

## CHAPTER - VI

FIELD WORK EVALUATION:

=====

- MEANING OF EVALUATION.
- WHAT IS FIELD WORK EVALUATION ?
- OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION.
- PATTERN OF EVALUATION.
- EVALUATION PROCESS.
- PROBLEMS IN EVALUATION.
- TABLES (Analysis of - empirical data )

=====

## CHAPTER - VI

### FIELD WORK EVALUATION

The present chapter deals, in the first part, with the theoretical background of field work evaluation and in the second part, with the analysis of responses of the agency supervisors, teacher supervisors and the social work students.

Evaluation is a most necessary tool for purposeful teaching and learning programme. This being a process should not necessarily be done at the end of the field work training. In fact, the process of evaluation runs throughout the field placement, culminating in periodic formal evaluations. The thoughtful supervisor continuously evaluates the work the student in order to decide the next steps in teaching programme. It is implicit or explicit in every supervisory session. The periodical supervisory sessions would help a student to have a pretty clear idea about practical training and it also helps the supervisor to judge the knowledge and outlook of the student.

#### 1. MEANING OF EVALUATION:

When we speak about evaluation of field work in social work education we refer to the summary evaluation which takes place at the end of the academic term or programme. At the end of each field work placement some written assessment is made about the progress and performance of the students. It is concerned with the appraisal of the students work when

appraised against certain standards established by the school of social work or the university concerned. This being a process, the supervisor as well as the students are the two important participants. Moreover, it is seen as an educational experience itself. This process totally aimed at the development of the students.

Evaluation is not just an assessment of the present performance, but it is also a review of progress since the beginning of the placement. In this process the supervisor continuously assessing the performance of the student in order to help to make him conscious about what he does, and to learn to improve his skills. It is most important for the student to get a sense of how far he has moved and what he has learnt in a given period of time.

## 2. WHAT IS FIELD WORK EVALUATION?

The proceedings of the faculty development workshop on field work organised by Delhi School of Social Work has outlined the meaning of evaluation of field work in social work education as follows<sup>1</sup>:

"Field work evaluation was a continuous and realistic assessment of a student in terms of his efforts, abilities work done, learning, use of guidance, and personal professional growth (or the lack of these) in a particular situation of the field. This was periodically conveyed to the student, with an educational objective,

and which ultimately was instrumental in the award of marks or grades for his overall performance in field work".

### 3. OBJECTIVES OF EVALUATION<sup>2</sup>:

The main objectives of field work evaluation are:

- i) to assess students knowledge and understanding of the field;
- ii) to assess the ability of the student to integrate theory and practice;
- iii) to assess the ability of the student to apply scientific methods of social work;
- iv) to assess the ability of the students to write records;
- v) to assess the supervisory inputs and contribution;
- vi) to assess the students ability to plan and act; and
- vii) to assess personal and professional growth of the student.

### 4. PATTERN OF EVALUATION:

Most oftenly the assessment of the field work performance of the student is done only by the concerned teacher supervisor with the proviso for moderation by the Head of the department. However, any pattern existed, has its own pros and cons. No pattern could be well considered as the standardized and unbiased method of evaluation. Following are the common pattern of evaluation of field work in social

work education in the Indian schools of social work<sup>3</sup>:

- 1) By supervisor only.
- 2) By supervisor and faculty (sixty marks and 40 marks between them)
- 3) By supervisor only with the proviso for moderation by the staff and/or the head of the department.
- 4) By the supervisor mainly but followed by viva-voce examination.
- 5) By the supervisor and external examiner(s) with or without viva-voce.

#### 5. EVALUATION PROCESS:

Evaluation process begins with the placement of student either in the agency or in the community settings. It is through periodical evaluation/supervisory meetings of the supervisor with the student that brings awareness about his (student) own performance in the field work training. The assessment should never be or is a surprising curse or gift to the student who is totally prepared and expected the positive saying of it. That is why the student should be made aware of his own performance at the every scheduled periodical evaluation/supervisory assession. If this is done the student could be well prepared to show his better performance in the next session. And he could also be mentally prepared to accept the result of his performance.

However, the last session of the evaluation process is most important where the student's overall performance is adjudged. This is most important because the student has no chance to show his better performance after the last session of the evaluation process. Hence, whatever changes and improvements are expected, could meet before the final/annual assessment of the students field work performance. With this intention the assessment of the field work performance of the students at the final stage is expected to be unbiased. This unbiased assessment is possible when there is a format of evaluation and a committee of assessment. It is expected that a bench evaluation of field work performance is always better provided that it is adopted very systematically.

The faculty development workshop on field work organised by Delhi School of social work has recommended the moderation committee for the field work evaluation. The committee should be consisted of:

- i) Two external examiners;
- ii) Head of the Department;
- iii) Field work co-ordinator; and
- iv) Concerned supervisor.

Some of the schools/universities have prepared evaluation chart and implemented them in their schools/universities. These charts are considered as standard evaluation charts for the assessment of field work performance. But these charts simply help the supervisor and the school to concentrate only on

specific items in which the students has trained.

The model evaluation chart of the university of Newcastle upon Tyne is given below:

UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE COURSE IN  
COURSE IN APPLIED SOCIAL STUDIES OUTLINE FOR  
EVALUATION OF FIELD WORK PRACTICE:

I) IDENTIFICATION:

Name of student : \_\_\_\_\_  
Agency : \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of supervisor : \_\_\_\_\_  
Period : From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of weeks at 3 days per week : \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of weeks at 5 days per week: \_\_\_\_\_  
Hours per day : \_\_\_\_\_

II) LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES:

CASELOAD described according to type of client, problem and case work service.

Administrative procedures: e.g. case conferences, case presentations, committee meetings, ward rounds, opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary and inter-agency discussion and treatment.

III) REPORT OF FINDINGS IN RELATION TO PERFORMANCE:

A) Administrative aspects of social work:

1) Capacity to work within agency function and structure.

Knowledge of agency function and structure.

Ability to use administrative procedures constructively.

Quality of relationships developed with various staff within the agency.

2) Capacity to work within the community.

Knowledge of other agencies and resources.

Relationship with others in the community.

B) RECORDING:

1) Process Records:

Do they contain the information necessary both for the purpose of the agency's service to clients and for facilitating teaching and learning?

How much of the student's diagnostic thinking and comments are included, e.g. purpose of interview, situation as student sees it, evaluation comments, plans for next stages? Are records upto date and given to supervisor in time to prepare for supervisory sessions?

2) Departmental Records:

Are they appropriate to the requirements of the agency?

Do they convey concisely a picture of the process, a statement of the social work task (related to agency function) and the clients understanding of the situation ?

Are they on time, upto date and easy to read?

Are they used as a tool in picture ?



3) Letters and referrals:

Is the content related to the purpose and appropriate to the person addressed?

## 4) Ability to use the English language in all aspects of recording.

C) USE OF SUPERVISION:

Supervision has to main purposes:

1) To improve student's ( and worker's ) practice and through this the agency's services to clients.

2) To facilitate and accelerate student's learning by giving the opportunity to exchange knowledge and ideas arising from the illumination of theory by practice and vice-versa.

How has student participated in achieving these purposes?

D) KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN THE STUDY-DIAGNOSIS - TREATMENT PROCESS:1) Direct Treatment:

Capacity to make and sustain professional relationships with clients.

Capacity to interview purposefully and in a way suited to the particular client.

Capacity to obtain the necessary information, reflect on it, make a social diagnosis and formulate an appropriate treatment plan.

Capacity to use a variety of treatment methods appropriately.

Capacity to modify any or all of the above in the light of further information and relection.

Interest in understanding both psychological and social cultural factors.

2) Indirect treatment:

Indirect treatment encompasses those measures used to involve other people - either professional or lay -who can provide services or effect changes in his environment, in the furthering of treatment goals for the client. The range of contacts is wide and the balance will vary with the setting, e.g. as between intra and extra-agency co-operation with social workers, members of other professions and other interested people.

IV) DEVELOPMENT AS A PROFESSIONAL PERSON:

This is the sum total of the knowledge and skills described above as acquired and used by each student in the furthering of his education, his agency's service and the welfare of his clients.

The Committee of the Faculty Development Workshop on field work organised by the Delhi School of social work has prepared a model evaluation sheet. The following is the evaluation sheet prepared by the group:

EVALUATION SHEET  
\*\*\*\*\*

Name of the student : \_\_\_\_\_ yearly of study \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of the agency : \_\_\_\_\_ From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
 Duration of placement : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Agency Supervisor : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Designation : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Faculty Supervisor : \_\_\_\_\_  
 Designation : \_\_\_\_\_

CONTENT OF FIELD WORK

Sl. Phases of evaluation No.	Marks out of	Minimum Marks	Marks Total Obta- ined
---------------------------------	-----------------	------------------	------------------------------

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1) Knowledge & understanding of the field.          | : |  |
| 2) Interaction with the field                       | : |  |
| 3) Identification of specific areas, need/resources | : |  |
| 4) Planning, involvement and interaction            | : |  |
| 5) Supervisory inputs and its use                   | : |  |
| 6) Relationship of theory and practice.             | : |  |
| 7) Recording  | : |  |
| 8) Professional development                         | : |  |

Remarks of agency Supervisor : \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks of faculty supervisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature  
Agency Supervisor.

Signature  
Faculty Supervisor.

The above model evaluation sheet would certainly help the supervisors/schools, to include the various items that the student has learnt during his training period, to assess the field work performance of the student.

#### 7. PROBLEMS IN EVALUATION:

As it has been stated earlier in this chapter that the assessment process of field work performance of the students begin with the placement. Evaluation is a lengthy process which require regular but periodical assessment through various supervisory sessions. This itself is a basic problem in evaluation. It is because, most oftenly, the faculties and the agency supervisors thought about the evaluation work that it is only either by the end of the term or by the end of the academic year. Concentrating on this, usually, the faculties do not pay much attention and give least importance to the regular periodical assessment of the student's field work performance that ultimately affect the evaluation.

Secondly, quite often the teacher supervisors who supervise the students and evaluate their performance have had little or no work experience in the field.

Still another problem in evaluation is the standards for evaluation. Most oftenly, the field work performance of the students is evaluated subjectively. The criteria for evaluation are not standardised in the schools of social work in India. Though these criteria are existed in

some schools are not as clear, sound and relatively objective as they are to be. It is well conceived that even imperfect criteria would be better than no criteria.

The evaluation pattern only by teacher supervisor may lead to some bias and prejudice in evaluation. But again this is not always true. Better if we have a moderate committee for evaluation.

In the light of this theoretical background of field work evaluation in social work education in India, an attempt will, now, be made to understand the students, teachers and agency supervisor's responses regarding the evaluation system in these schools.

ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONSES OF THE SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS, TEACHER SUPERVISORS, AGENCY SUPERVISORS TO VARIOUS PROBLEMS OF FIELD WORK EVALUATION IN THE SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK IN SOLAPUR.

TABLE - 61

SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK BY CONDUCTING THEORY TEST ON FIELD WORK EXPERIENCE			
Schools of Social Work	Theory test on Field work experience		Total
	Conduct	Don't Conduct	
Walchand College	-	7 (63.64)	7 ( 63.64 )
Institute of Management	-	4 ( 36.36 )	4 ( 36.36 )
Total	-	11 (100.00 )	11 (100.00 )

Note: Percentages have been given in the brackets Table-61 shows the schools of social work by conducting theory test on field work experience of the social work students for field work evaluation in the schools of social work in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total teacher supervisor respondents all the teacher supervisors had told that their respective schools of social work don't conduct any theory test on field work experience of the students for evaluation of their performance. Of the teacher supervisors who told that their respective schools don't conduct any theory test on field work experience of the students for evaluation nearly 64 per cent were working with Walchand College and the remaining nearly 36 per cent teacher supervisors were working with Institute of Management.

In general, it appears that theory test on field work experience of the students is not conducted by the schools of social work in Solapur for evaluation of the performance of the students.

It may be because of the failure of the University to frame the policies and rules and regulations regarding evaluation of the students in the schools of social work affiliated to the University and disinterest and negligence of the teacher supervisors.

TABLE - 62SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK BY OPINION OF THE TEACHER  
SUPERVISORS REGARDING PRESENT SYSTEM OF FIELDWORK EVALUATION

Schools of Social Work	Present system of evaluation		Total
	Yearly oral evaluation	Periodical Oral evaluation	
Walchand College	7 (63.64)	-	7 (63.64)
Institute of Management	4 (36.36)	-	4 (36.36)
TOTAL	11 (100.00)	-	11 (100.00)

Note : Percentages have been given in the brackets.  
Table-62 illustrate opinion of the teacher supervisors regarding the present system of field work evaluation in their respective schools in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total field work teacher supervisor respondents all of them had told that the field work evaluation of the students is done on the basis of oral interviews that too it is done yearly in their schools. Of the 100 per cent Field Work Supervisors nearly 64 per cent were working with Walchand College and the remaining 36 per cent were working with Institute of Management.

Thus, it appears that field work evaluation of the students is done on the basis of oral interviews only in the schools of social work in Solapur.

It may be because of the policy of the schools of social work in Solapur and the policy of the university and failure of the heads of the schools and the concerned teacher

supervisors in evaluating the performance of the students periodically to judge the knowledge of the students, to show them the stages of training, and encourage and motivate them to learn in a practical situations properly.

TABLE - 63

OPINION OF THE TEACHER SUPERVISORS REGARDING  
THE PRESENT FIELD WORK EVALUATION

Opinion		No. of teacher Supervisor Respondents.
Proper	...	4 (36.36)
Not Proper	...	4 (36.36)
Good	...	1 ( 9.9 )
Totally improper	...	2 (18.18)
Total	...	11 (100.00)

Note: Percentages have been given in the brackets.

Table-63 gives opinion of the teacher supervisors regarding the present field work evaluation system in the schools of social work in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total teacher supervisors nearly 36 per cent of the teacher supervisors had expressed their opinion that the present field work evaluation system in these schools of social work is proper, 36 per cent supervisors had expressed their opinion that the present evaluation system is not proper, 9 per cent



supervisors had expressed their opinion that the present evaluation system is good, and the remaining 18 per cent supervisors had expressed their opinion that the present evaluation system is totally improper.

Thus, it appears that a little less than half of the teacher supervisors are of the opinion that the present field work evaluation system in the schools of social work is not proper and a little less than 50 per cent supervisors are of the opinion that the present system of evaluation is proper.

This indicates that nearly 50 per cent of the teacher supervisors are not aware about the concept and purpose of field work evaluation in social work education.

TABLE - 64

SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK BY BALANCE IN  
THEORY AND FIELD WORK MARKS

=====			
Schools of	Balance in Theory and Field		Total
Social Work	Work Marks		
	Balance	Imbalance	
-----			
Walchand College	2 (18.18)	5 (45.45)	7 (63.64)
Institute of Management	1 ( 9.9 )	3 (27.27)	4 (36.36)
-----			
Total	3 (27.27)	8 (72.73)	11 (100.00)
=====			

Note : Percentages have been in the brackets.

Table-64 illustrates opinion of the teacher supervisors regarding balance in theory and field work marks given to the students in the schools of social work in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total field work teacher supervisors nearly 27 per cent of the teacher supervisors had expressed their opinion that there is a balance in theory and field work marks, and the remaining nearly 73 per cent teacher supervisors had expressed their opinion that there is an imbalance in theory and field work marks.

Of the 27 per cent field work supervisors who had expressed their opinion as balanced, nearly 18 per cent of them were belonging to Walchand College and 9 per cent were belonging to Institute of Management. Of the 73 per cent teacher supervisors who had expressed their opinion as imbalanced, a little less than 46 per cent were belonging to Walchand College and the remaining 27 per cent were belonging to Institute of Management.

Thus, it appears that overwhelming majority of the teacher supervisors are of the opinion that theory and field work marks are imbalanced. A very few per cent of the teacher supervisors are of the opinion that there is balance in theory and field work marks.

It is crystal clear that the social work students in the schools of social work in Solapur are given more marks in field work than in theory papers. It may be because of the tendency of the teacher supervisors, Head of the Schools and competition between the schools of social work affiliated to Shivaji University, Kolhapur.

TABLE - 65

SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK BY CONSIDERATION  
OF DIARIES AND JOURNALS FOR THE ASSESSMENT

Schools of Social Work	Field Work Diaries & Journals		Total
	Considered	Not considered	
Walchand College	5 (45.45)	2 (18.18)	7 (63.64)
Institute of Management	3 (27.27)	1 ( 9.9 )	4 (36.36)
TOTAL	8 (72.82)	3 (27.27)	11 (100.00)

Note : Percentages have been given in the brackets.

Table - 65 depicts opinion of the teacher supervisors regarding consideration of diaries and journals for the assessment of field work of the students in the schools of social work in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total teacher supervisors nearly 73 per cent of the supervisors had expressed their opinion that the field work diaries and journals are considered for the assessment of the students and the remaining 27 per cent of the students had expressed their opinion that the diaries and journals are not considered for the assessment of the students.

Of the 73 per cent teacher supervisors who had expressed their opinion that diaries and journals are considered, nearly 45 per cent are belonging to Walchand College and the remaining 27 per cent are belonging to Institute of Management. Of the 27 per cent who expressed their opinion that diaries are not considered, 18 per cent of them are belonging to Walchand College and the remaining 9 per cent are belonging to Institute of Management.

Thus, it appears that a Overwhelming majority of the teacher supervisors are of the opinion that diaries and jaournaals are considered for assessment and a very few per cent supervisors are of the opinion that diaries and journals are not considered at all.

This indicates that majority of the teacher supervisors might have defended and told as diaries and journals are considered just to protect themselves because it is observed and experienced that the diaries and the journals are technically (on record) considered for assessment otherwise only oral evaluation is done here in the schools of social work in Solapur.

TABLE - 66

SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK BY AUTHORITY OF AGENCY SUPERVISORS TO ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF THE STUDENTS				
Schools of Social Work	Agency Supervisors Authority to assess			Total
	Authorised	Not Authorised	Authorised only for 50 marks	
Walchand College	2 (18.18)	-	5 (45.45)	7 (63.64)
Institute of Management	-	-	4 (36.36)	4 (36.36)
Total	2 (18.18)	-	9 (81.82)	11 (100.00)

Note : Percentages have been given in the brackets.

Table-66 illustrates opinion of the teacher supervisors regarding authority of the agency supervisors to assess the performance of the students in the schools of social work in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total teacher supervisors nearly 18 per cent of the supervisors had expressed their opinion that the agency supervisors are authorised to assess the performance of the students and to give marks to the students, and the remaining 82 per cent, of the supervisors had expressed their opinion that the agency supervisors are authorised to assess the performance of the students and to give 50 marks out of 200 marks.

Of the 18 per cent supervisors who had expressed their opinion as authorised to assess all were belonging to Walchand College and the remaining 82 per cent supervisors who had expressed their opinion as authorised to assess and to give 50 marks, nearly 45 per cent were belonging to Walchand College and 36 per cent were belonging to Institute of Management.

Thus, it appears that a overwhelming majority of the teacher supervisors are of the opinion that the agency supervisors are authorised to assess the performance of the students and to give 50 marks only, but out of these majority nearly 36 percent teacher supervisors belonging to Institute of Management have also expressed their opinion as authorised to give 50 marks and to assess the performance but it is observed, experienced and confirmed from the agencies that the Institute of management has not given authority to the agency supervisors to assess the performance of the students and to give 50 marks. A few per cent of the teacher supervisors belonging to Walchand College are of the opinion that the agency supervisors are authorised to assess and to give f marks for field work.

SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK BY EXAMINING THE  
DIARIES AND JOURNALS FOR EVALUATION.

Note : Percentages have been given in the brackets.

It is seen from this table that out of the total teacher supervisors nearly 73 percent teacher supervisors had expressed their opinion that they examine the diaries and journals as and when they find time, 9 per cent supervisors had expressed their opinion that they examine the diaries and journals half yearly, 18 per cent supervisors had expressed their opinion that they examine the diaries and journals yearly.

Of the 73 per cent teacher supervisors who had expressed their opinion as they examine the diaries and journals as and when they find time nearly 36 per cent were belonging to Institute of Management and 36 per cent were belonging to Walchand College. Of the 9 per cent supervisors who had expressed their opinion as they examine the diaries and journals half yearly all of them were belonging to Walchand College, Of the 18 percent supervisors who expressed their opinion as they examine diaries and journals yearly all of them were belonging to Walchand College.

Thus, it appears that a overwhelming majority of the teacher supervisors examine the diaries and journals of the students as and when they find time. A very few per cent supervisors examine the diaries and journals half yearly and few per cent of the supervisors examine the diaries and journals yearly.

It is crystal clear that the teacher supervisors do not examine the diaries and journals every week to judge the knowledge of the students to show them the stages of field work training, and motivate them to do the work sincerely and honestly. The diaries and the journals are examined as and when they find time, half yearly and some supervisors examine yearly, this clearly shows that the performance is not evaluated properly and it is biased. It may be because of disinterest, laziness, and loose administration of the schools.

TABLE - 68

OPINION OF THE SOCIAL WORK STUDENTS REGARDING  
THEIR FIELD WORK EVALUATION BY THE SCHOOLS OF  
SOCIAL WORK

Opinion	No.of student Respondents
A	-
AB	5 (12.82)
ABC	-
D	10 (25.64)
EF	24 (61.54)
Total	39 (100.00)

NOTE : Percentages have been given in the brackets.

Table-68 gives opinion of the social work students regarding their field work evaluation in their respective schools of social work in Solapur.

- i) A stands for explanation of stages of training.
- ii) B stands for judging the knowledge of the students.
- iii) C stands for marks given on the basis of proper evaluation.
- iv) D stands for don't know
- v) E stands for not proper evaluation.
- vi) F stands for evaluation done on the basis of favouritism.

It is seen from this table that out of the total sampled student respondents nearly 13 per cent student respondents had expressed their opinion that their respective teacher Supervisors explain them the stages of training from time to time and judge their knowledge for training and evaluation



purpose, 26 per cent student respondents had expressed their opinion that they don't know anything about evaluation and the remaining 62 per cent student respondents had expressed their opinion that the evaluation of the teacher supervisors or schools of social work is not proper and it is done on the basis of favouritism.

Thus it appears that a overwhelming majority of the student respondents are of the opinion that the field work evaluation of the students is not done properly and it is done on the basis of favouritism. A few per cent student respondents are of the opinion that their respective teacher supervisors judge their knowledge and explain them about the stages of the training properly, and few per cent student respondents are not aware about their evaluation.

It is crystal clear that the social work Students are aware about the present evaluation methods of the teacher supervisors and the schools and they are unhappy about this evaluation. The researcher has also observed and experienced that it is fact and agreed with the opinion of the student respondents. This may be happening in these schools just because of the tendancy of the teacher supervisors, loose administration, keeping the students away from the evaluation and keeping them in dark.

TABLE - 69  
TYPES OF FIELD WORK AGENCIES BY FIELD  
WORK EVALUATION REPORT

Types of Agencies	Evaluation Report		Total
	Report sent but not considered	Don't Send	
Industries	4 (36.36)	-	4 (36.36)
Welfare Centres	2 (18.18)	-	2 (18.18)
Educational Centres	1 (9.9)	-	1 (9.9)
Rehabilitation Centres	2 (18.18)	-	2 (18.18)
Other Welfare Agencies	2 (18.18)	-	2 (18.18)
Total	11 (100.00)	-	11 (100.00)

Note : Percentages have been given in the brackets.

Table-69 shows the opinion of the agency supervisors regarding sending the report of field work evaluation of the students to the respective schools of social work in Solapur.

It is seen from this table that out of the total sampled agency supervisors nearly 36 per cent supervisors who are working in the industries had expressed their opinion that they send field work evaluation reports of the students to the respective schools of social work but the reports are not considered for the purpose of giving marks they are considered for only keeping technical records, 18 per cent supervisors who are working in welfare centres had expressed their opinion

that the reports are sent but they are not considered, 9 per cent supervisors who are working in Education Centres had expressed their opinion that evaluating reports are sent but they are not considered, 18 per cent supervisors who are working in Rehabilitation centres had expressed their opinion that the reports are sent to the schools but they are not considered for giving marks but considered just to keep the records, and the remaining 18 per cent supervisors who are working in Welfare agencies had expressed their opinion that the evaluation reports are sent to the schools but they are not considered for giving marks but considered for keeping the records in the office.

In general, it appears that agency supervisors send their field work evaluation reports to the respective schools but 100 per cent respondents were of the opinion that their reports are not considered for giving marks to the students but the reports are considered for keeping official records for the purpose of office records only.

It may be because of the failure of the University to frame the policies for the field work evaluation and failure of the administrators to have proper evaluation system in their respective schools. It may also be failure of the university bodies like Ad hoc Committees and Board of Studies in Social work to frame the policies because of the nomination and appointment and elected untrained and non professional teacher members on this bodies.

R E F E R E N C E S  
\*\*\*\*\*

- 1) Singh R.R., "Field Work in Social Work Education",  
Concept Publishing Company, Delhi, 1985.
- 2) Ibid., 1985, P.
- 3) Ibid., 1985, P.,
- 4) , "Supervision in Social Work,