases characterised in terms such as, 'unsafe', 'unprofessional', and 'unethical' (see, below).

Finally, a number of the current MA students expressed their doubts about the value of their degree, in a number of cases this was a response to the comments they received during the period of their placements and in others based on hearsay.

10.2 Diploma in Social Work

For many of the Diploma students this is their first experience of tertiary education and so they are not in a position to make comparisons with other tertiary courses and institutions. When questioned by the Panel, students in all three centres reported the same difficulties with changes in time and venue and similar problems in contacting staff. A number of Diploma students too felt that the work was undemanding and reported the differences between the level and demands of courses taught by non-Social Work staff and those taught by the Department. A number of Diploma students also wanted a greater emphasis on theory in the courses, and others desired improved preparation and supervision of the research project. Some Diploma students are unclear as to why they were not allowed to enrol as MA students and were confused about the entry criteria to both courses and the differences between them. Many Diploma students were pleased with their progress and a number expressed great pride in the progress made in their studies.

11 Joint Teaching of Diploma / MA (Applied)

The joint teaching of Diploma and MA students is a distinctive feature of the Victoria course. This co-teaching is presented as the context for cross-cultural communication and the bicultural basis of the Victoria programmes. As was noted above, the majority of MA students find the level unsatisfactory and unacceptable. The course teaching is, they report, set at the academic level of the Diploma students. The differences in the different student cohorts appears to be emphasised by staff as part of their pedagogical programme almost as if the highlighting of these factors is considered necessary for the teaching to be seen as effective.

The Diploma students, in particular Maori, expressed their view that they would like the teaching to be separate, and also found joint teaching undesirable. Both groups of students found the co-teaching an additional strain and were generally unsure of the degree to which cross-cultural dialogue was actually taking place. A significant number of MA students denied that such exchanges were meaningful, helpful, or sound preparation for life as a professional social worker.

The Panel considered that the complaint against the co-teaching of Diploma and MA students was a justified complaint and that it was not in the interests of either group of students for this to continue, except in the context of specific courses focussing on bicultural and multicultural perspectives.

12 Modular Teaching

The introduction of modular teaching offers greater access for students in employment and others with commitments to complete courses, particularly for Maori, women and mature students. Each paper is taught in two, one-week full-time modules. The Department handbook reports that each one-week module consists of 'at least 27 hours of contact time' and is taught by at least two staff members, with Marae-based modules having at least three staff. This block teaching is very intensive and students gave mixed reports of the benefits of this mode of teaching over the more usual regular 50-minute slots. A number of Diploma and MA students clearly preferred the block mode of teaching as it allowed them to concentrate on their studies separate from family and other commitments, while others found it less conducive to their learning. A proportion of the MA students would have preferred more traditional time arrangements. A significant number of students reported that modules often started later than advertised during the day and finished earlier than scheduled. A number of Diploma students raised the issue of the costs incurred by modular teaching and improved communication about such costs is advisable, others asked that parking be provided.

The Panel considered that modular teaching had significant benefits for many students in terms of access and that future developments should consider the inclusion of modular teaching (Recommendation 7.3).

13 Distance Programmes

The introduction of modular teaching programmes for Diploma and MA students at Rotorua and Nelson has served to increase overall numbers and to offer courses to many students who would otherwise be unable to study, including Maori, women, and mature students. The programmes at these two centres are run in conjunction with the local polytechnics. Students at both centres reported feeling rather separate from Wellington and Victoria University. Access to specialist library and other materials needs to be improved for students in Rotorua and Nelson. The programmes respond to an evident need in these communities.

13.1 Rotorua

During the Review the issue of whether new students would be admitted to the Rotorua programme appeared to be one of the Department's major concerns. The Panel received many submissions focussed solely on this question. The Panel members who went to Rotorua were told that the objectivity of the Panel and the Review was called into question due to the fact that the University had reached such a decision before the Review had taken place. This was a charge also made by some social work staff in Wellington. Most of those who made oral submissions seemed to have understood the University's decision as directed against them and the Department of Applied Social Sciences, and to be without foundation or reasons. A number of rumours were reported to the Panel including the University's decision to terminate all Rotorua programmes.

The oral and written submissions from students in the Rotorua programme reflected many of the same administrative difficulties as the other centres. In addition the relationship between the Polytechnic and the Victoria staff has broken down almost completely. The submission by the Polytechnic staff raised a series of quality issues, questioned the level of the course and the entry criteria, and reported safety concerns. In addition, they were critical of the management and administration of the programmes, stressing in particular the apparent lack of accountability over expenditure and finances. The Polytechnic submission also reported that decisions were made by Victoria staff members without consultations with the Polytechnic or with the University administration. The Rotorua student and community group submissions indicated a high level of community support for the Victoria programmes and students reported their educational achievements. The Panel concluded that although there were major quality control concerns about the Rotorua programmes these appeared to be generic to the programmes as a whole. There also appeared, however, to be problems specific to Rotorua, particularly in terms of the relationship with the Polytechnic and the absence of clear lines of accountability for the programmes.

13.2 Nelson

The Panel members who went to Nelson reported that the programme appeared to be well run and the coordinator seems to have successfully addressed a number of earlier problem areas. There was some disquiet concerning the costs of travel, particularly to the Marae. Maori Diploma students expressed their desire for additional Maori content and still considered the course mono-cultural. The Panel considered that many of the difficulties experienced by Nelson students were due to the central organisation of the programmes and that after the implementation of the recommendations of the Review the Nelson programme should continue to offer MA (Applied) and Diploma courses in the region. It is hoped that the Bachelor of Social Work, or a part thereof, would also be offered in Nelson.

14 Practica / Practice Teaching

Victoria requires its Social Work students to complete a 14-week, 70-day placement in an appropriate agency, in each year of the two-year programmes. This constitutes approximately 50 percent of the total curriculum time. The Panel recognised the difficulties that all Social Work programmes have in finding suitable placements for students following the ending of student units and the restructuring of social welfare services. It is this single component of the programme that generated the most regular student criticism. Students complained about the additional costs involved, including clothing and transport.

The agencies that take on Victoria students complained that often students were poorly prepared for their first placement after only eight weeks of the course and argued that it would be more valuable somewhat later in the programme. A number of agencies criticised the course entry criteria, as some students on placement appeared to have limited basic skills. Agencies also complained about the lack of planning on the part of the Department, with cases reported of notice being given only days before students were to arrive. Further, agencies appear unsure of their responsibilities and the Department's expectations in terms of placement supervision. There are also complaints about the regularity of tutor supervision, the difficulties of contacting tutors and other Victoria staff. A number of agencies reported with regret that they were unwilling to take on Victoria placement students because of these difficulties.

Students report their lack of preparation for their practice placements and the lack of clear guidelines of their own and the agency's responsibilities. A number of students reported quite unsuitable placements and others that they had to re-arrange their placement with other agencies. Some students report having had to arrange their own placements. Different practice tutors appear to have quite different ideas of their responsibilities with some receiving a considerable number of student complaints, particularly in relation to the regularity of contact. Students also report inconsistencies in the ways in which the practical is assessed, ranging from assessment by the tutor, or by the agency, or by self-assessment.

There have been a number of attempts to address the difficulties that have arisen with student placements, such as the introduction in 1988 of the practice tutorial. However, it appeared to the Panel that the placement arrangements seemed to be inadequately planned, administered, organised, and supervised. Accountability also seemed to be a major concern. Placements have been the cause of frustration and confusion to both students and placement agencies and have led to a number of negative appraisals of the Victoria programme by major agencies.

The Panel considered that the practice placements, a vital part of the Victoria Social Work education programme, needed to be the responsibility of a single person, or a single person in each centre, with an overall Wellington-based coordinator. Procedures need to be set in place to plan, administer, organise, and ensure proper supervision of student placements. Agencies should be consulted and agreements worked out over expectations and responsibilities. The Panel also

noted that even though there was disquiet about the organisation and administration of placements many students found the experience an invaluable and integral part of the education as social workers.

15 Teaching Quality and Level

The submission from the former VUWSA Education Coordinator reported that a significant proportion of all complaints about teaching quality came from Social Work students. The Department generated a larger number of complaints than any other department in the University, and a larger number than most of the faculties. In 1996 VUWSA surveyed the Diploma and MA students taking Social Work programmes at Victoria. Forty-five percent of students reported that teaching was poor or very poor. This result is consistent with the University's own UTDC evaluations. Using the UTDC Index of Quality, Social Work teaching was below the Faculty and University average and more significantly below the UTDC acceptable level of quality. A number of submissions by Social Work students also reported that Social Work staff were frequently present at the end of course evaluations, a practice expressly forbidden in the UTDC regulations and likely to distort the results.

The Panel was presented with the transcript of a lecture given by a Social Work staff member to postgraduate students. The level of the lecture was not only below that acceptable in any university but was almost incoherent. There are problems with teaching quality across a range of the current Social Work courses. The Panel considers that there are serious issues concerning the quality of teaching on the Social Work programmes that must be addressed before the incorporation of existing elements into new teaching structures. The staff whose courses are subject to complaints should be encouraged to complete courses in teaching methods at university level.

Delays in the return of students' work are unacceptable. Students have too frequently been denied the benefits of feedback before having to submit further work. The variable quality of markers' comments within courses and across courses also raises issues about a professional approach to students' learning. The Panel considers that Social Work staff should follow the guidelines set out in the Student Charter. The VUWSA oral submission focussed on the Charter, and reported that the Department was in breach of the majority of its provisions. The joint teaching of MA and Diploma students has been discussed above.

Student submissions reported the value of guest lecturers. The quality of the teaching on the Social Work programmes which was reported to the Panel seemed to be of an unacceptably low level. The level of the MA (Applied) programme was not at the required postgraduate level.

16 Bicultural Programmes and Cultural Safety

Among the topics most frequently commented upon in the written and oral submissions was the bicultural nature of Victoria's Social Work programmes and the related issues of cultural safety. A central part of the rationale for the joint teaching of the MA (Applied) and Diploma students is the bicultural and cross-cultural communication dimensions of such teaching. In addition, there are specific papers addressing bicultural issues, some located on the Marae, and the integration of bicultural teaching throughout the programme. Most student submissions reported that the bicultural nature of the degree courses was a factor in their choice of the Victoria programmes. A proportionately large number of submissions, however, while recognising that bicultural teaching is an essential part of their education as social workers were highly critical of the ways in which this was done at Victoria.

MA and Diploma students complained that the context in which cultural issues were raised was confrontational and did not allow for discussion or genuine debate. A significant number of submissions by non-Maori students wrote or spoke of students being humiliated, 'put down', and verbally abused by staff. A number of students reported that not being Maori denied them the right to comment in a class in which they were members. Staff behavioural abuse was also reported. Non-Maori student submissions regarded what they perceived to be as 'reverse racism' as counter-productive, and claimed that as genuine debate was denied there was little opportunity for cross-cultural communication. It was reported that Maori students were treated differently and were not placed in these demanding and threatening situations. Students also informed the Panel that they felt 'set up' by staff and that whatever answers they gave to questions led to the charge of being a racist. A significant number of submissions perceived this as an unsafe teaching and learning environment. Non-Maori students reported that they had made frequent complaints concerning about this situation.

A submission by Maori Diploma students also indicated that they were unhappy with this model of bicultural education and viewed it as not addressing their needs. They desired a more relevant and informed Maori component with attention being given to more contemporary interpretations and understandings of the Treaty of Waitangi. The submission by Maori staff also reported difficulties and dissatisfaction with the programme's bicultural teaching, and described the first encounter with Maori culture for many students as the beginning of 'the next two years in a state of discomfort'. Both Maori students and staff wanted a separate Maori environment for the teaching of social work.

It should also be noted that while most students personally recognised some value in a confrontational approach to bicultural learning, even these students indicated that others had been silenced, offended, and placed in unacceptable positions. Maori and non-Maori students felt that the issues raised by this mode of teaching would be an asset in the workplace.

It would be less significant if this approach to cross-cultural communication and bicultural education were a single course with that title but this approach is the norm for the majority of courses in the Victoria Social Work programmes. The Panel considered that the teaching and learning environment was unsafe and the approach unlikely to foster positive learning outcomes.

Many student submissions claimed that complaints about these and other matters were met with the response that these were cultural issues, or that they were being racist. It was clear to the Panel that claims for more theory, or a less confrontational environment are legitimate requests and not necessarily cultural issues at all. The submission by Maori staff supported the students' contention, in that they viewed complaints about content, or staff attitudes or behaviour, as cultural problems within an institutional context that was still racist.

The Panel acknowledges the difficulties in constructing bicultural social work education programmes and the commitment by the Department to this development.

17 Professional Training and Relationships with the Profession

The submissions from the various social work agencies focussed on the evaluation of MA (Applied) and Diploma in Social Work graduates from the point of view of the profession, and on the difficulties with placements (see, above). The Panel has restricted its comments in this section to the submissions from the major employing agencies. The majority of the submissions from these agencies reported major concerns about the preparation for professional life of those who had completed their social work training at Victoria. The Panel felt that it was important to note that relationships between educators and agencies have been difficult in the last few years largely as a result of the national restructuring of the social welfare services.

In particular, Diploma students were reported as deficient in a number of ways. Basic literacy and report-writing skills were a problem in a number of cases. Lack of awareness of the legislation that governs the professional activity of social workers, such as, the Children, Young Persons and Their Families Act 1989, was another concern. The issue raised by many of these agencies was the lack of core social work competencies, including accurate record keeping, interviewing experience and skills, and the ability to develop a critical distance from their clients and work. Another repeated complaint was that Victoria students have a poor grasp of social work theory, particularly of the theoretical models which serve to situate their day-to-day work, and of the relationship of theory to practice. Another repeated complaint was that the programmes included too great an emphasis on cultural issues at the expense of a range of necessary social work skills. A number of agency submissions considered that the research component of

the Diploma would be better spent on the acquisition of basic skills. Victoria students were not well informed about the recent social policy reforms.

The agencies report that some social workers with the Victoria Diploma lacked the critical thinking necessary to act responsibly or independently as social workers. A number of agencies considered that many students lacked a depth of knowledge and contended that the Victoria course was not academically demanding enough as preparation for the realities of contemporary social work practice. A number of the agency submissions were highly critical of the Victoria programme and reported that in a number of cases students were 'professionally unsafe'. One agency characterised the Victoria Diploma student as a person who spoke of their self-esteem and offered opinions, rather than draw on the established bodies of knowledge and experience. Also, some areas of social work theory and practice were seemingly neglected at Victoria, including disability studies, working with older people, mental health, family violence and child abuse.

A number of the agency submissions were most positive about particular MA (Applied) or Diploma students but reported that this appeared to be in spite of, rather than due to the Social Work programmes.

A number of the agencies reported their reluctance to employ Victoria graduates and their preference for the graduates of other programmes, and their unwillingness to release staff to attend Victoria programmes. Two of the largest agencies wrote of the inadequate response of the Department to the communication of their concerns and a number of other agencies reported what they termed the 'unresponsiveness' of the Department to the profession. Agency reports included the view that while promises had been made to address concerns apparently little action had been taken and the same problems would arise at a later date.

From the submissions made to the Panel by various agencies, it appeared that the Department's relationship with major social work agencies was poor. Poor relationships with the major social work agencies would have a potentially detrimental effect on the employment opportunities of Victoria graduates. Potentially, or actually these poor relationships may also damage the reputation of the University. In a field such as professional social work education the relationship between a university department and the professional agencies is of considerable importance and a significant measure of the success of that programme.

18 Staff Research

The Panel reviewed the published research by Social Work staff members. The Panel considered that while a small number of senior staff do publish regularly, although not always in the area of social work, or in the form of substantial articles in international journals, the general level of research productivity of the Department as a whole was low. A number of staff have a low publishing rate or

have published only slight articles and/or short reports. Some staff have little experience of research and little opportunity to pursue research as they are still enrolled in degree or other courses. It was considered that the departmental publications had had little national or international impact and that the Department urgently needed a research policy and clear directives on staff development.

19 Conclusions

The Panel considers that the rationale that underlies the current programme is in need of urgent revision and re-thinking. The plan to teach two very different groups of students together may not in itself be impossible and may well foster cross-cultural communication and bicultural perspectives, but in practice it seems to have reduced the educational possibilities and opportunities of Social Work students. The principle of co-teaching also appears to lie behind the chosen mode of teaching and particular staff appointments. It was reported to the Panel that members of staff, who appeared to have little or no university experience, had been asked to teach at the postgraduate level. In addition to the problems this immediately raises, those staff members have been asked to operate in a context which appears poorly managed. They also do not seem to have been supported in their efforts by a programme of staff development. Similarly, students do not appear to have been protected. Inexperienced members of staff would appear not to have ensured a safe and constructive teaching environment.

The Panel also considered that the Social Work programmes evidenced a commitment to the development of models of Maori social work practice and hoped that these developments would continue and be enhanced within the new structures. The developments since 1986, particularly in relation to the introduction of modular teaching and the use of different regional centres, have been successful in attracting Maori, women and mature students. The Panel considered that these developments had happened too quickly and extensively and that consolidation was much more important at this time than further expansion.

The Panel did receive a number of positive submissions and it is clear that some students have found the course to be of great benefit and a positive experience. Also, a number of the staff do teach and supervise students competently and professionally and particular lecturers and courses have been reported as being excellent. It seems to the Panel, that even these lecturers have had to operate in what appears to be an administrative shambles and in a situation which similarly appears fraught with tensions. Their efforts, in terms of the programmes as a whole, appear to have been undermined as a result.

The course does seem to have served the general interests of a number of Diploma students well. Students with little or no tertiary experience have completed first qualifications which are, formally at least, at the postgraduate level. The Panel considers that while this first tertiary training is valuable and the consciousness-raising of students is of importance it should not be confused with a postgraduate-

level professional qualification. There is a place at Victoria for both a first tertiary qualification for Maori, and others, interested in social work and social welfare, designed by Maori for Maori. There is also a place for the professional university training of social workers, designed for those with a degree in another subject or as a first-degree course. The Panel expressly considers that the latter is important at Victoria, in line with national and Australian norms. An undergraduate degree course is also the path favoured by the social work agencies and associations in New Zealand as the normal entry qualification to the profession. Bicultural learning and cross-cultural communication are essential ingredients of a relevant social work education in New Zealand and the Panel considered that both should be incorporated in the new structure of qualifications (see, below).

The Panel considers that the current arrangement by which the three teaching and research areas (social work, social science research, and recreation and leisure studies) are grouped together in a single department has not served the academic interests of any of these areas. Further, the difficulties in the social work area appear to have impacted negatively on the other two. The promised research collaborations and synergies have failed to materialise, the MA (Applied) Board of Studies appears to be largely defunct, and inadequate administrative arrangements exist to ensure the effective management of the three units, singly or collectively. Accordingly, the Panel recommends that the Department of Applied Social Sciences be disestablished immediately (Recommendation One).

The closing of the current Department of Applied Social Sciences leads on to the Panel's second recommendation. The two academic staff in Recreation and Leisure and their programme should be transferred to another department within the University (Recommendation 2.2). In a similar way, the Social Science Research staff member should be transferred to the Department of Sociology and Social Policy (Recommendation 2.3).

The submissions from Maori staff and students clearly indicate the desire for greater autonomy and self-determination in the planning and provision of courses. This is consistent with the developments envisaged in *Puao-te-Ata-tu: Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. Maori staff members saw a parallel Maori system of social work education as a natural progression in the path towards Maori self-determination. The Panel recommends that the full-time, permanent Maori staff be transferred to the School of Maori Studies as soon as is practicably possible to form a new Kaupapa Maori Social Work unit within that School. The unit will be responsible for the development and revision of the current undergraduate Diploma in Social Work (the Diploma of Kaupapa Maori Social Work) as a refashioned qualification specially addressing the needs and requirements of Maori students and communities. The Panel considered this to be an innovative and exciting development which would foster the development of Maori models of social work theory and practice.

The Maori Social Work members of staff report that they are under considerable strain in terms of workload and their perception is that they bear the burden of the responsibility for the bicultural aspects of the programme. These pressures have been increased by the persistent complaints about the joint teaching of largely

graduate MA (Applied) students and Diploma students; the tensions that are evident in the current social work model of bicultural teaching for staff and students; and the difficult personal relationships between current Social Work staff. The successes of the programme in attracting Maori students should be recognised and built on. The Panel, particularly after the visits to Nelson and Rotorua, concluded that significant relationships had been developed between Victoria and iwi and other groups to promote the tertiary education of Maori and that the Diploma programme had broad levels of community support.

It also became clear to the Panel that these very successes were consistent with a series of issues raised about the quality and level of the Diploma, particularly by the social work agencies and other academic staff. For a significant number of students the Diploma was their first experience of tertiary education. Many of these students appear to have made considerable progress and were rightly proud of their academic achievements and the hurdles, both in terms of self-esteem and skill acquisition, that had to be overcome in order to participate and complete course requirements. The educational background of many of these students places limits on the level of the Diploma programme. As noted above, additional programmes are required to ensure that the necessary skills for tertiary-level work are obtained and fostered.

Maori staff spoke of the difficulties that arise when students have to be introduced to aspects of their own culture, learn new ways of thinking about their own culture, and engage in a university-level training course. The course appears to fill an evident demand on the part of Maori communities for a social work qualification for Maori providers. That need, however, seems to be better described as a first tertiary qualification for Maori students with a particular emphasis on social work and welfare than the equivalent to the current MA (Applied) as a professional social work qualification. Further, it appears that many Diploma students find employment in iwi social services and community groups. The programme would draw on the staff of the new Department of Social Work for the provision of a number of the required social work courses.

The Panel considered that the course might also be appropriate for Pacific Island students and that consultations should take place in this regard about student and community needs. When numbers warrant the appointment of a Pacific Island student coordinator should be considered.

Maori Social Work staff should be able to draw on the existing expertise and experience of other staff in the School of Maori Studies to teach some of the 'cultural' aspects of the Diploma. This should allow these staff members to devote more of their energies to the development of indigenous models of social work, professional development, and research.

Accordingly, the Panel further recommends that particular attention be given to the need for appropriate staff development for the Maori Social Work staff in the context of the School of Maori Studies (Recommendation 2.1).

The Panel recommend that a new Department of Social Work be established and staffed for the beginning of the 1999 academic year or as soon thereafter as is practicably possible (Recommendation One).

It was reported to the Panel that the current Professor of Social Work's tenure as departmental chairperson ends at the end of 1997 after a period of eight years, with the exception of an interim arrangement for the coordination of the Social Work programmes in 1995. This extended period of management responsibilities has greatly reduced the time available for his research.

It appears to the Panel that a range of issues identified in this review have not been adequately addressed. This has led the Panel to recommend that there should be a change in the management to lead the planning and setting up of a new Department of Social Work at Victoria.

The Panel noted the innovative nature of the Social Work programme developed by the current professor, particularly in relation to the multi-centre, modular mode of delivery and the priority of the bicultural components within the programme. The Panel considered that one of the weakest elements of the current Social Work programmes was the underlying pedagogical rationale for its current structure and content. Accordingly, the Panel felt that it was important that the professor be encouraged to take the opportunity to reflect on his considerable experience in programme planning and implementation and to disseminate his findings in a substantial form to other researchers in the field. The Panel considered that the professor should be asked to begin his period of research and study leave as soon as is possible.

One suggestion made by the Panel was that the Vice-Chancellor might consider (Recommendation 2.4) the conversion of the current professorial position into a research position, perhaps in the context of the establishment of a Centre for Social Work. The Panel felt that the responsibility for this decision should rest with the Vice-Chancellor and that the decision concerning the duration, nature and review of any such arrangements should be his alone.

The Panel spent a considerable part of its limited time considering its recommendation in this regard and was advised by members of the Senior Management Group and Human Resources personnel in making this recommendation.

Recommendation Three is the attempt by the Panel to address a series of issues that should necessarily arise during the period between the closing of the current Department of Applied Social Sciences and the establishment of the new Department of Social Work. These provisions are designed to ensure that current students will be allowed to complete their courses of study. It is important that responsibility for overseeing the transition period is clearly assigned.

The Panel recommends that the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences be responsible for the implementation of the transitional arrangements and the assignment of appropriate Social Work staff to maintain the programme during the transition (Recommendations 3.1, 3.3). The Dean should appoint an interim coordinator, preferably from among the existing Social Work staff. The coordinator should manage the programme and ensure that liaison with the Kaupapa Maori Social Work unit is established and maintained in order to provide the bicultural components of the existing MA (Applied) and Diploma programmes (Recommendations 3.2, 3.3, 3.6). A number of other specific recommendations

relate to the practicalities of the transitional period (Recommendations 3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8).

The Panel considered that given the above recommendations it would be inappropriate to admit new MA (Applied) or Diploma students to the Rotorua or Nelson programmes for 1998 and recommends that a new intake be limited to Wellington only (Recommendation 3.7).

Recommendation Four proposes the establishment of a Social Work Planning Committee as soon as is practicably possible to prepare a strategic plan for a new Department of Social Work, within the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. The provisions of this recommendation outline the responsibilities of this committee (Recommendations 4.2 - 4.6), including the preparation of a draft position description for a new professional appointment, to chair the new Department of Social Work (Recommendation 4.3).

Recommendation Five details the composition of the Social Work Planning Committee. The Panel sought to ensure that the committee would include representatives from appropriate departments at Victoria, the social work profession, and other relevant bodies. The intention of this wide representation is to develop a range of working relationships within Victoria and with the profession at large.

Recommendations Seven and Eight outline the new qualifications structure for the new department. The Panel recommends that a new three-year Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) degree be introduced (Recommendation 7.1). The Panel carefully considered the arguments for and against a three-year undergraduate programme in terms of the international and national models of first professional qualifications in social work and in the light of the submissions from social work agencies detailing of their requirements. The draft programme for the new degree should be developed by a small working party established by the Social Work Planning Committee and should include measures to ensure broad access and the consideration of the inclusion of modular teaching (Recommendations 7.1, 7.2).

The working party should also prepare a plan for the establishment of Master of Social Work (MSW) programme as soon as is appropriate. The Master of Social Work will be a second professional qualification at research degree level. This qualification would be designed to allow those with a degree in social work to pursue their studies at an advanced level. The new Department of Social Work should also develop a more formal programme of higher degrees by research (Recommendation 7.4).

The success of the new BSW and MSW programmes and the revised Diploma in Social Work (Kaupapa Maori) should in part rely on adequate liaison and a good working relationship between the new department and the School of Maori Studies. Only this relationship can ensure that the bicultural components of the BSW and MSW, and the specialist social work components of the Diploma, are integrated into the respective programmes. The responsibility for this liaison should be the task of a designated person from the School of Maori Studies, and the interim coordinator under the transition arrangements (Recommendation 3.6). During the period of the planning of the new degree structures it should be the

responsibility of the working party (Recommendation 7.5), and that of the new chairperson after the establishment of the new department. The working party should also revise, clarify the entry level, status, structure and future of the MA (Applied) in Social Work (Recommendation 7.3).

The final recommendation (Recommendation Eight) by the Panel is that the working party develop a clear system of articulation arrangements with respect to the relationship between the Diploma, BSW, MA (Applied) in Social Work, MSW, and PhD qualifications. Students report confusion over the current relations between the different qualifications offered. Recognition of Prior Learning should still operate in the entry procedures to the Diploma in Social Work (Kaupapa Maori). The protocols for such entry should be published and transparent. Students who need it should be required to complete study skills or other preparatory courses as entry qualifications to the Diploma programme (Recommendation 8.1).

Entry to the BSW should be under the normal University entrance criteria (Recommendation 8.2). Students who have completed the Diploma in Social Work (Kaupapa Maori) should normally be eligible to apply to enter the BSW programme (Recommendation 8.3). Entry to the MA (Applied) in Social Work, a first professional qualification, should be for those who already hold a first degree in the humanities and social sciences in subjects other than social work (Recommendation 8.4). Entry to the Master of Social Work should be restricted for those who already hold a first degree in social work (Recommendation 8.5).

This system should serve to ensure that students have the opportunity of obtaining first professional qualifications and where appropriate develop their professional expertise and qualifications. The Panel would expect that a significant number of students who complete the Diploma in Social Work (Kaupapa Maori) would continue their studies at the BSW level.

Victoria University of Wellington has provided leadership in social work education for more than fifty years. It is the Panel's hope and expectation that the implementation of these recommendations will allow Victoria University of Wellington to offer a world-class, student-centred, and profession-responsive programme, and to regain its national pre-eminence in the field of professional social work education in New Zealand.

20 Recommendations

Recommendation One

The current Department of Applied Social Sciences be disestablished immediately. A new Department of Social Work be established and staffed for the beginning of 1999.

Recommendation Two

- 2.1 The three full-time Maori staff members be transferred to the School of Maori Studies to form a new Kaupapa Maori Social Work unit to be established there as soon as is practicably possible. This unit to develop and revise the undergraduate Diploma in Social Work, particular attention to be given to quality issues. Provision be made to ensure appropriate staff development.
- 2.2 The two staff in Recreation and Leisure Studies and their programmes be transferred to another department within the University.
- 2.3 The Social Science Research person and the programme be transferred to the Department of Sociology and Social Policy.
- 2.4 The Vice-Chancellor to consider the conversion of the current professorial position into a research professorship, perhaps with the establishment of a Centre for the Study of Social Work. This would allow the outgoing chairperson to devote his energies to further research endeavours. The Panel believes that this professor's unique and considerable experience in the development of bicultural social work education be disseminated internationally.

Recommendation Three

Transitional Arrangements

The following arrangements operate between now and the establishment of the new Department of Social Work.

- 3.1 The Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences be responsible for the implementation of the transitional arrangements.
- 3.2 The Dean to appoint an interim Social Work management coordinator, preferably one of the Social Work lecturers.
- 3.3 the Dean, in consultation with the interim coordinator, to determine the staff necessary to fulfil teaching obligations under the transitional arrangements.
- 3.4 Such staff be informally attached to an appropriate faculty, department or unit within the University.

- 3.5 This coordinator to report to the Social Work Planning Committee (see recommendation four).
- 3.6 The coordinator to:
- 3.6.1 ensure that provision is made to allow currently-enrolled Social Work students to continue with their studies for degree and diploma courses for which they are enrolled as of 14 November 1997.
 - 3.6.2 ensure that liaison is established and maintained with the new Kaupapa Maori Unit in the School of Maori Studies in order to ensure the bicultural component of the existing courses.
- 3.7 For 1998 a new intake to be admitted to the Diploma in Social Work and MA (Applied) programmes in Wellington only.
The 1998 MA (Applied) in Social Work intake to be the responsibility of the interim coordinator.
The 1998 Diploma in Social Work intake to be taught by the staff of the new Kaupapa Maori Unit in conjunction with the interim coordinator.
- 3.8 The Dean in conjunction with the interim coordinator to be responsible for ensuring that appropriate quality assurance practices and procedures are in place.

Recommendation Four

A Social Work Planning Committee to be urgently established, ideally to hold its first meeting before the end of 1997.

The Social Work Planning Committee to:

- 4.1 prepare a strategic plan for the establishment of a new Department of Social Work within the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- 4.2 devise comprehensive quality assurance policies and procedures (in accordance with the best University practice and the Student Charter) to ensure the development of a high quality, professionally responsive social work programme at Victoria University of an international standard.
- 4.3 to prepare a position description for a new professorial appointment and conduct an international search for the new Professor of Social Work to chair the new Department of Social Work. The new professor to be appointed as early as possible in 1998.
- 4.4 to review policy and practice in respect of practicum components of the programmes and to investigate the re-establishment of student units.
- 4.5 to review administrative arrangements and staffing.
- 4.6 to review teaching accommodation and reuniting the Social Work staff on a single site.

Recommendation Five

The Social Work Planning Committee to be comprised of:

- 5.1 A VUW Professor who will chair this committee.
- 5.2 The VUW Professor of Maori Studies.
- 5.3 The VUW Professor of Criminology, or the VUW Professor of Sociology and Social Policy.
- 5.4 The Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences.
- 5.5 The Interim Coordinator
- 5.6 A senior representative from Children, Young Persons and Their Families Service National Office.
- 5.7 A senior representative from the Division of Community Corrections, within the Department of Corrections.
- 5.8 A senior representative from the Department of Social Welfare, Social Policy Agency.
- 5.9 A senior academic from another New Zealand social work programme.
- 5.10 The Executive Director of the Federation of Voluntary Welfare Organisations.
- 5.11 A senior representative from Te Puni Kokiri.
- 5.12 A social work professional adviser from the local Crown Health Enterprise.
- 5.13 A representative of the New Zealand Association of Social Workers.

Recommendation Six

After the new professor has been appointed and a management structure has been set in place, the Social Work Programme Committee in consultation with the new professor to review its role with a view to establishing an ongoing Programmes Advisory Committee.

Recommendation Seven

A small working party established by the Social Work Planning Committee to:

- 7.1 develop a programme for a **three-year** Bachelor of Social Work degree.
- 7.2 ensure that the programme maintains broad access and considers modular teaching.
- 7.3 revise and clarify the entry level, status, structure and future of the MA (Applied).
- 7.4 set up a Master of Social Work degree programme as soon as is appropriate. This to be a second professional qualification at research degree level. The new department to develop a more formal programme of higher degrees by research.

- 7.5 liaise with Maori Studies to ensure:
 - 7.5.1 the bicultural component of the BSW, development of the MA (Applied), and Master of Social Work.
 - 7.5.2 that required specialist social work components are integrated into the Diploma in Social Work (Kaupapa Maori) (see below).

Recommendation Eight

The working party to develop articulation arrangements between the Diploma, BSW, MA (Applied) in Social Work, MSW and PhD.

- 8.1 In normal circumstances entry to the undergraduate Diploma in Social Work (Kaupapa Maori) to take cognisance of RPL. The protocols for such entry to be published and transparent. Where necessary sbstudy skills and other suitable preparatory courses to be recommended to students who wish to qualify for entry to the Diploma programme.
- 8.2 Normal University entry criteria to apply to entry to the BSW.
- 8.3 Holders of the undergraduate Diploma in Social Work to normally be eligible to enter the final year of the Bachelor programme.
- 8.4 The MA (Applied) is designed as a first professional qualification for those holding first degrees in humanities or social science subjects other than social work.
- 8.5 Entry to the Master of Social Work to be for holders of a first degree in Social Work.