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This thesis presents a review of the significance and application of field work in planning education. Specifically it describes and analyzes the critical issues, problems and benefits surrounding the use of field work as a supplement to traditional planning education. This study is based on the assumption that properly structured participation in field work activities can facilitate the professional development of graduate students lacking prior planning experience.

The major research of this thesis focuses on the examination of two field-linked educational programs within M.I.T.'s Department of Urban Studies and Planning. The basic assertion made in analyzing these two programs is that the inherent problems of field work are exacerbated when a field program lacks adequate faculty staffing, structured program organization and proper departmental status. This study establishes the inherent problems, strengths and weaknesses of field work administration and participation by looking at these two field work programs through the eyes and experiences of the administrators, several participants and their field supervisors.

The major thesis of this study is that field work can be a more valid and valuable part of the professional education process when properly administered, structured and supervised. Specifically the findings of this thesis suggest that successful internships require experienced internship administration under an "academic manager", careful placement based on defined criteria educational structuring of the intern experience and close integration with the academic and administrative resources of the university. Finally this study offers some basic notes toward a theory of professional field work. These notes as well as the study in its entirety are meant to serve as a discussion piece, guide and reference that will stimulate greater interest, planning and development of field work.
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INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this investigation is to describe and analyze the critical issues, problems and benefits surrounding the use of field work as a supplement to traditional planning education. My analysis will focus on two field-linked educational programs at M.I.T. This study is based on the assumption that properly structured participation in field work activities can facilitate the professional development of a graduate student lacking prior planning experience. Field work whether in an agency setting or a real life "proving ground" of another sort allows a student to operationalize knowledge gained in the classroom, experiment with personal theories of social interaction and agency intervention, pursue the development of specialized planning skills and gain valuable practical experience in dealing with contemporary planning issues. Using the two major modes of field work participation available in MIT's Department of Urban Studies and Planning, I will explore the field experiences of six student participants. In-depth personal interviews will be used to identify the inherent strengths and weaknesses of field-linked education.

There are two concepts essential to the organization of this research effort. "Field work" has been defined as anything from a complex team project to an individual student's involvement as a participant observer in a
public agency. The definition of field work is far from simple. However for the purpose of this thesis, field work is defined as: any kind of practical experience and/or knowledge gained through working in or observing a social organization, institution or agency as part of a professional course of study. There are other aspects of field work revolving around credit and/or money for student involvement, supplementary seminars, academic supervision etc. however these distinctions tend more to add to field work's educational significance rather then to its basic comprehension.

The second concept is "professional development", this is the broad objective toward which all field work efforts are organized. In other words field work seeks to foster professional development through a wide variety of educational opportunities not available in one classroom. More specifically professional development is defined here in terms of: (1) an achieved focus in an area of specialization; (2) a feeling of competence; (3) an ability to complete a task with little or no supervision; (4) the mastery of skills involving problem definition, setting goals, analyzing alternatives and presenting data; (5) an ability to communicate ideas and perceptions both orally and in written form, and (6) an understanding and ability to use professional jargon.
It is important to understand the basic elements which define the operation of field work education. Knowledge of these elements is necessary in order to analyze the factors which impede the feasibility and productivity of field work involvement. An "Ideal-typical" model of field work education is a convenient way of ordering these elements. The ideal-typical model used here is the Social Work Profession's traditional agency field work model. It can be summarized as follows: (I) "the focus is on the development of practical skills in one or more fields of practice; (2) field learning and class learning proceed concurrently with relatively early introduction of the student to certain responsibilities; (3) field learning experiences are based primarily in the agency in which the student is placed; (4) the learning experiences are organized and directly influenced by the agency's functions and service goals; (5) the primary teaching-learning method is the tutorial or individual conferences with the chief mentor—the field instructor and (6) the student is expected to perform in the role of an employee in accord with the agency's policies and procedures."I

The traditional agency model of field work practice is not necessarily the only or the best educational approach. Rather there are actually several field work
models that have some educational merit and could be considered: (1) a research field work model - with a focus on developing the student's ability to perform some type of data collection and manipulation leading to the completion of a written report; (2) a class assignment field work model - with a focus on developing the student's performance of some type of out-of-class observation or project as part of a specific course and (3) a community field work model - with a focus on the completion of a task linked to a specific geographical area or client group. However the agency field work model is the most traditional field linked education pattern followed by various professional programs. In addition the traditional agency field work pattern has endured over many years as a standard supplement to planning education.

The proper administration of an educationally viable field work program is a very complex and difficult undertaking. This reality becomes more keen over time as one's experience with the use of internships and field work matures. Looking back at the early curricula of most planning schools it seems that planning education has had considerable time to both build up some expertise in the implementation of field - linked education programs and to develop a theory of field work practice over the years. For example the 1942 National Resource Planning Board's
survey of planning programs includes a brief description of MIT's graduate planning curriculum which offers evidence of the profession's early utilization of field work. "Students wishing to combine specialized instruction in architecture or civil engineering with professional training in city and regional planning may register in the Course in City Planning Practice which provides for six months of varied experience in the office of local, state, and regional planning boards in additional to a six-year program of undergraduate and graduate study at the Institute. A student registering in the course follows the regular curriculum in architecture or civil engineering for three years and a combined program during the balance of the period. The latter includes two summers of inservice training, supervision being provided by the planning agency and a member of the instructing staff. Co-operating agencies include the Boston City Planning Board, the Massachusetts State Planning Board, the New England Regional Planning Commission and the New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission. The course in city planning practice leads to the degree of Master in City Planning together with a bachelor's degree in architecture or civil engineering." 2 Harvard University, during this same period (1942), required candidates for the Bachelor of City Planning degree to spend not less
than nine months as an "intern" obtaining practical experience in the office of a city, state, or regional planning board before receiving his degree. Harvard also set as a requirement for admission to candidacy for the Master's Degree the completion of not less than nine months of practical experience in the offices of planning boards. 3

In a study by Frederick J. Adams on Urban Planning Education in the United States (June 1964) updated descriptions of Planning curriculums offered by the major planning schools are described. It is interesting to note that MIT, Harvard, University of California (Berkeley), University of North Carolina, University of Oklahoma as well as several other planning schools all had a three months internship in a planning agency as a required part of their graduate curriculum. Still other schools like Yale University had a design Workshop as a required part of the two year graduate MCP program. To quote from the study these studio courses "require the student to work with municipal and private agencies, on actual sites, and with the assistance of visitors from the professional field." 4 Besides surveying the curriculum content of various planning schools this study also asked employers of planning school graduates to comment on the merits or deficiencies of existing professional training in the
field of planning. The general comments received suggested that there was a need for better understanding of planning procedures in practice. Specifically, the general contention expressed by the responses was that "in-service training (field work) is vital and neglected." 5

Additional indication of the planning profession's early involvements with field work can be gleaned from Harvey Perloff's book Education for Planning. Perloff describes the planning program at the University of Chicago from 1947 to 1956 in which a workshop (a crude approximation of field work) played an important part: The workshop was one of the key features of planning education at Chicago. There the students became accustomed to working as a member of a planning team. They were taught how to apply their previous learning acquired from lectures, seminar discussions and wide reading - in a realistic situation. The workshop provided an opportunity for testing abstract principles. 6 Perloff goes on to note that "some of the workshops were chosen because of the interest inherent in the problem and because adequate written materials were available. Other workshops (real life fieldwork) were conducted under contractual arrangement with a professional planning body or other organization interested in having preliminary or supporting studies made for decisions that had to be faced." 7
An interesting footnote indicated that there were certain dangers involved in contract work. "The limitations set by the necessity of turning out an "acceptable" report could cripple originality and inhibit exploratory reaching out into new fields. This always had to be balanced against the gains of working in a 'real' situation." 8

In 1955 the Pacific North West Chapter of AIP survied twenty-four universities and colleges offering planning degrees as part of a study on student internships. The report established that out of the seventeen replying institutions, six reported that a period of student internship was a required portion of the planning course, five indicated that such a period of internship was provided for on an optional basis, and six reported no internship program whatsoever. Four schools allowed scholastic credits for the internship work. In general it was found most planning schools favored internship training under proper conditions. The proper conditions usually meant close supervision. It was also established that "the majority of schools with internships programs considered internships to be an educational tool, and that definite understandings with employers were necessary to insure this." 9

Field work in one shape or form exists within most planning departments today. Over time however field work
has become some what of a "step child" of graduate planning education at least to the extent that planning departments do not effectively administer, structure or provide adequate faculty support for field work. Since most field work programs are not a required part of the planning curriculum they tend not to be given proper status, sufficient organization or adequate faculty staffing. All three of these deficiencies are crucial institutional constraints which decrease the effectiveness of field linked educational programs.

One hypothesis of this thesis is that adequate faculty staffing, structured program organization and proper departmental status make joint and independent contributions to the effectiveness of field work programs. A corollary to this hypothesis is that the inherent problems of field work are exacerbated when a field program lacks adequate faculty staffing, structured program organization and proper departmental status. The inherent pitfalls of field work tend to diminish the educational benefits to be derived from field work involvement. The logic for these realizations is heavily supported by both recent studies and the recurrent problems of "field" programs.

Adequate faculty staffing can be defined in terms of the following: (1) the number of faculty members involved in coordinating and supervising a field work
program; (2) the level of experience they have had in field work management or involvement as participant observers in field internships themselves and (3) the time commitment of personnel involved in programs (i.e. are they full time or part time?). The degree of program organization can be defined in terms of: (1) the clear establishment of role expectations and responsibilities of intern, field supervisors and academic advisors in a three party conference; (2) the continuing communication and coordination of field design or intern task assignment between academic manager and field supervisor and (3) the use and adequacy of a seminar format to help student interns mesh theory and practice. Proper departmental status can be defined in the following terms: (1) number of faculty devoting time and thought to structuring internships as part of the educational process; (2) a reward structure for faculty involved in field work programs (i.e. are there tangible status or tenure rewards connected to the administration of the field work program; and (3) actual number of senior faculty members committed to a field work program within the academic department.

To test the basic assumptions outlined, this study reviews two field work programs within the MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning. Using the traditional agency field work model as my frame of reference, I will
focus on two particular field work programs which closely parallel this model -- The HUD Internship Program and The DUSP Field Linked Education Service. It is my basic contention that neither of these two programs was adequately staffed, sufficiently structured or given proper departmental status. In analyzing these field programs several important observations will be made. First, the students in both programs will experience a number of similar problems created by inadequate academic monitoring and field supervision of field placements. Second, these problems will tend to retard and complicate the development and execution of field assignments by students. Finally, all students will derive a number of significant benefits from their field experience.

There is very little systematic information available on internships and the role of the professional school. In fact, a report prepared by the Centre for Environmental Studies indicates that "there seems to be little tradition in planning, unlike, for example, social work, of seeing practice as 'field work' and of appointing supervisors in local planning offices to ensure that the work is educational for the student and to coordinate his practical experience with his academic work." Furthermore in reviewing the literature on planning education - "it is noteworthy that the discussion of practi-
cal experience in the course of planning education does not centre on the quality and nature of the practical work or on the level and adequacy of supervision. 'Time out' is seen as 'time on the job', and the student fills a gap in the planning office rather than pursuing his education in a new context." Consequently I have had to rely on other professional schools in fields such as Social Work and Public Administration for theory and major research on field learning and teaching. The Social Work profession in particular has pioneered in the development of clinical education and field placement arrangements. For instance research studies completed during the period 1958 - 1963 by Margaret Schubert, and by the Social Work schools at Chicago and Tulane, directly address questions of achievement levels of first-year students and variations in teaching plans and approaches in first year field instruction.

Graduate Schools of Social Work have been dedicated to the need to bring educational order into field instruction for many years. In the early 1960's the Social Work profession outlined a number of areas of inquiry and investigation: (1) the objectives of field instruction; (2) the nature and range of field learning; (3) the use in field instruction of the educational principles of continuity, progression and integration; (4) the amount
of educational control necessary; (5) the difference between agency supervision and field instruction; and (6) dissatisfaction with existing measures for evaluating the students' learning in the field. The Social Work profession defines the educational principles of continuity, progression and integration in the following ways. "Insuring continuity of learning suggests not only the importance of planning field instruction with clarity about what knowledge, values, attitudes and abilities must be broadened and deepened in order that the student attain the stated objectives, but also the importance of making use of each learning opportunity to reinforce the student's perception of an important concept or theory, his understanding of the dimensions of a value or an attitude in operation, and his skill in putting knowledge and values into purposeful action. Progression or sequence in curriculum building overlaps with continuity but goes beyond in the expectation that each new learning experience be so ordered that previous learning is not only reinforced but deepened. This does not necessarily mean that the learning opportunities must themselves be progressively more complicated but rather that the student is expected to bring new perceptions, new understanding, and new skill to bear on the various opportunities given him. Integration conveys the
concept of unity of the total curriculum. Learning experiences must then not only reinforce the knowledge, attitudes, and skills of the profession, and make progressively more complex demands on the student's mastery of them, but help him to see the relationship between the various learning opportunities through which his professional development is promoted."12

There are several recent studies on internships programs which have special relevance to this study. The first source of information is an evaluation of 14 work-study projects supported by HUD's 701 Comprehensive Planning Assistance Program. This evaluation was prepared by the Architectural Research Laboratory of The University of Michigan. To quote one of the major observations of this 1970 study "the difficulties experienced by field work projects during their early stages of operation can be attributed to inexperience and inability of project staff to coordinate available resources and to create the circumstances to accomplish the desired ends."13 A Report done on Public Service Internships at The University of Massachusetts by Professor John S. Saloma offers some basic information that can be correlated with my research. This report which represents a comprehensive review and analysis of public service internships currently offered through
the University of Massachusetts defines a university-wide rational and approach to the expansion of such programs. This report suggests learning experiences could be significantly encouraged, by a clearer expression of faculty and administration support through:

- affirming the educational value of well structured and supervised field experiences and the right of every student to participate in such an experience as part of his degree program.

- urging greater emphasis on internship programs and related courses within the offerings of each department.

- giving equivalent status to faculty participation in internship programs and public service activities along with more traditional criteria such as professional competence/research and teaching in decisions to grant tenure and.

- establishing university credits and general guidelines for granting academic credit of internships and field work.14

Another major work closely related to my research is a national evaluation of political internships published by the Administrative Committee on Research, Pennsylvania State University. Bernard C. Hennessey, the author of this report entitled Political Internships:
Theory, Practice, Evaluation states: "It seems quite apparent that the best preparation, assignment and supervision of interns can only be done by teachers who themselves have had extensive experience as participant-observers. Here indeed may be the major contemporary bottleneck to greater use of internships — that the academic world has, as yet, neither the personnel nor the will to provide optimum supervision of participant-observation."  

There are a number of important questions that I hope this study will answer. How important is field work in supplementing a graduate student's professional education? Can field work be expected to fulfill all the demands placed upon it by school, agency and students? Should field work be an option or a required part of an academic profession? Who should supervise field work programs? Should students get paid for their work, if so by whom? Will agencies take students more seriously if they pay them? Field work may be one way of assuring that all graduate students have a minimum base of work experience to fall back on in making both academic and professional decisions. Can all field experiences be structured to be fruitful? — A conclusion fairly widespread among professional schools is that inequities in learning opportunity are inherent in the traditional
field work system, arising from both the person who is the field supervisor and the variation in learning opportunities available in agencies. This simply means that not all field placements or field supervisors can offer a student a viable learning experience. This thesis will attempt to discover the best ways of providing an equal opportunity for basic learning given any field agency and any field instructor.

The data presented in this study are drawn from personal in-depth interviews and case studies. The basic research design consists of five parts. First, from each of the two field work programs being evaluated three field work participants who meet certain control criteria (which are spelled out later) will be selected to be interviewed. Each of the six subjects selected will be interviewed at least twice concerning his field work experience within his given program. By looking at two field work programs through the eyes of the participants it should be possible to outline and examine the inherent weaknesses and strengths of their field work involvement. Drawing on the experiences of the program participants and my own experiences, I hope to develop a set of propositions regarding the design of field work programs.
The research for this thesis was undertaken during the period of September 1971 to May 1972. This time frame was chosen for several reasons: first, this was the first term that the HUD internship program was in operation at MIT; second, during this time period the two programs under study coincided most closely in program structure, and third both programs underwent several changes during the 1972-73 academic year. I have used four main sources of information: interviews with the academic staff in charge of the programs; interviews with supervisors; interviews with the six student participants, and personal field work observations.

For certain research problems like field work, the traditional one-shot survey technique, which assembles all data at the same time in one interview is clearly insufficient. The reconstruction of certain patterns of behavior or sequences of events through a single interview is often impossible. Thus to resolve this and a host of other difficulties each respondent was interviewed at least twice. "Single contacts in ordinary surveys have their time limits. Depending on the respondent's occupation, his interest in the topic and the time and location of the interview, the outer limits of the interview will range from a few minutes to probably a maximum of two hours with a mode of about 15 to 20
19. Whatever the limit (This research effort will make use of a basic interview time period lasting no longer than an hour and a half.), any effort to overstep it will result in interviewing failures and thus defeat itself. Using a two interview technique a much greater amount of data can be collected over shorter periods, without running the risk of over taxing the respondent at one time. There is still another dimension which makes the two-interview technique superior to a one-shot survey. Whenever the information desired extends back over some past time period, the survey interview must rely on memory.

To rely on a respondent's memory (especially if the respondent has only a casual interest in the subject) is always a treacherous undertaking, because of the unconscious and even conscious forces that tend to distort it. The two interview system increases the accuracy of the information gathered by reducing the memory burden placed on respondents by not asking them to recall everything asked for at one point in time.

Each respondent will be asked to recount: (1) his reasons for seeking field work involvement; (2) success or failure in achieving his original rationale for involvement; (3) the positive and negative aspects of his field work experience; (4) a detailed account of the
nature of his field work experience in his agency (The interviewer will be particular interested in probing into such areas as did the student initiate his own tasks, perform line responsibilities for placement or negotiate with supervisor over what he could or could not do. What intervention strategies did he put to use? What classroom concepts did he seek to operationalize or have reinforced? What skills did he acquire or gain experience in?) (5) his view of his role or function within his agency and within field work in general; (6) use of supervisors for aid or support and under what circumstances; (7) his perception of the seminar's function within his field work experience. What did the seminar accomplish? What should it have accomplished? (8) What were the results of his field work experience? (9) How did he intergrate his field work with his class work? and (10) his recommendations on how field work could be improved.

Third, the academic and field supervisors for each subject will be interviewed along the lines of the field work process described by the student. Fourth, any written materials submitted by the respondents on their field work experiences will be gathered and examined for additional content pertinent for the construction of case studies on the subjects' field work experiences.
Finally after all the necessary facts have been gathered about each subjects' experience, the information will be compiled in case study form and analyzed. In order to assure that subjects survived are all equally predisposed to the benefits offered by field work involvement it is necessary to hold constant such factors as: (1) the age of the student (22-25) and (2) their lack of prior planning work experience and/or field work experience. All subjects interviewed in this thesis have been selected from a pool of individuals who meet these criteria.

Any research enterprise is limited by the research techniques available and the complexity of the subject at hand. This study of field work is no exception. However if one is cognizant of the various factors which cause spurious correlations it may be possible to counteract them. There are several possible limitations on this study: (1) a financial stipend was the key inducement for students participating in the HUD Internship Program (HIP); (2) students interviewed as part of this study may have been interviewed on the subject before; (3) it is difficult using a simple interview technique to uncover true causes and motives for student actions taken in a complicated process like field work; (4) the accuracy of interviews are dependent
upon individual's memories of events that have taken place over a year ago and (5) the HIP is being analyzed during its start up phase or first semester in operation.

The significance of each of these limitations can be explained in the following ways. First, the HIP was offered by the MIT/DUSP to minority students as a more adequate way of providing for their financial needs in lieu of a rather small departmental grant-in-aid. Since most minority students' financial needs exceeded the grant offered by the department little choice was involved in students deciding to join the HIP. It is possible then that some students in the HIP perceived themselves as being co-opted or forced into taking part in a field work experience by their financial needs. That is to say that they were not given a real choice in selecting field work involvement solely for its educational benefits. Such feelings if intense enough can effect a student's entire approach to field work. Especially if he feels his participation is merely a means to an end of receiving money instead of a means to the end of becoming a professional planner. If the above is true then very likely his perceptions, attitudes and interaction within a given field work program may be significantly different from students who perceive field work as a tool to educate themselves. If a student really
feels that he has been coerced into such a situation he may not take full advantage of the opportunities offered.

In reference to the second limitation Hans Zeisel in the research text "Say It With Figures explains the concept of bias from prior interviewing: "if the first interview brought the topic to the respondent's attention his reactions thenceforth may become self-conscious and hence biased." Since there are other people interviewing students on field work (i.e. A Departmental Task Force on Field Work) I run the risk of possibly selecting a respondent who has been interviewed previously.

Next, certain dangers are involved in interrogating various field work actors (students and supervisors) on the motives of their actions. The process of reason analysis (known colloquially as 'the art of asking why') is complicated and its success is limited by two facts: actions, such as the decision to become involved in field work, are usually the result of a very great number of different causes and motivations; and many of these motives operate unconsciously and are, therefore, difficult to find. The technique, therefore, works best with respect to actions that are relatively simple and that have been taken with some deliberation.

Another problem is the fact that the accuracy of interviews is dependent upon individuals' memories of
actions that have taken place over a year ago. Trying to obtain adequate responses to questions asked may be complicated by a student's possible hazy recollection about specific happenings. The major problems arise from the difference between what the respondent thinks is a satisfactory answer and what the interviewer regards as satisfactory. A technique that can resolve this difficulty is known as "probing". This method involves the well-known art of cross-examination.

The time period of analysis September 1971 to May 1972 represents the beginning of the HUD Internship Program within the DUSP. It might be argued that the structure of the program has not had an adequate time to gel within this time period. Consequently an analysis of the program at such time might constitute a premature assessment of its potentialities. It might also be hypothesized that the second year of the program's existence would be a better point in time at which to analyze its structure and content. However the second year of this program is being administered by two new faculty members with different approaches to field work. A start up procedure for the program is once again in process and consequently very little would be gained in analyzing the second year structure as opposed to the first. In fact since one of the directors of the HIP
for the first year was also the initial implementor of the proposal to receive funding for the HIP program it seems to follow some what logically that his conceptions of what should be and his attempts to operationalize his ideas about field work's structure-make the first year's time span of this particular program most interesting to research.

The relative uniqueness and sophistication of this research effort is predicated on my role as a participant observer in one of the field work programs under analysis. When dealing with a complex educative process such as that posed by field work one must strive to get as close to the phenomenon as possible in order to adequately depict its faults as well as its mystique. For it is not enough to simply question others on field work or to perform a cursory literature research, one must get involved in the process in order to savor its potentialities as well as its faults. Having become an experienced participant observer in several past professional field work ventures as well as being at present a participant observer in the HIP, I have become attuned to the problems that need to be circumvented in order to maximize field work's educational benefits. Consequently by virtue of my past experience and present field work involvement, I occupy a unique position which
allows me the opportunity to intuitively analyze and interpret first hand the inner workings and hidden mechanisms of field work operation. Thereby off setting to some degree certain limitations and imperfections of my interview and case study technique. In other words based on my background experience and present field worker role I will be able to decipher and be insightfully discriminating in my analysis of participants' responses.

(*Note - My involvement in field work has spanned three degree programs: (1) as a student teacher I participated in an internship of 12 weeks while working on a B.S. in education; (2) as a graduate social work student I was involved in a 10 month field work experience in community organization and (3) presently as a graduate planning student I am involved in a field work experience of 20 months duration.*)
CHAPTER 1

ROLE OF FIELD WORK IN PLANNING EDUCATION
It has been said, that "the professional planner makes his contribution through the analysis of existing conditions and trends, the interpretation of long-range needs and potentialities and the translation of abstract and technical considerations into specific designs and programs which can be understood by and can exert an influence upon the people, in whom the power of decision rest. It follows that the planner's most important role is the part he plays in the inter-acting processed by which long-range socio-economic needs and goals are determined and by which these goals are achieved through a program of physical development."21 How shall the university produce a thoroughly trained, professionally competent planner who is capable of performing in this way. It is one thing to conjure up a definition of what a planner is or should be, but it is an entirely different thing to try to structure a learning experience that can produce that desired end result.

"Faced with increasing numbers of applicants, professional schools are more apt to admit the student who has been 'seasoned' by real world experience than the applicant with academic credentials only."22 This practice is based on the belief that specialized graduate programs like planning may require a clearer sense of purpose, and a sharper image of oneself as a
professional, then a student without previous experience can be expected to possess. Also "students who have worked for a period of time seem more able to take advantage of the interdisciplinary resources of the university." They are better able to gain a focus, achieve a specificity of interest, and develop some continuity with a minimum of prodding and supervision. However the chances of everyone entering planning school with some meaningful work experience in planning "under their belts" are very small indeed. For in point of fact it is very hard to find a job without some prior professional experience and it's very hard to get the experience you need without getting the right job. Consequently many people who might opt for professional experience prior to graduate education are stymied; they don't have the credentials which allow them to secure a job. In addition planning jobs at relatively low level entry positions are for a variety of reasons in short supply. This is especially true for people without undergraduate degrees in planning. Finally often it seems more prudent, especially in a tight job market, to get a graduate degree before seeking employment.

If experience is the best teacher and it is unreasonable to expect most students to accumulate
planning-type experiences prior to graduate school then it would seem to be a school's obligation to struc-
ture within its educational program ample exposure to real life planning experiences. An interesting datum which supports this realization is the fact that during each of the last three years over half of the students entering the MIT Planning Department have been below or between the ages of 22-25 (see table I). It seems reasonable to conclude that most of these students have had little or no prior experience. Also most of these students hold degrees in fields other than planning. Thus, it would seem that field linked activities have an important role to play in filling the void in the backgrounds of inexperienced planning students and in helping to create the focus, interest and continuity needed in an academic career.

Education must be an oscillation between teaching in knowledge and training in skills, between theory and practice.\textsuperscript{24} Some methods are more promising than others. One of the most promising is participation in and observation of the planning process directly by students. "A shorthand phrase for this is field work, the practice in operations that supplements the theory of the classroom."\textsuperscript{25} Field work has always been conceived of as a way of learning first hand from living people about their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of M.C.P.</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Ph.D.</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.'s and Graduate Instructors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Minority Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.C.P.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of U.S. Citizenship</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Foreign Citizenship</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Distribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Students</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1 CONTINUED


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters/Doctorate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Upon Entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Countries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics/Transportation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Political</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
work, institutions, organizations problems etc.. More specifically, in an academic sense field work has been perceived as an educational tool which seeks to mesh theory and real world practice.

Educators have always been intrigued with field work as a means of helping students integrate theoretical concepts from the classroom with the demands of professional practice. Robert F. Sexton of The National Center for Public Service Internships states "a large number of educators, including myself, know through direct personal experience that students can find fantastically rewarding learning opportunities away from the classroom in internships. We have found that students return from internships with a reawakened sense of their learning powers, with a more sensitive and incisive understanding of political and social undercurrents, with a clearer self awareness and understanding of where they are headed, with a greater understanding of the possibilities and problems of institutional reform, and with an ear for the nuances and interrelatedness of all sorts of administrative, political, social and cultural phenomena. We have found that these results can come from placement of students in real work situations with empathetic and alert supervisors, combined with outside intellectual stimulation designed to help the student
pull himself above his specific job and observe himself in the total scheme of things."26

In the last few years awareness of the importance of internships has increased substantially as the result of three converging tendencies; demands for "relevant education by students; the increasing demand for trained and responsible public manpower; and academia's reevaluation of traditional higher education. However "their viability as educational programs has been circumscribed by other factors; their positions as step-children in educational institutions, without the prestige of traditional research-oriented learning; their temporary nature (intern programs tend to come and go as individuals change positions); and the pragmatic and generally non-committed attitudes of the placement power structures. Also, in most cases present institutional attitudes have determined that those most convinced of the values of this mode of learning, i.e. intern program directors, instructors, and supervisors, have not been considered in the forefront of educational change.27 "Essentially, the intern program supporter sees an ironic situation - for years internships have been the sole for the student who wanted to learn outside the classroom and years of experience have been generated, but these resources have not been recognized as an integral part of the higher
education reform package." If a solution to this dilemma is to be found there has to be first an forthright examination of the critical issues, problems and benefits confronting the student, the field instructor, the field agency and the graduate school all of which operate in the field work matrix. It is inevitable that field education must be scrutinized because it is in field work practice that the student learns to do and, in the main, learns what he should be. Field instruction is the mirror in which the profession sees not its image but its problems and in which professional education sees not its accomplishments but its failures."  

Harvey S. Perloff in his book Education for Planning states that "a full-time teacher who falls back on the transmission of bits and pieces of practical wisdom is likely to be less effective and useful than an able part-time practitioner-teacher who can bring his students into intimate contact with practical work in the field." This statement should not be interpreted as intimating that part-time practitioners are in all cases to be preferred to full-time teachers. Quite the contrary is true in most cases. However a part time teacher can be more effective than a full-time teacher if he is able to offer students insightful and intimate contact with planning practice as he is experiencing it. The
practitioner-teacher is in a position to elaborate extemporaneously not just about the way planning is supposed to happen, but rather about how it actually happens. It is the opportunity to vicariously experience contemporary planning processes and the bits and pieces of information not available in textbooks that seems to make the practitioner teacher more effective. In a larger sense this realization seems to suggest that a viable mix of theory and action can offer special insights to planning students. Moreover most planning students are more interested in practical rather than theoretical problems. It has been noted "since old-style professionalism has too often addressed the wrong problems, students and faculty alike are becoming suspicious of the merits of theoretical exercises that lead to 'correct' solutions on paper, especially when they presume to deal .... with the welfare of human beings. The obvious catharsis is to seek problem material through direct interaction with people in their environment." Within the context of planning education there is an undeniable need to integrate real life practical applications of planning skills and opportunities for skill development with a framework of planning theory.

This basic point takes on even greater significance when it is realized that historically planning education
has tended to follow somewhat haltingly after the march of practical ends, rather than to anticipate needs and to develop new knowledge and methods. In general, it has only been after the practitioners have found themselves ill-equipped to undertake tasks thrust upon them—tasks such as population and migration analysis, regional economic surveys and the development of programming and capital-budgeting techniques—that the universities responded by changing their existing training programs or initiated new planning programs. Lawrence Mann has suggested that "it must be faced that the planning schools, especially the most highly reputed ones, are preparing planners for a Utopian market. Planners are not being trained for jobs that exist but rather for ones that the students and professors think it would be nice to have exist." There is also a wider tendency of employers in many fields to require students to emerge into the world ready equipped to do an efficient job. Thus it is evident that a tool like field work is needed to achieve the proper mesh of action and theory that allows a university to produce thoroughly-trained, professionally competent planners.

Field work has not been the only educational vehicle used to accomplish a marriage between theory and real life practice. The predominant importance of the studio
or workshop course in early planning history was specifically in this area. "Such classes were supposed to simulate the real world and to keep training from being entirely theoretical." Lawrence Mann in recounting the history of studio courses states - "a very large proportion of the student's time in some programs has been devoted to such courses. But, in operation, these studio courses often tended to arrive at such unreal problems that their educational value was dubious. Moreover, they required so much student time that often students simply did not do the reading or other work for nonstudio courses. Finally, with their vast scope and compressed succession of deadlines, they often made decision-making on team proposals a caricature of the worst elements of office practice. A studio problem is usually decided by head-on collisions in which the one with the thickest skull survives, and then having the rest of the team draw up his solutions to the problem at hand. But the gravest difficulty with studio instruction in graduate planning schools has been the excessive costs in terms of necessary faculty input, space and materials requirements, and opportunity costs for students in terms of other educational opportunities, relative to the demonstrable benefits that are obtained from such instruction."
Field work has however served many of the same educational and research functions more effectively. Involvement in field work offers a variety of options ranging from advocacy work to sampling of career roles in various settings. "But primarily pre-professional field experiences have always been seen as a means for easing the transition between the world of study and the world of work, for helping motivate and focus students in their academic activities and for providing experiences in certain kinds of skills not easily practiced in the university setting. To these uses certain changes in professional roles and training have added new sorts of salience. As 'planning' has come to deal more and with issues which are, in large part, psychological, social and political in character, with institutions and organizations, the 'studio' in which students used to spend much of their time has become a less and less adequate way of simulating the reality under discussion." 33

"The situations with which the profession is now concerned have less clearly bounded and understood components than when the focus was on physical planning. Our models for describing social and political reality are very rough approximations. It is very difficult to simulate these situations in the studio or to describe them adequately in the classroom. The only viable teaching
alternative seems to be real-life exploration of actual situations, under careful guidance and supervision. One way to understand the functioning of institutions is to work in them from a variety of points of view. More and more, too, the kind of work we are coming to do demands skills institutional invention and orchestration not easily described or practiced in the classroom, but in which the student can begin to acquire some competence by witnessing others in action situations and experiencing such situations at first hand."\textsuperscript{39}

Before one accepts field work as the "best of all possible worlds", it is important to understand fully the field worker role—its limitations and its capabilities. A person involved in field work in the previously mentioned sense is much like a sociologist who must observe, participate in and report upon a segment of his own world.\textsuperscript{40} The outstanding peculiarity of this method of learning is that the observer or student, in greater or lesser degree is caught up in the very web of social interaction which he observes, participates in, analyzes and reports on. The unending dialectic between the role of member (participant) and stranger (observer and reporter) is essential to the very concept of field work. It is hard to be both at the same time.\textsuperscript{41} This dialectic is critical to an understanding of the com-
plexity of field work. At one and the same instant a student must play two different roles. In one sense he is a stranger who seeks entry into the agency organization (often on a rather tenuous part time basis). Within this role he seeks to become a part of an organization and to master certain, skills. While at the same time (as a reporter or observer) he wants to learn from the situation. Which means that while he is striving to be a so called member or participant (as he pursues the mastery of certain job skills) the field worker is also involved in a much higher order learning process of trying to abstract from his experiences certain realities or rationalizations that can: (1) make his future interventions into similar situations simpler and more meaningful; (2) suggest new areas for personal inquiry and (3) enable him to offer critical insights into the ways of improving organizational effectiveness as well as his own.

To summarize briefly, an individual cast in the field worker role of participant/reporter must be both close to and distant from what is going on around him. This means that the field worker must be active in what is going on but at the same time he must be able to display an objectivity that allows him to mentally step back from the situation and take a critical look with a
clinical eye at what is taking place. This process constitutes the conscious use of self needed in field work. In simpler terms, conscious use of self translates into a student's ability to scrutinize a situation with the goal of deciding upon what best course of action or non-action will achieve a specific effect on the group, person or process at hand.

It is hard to be both a good reporter and a good participant at the same time. One has to learn to acquire new data in a variety of settings. Ways of dealing with these problems include being a part-time participant and a public reporter, or a public participant and a secret reporter. All these approaches to field work are in practice and all have their short comings. The problem can never fully be resolved, for to do a good job of social observation one has to be close to people, living their lives with them and reporting on what is taking place. The problem of maintaining a balance between the various roles of the field worker is the key to the successful use of field work as a learning vehicle.42

"The problem of learning to be a 'field worker' is like the problem of learning to live in society. It is the problem of making good guesses from previous experience so that one can get into a social situation in which to
get more knowledge and experience to enable him to make more good guesses to get into a better situation, ad infinitum. The problem involved in field work then is to learn how he, can keep expanding this series as long as possible and in what situations he can do so. The part of theoretical analysis and the part of insightful experience and the relation of the two to each other are in a sense, what we set out to discover. 43

To outline in a more detailed way what field work is and what it entails for a student who is so involved, it is necessary to construct a basic model of field work operation. The most traditional form of field work operation is the agency field work model outlined in the introduction. To reiterate, this model can be summarized as follows. The general focus of the field experience is on development of practical skills. Field learning and class learning proceed concurrently with relatively early introduction of the student to certain (agency/planning) responsibilities. Field learning experiences are based primarily in the agency in which the student is placed. The learning experiences are organized and directly influenced by the agency's functions and service goals. The primary teaching-learning method is the tutorial or individual conference with the chief mentor—the field instructor (he may be agency or school
based). Finally the student is expected to perform in the role of an employee in accord with the agency's policies and procedures.

The potential pitfalls and inherent difficulties involved in structuring field work arrangements have become just as apparent over time as the educational benefits. Unorganized field work activities at their worst offer sham work alternatives, busy work, meaningless tasks and sporadic idleness. At its best field work creates a feeling for critical real life planning issues. Some of the most critical problems related to field work are: (1) the timing of events and organizational needs in the real world does not follow any academic rhythm of semester schedules and vacations; (2) field work in agencies cannot be made "safe" or "non-controversial" either for the agency, the university or the student.

"Risks are involved for students. They have been conditioned and taught with authoritarian support for so long that they find it difficult when forced by necessity to teach themselves in an internship experience.

"Risks are involved for universities that sponsor and sanction intern-type programs. To acknowledge that learning can occur beyond the walls of the campus is close to hersey. We risk an awareness that universities do not, after all, have a monopoly on all
knowledge and learning opportunities. We risk redefining teaching as the providing of learning environments rather than dispensing knowledge about the past.

- Risks are also involved for those agencies with whom interns work. Public organizations are product oriented and have public missions to complete on a definite time table. As of the moment, very few take to a teaching role - the provision of learning environments - with confidence and ease. The risk is that they will not be able to handle the tension we create for them — a tension requiring them on the one hand to carry out their publicly mandated missions and, on the other hand, to carry out the teaching missions urged upon them in internship programs]

4. (3) it is not yet known how to insure a minimum equality of learning opportunity for all students, no matter what their field placements or who their field instructors are; (4) it is not clear how to achieve orderly learning in a disorderly situation or how to relate the 'field order' of the field to the logical order of organized knowledge; (5) in our effort to make field instruction as educational an experience as possible, we have to guard against splintered learning. (Splintering is likely to occur when field learning is broken into small discrete tasks that take planning practice apart but do not lead quickly
enough or directly enough to synthesis or comprehensiveness) and (6) a relative imbalance of learning may occur in the field when a student is only in the agency intermittently and the learning experiences are organized primarily around small short-term responsibilities or tasks.

There are on the other hand a number of advantages that nevertheless intice students to seek active involvement in field work. For example, participation in field work allows students to sample various career roles. Field work helps to clarify certain kinds of information for students and can spawn their further investigation in specialized areas. In field placements students learn to work toward specific goals within specific time limits. Field work allows students to operationalized their ideas in a real life setting (True creativity as it relates to field work operation lies not just in the chance creation of an idea but also in the planning and implementation of that idea in an organizational context into practiced reality for an agency). Students who participate in field work are able to get positive feedback and criticism or their professional capabilities. Field work allows students to try out a number of different job settings. When field work is linked to a paying agency it offers
students an opportunity to earn money while also attaining academic credit for time spent on the job. Most importantly, participation in field work experiences enhances a student's sense of competence and gives him real life exposure to the nature of his future vocation — The fact that field work can serve to speed up a student's achieved sense of competence as well as give him a greater sense of self confidence through exposure to the basic types of tasks associated with the practice of planning should not be understated or taken lightly.

For example it is common for students to experience some form of separation anxiety upon graduation from a professional school (especially if he has had no prior experience in his field). What this anxiety means to the student is that he may be aware of having some knowledge, some skill, and a professional label, but he is also acutely aware of not yet having an identity. He may know planning, he has a professional designation, but he is not yet a planner. Thus in this ego-identity sense it is a professional privilege, and an immensely important step in learning, to have for a while the status of a postgraduate fellow, resident, intern, advanced trainee, or whichever more suitable term may be chosen, as a transitional integrative and identity-establishing period between being a student and a full
fledged staff member. Most of the turbulent stages of life are followed by a shorter or longer latency period, before the next great developmental step can be taken. Postgraduate residences or fellowships can thus be seen to some extent as a designed and stylized latency. They allow for some basic internal rearrangements that do not meet the eye in a spectacular way. Nor do they merely give a person a breathing spell or enhance his comfort, although these things are beneficial and not to be minimized. Rather, they constitute for many bright graduates an indispensable foundation for productive professional growth.45

There are a number of other benefits to be derived from field work participation by students. For instance, field work practice not only allows a student to test theory but in some cases it can lead him to new theory. Field work also aids a student in developing a theory of planning practice or a general notion of how to succeed in a planning agency. More specifically, field work gives a student a reality framework or real life proving ground to pull together all his theories of action, both in terms of personality interaction and organization operation. (With this reality base in front of him a student's concepts and theories sharpen and come into focus, strategies of consensus and conflict
come into play as the student interacts with the intangibles of a field placement i.e. inadequate funding for projects, limited staff, political fights, weak agency powers, conservative supervisors, red tape etc.) In a general sense field work participation helps to shape, enlarge and reinforce those planning concepts, theories etc. taught to students in the classroom.

Hugh Roper (the head of the department of Town and Country Planning at Liverpool College in England) suggests that the rationale for practical experience (field work) being 'sandwiched' between school work centers around several specific advantages. He states that a student profits from field work via "the development of personal confidence and maturity of outlook through daily contact with senior members of the profession and with the general public." Roper indicates that field work aids a student in achieving an "accumulation of a background of relevance for all subsequent academic study and practice through direct experience of the complex problems, frustrations and achievements of planning practice." Furthermore he suggests that field work stimulates a "student's desire for learning and critical appreciation through a realization of the inadequacies of his personal knowledge and experience." Finally, Roper states that field work offers to an academic
institution "the opportunity to deal with particular academic weaknesses of a student without interrupting the general curriculum of study." 

In addition to the final advantage outlined by Hugh Roper, are a number of other tangible benefits that accrue to academic institutions which sponsor field linked education. Field work programs offer to academic institutions the opportunity to test the proper mesh of academic theories and real world planning towards the ends of producing an ideal model for a planning education matrix. Such programs create ties between academic institutions and public/private agencies thereby offering the former a real world proving ground for theoretical concepts and the latter the by products of 'intellectual capital' marshaled in the university on their behalf. Field programs also tend to enhance a planning department's ability to gain immediate feedback on the feasibility of ideas and techniques being taught in the class room. Through field work an academic institution can offer a more comprehensive and professional learning experience to its students. Finally through field work programs academic institutions can extend and strengthen their lines of communication with public agencies. In fact the close ties that result from such relationships aid the academic
institutions in maintaining a political and social awareness of changing local planning issues and needs.

Agencies which sponsor internships benefit in a number of ways. First of all the use of graduate students in one sense provides agencies with relatively high level-low cost man power. Within agencies interns often tackle problems or tasks neglected under daily routines and pressures by supervisors. In fact interns often complete tasks for agencies that would not otherwise be accomplished. Over the long-term field work programs help to attract new talent into state and local government agencies. In the short term field work creates a flow of new ideas and theoretical knowledge into agencies via students.

Even without these basic incentives there is still a more selfish reason why agencies are and should be involved in field work activities. That reason is that many of these agencies are future employers of many planning school graduates. The basic office practice skills and organizational knowledge developed by students in field work are readily transferable to various subsequent work experiences. Thus agencies by taking an active part in the education of students not only insure a higher level of competence of possible future employees but also decrease the amount of time a graduate
will need to become an effective staff member in any agency.

Much of the past history of field practice in Planning education centers on the use of 'sandwich' arrangements. The basic pattern of sandwich education is a period of practice integrated between the required years of graduate study. In 1937 for example MIT used a 'double-decker sandwich course' of a total of six years for a degree program leading to a Master in City Planning and a degree of Bachelor of Architecture in City Planning. "The curriculum of this course included a year of varied experience in the offices of local, state and regional planning boards. This was accomplished by providing for summer work at the end of the fourth and fifth years of the six-year program, and an additional period of office practice in the second term of the fifth year." A news release on this program stated - "With this background a student will not only approach his academic work with a more realistic view point but should graduate with a better understanding of the professional field and with more chance of being of immediate value to his employers." In 1948 the traditional pattern of 'sandwich' education was a three month period of practice between two years of graduate study. In the 1948 issue of Planning
(ASPO) it was noted that the Planning Department of the University of California (Berkeley) had a program which required a period of at least two years, including a three months' period of internship in a planning office, preferably under taken during the summer between the two graduate years. In 1954 Frederick Adams' report Urban Planning Education In the United States indicated that several major planning schools required a three month internship period as a required part of their graduate programs (i.e. MIT, Harvard, University of California (Berkeley), University of Oklahoma, University of North Carolina, University of Chicago).

A significant report on Student Internships in planning education was compiled in 1955 by the Pacific Northwest Chapter of AIP. Using a series of questionnaires sent out to planning universities, students and agencies, the study attempted to answer the following questions: (1) What methods are utilized to give students practical planning experience by U.S. schools offering graduate planning curricula?; (2) What general method is most appropriate from these standpoints: the student, the community under study, and the planning profession?; (3) How can the Pacific Northwest Chapter aid local universities in carrying out the most appropriate method? This study defined an intern as "a planning student
should continually seek suitable positions for planning interns so that individual students may be placed where maximum educational value may be achieved." It also mandates that "each established planning agency should cooperate to the maximum of its capabilities in providing suitable positions for planning interns." Most importantly the report establishes that "the scope of the work to be accomplished by an intern should be clearly outlined and agreed upon by the employing agency, the school, and the student. Finally the report stipulates that the training of the intern should be the primary objective of field work and that "no work involving the actual development of plans should be attempted unless the intern receives continuing professional supervision." 

A common thread which seems to run through both the conclusions and the recommendations of this 1955 report is that continuing supervision of students is the key to a successful experience. However J. C. Holliday in his paper "Link between Education and Practice" prepared for the Education Conference of the Town Planning Institute (June 1970) states that a major problem in field education is "the establishment in a planning office of a practitioner interested in education and able to devote time to it." If a agency supervisor can't
serving for pay on an actual planning job, this work being required or actively encouraged by the school prior to his receiving a degree."54 (The significance of this definition will become more important later.)

Basically this report established that out of the seventeen replying institutions, six reported that a period of student internship was a required portion of the planning course, five indicated that such a period of internship was provided on an optional basis, and six reported no internship program whatsoever. Four schools offered scholastic credits for the internship work.

The most significant conclusions reached by this study are as follows:

1. "Internship training for planning students is desirable where the conditions outlined in these conclusions are substantially met. Such training is of mutual benefit to the planning student, the employing agency and the profession.

2. No single type internship program appears most desirable for every school. The nature of the school's planning curriculum and its facilities, the status of professional planning in the region, the background of the student, and other factors have a bearing on the type of internship most desirable in each case."
3. While it is necessary that an internship be of benefit to the employing agency, it should be selected and conducted primarily to afford that kind of experience which will enable the intern to receive maximum value from his education.

4. Generally, an internship can be of maximum educational value to a student when it is served with an established planning agency, because it affords: (a) opportunity for contact with a broader planning program and; (b) day-to-day contact with professional planners, and (c) continuing supervision.

5. An internship is appropriate in a community with no resident staff only where continuing supervision is exercised by the school's planning faculty or a planning consultant, or where the work is confined to basic studies.

6. A period of internship training can be a substantial contribution to the student's education only with conscious effort on the part of both planning school and employing agency. This necessitates a close liaison between the two in the establishment and direction of the internship."55

This report also made several important recommendations. In general the report suggests that "planning schools
be depended upon to give the continuing supervision needed by a student in an internship then it seems that an academic manager needs to be appointed. "There seems", however "To be little tradition in planning unlike, for example, social work, of seeing practice as 'field work' and of appointing supervisors in local planning offices to insure that the work is educational for the student and to coordinate his practical experience with his academic work."60 In fact most major literature on planning education neither discusses the importance of the quality and nature of field work (practical experience) nor considers the significance of the level and adequacy of field supervision. Further more a student's time out in the field is seen as time on a job. It appears that traditionally speaking, a student fills a gap in the planning office (or placement) rather than being allowed to pursue his education in a new context.61 Collectively these points tend to indicate that the planning profession has not given a great deal of rational thought or action to the structuring and operation of field work on an educational level. In fact the planning profession's laissez-faire attitude toward field work tends to turn internships into apprenticeships and threatens to turn a professional experience into a volunteer manpower program.
It is obvious that there have been difficulties in the organization of practical experience for students even while planning was mainly a 'one niche' career, with few opportunities for employment outside the local planning authority. Today as planning has tended to become more complex and employment opportunities more diverse (and widely disperse in different settings), the difficulties in the organization of practical experience for students have increased and the need for closer supervision has become greater. "It is no longer good enough to give students little, bottom of-the-ladder tasks that they can (hopefully) do well without much supervision." The complexity of both planning and the field work process demand that students be placed in the best possible learning environment under close and continuing academic and professional field supervision. Any compromise toward allowing a student to simply serve as manpower for an agency severly limits the "professional" nature of the experience and diminishes the educational returns to the student. Such a situation can result in a student being trained to perform task for an agency but not necessarily "educated" to the nature of the planning process.
CHAPTER II

The Hud Internship Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Program:</th>
<th>HUD Internship Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship:</td>
<td>Program is supported by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development through the Massachusetts Office of State Planning and Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Staff:</td>
<td>One half time program coordinator with instructor status (a graduate student in Ph.D. program) and one quarter-time seminar coordinator with instructor status (a full time employee of a community services agency).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students: (* During Period of 1971 - 1972)</td>
<td>Twelve (12 graduate students. Minority students who are in financial need are offered participation in HIP as a way to finance their matriculation at MIT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry or Selection Process:</td>
<td>Financial Stipend: $4,000 per year plus tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Participation:</td>
<td>Students become initially involved in program for at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time and Credits:

12 hours per week spent in field = 9 academic credits per semester / 3 hours per week spent in academic seminar = 9 academic credits per semester.

Seminar:

Weekly class entitled "Planned Change and Implementation" Emphasis of class is on the synthesis of practice and theory.
Background Information/Funding Source:

Hud-supported work-study projects are addressed to individuals from minority groups who are interested in pursuing careers in various aspects of urban planning. HUD identifies two basic functions for these work-study projects: (1) To prepare additional persons, who by their backgrounds have special insights into the problems of minority groups and disadvantaged citizens, for jobs in planning and related activities. (2) To assist public agencies in carrying out their roles, by providing an additional source of trained manpower.

Each work-study project calls for a collaborative relationship between a state or local agency, which is eligible to receive 701 funds, and one or more universities. Each agency-university consortium is expected to recruit a predetermined number of minority group students who are expected to carry a full-time academic load while working part-time (12-20 hours a week) on tasks assigned by the agency. The nature of the work is determined jointly by each student, the agency, and the university. Academic credit is to be given for work experience. Also each university is expected to conduct a seminar as an integral part of the work study program which will provide opportunity for the students
to relate their academic and professional experiences.

The cost of each student program is borne jointly by HUD, the collaborating agency and the university. Two-thirds of the cost is provided by HUD in the form of funds given to the agency while the other third is provided by the agency and the university. The agency's contribution takes the form of supervision given to the student in the placement. The university's contribution is primarily through program management, supportive services and tuition awards. (It is estimated that the total MIT contribution to the HIP was about $35,000. About $5,000 was spent in administrative cost and $30,000 was given in tuition awards.) The funding for the MIT program was provided by HUD through the Massachusetts Office of State Planning and Management. Funds to support work-study projects are committed by HUD on a yearly basis. There is no guarantee that a student can be supported for more than one year under this program. However if a work-study project is approved for renewal by HUD, a student's participation in the program can be extended beyond the initial period.
MIT/HUD Program Description:

The program was initiated September 1971 as a special work-study program to financially aid minority students in the DUSP. The program was developed by the DUSP in an effort to draw more minority students into the planning profession. Participating students worked in state, private and federal agencies in the greater Boston area, where each was assigned an individual work supervisor. Their assignments included positions with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination, the Governor's Office of Urban Affairs, the Department of Community Affairs, the Citizens Housing and Planning Association, Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency, Massachusetts State College System, Office of Planning and Program Coordination, Governor's Citizens Committee on Corrections, State Economic Opportunity Office, United South End Settlements, Governor's Office of Human Rights, Christian Science Monitor, Circle Associates, Boston Transportation Planning Review, Roxbury Comprehensive Community Health Center and Roxbury Action Program.

The two program coordinators held a seminar, "Planned Changed and Implementation", on a weekly basis.

The seminar was designed to help synthesize practice and theory by providing for a bridging of field and academic experiences. The seminar was organized into
two parts, an initial segment focusing on theory building for planning (this included assigned readings on general planning theory) and a series of case studies presented by the Interns regarding their work placements. The initial reading and general discussion segment comprised eight sessions. The remainder of the time was spent on case study presentations during both semesters. Integrated between these two main parts were a few sessions for speakers and two sessions of CLUG - a housing development simulation game.
On the following pages a three part process is used to present the information obtained from interviewing this program's coordinators. The three parts are an interview preview or summary, a dialogue (question/answer) outline of the interview and an interview review. The interview preview gives a brief overview of the major points to be gleaned from the interview. The dialogue (question/answer) formate is used to preserve the clarity and candor of the information obtained. It helps also to succinctly outline the philosophy of field work held by each individual. The interview review analyzes the significance of the information uncovered.
Interview Preview

This first interview takes a look at the HIP through the eyes of the program's initiator and chief administrator. In it he outlines the goals of the program. The primary goal of the program was to provide financial aid to minority students while the secondary goal was to test out the effectiveness of a model of field-linked education. He also establishes the inadequacy of his part-time commitment to the program and comments on what appears to him to be a closer approximation of adequate staffing of the HIP. The subject states that a case study presentation by students was the basic mechanism used to integrate theory and practice within the field seminar. In discussing the inadequacies of this approach he states that there was a lack of lead up points to the final oral case study presentations in the seminar. He suggests that the building process (structuring the lead up points) could have been accomplished through meetings between the field supervisors and the interns. However he concedes that during the course or the program such meetings took place so infrequently that the building process was not able to take place.

Within the interview the subject states that a lack of time prevented both coordinators of the program from
making any visits to field placements or having any conferences with field supervisors. In fact he cites the inability of both field supervisors and faculty coordinators to make the needed time commitment toward making field placements into useful educational experiences as the main problem of the program. As a result of this factor, students tended to be used by field supervisors as just extra manpower instead of being given an educational experience tailored to meet their needs. Finally the subject comments on field work's major advantages as being in its ability to aid students in developing: an educational and professional focus; a sense of competence and a theory of planning practice.
Subject # 1 - the program coordinator of the HIP made the following responses to the given questions asked.

Q  - What were the goals of the program?
A  - Of course the first goal was to draw more minority students into the department by being able to offer them financial aid via this program.
    - The ambitious goal was to test out in some coherent way a model of field-linked education. Which entailed putting people from a planning education program systematically into points of key policy generation. Places where something important would be happening. The second step was to see how this type of program would relate to the nature of the planning curriculum. We were also interested in the kind of feedback into the department and faculty that would come as a result of the program. In terms of how well the department was addressing issues out in the field and how well agencies were functioning around these issues.
    - The second goal was to use the seminar as a point of generation of planning practice and theory. It was probably one of the first attempts by the department to tie the academic to the practical.
    - The goals of the seminar were to advance the state of planning practice. A point where the student could step back and reflect on both the relevance of theory
and practice.

- What this really entailed was trying to do what all planning education is about - make theory and practice coherent.

- The next major goal was to get the kind of substantial contributions that minority students could make in policy and issue areas where heretofore they had not been involved in to any significant extent.

- The time availability of faculty committed to the program was minimal in terms of accomplishing such a range of goals.

- To really operate the program in reference to these goals most effectively requires the involvement of a broad range of the faculty in the department and not just one other person and myself.

Q - How much time were you required to devote to the program by the department?

A - I was technically a one half time staff member and the co-coordinator was a one-quarter time staff person. Both of us were putting in much more time then that because of our own personal commitment.

Q - What do you feel constitutes adequate staffing of a field work program?
A - This year is a closer approximation to what is needed. The program needs at least an associate level professor to give general direction to the program. There probably ought to be some other staff members with similar status to deal with the substantive issues of the field placements.

- There should be also one teaching assistant or professor for every five students to work with them around specific placement interest.

Q - How were theory and practice supposed to be integrated with the seminar format?

A - The case study was supposed to be the mechanism to do that. However trying to do this in one case study with out any basic steps leading up to it seems to have been unsuccessful.

- The whole notion was to take a particular situation and to develop some theory out of it. We kind of leaped from the situation into students' theory statements within the case study. What was wrong was that there were no lead up points. The lead up points could have been meetings with the field supervisor and the student. But these meetings occurred so infrequently that it didn't happen.
However students were told to dovetail papers they were doing out in the field.

Q - Were there any planned on site visits made to field placements for conferences with field supervisors and or students?
A - None in the first semester and a few in the second semester.

Q - Why so few conferences?
A - We wanted to have conferences but we didn't have enough time. Also we were operating on the assumption that the intern and field supervisor would work out the job situation. But we found that it makes no sense at all to ask people just coming into a new setting from a variety of backgrounds with no knowledge of what MIT really wants and field supervisors having very little knowledge to figure out an educational kind of a placement without some kind of academic involvement from the school.

- Another oversight was the fact that the supervisors had not been thoroughly brief on what the program was trying to accomplish.

Q - Had you to do it over again - what would be your orientation strategy?
A - During the first week of the program somebody from the faculty should sit down with the student and supervisor and talk over the whole range of the program for an hour. Then another half an hour should be devoted to figuring out what the task options of the placement are, the sequence, time schedule etc. Then some time should be given to the student to go to the agency and decide what option he wants to get involved in.

Q - How were placements selected?
A - The first time around we went hat in hand around to every place where we knew people who worked in certain agencies.

- The utility of a field placement depends upon who the student is and who you have available on the faculty for back up resources and about five or six other elements.

- A placement may be good for one person but bad for someone else.

- A program that is adequately staffed allows you the freedom to make a more accurate determination of what placement is right for what student.

Q - How did you view the student's role in a field placement?
A - To do a job. Be involved in something that is
real in terms of generating a particular policy.
- Something that is useful to a student.
- What the student does should be useful to both the agency and the student but priority should be given to what the student wants to achieve.

Q - Did you make this notion of student's needs being given priority to agency work needs clear to agencies?
- We had a initial letter which said here are our expectations. In so far as you can say a letter does an adequate job in communicating this idea - yea.
- But of course it didn't, you know everybody interprets what a thing like that means differently.
- There were some good fits and some bad fits in placements for students. Some students had similar expectations on the agencies others did not.

Q - What were some of the problems of the field work program because of "bad fits" between student and agency needs?
A - Some students were used for turning out small agency tasks that had to be done right away.
- Probable the biggest problem was the inability of supervisors and faculty to make the time commitment
to make the placement into a useful educational experience. A lot of responsibility was left to students to make good use of the placement.

Q - What were the basic academic demands made on the students?
A - At the beginning of the placement some reading and short written analysis of readings were required through the seminar meetings. Of course later a written case study on the agency was passed in after their oral presentation of it in the seminar.
- The case study was supposed to be a mechanism to give focus to theories about field placements: We were aiming at building theory on organization intervention.

Q - Were you able to help students mesh theory and practice via the seminars?
A - Some students were able to tie their field work to academic courses.
- Overall we did not have enough time to do an adequate job of providing an education link between theory and practice within the seminars.
- Another part of the fact of why we couldn't do an adequate job linking theory to practice was because we also didn't do an adequate job of fitting everyone into a good placement.
Q - What changes do you see that are needed to make field work more effective?
A - To be more effective a full time school/part time field experience has to have more faculty involved in it and they have to be supportive of the concept.
   - I would also like to see greater time commitments given to field work activities i.e. full time placement for a semester.

Q - What kind of initial field placement descriptions did you get from field supervisors on experience options?
A - They were pretty general and not too specific on what a student would be doing.

Q - What makes a good placement?
A - The first criteria is an interesting question or policy issue to work on. The second thing would be a competent field supervisor - somebody who has a sense of the breadth of the issue as well as its immediate relevance to an agency.
   - If these two criteria are met then the amount of time the students spent in the field is less critical then the quality of time - how it is spent.
- Another criteria of a good placement is the extent to which the field task relates to the time the student has available. In other words the activity should not be more then you can do or less then you can do given the specific numbers of hours out in the field.

Q - Do you think there should be a specific time for field supervisors to meet with students each week?
A - As a general notion there should be periodic meetings.

Q - What were the major problems with field supervisors?
A - The most significant problem was that some supervisors wanted to just use students as man power rather then provide an adequate educational experience.

Q - What is the advantage of field work to a student?
A - One of the major advantages of field work for a student is that it aids him in moving quickly through that initial threshold of competence. This is particularly important for people who have had no previous experience.

- After being in field work you know that you know something - which is a critical variable in this game.
Another advantage for people with out previous experience is that field work gives them some context against which to judge the Chinese menu of planning specialities and directions to go. The student can decide do I want this or do I want that.

It allows students to rule out certain career options and make more effective use of their time at school. This process is alot more difficult to accomplish if you are just reading about planning or talking to other students.

Field work also provides a mechanism to generate your own theory of planning practice and offers an arena in which the academic specialities can be worked out and understood.

Q - How did student's used their first field placements?
A - The initial round of placements last year served mostly to help students to decide what they did or did not want to do. All most half of the students changed placements after the first semester.

No matter how good a course is about a certain field it is not the same as testing out the actual role in a placement.
Several important facts stand out in analyzing this interview. First the immediate goal of the HIP was the development of a financial mechanism to allow more minority students to financially afford to matriculate in the MIT Department of Urban Studies and Planning. However a broader objective of the program was to consider the most effective use of field work in planning education. Just how the broad objective would be met was not established. "The underlying assumption was, however, that as various issues were raised by Interns other DUSP faculty would be drawn into the discussion. This was to occur either formally (faculty attending the seminar, meeting with supervisors or students on specific issues, etc.) or informally (occasional discussions with Interns, program faculty, or others on use of work placement issues for course papers, etc.).

In looking back over the experience I can personally say that no formal involvement process took place. Specifically no faculty attended seminars on a regular basis and few if any faculty members consulted any students relative to work placements.

According to the respondent the program was inadequately staffed and supported by the DUSP in order to
carry out its more ambitious goals. To quote the respondent more specifically from his February 23, 1972 status report on the program:

"For a program which can amount to as much as 40% of an intern's MCP coursework, this program is understaffed. Faculty time has to be divided among many responsibilities, including teaching, field supervision, administration and "informal" (but often extensive) advising. At present the total time assignment of the two faculty members assigned does not equal a full-time position." Even though both of the program coordinators made attempts to service the needs of the program on their part time basis as well as they could, their other personal time commitments interfered with a more successful operation of the program. For example the first significant program mechanism to be neglected by both program coordinators was a basic three party conference (student-field supervisors - academic manager). Their neglect of this crucial communications and coordination tool was due largely to the coordinators' failure to have time to devote to it and partly to their underestimation of its importance.

Such a meeting of the minds could have accomplished the following things toward properly structuring the placement: (1) establish the needs and expectations of
each participant; (2) establish the educational emphasis of the program and the field supervisor's responsibilities to the student along those lines; (3) establish some guidelines on how the placement experience should be designed to give the student maximum exposure to the planning process found there and to assure the attainment of the student's specific goals; (4) establish the "housekeeping" details of the program (i.e. written evaluations of students by supervisors, time limitations of a student, scheduling of periodic conferences between student, field supervisor and academic manager, establishment of the need of a close working relationship between student and field supervisor etc.) and (5) establish the academic manager's role as co-field teacher and crisis mediator.

Besides the initial omission of a three party tete-a-tete there were also no on-site visits made by the academic advisers to the placements in order to assess the nature of the learning environment offered to the students. But perhaps even more important then this is the fact that there had been no real structured approach to selecting placements. Placements were developed and established not on the basis of any analysis of if the supervisor and setting provided an optimal planning learning environment (i.e. which could be established by such facts as - Have interns been placed there before?
Does the agency offer exposure to real planning professionals or to people who by job title are involved in planning and have no firm commitment to planning as a profession? Flexibility of agency to let student sample as many experiences as desired and not be limited to only working on tasks that need to be done etc.) but rather on the basis of "who do I know works where?" Or to be more specific the coordinators of the program more or less just placed students in any agency placements where there was an opening or where there was a contact person that they knew.

Perhaps the major point of this interview is the fact that because of a lack of adequate time commitment to the student by both the academic manager and the field supervisor the burden of making a viable learning experience of an agency situation was placed solely on the student. Some responsibility for this task rightly falls on the shoulders of the intern by definition. But also by definition of roles, the field supervisor and the academic manager must play a major role in addressing the needs of the intern and in assuring a proper learning environment is created.

Within this interview it was also established that one of the significant problems with field supervisors was that they wanted to use students only as extra man-
power rather than trying to provide them with an educational experience. Finally the program coordinator lists several major advantages of field work for a student as being: (1) it helps a student to move quickly through an initial threshold of competence; (2) it allows a student to test out certain career options and make more effective use of his time in school, and (3) it provides a mechanism for a student to generate his own theory of planning practice.
Interview Preview

This second interview deals with the frank and candid perceptions of the seminar coordinator of the HIP. The subject outlines his specific responsibilities to the program as being to help teach the field seminar and to help supervise field placements. He establishes his worth to the program as being centered around his prior contact with many of the supervisors that the interns had to work with. His pledged commitment to the HIP was technically only four hours. Even though he tended to give more time to the program he found that it demanded much more time than he could give. It is significant to note here that the three or four hours that the subject was to spend on the program were technically consumed by the night field seminar (7pm-10pm). During the day the subject was engaged in his full time job with a community service agency. Consequently during the day when students were in the field and perhaps in need of him, he was not able to take off time from his regular job to service their needs. Quite candidly the subject comments that the students needed much more help from the faculty program managers than they were able to give.

The subject states in this interview that there was
a lack of adequate development of field placements. He reports that placements were just selected from what was available and not judged by any criteria as to their potential educational value for students. Specifically he notes that field placements were not adequately surveyed or tested before hand to establish: (1) that they had tangible assignments to offer to students and (2) if the tasks available had a beginning and an end. (I might comment here that as an HUD intern I received a field placement list on which were brief sentences on what work activity was offered at each placement. However I found that the field assignments offered me in the placement that I chose bore little or no relation to what was stated in the placement description.). Within this interview it also becomes obvious that field supervisors were not adequately screened or chosen before hand. Proof of this is found in the subject's statement that there was a lack of commitment of supervisors to interns. This lack of commitment to interns tended to manifest itself in the supervisors' perception of interns as just "free labor" instead of students in need of close supervision. Another indication of the supervisors' lack of commitment to both the interns and the program is represented by the fact that very few supervisors turned in written evaluation statements on the nature of students'
field placement experiences as requested by the program directors. (In fact the responsibility for writing these summaries later fell to the students. This fact reinforces the chief coordinator's earlier observation that much of the responsibility or burden of making a viable learning experience out of an agency situation was placed solely on the student.) The subject indicates that another problem with supervisors was that many of them had not had any previous experience in supervising interns. To quote the subject - "We learned that you have got to be careful who you select as supervisors."

Within this interview the subject not only gives a very in-depth analysis of the field supervisors' failure to take on their full responsibility in supervising interns but he also categorizes the levels of supervisory competence encountered.

Most important to this thesis, the subject establishes within this interview that one of the problems of the HIP was the relative lack of total commitment to the program by the academic department and other faculty members. The subject also suggests as a structural problem the fact that students had to "squeeze" in time for field work in between different classes. He comments that if students could take all their classes on one or two days and then have the rest of the week for field work that
this would constitute a better time formate. Another "time" problem that the subject notes is that the placements during the course of the program called upon the interns to be available when they needed them and not when students could find time to be available. (This fact serves to reinforce the need for a change in time formate as suggested earlier.)

In reference to the field seminars, the subject states that they were successful in spawning honest criticism by interns of other interns' work. However he concedes that they were not as successful as they could have been from the students point of view. In discussing his monitoring of field placements the subject states that he did not get a chance to talk to supervisors often and he did not initiate any three party conferences. Finally the subject states that the major advantage extended to interns via the HIP was the opportunity to develop a clearer career focus - "students were able to make better career choices for their area of specialization based on their field involvement."
Subject # 2 - the seminar coordinator of the HIP made the following responses to the given questions asked.

Q - What was your role in the HIP?
A - I was brought on board to help teach the seminar and help supervise the field placements.

- It was felt that since I had been working in a community services agency in Boston that I had contact with or at had come in contact with many of the supervisors the interns would be working with. Consequently I could be instrumental in helping to solidify the placements for the interns and help supervise some of the work.

- Technically I was supposed to only commit about four hours a week to the program. However I ended up spending about 9 or 10 hours a week and it still wasn't enough time to do an adequate job.

Q - How did you view the program?
A - The program attempted to place students in various situations of decision making throughout the Commonwealth.

- The program was trying to give to the interns through the placement a feeling of reality and a feeling of the difficulties of the decision making in governmental or private situation.
I don't think the program worked any worse than most field work programs.

The problems with field work programs haven't been solved except in graduate schools of social work and in strict apprentice models in some fields like education and medicine.

In both the fields of social work and medicine a student is placed with a particular professional to gain particular knowledge.

The planning field hasn't done that as well. What we have done is reach out for placements that are available and just involve the student in the placement. The HIP was run just like this.

Q - What were some of the problems of the HIP?
A - There was no real commitment on the part of placements to the interns. Most supervisors felt that they were just getting some free labor.

We found that the "supervisors" really didn't take on responsibility for supervision.

Some supervisors tended to just let interns go do whatever they wanted. Actually there were three types of supervisors: (1) some would let the intern go and do whatever he wanted to do and assumed that the intern had some capability to do it (some interns responded to
the challenge some did not); (2) other supervisors had some concept of their responsibility to the student and tried to give some supervisory time to the student but they felt very clumsy about it and didn't get much supervision going; (3) then there were those very few supervisors who knew what supervision was about for students and understood how to designate an appropriate amount of work which was time centered.

- Time centered meaning the work began here and ended there.

- The experience in the HIP program is no different then I have seen in other field work programs.

- One thing which helps to decide if a student will get something out of a field experience is what kind of personality he has. If he is not used to working in an unstructured or partially structured situation then the placement will succeed.

- About 3/4 of the interns were successful in getting something out of their placements.

Q - How can you maximize the opportunity for any student to get some educational benefit out of a placement?

A - The only way you can do that is by paying the supervisors. If you pay your supervisors like they do in social work school then it will work.
- Or if you can't afford to pay then - give then a faculty appointment as a lecturer or instructor at MIT. Make him an employee of the University even if in name only. Then you make requirements on him to come to certain meetings concerning the field work program.

- Another problem was the relative lack of total commitment to the program by the department and other faculty members.

Q - How were placements selected?
A - A letter was sent out by the chief coordinator to all the possible placements that he saw. He then followed this up with some phone calls to some of the people he knew.

Q - Do you think the field program was structured properly?
A - No - I think students should have had all their classes on one or two particular days and then have the rest of the week to spend in the field. As you remember last year students were taking classes all over the place and they had to squeeze in field time in between different classes.

- Another problem time wise was the fact that some placements called upon the intern to be available when it needed him and not when the intern could find time to
be available.

- A good field program should have only one day a week when the student takes classes and the rest of the week should be used for the field.

- A good intern program has got to be design so that the total faculty that is coming into contact with that intern is responsive to his field work.

- Field work has got to be seen as a major component in a student's education.

- Faculty have to respond to a student having the burden of doing field work and class work.

Q - Were there any integration mechanisms that you tried to operationalize in the field work program?

A - We recommended to students that they should dovetail papers for classes with things they were doing in the field.

- We also suggested that students should take course work which had some relation to field experience.

Q - What was your view of the seminar in the HIP?

A - I thought the seminar was absolutely essential in terms of trying to tie things together.

- I don't think the interns got as much out of the seminar as they could have.
- The case studies were not as detailed as they could have been.

- It was successful in terms of spawning honest criticism by interns of other intern's work.

Q - What are some things that you see that should be changed about field work?

A - A student should never be placed in a placement where you are not sure of what they are going to give him to do. You have got to know up front what a placement has to offer to a student so you can decide if it fits into an accomplishable time frame for the student.

- We didn't do any testing on placements before hand to sample if the work had a beginning and an end.

- Some placements had nothing tangible to give students to do.

- Late funding caused some of the problems of the program. Everything had to be done in a hurried fashion.

- But most of these problems wouldn't have happened if the DUSP had expanded its commitment to the program before it started.

Q - How many students were you supposed to supervise?

A - About one-half of them (6).
Q - How many times did you get to talk to interns in placements?
A - Not often.

Q - As an academic manager what types of things did students come to you for help on?
A - Most of my encounters with students and placements were usually on the basis of correcting difficulties or conflicts in the placements - mending relations and trying to get placement to measure up to what we wanted it to be.

Q - Did you have any three party conferences?
A - No - none in first semester but a few in the second semester at the end of the placement. We definitely didn't have enough of them though. I did get a chance to talk to most supervisors at least once or twice during the semester but nothing on a periodic basis.

- There were a lot of problems in trying to coordinate times just to meet a student or a supervisor on a single basis.

- Another problem was that students needed much more help from us then we were able to give.

Q - Did you see your self as being more of a trouble
shooter rather than a counselor?

A - Yes. I was primarily involved in solving immediate problems which represented a crisis in the agency.

Q - Why just the trouble shooter role?

A - Because I didn't have the time to do the latter.

Q - What do you think the role of the field supervisor should be?

A - His first responsibility is to set up a structure that responds to an intern's needs - academicly, experience wise and interest wise.

- To make sure the task structure set up by the field supervisor is responding to the needs of the student there should be constant evaluation by the academic manager.

- The tasks that a student gets in a field placement should be time centered.

- The field supervisor along with the academic advisor should make sure certain basic skills are integrated into the demands of the student by the placement. i.e. writing skills, team work skills - (working with other people in the field on a problem).

- The field supervisor should make sure the intern has real responsibilities and not just busy work to do.
The field supervisor should also make sure that the student gets adequate feedback on his progress in his work.

Q - Were field supervisors asked for any reports on placements?

A - Yes - supervisors were asked for written statements about the student's activity in the placement but very few turned any in. Students had to be asked to turn in general descriptive statements on their involvements with the placements.

Q - What were some of the other problems with supervisors?

A - Many of the supervisors had not had experience in supervising interns before. We learned that you have got to be careful who you select as supervisors.

- Unfortunately, however when you make a contact with a competent head of an organization too often he accepts an intern but turns over the responsibility for supervision of the intern to somebody else. You can not control these types of situations. This type of thing happen several times in the HIP. We contacted some top level people for the interns to do field work with but the interns were turned over to a staff member with lower status and an inadequate ability to supervise a student.
Q - What do you think is the major advantage that interns got out of their field work experience?

A - They were able to make better career choices and decisions on what they wanted to get involved in as a field of specialization at MIT.
Interview Review

In reviewing this interview a number of significant facts stand out. Perhaps the most telling comment on the failure of the planning profession in general and the HIP in particular to adequately approach and structure field work is the following one made by the subject: "In both the fields of social work and medicine a student is placed with a particular professional to gain particular knowledge. The planning field hasn't done that as well. What we have done is reach out for placements that are available and just involve the student in the placement." A close scrutiny of this interview reveals that both the planning department via the HIP faculty and the field agencies via their supervisors were culpable of not giving adequate time, thought, supervision and structure to interns and their development of field assignments. This analysis is supported by the following facts: (1) the interns tended to be given more busy work than real responsibilities; (2) most supervisors just regarded interns as free labor; (3) much of the work of the interns was not time centered; (4) some placements had nothing tangible to give students to do and (5) most supervisors did not have periodic conferences with interns.
There were a number of major administrative shortcomings or problems which precipitated the negative realities outlined above. First of all there was late funding of the program by HUD which caused the program to be organized in a hurried fashion. Then there was a lack of total commitment to the program by the department and other faculty members. In fact according to the subject, "most of these problems wouldn't have happened if the DUSP had expanded its commitment to the program before it started." There was a poor field work time structure which forced students to squeeze time for field work inbetween their classes. The significance of this problem is best illustrated by the fact that placements called upon interns to be available when they needed them and not when students could find time to be available. One of the major problems of the HIP was inadequate staff time to deal with both the total administrative needs of the program and individual educational needs of students. Proof of the inadequacies caused by this problem is mirrored in the lack of three party conferences and adequate monitoring of field placements. In addition to quote the subject of the interview "the students needed much more help from us then we were able to give." Finally there was a lack of adequate development of field placements and screening of field
supervisors. The validity of this observation is confirmed by the basic lack of commitment of supervisors to interns and the fact that many supervisors hadn't had any prior experience in supervising interns and found it difficult to do so. Also some field placements were sabotaged when the responsibility for supervising an intern was turned over from the person who was originally contacted to a staff member of lesser supervisory competence (and with dubious commitment to educating an intern).
Case Study I
Case Study Introduction

The intern in this first case study is a 23 year old female student. Her undergraduate major was in Sociology. Within the interview process the subject was quite lucid and interested in relating her field work experiences. In fact some problems were encountered in trying to get the subject to just limit her observations to her first field experience. The subject also displayed a sincere concern that field programs be continued but under more thoughtful organization and administration. She specifically hoped that more time would be taken in such programs to tell students what to expect out in the field.

This case study is significant in highlighting several important issues. Demonstrated within this case study are the problems created when a field program selects a field supervisor who is too busy to devote time to an intern. This case illustrates the lack of commitment to an intern by a supervisor whose only reason for accepting an intern was to get some free labor. Portrayed in this case is the conflict between the intern's and supervisor's expectations caused by the lack of a three party conference. Evidence also exists within this case of a supervisor's lack of adequate experience in supervising a student causing the former to delegate inappropriate
tasks to the latter. Finally illustrated in this case are the frustrations of a student confronted with busy work.
Background

The respondent's primary reason for becoming involved in the HIP was because of the financial aid offered. The HIP offered the student a stipend significantly larger than the one extended through the MIT Planning Department's normal student financial aid resources. The respondent's early feelings about the work-study commitment connected to the stipend were neutral. She felt the chance to acquire some practical experience in planning would be helpful but having had no previous field experience had no way of judging the true merits of this program. (Note - all the students involved in the HIP were contacted by mail about the existence of the program and only had a short glossy outline of its content to base their decisions upon.) At the time the student selected her first placement she was interested in children, programs for children and education. Her interest in these areas had been primarily stimulated by prior exposure to a head start program. With these areas of interest as her focus she decided to select a placement with the State Day Care Planning Department under the Office of Planning and Program Coordination.
Placement Narrative

The respondent served as an intern to the chief administrator of the State Day Care Planning Office. The office staff consisted of an administrative assistant and a secretary. One consultant also worked with the office. The intern's supervisor was responsible for coordinating various regional Day Care Planning Offices around the State. The intern had about a month to orient herself to the agency's operation. During this time she went to a number of committee meetings of day care representatives, read office reports and attended some meetings at Harvard on special education funding. Initially the intern was involved in working at a number of different small tasks for the office during this period.

The student over time became frustrated by the fact that she hadn't been given any one specific task to accomplish. In addition the intern was afforded only limited contact with her supervisor. Her supervisor was constantly busy, owing to the organization's relative lack of staff. This situation made it difficult for the intern to establish a viable learning relationship with her mentor.

After a month the student came to the realization that she wanted some contact with people who actually ran day care centers and wanted to get involved in finding
out the problems of day care centers in dealing with the education of the children. To quote the respondent "I wanted to deal with day to day child care problems but the State Office didn't give me that experience." In an attempt to solve the dilemma the student spoke to her academic manager. He suggested that she explain her goals and interest to her field supervisor. After a talk with her supervisor the intern was given a specific task to accomplish in lieu of the many different tasks she had been performing around the office. The task although in line with the needs of the agency did not focus on what the student was really interested in. The intern was asked to: (1) draft some criteria for reviewing funding applications and (2) set up a funding application review committee. (This committee was to be set up to review regional applications for state and federal funding.) More specifically the first task entailed: (1) contacting people to see if they would serve on the committee; (2) trying to get the people together for organization meetings and (3) trying to persuade some one to become chairman of the committee. Because of constant time conflicts between the time the intern had available and the time at which perspective committee members could be reached the process took longer then expected. The organization of the funding review committee and the
drafting of application review criteria occupied the intern's time until the end of the semester.

The following quotes are taken from taped conversations with the field supervisors and interns. To allow for easier reading the different quotes are placed in thought blocks where possible. An asterick (*) will designate my personal comments or elaborations on the crucial significance of certain statements made by interns or supervisors.

The intern made the following specific observations about this field work experience:

A. Positive Aspects/Advantages/New Learnings

1. "I found out what I didn't want to do."
2. "I gained some exposure to state day care procedures."
3. "Made contacts with a number of professionals in day care."
4. "First experience helped me to relate better to other placements."

"Learned that I needed a supervisor who would sit down with me and work together with me at frequent intervals rather than just being
pushed out into the field with nothing particular to do."

B. Negative Aspects/Problems/Pitfalls

1. "My supervisor was the only administrator in the agency. She was always busy ... It was very hard for me to get a chance to talk to her .... The supervisor – intern relationship was not as stable as it should have been. It would have been better if there had been someone else in the office on another level who had more time to spend with an intern."

2. "One of my main complaints in the beginning was that I didn't have a definite project and a definite time span to work on something."
"I would have felt better if I had a job to do and a certain period of time to get it done in."
"When I started I was working at several different things. This is very time consuming because you don't know how far to go or exactly what your limitations are and since my supervisor wasn't always available it became a problem in terms of knowing what your role was."

3. "I didn't want to continue the experience at the end of the semester because I thought I should be doing something I was really
interested in."

4. "It was hard to keep up with what was going on in the agency. So many different things happen between the time you leave the agency and the time you come back."

* This is a particularly crucial perception in an agency which has only one overtaxed administrator. When a supervisor is always busy or is out of the office frequently an intern will rarely get a chance to be brought up to date on what is happening or what has changed since his last time there. In addition if a viable relationship between both the intern and the supervisor has not developed over time then the student feels guilty about even asking the supervisor to be brought up to date on things that have transpired in his absence. This is especially true when the student must always take the initiative to become informed and the supervisor gives the impression that his time is being imposed upon.

5. "Supervisors are not paid by the school so they feel no responsibility to you."

C. Comments on Intern Seminar
1. "The seminar was useful in the sense that it did give you a chance to find out what everybody was doing and see if anybody else was doing things similar to your field of interest."

2. "Over time the seminar became boring. They should be held every other week. The format should be changed so that students can talk about problems they are having in the field and be less formal."

3. "I didn't get that much out of the seminar as far as linking theory and practice."

D. Integration of Course Work and Field Work

1. "I did an analysis of State Day Care Planning for the "Planning Process" course the first semester."

2. "I used my contact with certain Day Care professionals to access information for my paper."

3. "I often raised questions and made comments in different classes based on what I was experiencing out in the field."

4. "In one of my later placements I took an independent study course which was related directly to my field work in criminal justice planning."

The intern made the following overall observations and recommendations about field work in general and the
HIP in particular:

A. General

1. "Too often supervisors say they will supervise an intern and they just give him something to keep him occupied. Alot of the time the responsibility is placed on them (supervisors) and they don't really asked for it, want it or have time to do it."

* Academic managers often contact one person in an agency to find if an intern can be placed there with him. The contact person accepts but usually shifts responsibility for supervision of intern on to somebody else.

2. "There should be constant communication between intern, supervisor and those in charge of the program."

3. "People think interns are students who have come to lend a helping hand."

4. "An intern gets tasks that are not very important to him but is work that the agency wants done."

5. "Interns should be introduced around to different people in the office. Many other people in the office don't know who you are or why you are there."

6. "I think academic supervisors should pay periodic
visits to field placements to see how everything is operating."

7. "Field work is more meaningful to an intern if he has a staff position."

8. "Supervisor often will give you a project just to get you out of the way."

9. "A field work experience is beneficial to me when I am interested in the work, I can relate to the staff as an equal and the situation is giving me something."

10. "No matter how dynamic your field work structure you will still have some problems because you will have to deal with personalities."

11. "When a student is placed in an agency that he doesn't know anything about, he needs something concrete to hold on to."

B. The HIP

1. "The directors of an internships program should actually go out to a placement and establish if an agency wants an intern. And if they really want an intern find out what they are going to do with him."

* One way to decide if an agency will be a viable placement for an intern is to establish the willingness on the part of the agency to permit
a student to select his work assignment. It is important to establish to what extent an agency is willing to contribute to the educational needs of the student. A student should be free to develop a work assignment that doesn't necessarily contribute to the immediate task accomplishment needs of the organization.

2. "Before you start to formulate a program you should sit down and decide what kind of roles you want the interns to occupy. And then inform the field supervisor of what role interns will be serving. Then there should be constant communication to assure the role is being pursued by the student."

* When the perception of the student's role on the part of both the agency and the school are not congruent the end result is role conflict for the student.

3. "There should be a monthly or bi-monthly progress sessions with intern, supervisor and academic supervisor."

4. "Priority should be given to a student's interest and needs in developing placements."

5. "There should be a choice to get in to this program or not. Field work should not be a burden
you have to accept because you need money."

The field supervisor had the following perceptions
and specific observations about this field work experience:

Overall Evaluation of Experience

"I asked her to set up a proposal review committee
but that turned out to be a hard thing for a student to
do because it required being available to other people
on their time schedule."

"Getting a committee together is a crazy time
consuming thing, it took a lot longer then she expected."

"It was frustrating for her because she couldn't
reach some of the people during the time she had avail-
able. Some times she wouldn't have too much to do.
There wasn't much she could do until she rounded up all
the people and got in touch with them."

"Students need something that can be scheduled. I
learned that from the experience with the intern."

Orientation of Student

"I showed her the organizational charts and gave her
some material to read on the agency."

"She went to some state budget meetings with me."

"She went to a number of other committee meetings
during the semester."
Supervision

"At the beginning of the placement I probed for her goals but she was not sure of what she wanted to get out of the total program or the placement."

"I expected a fairly high degree of self direction. With broad outlines laid out by me with some supervision, and a chance to bounce ideas back and forth."

"The intern and I had a meeting after she decided she wanted one specific task to work on. I gave her three or four options. We both agreed that setting up the proposal review committee would be the most interesting task but we were wrong."

Reason for Taking on Intern

"I had an overwhelming job and not enough funding to do the job. So I had to have field placements."

Benefits Derived from Experience by Student

"I don't know she might have been able to pick up some experience. There were a lot of different people on that floor of the planning office. There were a lot of reports and things for her to read."

Problems of Field Experience

"It wasn't designed well for a field placement any way I think in retrospect. Now that I have done a lot of other field placements. ... I am beginning to see what works well and what doesn't."
"For example we just had one graduate student who was assigned to do the staff work for a task force ... developing a written report on our staff development in day care. The job in that field placement involved working with a group of people - getting their ideas down on paper for them ... keeping minutes for meetings and taking those minutes and turning them into a final report ... and it was a long field placement. She worked with us for six months. I think it worked better then last time. The task force was set up and established before she started. So she didn't have to get involved in that kind of mickey mouse stuff of not being able to get a hold of anybody for several weeks. It started when she started which is important. That ended up as a published report with her name on it and with her becoming quite an expert in a field. Now that's the way a field placement should work."

"There were no three party conferences between the intern, the academic advisor and myself and there should have been. He (academic advisor) seemed to be quite over extended. I never talked to him about the intern."

"I think the intern felt she wasn't getting the support she needed from the school but the intern never really talked about it."
General Observations

Role of Supervisor

"The supervisor really needs a job to be done and supervises work not entirely from the point of view of the student learning experience but also from the point of view of getting that piece of work produced."

"I don't think a field supervisor should be only concerned with student's growth because you get that back at the academic institution."

Advantage of Intern To Agency

"Well one specific advantage is its free ... an underfunded agency often has no other way of getting certain extra things done. Also it adds a fresh approach to some problems."

Structure of Field Placement

"The design of the project is key. It has to be designed to fit the time of the student."

"The student should be able to plug into something that has already started as opposed to trying to get something off the ground in a short period of time."

* This is a very important point. Unless there is an extended placement – meaning that a student anticipates spending at least two semesters if not more in the
same placement - the student should not take on responsibility for task that demand more time then he can realistically give.

**Improvement of Field Work**

"The relationship between the field agency and sending institution needs to be improved. There should be more communication and collaboration between the school and the agency."

"Field work functions much better when the sending institution follows what the student is doing in the placement and is suggesting things that they might read. Just taking a general interest in what the student is doing is not enough."

"There needs to be a basic orientation to what the agency is and where it fits with other agencies before the student even get to the agency. Some body should do that."

**Student**

"The student who becomes an intern should be quite self directed."

"The student has to be absolutely rigorous in meeting a time schedule that is agreed upon in advance."

"The student should participate in an agency as an accepted member of the staff."
In reviewing this case study several important points stand out. The supervisor's busy schedule and the fact that she was the lone administrator of the agency hampered her ability to give adequate supervision to the student. The nature of the placement as it evolved initially around a multiplicity of short term work task did not meet the learning needs of the student. The academic adviser failed to intervene at the appropriate time to rectify the role conflict between the student and supervisor (the appropriate time being when the student asked him for help but she was told to more or less solve the problem on her own). Next, the student was able to convince her supervisor that she needed a more focused task assignment to follow but failed to persuade the supervisor into allowing her to pursue a project more in line with her particular interest (i.e. analysis of the problems of local day care centers). Finally the inappropriatness of the task assigned to the student was mirrored in the difficulty in which the student had in contacting and organizing people on her limited time schedule.

Overall this field experience was a study in conflict. The student had anticipated becoming involved in a more "grass roots" field experience where she would have had
both personal contact with children and the problems of
day care centers in administering to children's needs.
However she was exposed to a more abstract planning
experience. Instead of being able to progress from a
simple to a complex form of planning the student was
placed in a more complex form of planning experience
where she had no immediate ties to a client group and
was asked to perform routine office duties. The creation
of such a improper field design stemmed from the fact
that the supervisor viewed the intern not as a student
essentially there to learn but as an extra body there
to lend a helping hand. It was basically the role conflict
between the student's wanting a certain kind of learning
experience and the supervisor's wanting some extra man-
power to perform certain tasks which dimished the positive
learning returns that could have accrued to the student.

Had the academic advisor held a three party-conference
initially or intervened when it was appropriate he could
have help structure a field design that would have
addressed the needs of the student more positively. If
the field supervisor's role had been made clear by the
academic manager at the beginning of the placement then
she might have been more aware of the need to concretize
learning experiences for the student. (i.e. sitting down
with the student after they attended meetings and draw
out of the experience important points the student should understand or to solicit the student's perceptions on the interaction that took place. If, the field supervisor had been properly indoctrinated with the significance or the importance of providing a learning experience which suited the needs of the student, a more creative field design could have been constructed. For example the supervisor could have capitalized off of the students interest in problems of day care centers by having the students do an analysis of the problems which they were experiencing and which might lead them to need more money. This preliminary type of experience might have then lead up to the student's development of some criteria for funding proposals. This would have been a more logical order of sequence of field work. Because the student using the base of information she gained in researching the problems of day care centers would probably have a clearer understanding of what types of criteria could be appropriate in making decisions on funding.
Case Study II
Case Study Introduction

The intern in this case study is a 23 year old male student. His undergraduate major was in Sociology. The student was quite open and frank during the interview. He displayed an obvious concern for not having got as much out of his first field experience as he had hoped. In fact the student admitted that he was bitter about the fact he didn't receive as much back up support from the school as he thought was needed. The subject was also very candid in admitting that he might not have been ready to go out into the "field" during his first semester at M.I.T.. He felt that coming to M.I.T. straight out of undergraduate school with little clear understanding of what planning was might have caused him to be a little immature. Immature in the sense that he might not have had enough foresight on his own to choose the best type of field placement or field assignment to give him a clearer understanding of the planning process. I was quite impressed with the growth of this student. From my own personal observations of him both in the field seminar and other classes, I have seen him develop over the course of a year a clearer sense of "self" and a stronger sense of independence. Within this interview the subject showed his ability to analyze the HIP not just from the perspective
of the inadequacies of the program but also from the point of his own personal limitations as well.

This case study points up a number of important issues and problems. The case presented here demonstrates the problems created when the responsibility for supervising an intern is shifted from one person to another. Illustrated within this case is an intern's classic struggle to balance his time between classes and field work. This case also shows the negative learning that takes place when a student is denied active participation in field activities and not given adequate supervision (i.e. The intern was made to feel he had nothing to contribute to certain meetings after he was repeatedly restrained from making comments by his supervisor. Most important the supervisor did not give the student a chance to even discuss his ideas later-between the two of them). This case shows the lack of adequate development of a task assignment for the student by either the field supervisor or the field manager. Demonstrated in this case is the lack of crisis intervention by the field manager to solve the lack of supervision problems of the intern. Finally this case establishes the disadvantage of placing a student under a non-planning professional who has neither real commitment to the planning profession or to educating interns.
Background

The respondent's primary reason for becoming involved in the HIP was because of the financial aid offered. The HIP offered the student a stipend significantly larger than the one extended through the MIT Planning Department's normal student financial aid resources. The student viewed the field work component of the program as a chance to gain some perspective on what planning was about. The student's initial interest at this time was in politics and economics. Specifically he was interested in the interface of politics and economics in the planning process. With this general concern as his focus he decided upon the State Economic Opportunity Office as his first placement.

Placement Narrative

The respondent served as an intern in the State Economic Opportunity Office. At the beginning of the field experience the intern was given several field project options. The intern decided to become involved with a Governor's Citizens Committee on Corrections. This Governor appointed commission was charged with the responsibility to: (1) identify grievances of inmates; (2) identify grievances of officers and other staff of
the correctional institutions; (3) assess channels of communications and if necessary to recommend changes and (4) identify priority goals for improvement of the correctional system within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The intern choose this placement for two reasons: as a result of several prison riots at that time, prison reform had become a major issue with national attention focused on it and the intern's supervisor was serving as an administrative aid to the Governor's Citizens Committee on Corrections. The supervisor had primary responsibility for writing the report on the findings and actions of the commission. The intern's responsibilities were to accompany his supervisor and the committee on their trips to various Massachusetts Correctional Institutions and to take notes on the proceedings. The intern was also to attend the regular internal meetings of the committee. The intern's role was basically to observe what went on at various meetings and to take notes with his supervisor.

The student at the beginning of the placement felt that he wasn't getting adequate supervision from his supervisor. This belief was centered around two issues: the supervisor was often very busy or not in the office and had little time to spend with the student. Second, meetings of the corrections commission had taken place
and the student had not been contacted about their occurrence. The problem of lack of adequate supervision was brought to the attention of the director of the OEO office. (*It was the director of the OEO office who was initially contacted and accepted the intern for the office. Technically he was supposed to be the intern's supervisor.*) A meeting was held between the director, two interns and the supervisor to resolve the issue. The outcome of the meeting was that the intern's supervisor would try to meet with the student on a structured basis of one hour once every five to ten days. It was also established that the supervisor should make sure the student was informed of all committee meetings so he could attend. (*Due to time conflicts in both the schedules of the intern and the supervisor the student-supervisor conferences occurred less frequently than anticipated.*)

The student spent the rest of the semester attending meetings of the committee. The student although cast in the passive role of just being an observer wanted to play a more active part in some of the discussions of the committee. However the intern's supervisor restrained him from doing so several times. The supervisor explained to the student that although he (the intern) had relevant comments to make, as a staff member
he was responsible for only taking notes. The intern finished out the remainder of the placement fulfilling this role.

The intern made the following specific observations about this field work experience:

A. Positive Aspects/Advantages/New Learnings

1. "I got a chance to see how some important political decisions were really made on a very sensitive issue."
   "I got a chance to experience how a commission is used as a political tool to give the appearance of doing something."

2. "It was a unique experience dealing with politics at that level. I was able to draw upon my experiences in the field for a course in Urban Politics. In fact I wrote papers for two courses based on what I was exposed to."

3. "I got involved in meeting many interesting professional contacts."

4. "Perhaps the major thing I got out of this experience was the fact I decided to get involved in a different aspect of planning."
"I wanted something more substantive and technical - something I could become a part of and contribute to. A real planning process."

5. "My academic advisor happen to be one of the members of the commission. He helped me to understand some of the political dynamics of the commission."

B. Negative Aspects/Problems/Pitfalls

1. "The commission had many internal meetings as well as outside meetings with the staff, and inmates of different institutions. I wasn't always around when meetings were called or trips taken. Things happen so quickly that it was hard for me to schedule the right times to be at my placement."

"The commission required alot of time."

"We went to one institution at 2 o'clock in the afternoon and didn't leave there until 11 at night."

2. "My lack of background in planning prevented me from playing a more active role."
"My contributions to the report were very limited because that was my first experience in planning and the problem was politically very sensitive."

3. "I wasn't really given any significant responsibilities. There was not enough structure given me to make me feel secure in my role as an intern. I never really knew how far I should go in getting involved in meetings."

"According to the HUD guidelines I should have been allowed to play a more functional role in my placement."

4. "Both supervisors (academic and field) didn't have a understanding of the problems of a student. My agency supervisor was always busy."

"There were no three party conferences ever."

"Overall the academic supervision I got was mediocre."

5. "I got too involved in field work at first to the point that I got behind in my classes."
"Then I had to neglect my field work to catch up in my classes."

* This is the classic dilemma that a student faces in doing part-time field work in between academic classes.

6. "I am bitter about the first field placement - I should have gotten much more out of it."

"Some problems had to do with the placement itself while many others had to do with the institutional framework in which the total field program was found. The supervisors basically though didn't give me the support or direction I needed."

C. Comments on Intern Seminar

1. "It was a farce. I didn't get anything out of it."

2. "It was a failure. There was a lack of coordination and concern."

D. Integration of Course Work and Field Work

1. "I did papers for two courses (Urban Politics and Planning Process) based on my field observations and experience."
2. "My participation in some classes was prompted by what I had been exposed to in the field."

The intern made the following overall observations and recommendations about field work in general and the HIP in particular:

A. General

1. "There is not enough communication between the agency and the school that is operating the program."

2. "It is hard to balance out your time between your field work and your course work. If you get too interested in your work you spend too much time in the field and your academic work suffers and vica versa."

3. "I have used my field placements to test out my interest in different planning areas."

4. "There should be more relation between a student's abilities and the placement."

5. "Your involvement in an agency should be meaningful. No busy work. You should have a real task to work on."
6. "Students should not begin field work until they have had at least one semester of academic work under their belt. With one semester of orientation to the planning field on an academic level ... you have some kind of perspective of the profession ... which might help you to choose your placement."

* This is an extremely important realization. Students who are placed out in the field before they can be socialize to their profession are at a loss in having any idea of what they are supposed to be doing or how they should go about it.

7. "There should be some relation between what a placement has to offer - the goals of the intern - and the academic work he is taking."

B. HIP

1. "I was not fully prepared to take full advantage of field work. You and some of the other students had been exposed to field work before you came to MIT or had some knowledge about planning. Maybe students just out of undergraduate school are not ready for field work in the first semester."
2. "There were never any meetings between the academic supervisor, field supervisor and myself."

"The coordination of an internship program like this is a full time job. I think the fact that both directors were part-time reflects the institution's commitment to the program."

3. "There shouldn't be a seminar with people who have so many different interest."

4. "You should have supervisors who have an affinity for the students in the program and their problems."

5. "I don't think enough time went into developing the program. It's my understanding that its as if an opportunity arose which had to be capitalized upon and MIT took advantage of it. There was great haste in developing the program to fit the needs of the bureaucracy that would allocate the funds. This is my perception of how the HIP was developed."

The field supervisor had the following perceptions and specific observations about this field work experience:
Overall Evaluation of Experience

"I offered several different issues to him to work on. The intern became interested in prison reform issue. There were a lot of things happening around that topic both in the state and nationally. He was supposed to take notes and attend meetings and trips we took to prisons."

"There was some conflict in the early part of the placement. The intern thought I ignored him about trips to prisons because he wasn't notified but I tried. The problem was resolved - we sat down with the OEO director and talked it out. After that I tried to have a structured meeting with the intern once every week or ten days. However generally during the week I did not have that much contact with student because I was usually in and out of the office."

"The main thing the intern got out of the experience was that he discovered he wasn't really interested in it. The intern had a strong dependance for supervision but at that time my work didn't allow me the chance to give him the supervision he needed."

Orientation of Student

"Nothing particular done. There were a lot of interesting people in the office he could have talked to."
Supervision

"Once a week or every ten days I tried to sit down and talk to students about where he was and what he was working toward. The conferences consisted of me establishing some time frames for getting things done, people they could talk to, ways I could move to help him. I tried to used that hour to structure the experience. I wanted to have a very tight hour to talk about how to get something done. It was structured so that there wouldn't be a constant tapping of my resources."

Reason for Taking Intern

"At first I wasn't interested in having any interns but then some issues came up that some minority students could be of some use in working on."

Benefits Derived from Experience by Student

"Intern got an introspection on a political process. He found out what he didn't want to get involved in."

Problems of Field Experience

"Did not have much contact with academic supervisor ... the intern's academic supervisor is a good man but that was one of his busy periods. In fact even though the intern's supervisor was a member of the commission he was often absent from there too. There were no three
party conferences."

"The fact that the intern's supervisor was on the commission created difficulties. I wanted to share thoughts on how commission members were interacting and did not want the intern telling his academic advisor what I said about him."

"The intern did not understand his role. The intern was not in a position to participate but to watch. This was both his and my role at meetings. There were times when the intern made comments during meetings and I had to hold him back. I told him there were things I wanted to say to but when you are staff to a commission and the commission is in session you have to allow them to talk no matter how asinine they may sound. It was difficult for him to appreciate this role."

"Lack of time and my critical role in putting together the report for the commission limited my effectiveness as a supervisor for the intern."

"The intern at one time was experiencing academic stress which prevented him from being able to make all the meetings of the commission."

"We didn't have an agency we had a office where everybody was free floating. There was really not that much supervision for anybody. Eventually we ran into a crisis about that. They were (interns) free birds
their time was their own!"

* Such an office situation subverts the whole notion of an internship. A student gets involved in field work because he wants to be attached to a place and a person who will give him structure and some sense of what his profession is all about. The very essence of a field experience is being exposed to a professional who is in the process of "doing". If an intern does not have a chance to experience form up close the performance of his mentor then the placement is of little use to him.
General Observations

Role of Supervisor

"I believe in offering a free floating position with minimal structure in which an intern just takes hold of an issue and works on that on his own."

"It isn't cost effective for me to spend too much of my time with a student for what I can get out of it at the end."

"An intern has to fit into my frame work of activities. I am the boss. If it isn't worth my while then we should think of something else for intern to do."

"Supervisor should share a significant number of perceptions with an intern about what is happening on job. The student is here for a short period time and the idea is to help him to learn something about the sociology and the politics of what is happening in different situations and not just the issues of what's there. The only way to do that is to expose the intern to what goes through your eyes as well as try to give him the roots of personalities and previous events. That's a supervisor's responsibility. Such informal perception are meant to sensitize the student to the group dynamics of the situation and give him the raw reality of what goes on underneath the rationale surface"
of who is wheeling and dealing and show him what the various self interest are."

* This is a crucial responsibility that all supervisors should follow through on. Without these very special insights (that only an involved supervisor can give) simple field observation becomes dull and mundane. With these special insights into a process - a meeting or a particular situation, field learning comes alive for the student. The intern learns to look beneath the glossy surface of what appears to be routine and discover the hidden agendas and vested interest which manipulate the process. After a student has been exposed to this type of experience he is able to build upon his foundation of insight some personal strategies of group dynamics. In other words once the student is able to learn the significance of the action or non action by individuals within this context (hidden agenda - vested interest) the concept of conscious use of self begins to take on meaning.

"A supervisor should get something out of his working with an intern other then just trying to educate a student. The supervisor should be able to get an identifiable potential result, i.e. work, report etc."
"A supervisor should communicate to interns some notion of group dynamics - how to analyze situations, predict situations and manipulate situations."

Advantage of Field Work for Student

"It allows for exploration of professional interest. Student gets exposed to a situation to see if he wants to direct his academic interest that way."

"Student has opportunity to relate practical experience to academic study. Field work also gives a student something to talk about when he is in class."

* This is a very important attribute of field work, especially for students who have had no previous planning experience. Without any planning experiences to relate to classes (which are often composed of verbose experienced professionals with a wealth of practical knowledge about the state of the art) a student feels he has nothing to give to discussions or lectures. He becomes intimidated by their (experienced professionals) verbal prowess based on their past experiences. The unexperienced student must accept at face value what is told him as being the truth. However with some exposure to planning via field work a student's sense of self is enhanced. He knows he knows something and can contribute to what is being said. Using his small but growing base of experience he
can now challenge concepts and stimulate discussions.

"Field work is an important part of a total academic experience."

**Student**

"Finding an interesting experience for an intern is not hard if he is willing to work for no pay!"

"Most interesting placements are with busy people and the more busy the people are the less they want to be bothered with an intern. Therefore the more need for a self starting student. Such experiences presume some level of competence. Not every student can work with the director of an office."

"There is no proper role for intern to play. There are a variety of roles he can play. The role is dependent upon needs, interest and background of the situation and the needs and requirements of a particular situation."

**Improvement of Field Work**

"There has to be some incentive for a supervisor to take the time to build a constructive relationship between he and the intern. Money is one good way but there are others."

* Field supervisors who are not 'professional planners' or who hold no affinity to the profession tend to need
or demand more tangible rewards to stimulate their commitment to help an intern to learn. Without such rewards a field supervisor is most likely to view the intern as just a source of extra manpower to be used. When using a member of the profession as a field supervisor for an intern there is a greater likelihood his commitment to the intern will not necessitate the offering of tangible rewards. The implication is that a 'professional' will achieve symbolic gratification from inducting 'new blood' into the profession and from having the chance to share his theories and concepts with an attentive 'ear'.

"There should be incentives for supervisors whether its money to the agency or supervisors or trading. Trading meaning opening up some academic resources to supervisors. Get a supervisor to take a student for two terms but allow him to take a free course at MIT or get to used the library."

**Disadvantages of Field Work for Supervisors**

"Interns are just another person you have to worry about handling. You lose time talking to them because you not getting paid for it. It's not cost effective if you have to talk to somebody and you are not getting something back out of the experience."
"I want to spend my work day thinking about some changes in the State system and not just educating students."

"If a student can be useful in some process of change and there is some education related to that for the student that's super. But I'm not going out of my way to structure a learning situation."

"Students after a while become a liability that you can't get rid of. Plus you got to handle a whole lot of extra paper work that the academic supervisor wants or needs."

**Structure of Field Placement**

"Has to be a concern for customizing the experience to each student. Student should be given some choices."

"The matching up of the right student with the right placement is the chief responsibility of the academic adviser. He is the person who presumably knows the combination of placement opportunities and the background of student best."

"The work supervisor has the obligation of mapping out what roles are available with in a placement and what his expectations are. A work supervisor should be able to say to an academic adviser—here are the kinds of roles and activities that are available. This is the
type of relationship I expect to have with a student one - two - three and then the rest is a matching exercise between the intern and the academic adviser before he even gets to the placement."

Seminars

"I never went to any of the intern's seminars. That's a bad time to have it at night. It also intrudes upon a supervisor's personal time."

"They should have seminars in the office with various professional City Hall types. The student could get a chance to ask questions of various folks who work in different high level positions in the government on their turf."
Case Study Notes

Much of the conflict and frustration for the student in this case study centered around the fact that he was placed in almost a totally passive role as an observer. The student's learning capacity was also hampered by the fact that he was restrained from interacting verbally at meetings. Being an observer in a field work situation is not an invalid role for a student to occupy. However, in order to assure real learning is taking place such a role necessitates constant interchange between the student and the supervisor. For it is only through the supervisor allowing the student to ask him questions about what has taken place at meetings and the supervisor's sampling the perceptions of the student that this role takes on some academic significance. For example the supervisor failed to take advantage of two opportunities which could have been used to create a real learning experience for the student. The first opportunity was during one of the commission meetings when the supervisor said he had to restrain the intern from making comments. Besides just explaining to the student that it was inappropriate for him to make comments during meetings, the supervisor could have structured the situation so that learning occurred at several higher levels.
The supervisor should have had a conference with the student soon after the commission meeting. During this session the supervisor should have: (1) reaffirmed why because of their staff roles it was inappropriate for either of them to make verbal comments during committee meetings; (2) solicit and draw out what initial perceptions the student had and wanted to articulate; (3) analyze with the student the substance of his perceptions and (4) help the student to strategize more appropriate ways of communicating his ideas or in transferring them into action. *(Of course if the student had been given a more active role in the writing of the final report the student could have taken some solace in the fact that he would have an opportunity to express his thoughts then.)*

Another example of a learning situation which was not capitalized upon occurred when the student had an opportunity to talk to some inmates at a prison. The supervisor says he was aware of the fact that the inmates were really trying to teach the intern about the problems and difficulties they were experiencing. The supervisor failed to pick up on this learning opportunity by talking to the student about what he learned from the inmates and what relevance did their views have on the process at hand.
The supervisor in this case study was caught in one of the peculiar paradoxes outlined by the assistant program coordinator earlier. Namely, the supervisor knew what makes a good field experience for a student and what type of supervision a student needs but still had problems in operationalizing his knowledge in these areas effectively. *(The supervisor's clear and precise thinking on field work stemmed from the fact that he had been an intern in a professional degree program in social work.) His failure to adequately supervise the intern is linked to three major factors: the supervisor was too busy in his own estimation with work to be done for his particular office (OEO) and with the task of writing the final report for the prision commission to adequately supervise one intern let alone two; also the supervisor especially did not want to supervise a student who required too much structure or definition of task; and accepting the responsibility for supervising the two interns was not his idea but a burden placed upon him by the director of the OEO office. The director of the OEO office took the two interns as if he was going to supervise them but later shifted the responsibility to one of his staff members.
Case Study III
Case Study Introduction

The intern in this case study is a 24 year old male student. His undergraduate major was in History. Based on my observations of this student both within the interview and within field seminars, I found him to be a very serious and thoughtful about his field experience. This student besides being a very active participant in field seminar discussions also served on an ad hoc program evaluation committee (The committee was composed of four students plus the field managers.). The student was very careful and meticulous in recounting the proper sequence of events in his first field experience.

In reviewing this case study the reader will uncover a number of significant field work issues and problems. This case study points out the stumbling blocks encountered by a student when he is linked to a supervisor who doesn't want to closely supervise an intern and is not directly involved in the same project area as the student. Also demonstrated within this case is the paradox of a supervisor who has an idea of how students should be supervised but has neither the time or professional commitment to operationalize his ideas. Shown within this case are the problems created for a student when he is given a task inappropriate to the time he has available and to the skills he can bring to bear on the process.
Finally this case illustrates the problems created for a student by the failure of the academic manager to establish the basic role expectations of all the parties involved in a three party conference.
The financial aid offered to the student via the HIP was the primary motivation for his involvement in the program. However the respondent also felt that the opportunity to take field work with his course work would give him a better overall academic experience. In selecting his first field work experience the student was interested in getting a field work placement which would coincide or correlate with the kind of course work he would be taking. To quote the respondent "I more or less wanted to have a sort of hand in hand operation in which my academic work would relate back to my field experience". The student's first placement choice was the Senate President's Office at the State House. However since the Senate was in between sessions at that time the student selected a temporary placement with the State Office of Economic Opportunity. The basic interest of the student was in Politics in general and in understanding the state legislative process in particular.

Placement Narrative

The respondent served as an intern in the State Economic Opportunity Office. At the beginning of the field experience the intern was given several different project options available at the placement. The intern decided
to become involved in a project which centered around his researching the legislative needs of disadvantage communities in the State. The total project package also included drafting legislation based on the needs identified to be submitted to the governor and the legislators. The intern's specific tasks were: to look at some of the old legislative issues related to needs of minority groups and see what happen to them; to interview State Legislators representing minority constituencies and minority community organization leaders in an attempt to ascertain their views on the legislative needs of disadvantaged residents of the State; and to organize some politically active minority persons into a technical assistance team for Black State Legislators. The respondent stated that "the purpose of the project was to initiate a means whereby the agency (OEO) might become more sensitive to the needs of the poor; and to provide a mechanism whereby a selection of legislative proposals dealing with the needs of the disadvantaged might be submitted to the Great Court of Massachusetts."

The first conflict in the placement arose over definition of the intern's role. The student informed his supervisor that owing to his limited time arrangement he could not extend his research through out the State. Rather it was more realistic for him to confine
his research efforts to Boston. The supervisor agreed and allowed him to proceed. Later there was another crisis over a lack of adequate supervision. The problem was talked over in a meeting of two interns, the supervisor and the director of the OEO office (This intern had the same supervisor as the intern in case study II.) and was resolved.

The intern set upon his task by making some contacts in order to try to set up a technical assistance team for the Black State Legislators. The intern ran into a number of communication problems in trying to intice some local people into such a project. First of all there was a basic distrust of the agency by most people contacted and second of all the agency had not mapped out clearly for the intern what the team would actually do once they got together. Further complicating the task was the fact that the student ran into numerous time problems in trying to schedule meetings of individuals who were interested in the project. The time problems which arose centered around their not being able to meet during the day and the intern's limited available time at night. After several attempts to coalesce those individuals contacted failed, the project was dropped.

The intern then became involved on an individual basis in going out to various community organizations
and talking to different minority leaders about their view of some legislative needs. The student met with minimal success. Some general issues were picked up but nothing really substantial was uncovered. The intern attributes the lack of responsiveness on the part of individuals contacted to two factors: neither he nor the agency had the clout or rapport to go into different organizations and access some real critical issues and most individuals and organizations contacted had a basic lack of confidence in both the agency and the State legislature in addressing any needs that might be identified. Ultimately the intern was able to pull together some ideas for legislation which were related to State housing policy and anti-snob zoning amendments. This information was turned into the agency at the end of the placement by the intern.

The intern made the following specific observations about this field work experience:

A. Positive Aspects/Advantages/New Learnings

1. "I gained experience and knowledge of the problems involved in trying to organize different individuals around trying to define legislative minority issues."

2. "I gained some understanding of the dynamics of the State legislature."
3. "I didn't acquire any specific skills rather I acquired a body of knowledge related to gaining a better understanding of how a state OEO might operate. And I gained an understanding of the kinds of perceptions it had in terms of defining its task."

4. "Opportunity to talk to some professionals in the field. Opportunity to be exposed to the kinds of activities that planners are involved in."

5. "I was taking a class in "Social Policy", a course in "Manpower Planning and a course at the Law School in Civil Rights Legislation" all of which I was able to relate to my field work along the lines of problems of disadvantaged groups."

B. Negative Aspects/Problems/Pitfalls

1. "One of the problems at first was that the program developed was too ambitious. The supervisor was not only interested in analyzing the needs of disadvantage groups in Boston but he really meant the State. This was an obvious communication problem. Also there was no way I could survey the needs of the whole State on my limited time basis."
2. "The number one criticism of this field experience would be a lack of a very tangible very well prepared program and job description in terms of exactly what I would be trying to do."

3. "There were problems with the organization itself. One of the things they weren't interested in doing was in getting some kind of communications links into the Black community. They hadn't established any to that point. So problems arose for me in trying to really establish some type of initial communications links for the agency. I was the only Black person working in the agency. Problems just arose over the amount of time and energy I could really put into that type of task."

4. "Lack of adequate supervision also was a problem. We had to have a meeting over that."

C. Comments on Intern Seminar

1. "I think the seminar dealt primarily with trying to give students an over all definition of planning particularly as its relates to field work. That was good but there were other courses much less unique that could have done that. So the seminar was actually overlapping alot of activities that the student could find else where."
2. "Communications between interns is important but the process of how that took place within the seminar I thought was very poor. To have a student come in and give a 1 1/2 to 2 hour case study on his project was usually very boring. Particularly if it doesn't relate to your area of interest."

3. "The seminar was unique in the sense of the goals of the program. It was an effort to bring minority students into the planning profession by exposing them to practical experience in the field. Also the seminar was unique in the sense that it was supposed to be an experiment in looking at different problems or planning issues students would be facing later."

D. Integration of Course Work and Field Work

1. "One class I was involved in was Social Policy and Legislative Issues. I used my field placement opportunity to look at some of the issues brought up in class. Also I had a course in Manpower Planning and a course in Civil Rights Legislation at the law school. There wasn't any clear cut, precise coming together of all of these different aspects but on a general basis
I was able to apply some of the things I was learning at the Institute to research in the field placement."

2. "One of the concerns I had at the time was looking at employment i.e. manpower programs, civil rights laws - Title 7. Also I was looking at the so called 'Boston Plan'. Through my placement I was able to talk to a number of people who had been involved in affirmative action programs for minorities in the construction industry. At the same time the course I was taking at the law school dealt primarily with Title 7 - looking at different laws and court rulings pertaining to employment discrimination. The course I was taking in Manpower Planning dealt primarily with looking at the employment problems faced by minority groups. The course in social policy was involved with looking at past policies and evaluation of civil rights acts."

The intern made the following overall observations and recommendations about field work in general and the HIP in particular:

A. General
1. "What has to happen first is that the people involved in planning field work experiences should carefully examine and recognize the different categories of field work. Different types of field work call for different types of strategies. For example before you can ask the question is it valid to be a participant observer you have to define what type of situation you are talking about. One of the things that has to happen is that the Institute has to take a closer look at classifying different kinds of placements and develop strategies or goals for what they feel a student should get out of that placement depending upon the classification."

2. "A good placement is one which has the kind of staff that is receptive to bringing in an intern to learn as opposed to simply wanting an intern on board as some extra manpower. It is important that the field experience relate back to what the student is primarily involved in back in the classroom. The correlation between academics and field work should be a major priority in scheduling field work placements. Placements should be developed on the basis that they offer the kinds of learning opportunities which relate
directly back to what things are being taught in different courses."

3. "Too often when a student is brought into a large bureaucratic network his task is not clearly defined by the agency or by the school. Thus a lot of wasted time is spent in trying to define for yourself what you are supposed to be doing. The school should make sure that if a student is going into a placement as a participant observer or as just a worker that this is understood by the placement. The placement which is not helped by the school to define the student's role clearly at the front end will eventually turn into a poor placement."

4. "Field work can be a very valuable and useful experience. Based on my experience I have found that the academic end of it in terms of course work really can only provide say 50% of the kind of knowledge you need to learn. Particularly in a program like Urban Studies and that other part of that really has to be picked up by actually working out in the field."
1. "The HIP from my own personal experiences is a very valuable program. In terms of improvements the directors of such a program should really try to locate very well structured and relevant kinds of field work opportunities. In this manner they can eliminate a student spending a lot of wasted time in a field placement which is really not structured to give a student the type of experience he is looking for."

2. "The seminar should have been used to look at problems of minority planners in the field. The seminar should have been looking at the kinds of projects and activities that minority planners were involved in. Overall the seminar should have helped students to establish goals they wanted to pursue in their field placements and help them plan how they can achieve these goals."

The field supervisor had the following perceptions and specific observations about this field work experience:

**Overall Evaluation of Experience**

"It was a very useful educational experience for the intern. It had a reasonable probability of good pay off to the state. We were trying to tie up with connecting a Black community to a legislature. So that meant a pro-
cess of talking to community leaders and Black representatives to uncover issues that should be in legislation. The intern had a good background for that. He had been the president of a Black student group at his undergraduate college. This gave him some organizing experience. Also the intern had some exposure to some of the people around the city."

"What I think was revealing for him in the process was the difficulty in getting heads together. He went in expecting to organize much more quickly then he did because the idea made sense of what should be done. But he found out people wouldn't come to meetings and get together. There was no way that I really expected him to bring it off given the limited time a student has, the busy situation of most of the people contacted and the role the student had. I think he performed well for the limitations that were inherent in the process."

"If a few things had worked out from the other end where the intern could have simply provided support for that whole idea. That would have worked out fine. But the people around whom the organizing was critical fell apart and didn't follow through on meetings."

"If everything had worked out he would have enabled us to do something that we could not have done without him because: (1) I wasn't Black and (2) we didn't have any
body else who was Black who could do that. He would have done something that we didn't have the people to do and he would have given us an Black advocacy group in the legislative process. Things didn't work out. It was worth the try and a good try was made. This year the things that are happening with the Black Caucus are the seeds of what we wanted to have happen before."

**Orientation of Student**

"I don't recall exactly what we did but we did have about one or two sessions which dealt with something like that."

**Supervision**

"Once a week or every ten days I tried to sit down and talk to the student about where he was and what he was working toward."

"The meeting usually consisted of us talking about some possible strategies he could use in getting the people together. None of which worked, not because the strategy was bad but because the situation, the intern's role and the limited time he had didn't allow a positive pay off to be forthcoming in such a short period of time."

**Reasons for Taking Intern**

"We didn't have anybody in the office to do this type of work and I thought if we had a minority intern maybe
we could used him to get a few things like this accomplished."

**Benefits Derived From Experience by Student**

"I think the intern got an experience which contributed to his sense of realism about the pace of change and the difficulties of an organizing process. The experience he received will probably allow him to approach similar situations in the future with greater insight as to what to do and what not to do."

**Integration of Field Work and Course Work**

"I don't know if the student made any connections with his field work and his course work but he should have."
The student in this case was under a direct disadvantage by being under a supervisor who was not inclined to want any interns to supervise; was very busy writing a report for the corrections committee as well as performing other office duties (which left him little time to give to supervising a intern) and was not immediately or personally involved with the task assignment this intern was pursuing (Hence this intern suffered less supervisory contact and over all supervision then the intern who was directly involved with the corrections committee the supervisor was working with). Within this case is also the recurring theme of role conflict between student and supervisor expectations. The supervisor, intent on getting something accomplished for the agency, allowed the student to take on a task (organizing a Black resource team and researching legislative needs of disadvantage groups throughout the State) which the student with his limited time, community creditability and skills could not hope to complete. Further complicating the intern's task was the fact that the agency had not even laid sufficient ground work (i.e. established rapport with the target client population) for the task to be pursued by anyone in the agency let alone a student.
It was the intern who had to insist that the geographical area upon which he was to focus his research efforts be narrowed to Boston. This fact tends to indicate several things: the original task was not properly conceived for a student's limited time and abilities; the field supervisor was not properly predisposed to the needs of the student over the needs of the agency and the academic manager had not been instrumental in either structuring the placement (i.e. defining the student's needs and limitations for the agency) or intervening on the student's behalf to limit the scope of the assignment. In spite of the student's attempts to modify the focus of the task assignment it still proved to be too ambitious for a part time intern to accomplish in the course of one semester. The significant inadequacies which contributed to the dysfunctional nature of the placement are as follows: the agency's lack of creditability in the eyes of the target population focused on; the agency's lack of established communications links with the Black community (which could have expedited the coalescence of a Black resource team); the student's lack of time to build up adequate rapport and creditability with the community he was dealing with (Student had no roots in the community - Educated minority individuals, especially Blacks, are not above suspicion in their own communities
until they have proven themselves worthy of trust by rendering substantial and worthwhile community services.\) and the agency did not extend to or develop for the student a clearly defined outline of his task assignment. In order to have properly structured the task assignment for the student, the field supervisor should have: set down with the student at the beginning of the placement and mapped out in specific detail what steps he should be taking toward accomplishing his task and or get the student to develop a written 'game plan' or step by step process that the supervisor would critique and give added suggestions on. Also the supervisor should have been able to identify at least one Black contact person who would have had a developed interest in the project and who could have extended a real "in" into the community for the student.
Overall Case Study Analysis
These three case studies are classic examples of what happens when students are improperly placed in the field by an academic institution. First of all the students were not "screened" before they were placed in the field. By screened I mean they had no counseling conferences with the academic manager to establish some notion of their needs, expectations and field worker role concept. Any student being placed in the field by an academic institution should be questioned at length as to his particular interest in a placement and what type of an experience he desires (i.e. Does he just want to develop some skills?, Does he want to gain some general exposure to what planning is?, Does he want to test out his interest in this particular field etc.). Such a process has a three fold purpose: it establishes the concern of the institution that the student be properly placed into the field; it acknowledges the fact that in order for a student to obtain the maximum amount of benefit out of a field experience it must be approached with some degree of fore thought and design of expectations and it is the first step in eliminating future role conflict between what a student wants and what an agency has to offer.

The need for a screening process is particularly acute in terms of properly introducing first year students who have had no past professional experience into the
field. A student with no background experience or a professional knowledge base to call upon lacks a clear sense of role performance. Consequently this results in an almost total dependence on the field supervisor as the ultimate role model. The student is then forced into the role of an apprentice. He must perceive what his supervisor does as planning and what he is given to do as part of planning. Neither of which may be true as is the case in some of these case studies. The supervisor in many cases was either an administrator or a staff member of an agency who by job title was incidentally involved in planning but was not a "professional planner" per se. (*Note - One of the hall marks of a "profession" is that practitioners take responsibility for teaching and inducting new members or students into the profession. Individuals chosen outside the profession to serve as field supervisors for planning interns should have an in depth knowledge of the field and a clear image of themselves as a professional. If field supervisors don't at least meet these two basic criteria it then becomes dubious as to whether students should be entrusted to them.)

Furthermore most of the supervisors viewed themselves not as "professionals" with any commitment to interns but as individuals who had a job to do. They viewed the
students as a tool for getting more work accomplished. What the student learned or did not learn was incidental to the process of getting a task completed. If a field work experience is structured properly what the student does is key to the learning process - the mesh of theory and practice. If there is no planning practice no such integration can take place. If the supervisor can not be observed planning or does not placed a student in a situation in which he must engage in the planning process, the student has not learned to be a planner. The student has instead learned to perform some duties for an office.

The point here is simple. A supervisor who takes on the responsibility of an intern must not only be task orientated but also process orientated. He or she must make sure that the student in accomplishing a certain task is also involved in the process of learning. The learning should not be an accidental by-product of the task but a structured part of its intent.

The field managers were both sincere and dedicated to operating the program adequately. However both coordinators admitted that they had not had previous experience in operating such a program. In fact both individuals admitted in their warm up interviews (the first interviews performed) that the program entailed a great deal more orchestration then either one of them
had anticipated. Complicating their commitment to the program was of course their other personal time responsibilities (i.e. the chief coordinator had academic responsibilities as a graduate student and the seminar coordinator had a full time job). But perhaps the larger issue that is raised here is one of professional standards and guidelines. The program managers neither developed on their own nor were given by the academic department any professional criteria to used to choose field supervisors; guidelines establishing the basic level of monitoring of field placements to be maintained and discription of a field supervisor's role commitment to an intern. Besides these basic oversights is the fact that due consideration was not given to the infeasibility of placing new planning students out in the field before they can develop a sense of the profession. It seems to be rather poor judgement to place a student in a placement without making a rather in-depth assessment of the field supervisor's competence, commitment to the profession and predisposition to or experience in educating interns. It seems to be an even greater blunder to not assure stable (full time) academic back up support for students by field managers when both the field supervisor's commitment to an intern and to the profession are in question.
Perhaps a basic example of the lack of a truly structured approach to the field program is mirrored in the poor case study organization established by the field managers. One of the managers noted in his interview that the student's case studies were not as detailed as they could have been. This may have been true however the fact remains that no specific guidelines were given to the students to follow in developing their case studies. Such things as: what the case studies were supposed to establish about the field experience, what links between theory and practice should they have been looking to describe, what basic points of analysis they should have been trying to make etc. were not clearly outlined for the students. For example, I had to take it upon myself to sit down with the chief coordinator and have him outline in a precise fashion what specific things he was looking for in a case study. This was perhaps the only reason why my case study escaped the label of being not detailed enough.

The field seminars were a peculiar mixture of both the sublime and the mundane. At some points when students presented case studies and their field supervisors were in attendance some very stimulating discussions took place. The presence of the field supervisor made for a more complete discussion of critical issues raised in
case studies. Students were better able to challenge the case analysis of the student presenting his report when they could raise crucial questions on agency goals, policy and operation of the field supervisor. In fact in some cases the students conspired with the student presenting his case to place a supervisor in the "hot seat". By this I mean a student prior to presenting his case study (about a week before) would feed certain questions he thought should be put to his supervisor to the other interns. Usually these questions raised critical issues that the student could not ask of his supervisor without jeopardizing his relationship with him. At these times much useful information was exchanged and real learning took place.

However these types of sessions occurred much too infrequently because most field supervisors did not come to their intern's case study presentation. The other low points of the seminar series occurred when there was just simple discussion of planning theory. The students in general were eager for some specific skill development or learning that was directly applicable to their field work but this seemed never to occur. Instead the students were perplexed with a constant barrage of general theory. Nothing was wrong with the theory but the managers failed to make a clear attempt
to demonstrate how the theory should be linked up to what the students were doing in the field. Since most students were getting similar vague exposure to planning theory in another general course, they were turned off by the repetition in the seminars.

In an attempt to relieve some of the tedium caused by the routineness of seminar sessions one student was creative enough to have the class meet at his field placement office when he gave his case study. Besides relieving the monotony of meeting in the same surroundings this change helped to create new and increased learnings for the students. First of all it gave them some physical familiarity with an organization's facilities and its location. (This is important when students are new to a city.) Second the field supervisor felt more secure in meeting with students on his own "turf". When feeling secure a supervisor tends to be more candid in his remarks thus giving students greater insights.

During the seminar series a few speakers were brought in to discuss their planning experiences. This made for some interesting sessions but again they occurred too infrequently. The discussions during seminars flowed most easily and spawned the most group interaction when a speaker or a case study was dealing with some housing issues. At other times discussions and group
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interaction was labored. A number of students were able to relate and offer critical insights and comments around the subject of housing. Most students had housing as a field of specialization or were involved in a housing related placement. This fact tends to further substantiate the need for specialized seminars where the students involved have one common field of interest. In summary it can be said that the more productive seminar sessions tended to be obscured by the constant routine of general planning theory lectures, discussions of administrative problems (i.e. hold ups in funds for students) and general conflict resolution sessions (i.e. student dissatisfaction over structure of seminars).

In June, 1969, the Architectural Research Laboratory (ARL) of The University of Michigan entered into a contract with the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to evaluate a series of work-study projects supported by HUD's 701 Comprehensive planning Assistance Program and to advise HUD on the future conduct of such projects. The final report submitted in August 1970 constituted a detailed survey and evaluation of fourteen work-study projects funded by HUD during fiscal year 1970. Each project was examined in terms of its impact on students, agencies, universities, and, the planning process in general. Each was evaluated for its potential both from the standpoint of its own frame
of reference as well as in the light of overall criteria set forth by the HUD program. The findings of this study both correlate with and expand upon some of the general perceptions of the students and program coordinators interviewed in this thesis. Specific problems uncovered by the ARL project were:

— Lack of coordination between the educational and the work components of the program.
— Lack of freedom for the student to adjust himself to the combined work study situation.
— Lack of flexibility in work assignments in terms of subject matter and time requirements.
— Lack of supervision on the professional side.
— Work assignments that did not contribute to the student's professional development.
— Lack of definition of the student's role and responsibility in the program.
— Inadequate time for program preparation because of late funding by HUD.
— Reluctance by universities to make change in educational programs to accommodate the needs of students.
— Lack of support on the part of the agency for student efforts to bring about changes in agency activi-
As a footnote to these problems the report makes a very significant operational observation on the organization of the field work programs. "These were common though not universal problems. In some projects where a harmonious working relationship among university and agency staff was established form the outset and main emphasis was placed on the educational needs of the students, few or none of these problems existed." This crucial observation strikes at the very heart of this thesis. For what is quite clearly being said here is that unless there is a very well defined and operable communications loop established between a university and field placement (with the major emphasis on servicing the educational needs of the student being the common thread which binds them) then the effectiveness of the field experience is in jeopardy.

Most of the problems observed by the ARL project staff in their survey of HUD work-study projects were found to be related directly to the field placement or work situations. The most common problems were found to be the result of: (1) students being assigned to routine work which did not contribute to their education; (2) inadequate supervision available to students in performing their tasks; (3) inability on the part of agency...
personnel to understand the needs and inner conflicts of students and (4) lack of coordination between the work assignment and the students; educational programs.66

In case study II the intern suggests that in developing the HIP the department or academic institution lacked real commitment to the program as an educational vehicle. In fact he intimates that the department was more concerned with capitalizing on an financial opportunity (getting funds to support minority students) then in structuring a valuable learning experience for students to be involved in the resulting program. Specifically the student states: "It's my understanding that its as if an opportunity arose which had to be capitalized upon and MIT took advantage of it. There was great haste in developing the program to fit the needs of the bureaucracy that would allocate the funds." The ARL report offers the following illuminating observations along the same lines. "Universities are under pressure to enroll more minority group students. These students usually require financial aid in addition to other supportive services of an academic nature. Most universities are not able to meet this financial responsibility on their own and are seeking fellowship funds from the outside. Such funds are scarce and difficult to find. Under the mounting pressure for higher minority student enrollments, a
university may become involved in the HUD-supported program without really being prepared to conduct an integrated work-study arrangements for the students. In cases where university agency collaboration for educational purposes has not existed previously the HUD program is likely to be approached as a source for additional fellowships with the work element being viewed as a necessary constraint in order for the funds to become available."

"The agencies are also under pressure to increase their employment of minority group individuals. In addition, many are understaffed to the point of not being able to handle even routine work. The program may therefore be viewed in some instances as offering an opportunity to satisfy both of these aspects at low cost. As a result, insufficient attention may be paid by the agency to the educational needs of the student. The combination of a university and an agency thrown together by social pressure and not really prepared to conduct an educationally credible work-study program would result, at best, in a compromise situation where the work and study aspects are not truly integrated. When this happens, the education of the student is likely to suffer considerably."
Summary of Findings
In reviewing the information uncovered on the administration and operation of the HIP the following significant findings stand out:

1. The staff of this program had neither prior experience in operating a field linked education program nor the proper time assignment (i.e. full-time status) to operate the program effectively.

2. There was a lack of program support or extra faculty resources backing up the operation of the program.

3. The program staff did not adequately develop (i.e. identify placements with professional planners who wanted to help interns learn about planning as opposed to use interns for cheap labor), initiate (i.e. begin each placement with a three party conference), structure (i.e. help develop with field supervisor an appropriate field design or task assignment for intern) and monitor (i.e. make periodic visits to placements or checks on student's progress) field placements.

4. The problems suffered by the students were a direct result of the program staff's failure to adequately develop, initiate, structure and
monitor field placements.

5. Lack of adequate communication and coordination between academic managers and field supervisors.

6. The program required students to encounter work assignments in agencies before being immersed in the knowledge, theory and value base of the profession.

The students involved in the HIP met with the following problems:

1. Lack of early and clear definition of the student's responsibility in field placement.

2. Lack of adequate field supervision.

3. Lack of structured orientation of student to agency.

4. Lack of adequate supervision from the academic managers.

5. Role conflicts between student and field supervisor over what the student was capable of accomplishing in a limited time span and what the supervisor expected.

6. Lack of a developed, tangible well organized field design or task assignment to follow.
7. Field supervisors viewed interns as sources of manpower rather than as students in need of continuing supervision.

8. Students found field seminar made up of individuals with too many diverse professional interest to be productive.

9. Students found out less about planning in general through field experience then they had expected.

10. Time commitment conflicts between the amount of time demanded by field assignment and the actual time student was able to give in view of his academic course work responsibilities.

11. Lack of flexibility in work assignments in terms of subject matter and time requirements.

12. Work assignments that did not meet the total professional interest or needs of student

Students who participated in the HIP tended to benefit from the field experience in the following ways:

1. Students were able to establish professional contacts through field experience.

2. Students were able to integrate their course work and their field work in the following ways:
- writing papers based on what they observed, learned or experienced in the placement.

- raising questions in classes based on what they had observed, learned or experienced in the field placement.

- used field placement as a place to experiment with ideas developed or learned in class.

3. Gained specific knowledge about a particular agency, an understanding of its functioning or operation and experience in performing certain duties and tasks assignments of the agency.

4. Students were able to test out their interest in a specific job setting. Ultimately students were prompted to refocus their career or academic pursuits as a result of their field experience.
CHAPTER III

The Department of Urban Studies and Planning

Field Linked Education Service
**Program Overview**

- **Name of Program:** DUSP Field-Linked Education Service.

- **Sponsorship:** Department of Urban Studies and Planning/MIT.

- **Program Staff:** One half time program coordinator with Lecturer status. (A full-time director of his own consulting firm.)

- **Number of Students:** Thirty-four (34) graduate students/Ten undergraduate students. (* Sept. 1971 - Dec. 1971)

- **Entry or Selection Process:** Students become part of the program based on personal prerogative and a screening interview by program coordinator.

- **Length of Participation:** One-semester is the basic time period.

- **Time and Credits:** Students must spend at least 9 hours a week in a placement. Longer time commitments are also possible.
at the discretion of the student. Academic credit is awarded in direct proportion to the weekly time commitment. i.e. 9 hours in field = 9 credits 15 hours in field = 15 credits.

In formal gatherings held on an optional basis. No structured format or time schedule.
Program Description:

The DUSP field work program has been in operation for four years. The program is oriented toward a personalized approach to field work. Each student must:

1. contact the program coordinator;
2. establish his need or rationale for a field work experience with the program coordinator;
3. outline his particular area of interest in reference to placements and
4. seek out and initiate a placement from one of the options offered on his own. Students usually select a placement from a list of several possibilities suggested by the program coordinator. However students may make their own contacts with a field placement and then arrange for appropriate credit through the DIP and its coordinator.

Students are required during their first week of involvement to develop a set of objectives. Specifically the student is supposed to outline what he will be doing within his particular placement and what steps if any are involved in the work process. The work program statement is to be worked out first between the student and the field supervisor and then submitted for approval to the DIP coordinator.

During the course of the field semester the students are at liberty to participate in ad hoc seminar meetings.
Seminar formats are open-ended, informal and unstructured. Emphasis is placed on a "cross fertilization process" where teacher and students learn from each other and share theories on different problems. The basic approach is to use different persons as sounding boards. The program coordinator believes that "if you bring different students together, their discussion can raise their level of understanding of the problem chosen for analysis".

The program director states that he attempts to meet with each student for a half-hour to an hour each month to monitor their progress. The program coordinator also attempts to solicit judgements from field supervisors periodically on the progress of each student. Fundamentally students are evaluated in terms of growth or capacity to significantly expand previously held skills or to develop new ones. At the end of the field experience each student is required to write a brief analysis of his placement. The emphasis of this evaluation outline is supposed to be on the limitations of the work experience i.e. what didn't they get out of it, what didn't work or get accomplished. However it should also contain references to significant success and skills gained.

The program coordinator views field work's importance for students as being based on an opportunity to experience serious responsibility in the performance of some
task. He offers the following paradigm of his "responsibility model" of field work. The student enters into a working situation where the stakes are high and where his role is important. The pressures on him to perform are tangible and intense. He sees that not only his "grade", but real values in the situation depend on his proficiency. The experience works when the student feels the pressures and works at responding to them. He thus learns to take the process of conceptualization seriously. It works when the student learns, in the high risk situation, not only to play it safe but to carry over the exploring, probing, experimental behavior he has learned in other settings. In order for this model to work, there must be: (1) real responsibility for the student; (2) a context of active and competing initiatives; (3) a placement process in which the client makes the key decisions; (4) a strong sense of service, affecting both faculty and students and (5) a sense of need, on the part of the student, both to be in the field situation and perform, and to report back on his experience.
Interview Preview

This interview takes a look at the DIP through the eyes of the program's only administrator. In it he outlines his philosophy of field work. Basically he believes that a student profits most from a field experience in which he is given real responsibility to solve a problem or complete a task. Within the interview the subject comments on the difficulty of a student just entering an academic institution being able to make a good choice of placements. In fact he suggests that a student needs at least a term to get to know various field opportunities before he selects one. Of particular import to this thesis is the subject's comment that the MIT faculty is not basically interested in field work or posses any specific abilities to perform field supervision. The subject within this interview establishes his very limited time availability to students. In addition he reveals his limited periodic contact with both students and supervisors.

On the other hand he suggests that in order for a student to profit from his relationship with a field supervisor the student needs close and continuing contact. The program coordinator outlines the main problem in field work is trying to get a good field supervisor who
will give the time, energy and commitment toward really providing a student with a productive experience.

Within the interview the subject discusses the scheduling difficulties involved in trying to hold a field seminar. He specifically outlines the problems of holding a seminar with individuals who have no common field of interest. The subject states that he views his field seminar as a cross fertilization process in which students learn from students - students learn from teacher - and teacher learns from students. Finally the coordinator lists several achievements that students can obtain from a field work experience: a sense or ability to deal with problems; a sense of maturity; an ability to think through a problem; and a sense of commitment to a client group or to a desired end.
Subject # 1 - The program coordinator of the DIP made the following responses to the given questions asked.

Q - How long have you been operating the field work program in the department?
A - About four years.

Q - What has been your view of field work?
A - What I have been interested in offering in my field work program is a very hard situation. It is not a participant observer situation. It is not your going out as a student to bridge the gap between the academic and the real world and look at the real world as an observer ... cut it open maybe, see cancer in it and ... then sew it up ... and come back and write a paper about what you learn by looking at a cancerous situation.

- Everybody out in the field knows the damn world stinks. Being a participant observer of a good or bad situation or a powerful situation in the real world is a valuable experience. But what I think is more valuable at this graduate level is to take on responsibility. Taking on a share of the responsibility in a real life situation can be more rewarding.

- I make the assumption that a real problem can be
tackled and solved by a student in a real life situation.

- I don't want a student to go out and watch a committee at work. I want him to go out and help that committee to function. I want him to function as a staff person and take responsibility to help solve the problem. I want his experience to have a beginning, a middle and an end.

- I think it is profitable for a student to do theoretical work on housing and then go out and help the North End Tenant's Council prepare an application to get housing for themselves. Or the student might help to get a tax shelter for another group.

- Taking on a risk situation is an important experience.

- Our profession is different from chemistry or physics. You enter planning with some sort of orientation that you want to help people. Part of your training then should involve stimulating a student's sense of social responsibility to accomplish things. You must learn that you are going to get into a risk situation and you can't afford to fail. We fail too often.

- Part of a real education experience out in the field is the student's ability to operate in the face of constraints against his efforts to achieve success.
If you don't have a sense of the constraints in the real world then you are not well trained.

Field work is not for everybody. If you come to MIT with a rich past of experience with an OEO program - you don't need field work.

Students have to choose field work after careful consideration.

Q - What can help a student in making a better choice or decision about field work?

A - I think a student needs at least a minimum of a term to get to know the opportunities and the work.

A student just entering a department in the first term can't make a solid decision on what is a good field placement in a new city he has just been in for two or three days.

I also have a feeling that MIT faculty by disposition and ability are often not predisposed to give aid to students in field work or to do field supervision.

Q - How much time do you have to commit to the field work program here?

A - I am only part-time. I work full-time over at my office. I am usually only over here at MIT one day a week.
Q - Do you think the present field work structure is adequate?

A - My judgement is that field work might be more effective if you put a student out in the field for a longer period of time. If you really want to learn something from a good supervisor you can't expect to pick it up in 2 and 3 hour spurts. You have to be with him all day 24 hours a day.

Q - How many hours are people committed to take under your program?

A - I won't take anybody unless he will work at least 9 hours a week?

Q - What has been your experience with field work seminars?

A - Last year's seminar didn't work. The students were doing so many different things at so many different hours that to get them together at the same time was an endless task. When we could get them together there was no community of interest. One person interested in housing and another person interested in law reform just didn't match. The person interested in housing fell asleep on the student talking about law reform and vica versa.
Q - What was the purpose of the seminar?
A - The purpose was cross fertilization. The student could learn from me and I could learn from the student and one student could learn from another student.

The process hasn't been too successful because of the different interest students have.

There were no regular times for the seminars nor was attendance required.

The seminars had an open agenda with no special focus.

Q - What are the problems of the field work program?
A - One of the problems of field work is that its tough to get a good field supervisor who will give the time, energy and commitment to really help give a student a productive experience. Too often field placements just take students because they need extra help and a student doesn't cost them any money.

Q - Whose needs are more important in a field experience the student's or the agency's?
A - I have to place priority on the needs of the agency. I don't want to put somebody out there who is going to fail them.

Q - How do you develop field placements?
A - I used personal contacts. I develop a placement
around the needs of a given area.

Q - Do you ask field supervisors about how much time they will spend with a student?
A - Yes, I try to establish that supervisors will give students adequate direction and time. However I leave the actual time up to the supervisor and the intern.

Q - What are your goals concerning field work?
A - I think a student should be able to achieve out of a field experience: a sense or ability to deal with problems; a sense of maturity; an ability to think through a problem; and a sense of commitment to a client group or to a desired end. I don't demand too much out of field work.
This program is operated by a very outspoken and committed professional. It is perhaps only through his unique commitment to field work and to meeting the needs of students that the DIP remains afloat amid a general sea of indifference to field work within the department. The most striking thing about this program is the fact that it has been operating for four years with only one part-time administrator. This fact alone tends to dispel any conjecture that the inadequacies of the HIP (i.e. lack of staff, status, organization) were caused only by the fact that the program was just getting started. For here is a program (DIP) that has been in the department for four years and yet is just as understaffed as the HIP if not more so.

An interesting fact to be noted is that according to the program coordinator (DIP) his program was more structured during its first year of operation than at present. He states it was during the first year of the program that he had access to funds to hire a number of part-time specialist in different planning areas (i.e. urban renewal). Basicly these specialist tutored students in the general areas that their field placements focused on. In view of this bit of history it would seem that
if anything the DIP has become less supportive of students out in field over time then vica versa. Although the coordinator of the DIP has had four years experience in working with this program his basic effectiveness as a field manager is still hopelessly neutralize by his part-time status and the fact that he is the only administrator of the program. The sheer number (twice as many as in the HIP) of students the coordinator has to deal with tends to suggest that even if he was full time he still couldn't service the needs of every student adequately.

Within the interview the subject stated that "a student should choose field work after careful consideration." In the process of careful consideration especially for new students it seems that the academic manager must play a key role because presumably: he knows what placements exist, the caliber of supervision available, the range of tasks available etc.. He must in conjunction with the intern decide what best combination of placement, supervisor and task assignment meets the student's goals (or will produce the desired learning situation the student seeks).

One basic difference that stands out between the DIP and the HIP is that the coordinator of the DIP does try to hold a screening conference with students interested
in field work. Also the coordinator tends to counsel some students out of taking field work if he feels they are not ready for it.

In reviewing this coordinator's view of field work it seems that he has a very "work" oriented approach to field work. In fact he states that he places a priority on the needs of the organization as opposed to the needs of the student. I tend to agree that when there is a specific client group linked to the work in which the student is involved that great care should be taken in assuring that the group accomplishes its goals and the student performs. However when talking about an agency setting of some kind there should be less need for a student to perform only tasks that benefit the agency. Rather the student should be given some degree of autonomy in developing the task assignment which he is most interested in and which will increase his learning the most.
Case Study I
Case Study Introduction

This case study deals with a 24 year old female student whose undergraduate major was in Music and Drama. This student was quite outspoken and animated. She displayed a unique zeal in relating her field experience. Her vivid memory of the experience is linked to its importance as the only way she could gain exposure to her particular area of interest. The subject from her personal perspective felt that there is a crucial need of field work to fill the gaps of course work not found in an academic department.

This case illustrates the use of field work by a student to gain exposure to an area of interest not offered within the department's academic courses. Demonstrated in this case are the problems created for a student when she is not properly introduced into an office (i.e. given an orientation to the agency its work, its accomplishments, its organization/introduction to staff members and their work etc.). This case shows the frustrations and lost of time suffered by a student when she is not given adequate direction by her field supervisor. This case also points out how a student's particular educational interest can get side tracked when the academic manager does not establish any preli-
minary contact with the field supervisor. In addition this case portrays how a field work program can disintegrate into a simple volunteer work program when a field supervisor is neither contacted or informed by an academic manager of the responsibilities in supervising a student (no educational responsibility will be assumed by a field supervisor for a student when no obligation is imposed upon him.). Finally this case demonstrates the diminished worth of a field placement to a student when she does not receive close-continuing contact with her supervisor.
Respondent # 1 - The Intern

Background

The respondent had three basic reasons for becoming involved in the DIP. Her primary reason was because she didn't like doing straight academic work. To quote the respondent "coming out of theater and music I had always been performing or doing something very active. Secondly I was in a field at MIT that they didn't have anything in at the time. I was in cultural administration and there were no courses in it and nothing offered anywhere. So the only other alternative was to get involved in some field work and start to get to know the people. I guess the third reason was to try to get to know some of the arts places in Boston because the only way you can get an "in" to jobs and get involved in programs is to usually volunteer for something and get to know the people." Since the student was new to Boston and didn't have any placement ideas or contacts she went to the director of the DIP to get help. He was able to come up with the name of a woman who worked at Summer Thing (an arts and recreational program for the city of Boston). The student then went to the office of Summer Thing and "volunteered her services for credit". She was given responsibility of organizing a special Christmas
exhibit to be put together by different ethnic groups.

Placement Narrative

The respondent served as an intern to the chief administrator of Summer Thing. The intern was informed of several things the organization was working on but was primarily pointed toward working on a Ethnic Christmas Program. The intern's supervisor needed someone to put this program together for two reasons: she was becoming too busy to do it herself and there was no one available on the staff to work on it. The supervisor suggested to the intern that she could learn a lot about different ethnic groups, neighborhoods and in general about the different cultural things going on in Boston by working on the program. Specifically the intern was responsible for organizing a Christmas exhibit to be set up in City Hall consisting of various Christmas trees decorated by different ethnic groups around Boston. This task entailed several different duties: getting in contact with as many different ethnic groups as possible; stimulating their interest in decorating a Christmas tree or putting on some type of entertainment (i.e. singing, dancing, puppet shows, drama presentations etc.); making arrangements according to what types of materials, facilities and equipment the group need in setting up their
particular exhibit or presentation; and making sure that the community groups that volunteered showed up to decorate the trees and give any assistance where necessary.

The student used contacts through different organizations like the International Institute to get names of ethnic groups and people to talk to. The intern after talking to a number of different contacts was able to get 12 groups to agree to put up exhibits and decorate the trees. Initially in trying to orchestrate this program the intern ran into difficulties in: making contacts and finding people on her own since she was new to Boston; establishing rapport with different ethnic individuals; organizing different people and groups who weren't sure who she was since she didn't know that much the organization she was working for (Summer Thing); and circumventing restrictions in City Hall placed on the setting up of exhibits. There were two major crisis involved in the intern's attempts to put the program together. The first crisis centered around the intern's attempts to by pass restrictions placed on setting up exhibits in City Hall. This problem was solved by the supervisor's conference with the maintenance man in charge of the area where the exhibits were to be placed. The second crisis arose over two ethnic groups who didn't want their trees next to each other and another ethnic
group which didn't want a tree as part of their religious exhibit. This problem was also settled by the supervisor. The intern was involved in setting up the program for the entire semester and her field placement ended with the holding of the Christmas program in City Hall.

The intern made the following specific observations about this field work experience:

A. Positive Aspects/Advantages/New Learnings

1. "I think I gained a better idea of how to scheduled things in setting up a program of that type."

2. "I worked later for Summer Thing during the summer. Also out of the contacts I made through Summer Thing I got involved in quite a few areas of teaching drama, doing special courses and working with other organizations. It was really helpful for uncovering future jobs."

3. "It helped me define what types of areas I want to work in. With that job I was working solely with administration. Since then I have decided that I want to work more closely with neighborhoods."

4. "Basicly I gained insight into the way some of the cultural programs are set up in Boston and
the way they are run. I found things to be quite harhazard. You just think up a program and then start contacting people and then do it. There is no formal planning involved in that sort of thing."

5. "When I first started my field work I was just interested in cultural administration but through my involvement with my particular project I have branched off into ethnic studies. I didn't plan it that way. I just ended up doing different projects after my field work which were related to ethnic studies. In fact I did another project in the spring which was related to that. Then in the summer I worked for Summer Thing and now I am doing my thesis on ethnic studies."

B. Negative Aspects/Problems/Pitfalls

1. "Another problem that I had was that I could only put in 15 hours a week. That was all I could put in with regard to my academic work commitment I had at MIT. Which meant I spent two days there. Sometimes this wasn't convenient for community people and they would say why aren't you going to be here on Wednesday or Thursday when I could only be there on Monday and Friday. Also I didn't
have time to meet with all of the people connected with the program before the exhibit. If I had this might have made things easier to organize and maybe there wouldn't have been any conflict at the end."

2. "My actual work task wasn't really well defined. There wasn't a good use of time. I think I could have done more if I had been given some clearer directions on how to proceed and what to do."

3. "It was difficult because I had no 'ins' in Boston and just to start working with different people in Boston right away was hard. It was also difficult finding people on my own. Because for one thing people don't know who you are and you aren't really familiar with that program enough to just go off and start organizing things."

4. "I guess one of the major problems I had was that there were so many restrictions in City Hall and to try and get around them wasn't easy. The program was poorly set up, in so far as putting on programs because the man who was in charge of the plaza and all the spaces where you put up exhibits hates to have exhibits going on. You have to have things almost specially planned to
suit his needs before you can get anything done."

5. "I really didn't get that much supervision."
"She left everything up to me. I think if we had talked more about different ethnic frictions ... I think that might have helped me to know how to arrange things differently so that there would not have been so much conflict later."

6. "Another problem was that nobody in the office really knew what I was doing and I sure didn't know about the different projects that they were working on. This lack of communication caused a problem all most around the time the Christmas exhibit was supposed to start. There was another special program someone was planning ... which was going to conflict in time arrangements at City Hall with mine. It was finally resolved but it would have helped if at the beginning my supervisor had told me what other people were doing in the office or at least introduced me around to different people ... explaining to them why I was there and what I would be doing."

C. Comments on Intern Seminar

1. "I didn't go to any seminars. A seminar might have been helpful if the other people were
interested in the same thing I was."

D. Integration of Course Work and Field Work

1. "I found my field experience to be helpful in giving me some base of experience to relate back to for a class I had with Steave Carr and Kevin Lynch."

2. "Gave an oral report for one class based on my field experiences. I think it was some Urban design course."

3. "I have taken an independent study course on Arts in Cambridge which was directly connected to field work. In this course I basically wanted to take a look to see how art programs were set up, find out types of neighborhood programs they had and what types of facilities were offered."

4. "I did a paper for another course based on interviews of people's reactions to a special art sculpture show placed in the plaza surrounding City Hall."

E. General Observations about the Experience

1. "I think field work can be more structured. Looking back, I would like to have had a better introduction to the office. Nobody was quite
sure of where I was coming from or why I was there from MIT to work with them. They weren't quite sure of what I was supposed to do. There were also time allocations of the internship program which should have been made clear to the placement supervisor by the department."

2. "It would have helped if I had a chance to sit down and talk to some other students or people who were interested in the same thing. I think I would have liked to have worked on a more professional basis then I did. Something more complex involving more planning skills and coordination skills."

3. "It took me about a month to get some what adjusted to my placement."

4. "It helps if you can relate your academic work to field work. But at the time I was taking field work MIT didn't have any courses in cultural administration."

"I think more courses should be structured to have field work experiences linked with them."

5. "I found out the arts are very unstructured and there weren't any definite planning skills attached to cultural planning at that time."
Perhaps if I had more academic back up there might have been some more professional things I could have gotten out of the experience."

6. "For me a good or successful field experience is one that is unique. One that you have not been involved in before. Also you should be able to gain some specific skills, expertise and a knowledge of some area or field out of it."

7. "I did not develop as much professional experience out of this placement as I would have liked to."

8. "I would have liked to have worked more extensively with different programs and gained some skills in planning for programs. At that time just working with one program there wasn't that much planning to be done. It was just mostly coordinating and getting people involved. It would have been more interesting for me to watch their procedures of how they put overall programs together. Like their summer rock shows and how they coordinate different schedules and program different things for different areas of the city. I would like to have had a chance to deal with multiple problems in planning cultural programs for cities,"
8. "I gained some insight in how to coordinate a very simple program, and a knowledge of how the agency is run but overall my knowledge of my field of specialization was not extended."

9. "I found field work more beneficial than class work. Because you find that one usually gets more realistic insights in the field and an understanding of what you are doing."

The intern made the following overall observations and recommendations about field work in general.

1. "A lot of incoming students are not aware if field work opportunities are available. They should be better informed on what opportunities are open through the department."

2. "An agency should be aware of what role MIT is going to play in structuring a field placement for a student. It should be made clear to the students by MIT what role the agency is going to play in working with the student in teaching him different things."

"I think maybe if you are working with an agency and you want to get some sort of additional insights into the field you are working with the
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people should spend some amount of time working with you. I would debate the point where you go out on your own and work on your own projects. Because you are apt to just used the skills you brought with you. Whereas if you are working with an agency and you are seeing different ways that they are working on different problems you might get more out of it."

The field supervisor had the following perceptions and specific observations about this field work experience:

Overall Evaluation of Experience

"I just happen to have a project that I needed to get done at a time when the intern was looking for something to involve herself in. The idea that I had was building around Christmas in City Hall and getting Christmas trees decorated by different ethnic groups in the community. It had started last year when I had three groups but I wanted to build it to 13 - 15 - 16 groups."

"What we needed was someone to go seeking who were the right people in the community and I knew how to do it but it takes some time to do it. The intern was willing and certainly the proper person to approach these groups. She called the international institute which has 40 member groups and got their mailing list
through them. She contacted various people who were interested in various forms of ethnic entertainment, food and dancing."

"Through this process we came up with about 12 groups which decorated trees in City Hall and had proper graphic design talking about their native country. And then in the afternoon we had about four or five groups which had entertainment during the two weeks before Christmas. It took a lot of effort on her part. It was her special personality that made it work. It was a unique thing for her to do vis-a-vis MIT because she got an official entree into some ethnic groups which she would never have gotten into otherwise."

"It was a three month project for her. She had an opportunity to be in an urban area, involved with a cultural activity connected with the mayor's office. The whole thing was beautiful. It gave me what I wanted and it gave her some experience. The two most important things about the experience were: (1) there was a short term very interesting project to be done and (2) very good 'vibes' between the intern and me."

"There was no sort of formality involved. I never viewed it as an orientation thing or credit thing. Although I knew that was the end result. I felt she was getting an experience that was valuable to her. I was
getting her mind and talents."

**View of Intern**

"I viewed her as a worker who was helping me to do something that I wanted to do but didn't have time to do."

**Skills Developed by Student**

"Well I have no idea. That's a silly question. I didn't know what she was capable of doing before. She was capable of doing everything I asked her to do. Now whether she had ever done it before I don't know. It was a happening."

* The learning that occurs out in the field should not take place solely by happenstance but by design. A student's learning in the field should result from the conscious planned effort of both the academic manager and the field supervisor to provide or create the most viable learning experiences possible.

"A set of educational goals must to some degree be build into the learning experience by the academic mana- ger if the internship is to be more than a spontaneous happening."
Supervisor

"Hardly any supervision was given her by me. I told her what I thought she should do. Gave her all the phone numbers of the people I knew but after that she was on her own. She would check back with me when she was doing things. She would write me notes because I was so busy and her time was so limited. She tried to come in at one specific time each week so that I would know when I could talk to her if I needed to."

General Comments

"I think with any of these things. It is very much a one to one situation. If the person who arrives hits it off with the office and the overall people."

"The most crucial thing about this kind of a relationship between a graduate student and a office is that it is categorized in time that a person connects with the administrator at some specific time maybe its only one hour a week. Alot of stuff can be done outside. But the office should be kept inform periodicly of what they are doing."

"It was a unique experience. A happening that I don't expect to duplicate"

"We did talk informally on ways she could relate work back to MIT course work."
The general pattern of this case study is very similar to many others. The field supervisor, the chief administrator of the placement, was very busy with a number of projects she was trying to complete. The field supervisor essentially needed some extra manpower to work on one special project that neither she nor her staff had time to work on. The field supervisor was never contacted by the academic supervisor about taking on an intern. The intern just showed up one day to "volunteer her services". With such an informal introduction to the placement it is not hard to see why the field supervisor would tend to regard the intern as more of a volunteer worker then a student coming to learn about a planning process. No one from the academic institution took the time to explain to the supervisor what she should or should not do in order to give the student a full learning experience. Thus it was quite easy for the field supervisor to regard the student as simply a part time helper who she had no real time or supervisory obligation to. This realization is perhaps best mirrored in the fact that the supervisor did not take the time to give the student:

(1) a structured orientation to the placement;
(2) an introduction to other workers in the
placement and an explanation of their work task;

(3) an overview of the total nature of the agency's planning process and

(4) a chance to look over her shoulder as she (field supervisor) developed, planned, scheduled and coordinated more complicated cultural programs.

The supervisor in this case study also failed to properly prepare the student for the task assignment she was given. The student was both new to Boston as well as to the particular placement. This meant she had very limited knowledge about: (1) who and where significant contact people in the community were; (2) what the best way of gaining an 'in' into the community was and (3) the operation, organization and past accomplishments of the field placement. (The student was often at a loss for words in trying to explain to people she had to contact about who she was and about the nature of the organization she was working with. — *A student who is not properly coached by his field supervisor finds it hard to decide how he should represent himself to people he must contact. This is especially true when the student must generate people's interest and participation in some special project or task.) The field supervisor should have sat down with the student and worked out a precise game plan for the intern to follow.
The game plan should have taken into consideration the aforementioned variables.

The student in this case study was never really involved very much with the placement office or the other staff members. This point is best illustrated by the conflict in program scheduling that occurred because no one in the office (outside of the field supervisor and the intern) knew what the intern was doing. In fact some of the staff didn't even know who the intern was, where she was from or why she was there. This is a serious flaw in a field placement when a student does not have basic contact with other individuals who are working on similar projects or tasks. The intern's interaction and discussion with other staff members about her project and their projects could have helped her gain clearer insights on how to approach her task, where to go for certain bits of information, what she should or should not do etc. Not to mention the fact, that the scheduling faux pas would never have happened if there had been some communication between the intern and the staff members.

Finally, the major problem in this case study as in many of the others was lack of adequate close supervision. The student never had a chance to actually work with her supervisor to see from up close how the supervisor handled
the planning and development of programs for the agency. The student got no exposure through her supervisor to the different facets of cultural administration in the agency (i.e. coordinating and scheduling programs, developing funding sources, program orchestration etc.). But perhaps the intern herself articulates best the significance of a close field supervisor and intern relationship — "I think that when you are working with an agency and you want to get some sort of additional insights into the field you are working with, the people should spend some amount of time working with you. I would debate the point where you go out on your own and work on your own projects. Because you are apt to just use the skills you brought with you. Whereas if you are working directly with an agency and you are seeing different ways that they are working on different problems you might get more out of it."
Case Study II
Case Study Introduction

The subject of this case study is a 24 year old female student. Her undergraduate major was in Economics. The subject is a very straightforward, articulate and disciplined student. I had occasion to work with her on a special research project—the Southwest Corridor Land Development Coalition. Although quiet in nature the student is a very independent, precise and dependable worker. She was consistent in meeting the deadlines for the various parts of the research project we were doing. Within the interview the student was interested in outlining her field experience but was slightly intimidated by my tape recorder.

This case study is significant in pointing out a number of important issues. First of all this case demonstrates the problems (i.e. busy work) created for a student when linked to a field supervisor who is not sensitive to the needs of a student. Mapped out by this case is the sort of haphazard manner in which a student is passed from one supervisor to another with out any intervention from the academic manager. Specifically this case illustrates the problems of a student in trying to develop a worthwhile field assignment without adequate back up support from a field manager. Also highlighted in this case are the frustrations
suffered by a student when her work is not taken seriously enough by her supervisor. This case points out the dubious value of a field manager's selection of field supervisors and placements solely on the basis of his casual contacts in various agencies. Finally this case study exposes how a student without proper academic monitoring and/or field supervision can emerge from a field experience trained but not educated (In other words the student may learn how to perform some basic tasks for an agency but may not attain a clear understanding of planning or other educational goals he sets for himself.).
Respondent # 2 - The Intern

Background

The respondent's primary reason for becoming involved in the DIP was to obtain some type of experience in planning. The respondent felt that since most students in the department seem to have had some kind of outside planning experience it might be advantageous for her to gain some practical experience to complement her academic course work. The student talked to the director of the DIP in order to discover what field work opportunities existed. After receiving the names of several possible placements, the student made phone calls to inquire into the nature of each placement. The student, after some thought, decided on the Boston Transportation Planning Review as her placement. The student chose this placement for two general reasons: it involved a local issue in which she was interested and it offered the possibility of her becoming involved in some type of housing related project which might relate to her interest in housing development as an area of specialization. The intern was also influenced by the fact that the director of DIP stated that the BTPR was an effort at comprehensive planning.
Placement Narrative

The respondent at the beginning of her placement worked under an administrative supervisor of the Boston Transportation Planning Review. The student under this first supervisor spent most of her time performing some general day to day work tasks (i.e. population studies/combining data on changes in neighborhoods). After having enough time to feel out what was going on in the organization the intern become eager to work on some specific project over a longer period of time. Out of frustration of not getting enough direction from her original supervisor, the intern started to look around the organization for a more specific project to work on. Almost simultaneously a staff member asked the intern's supervisor if he could have some help for his study on housing relocation. The intern upon being informed of this option seized the opportunity. The staff member then became the intern's immediate supervisor throughout the rest of the semester.

The intern was basically asked to do an inventory of existing dwelling units in the Southwest Corridor. Specifically this task involved looking at the number of houses that had to be relocated, marking on a map where houses had been bought by the BTPR or by the City, noting which houses remained to be purchased, and noting which
were inhabited still and which were not. The basic thrust of the project was to record exactly just how many people would have to be moved and how many people had already been moved to allow the I-95 highway to be built. The intern was given about 200 scale engineering plans of the corridor to work with in order to uncover this information.

The intern within the process of working on this task discovered there was a second phase to this study which was both academically more challenging and interesting from her perspective. However she was prevented from working on the second phase of the study by two problems: the organization wanted the inventory part of the study finished first and there had been no data generated by the organization for the second phase of the study. The intern spent the rest of the field placement compiling data and at the end submitted a report on the amount of relocation that had been caused by the highway.

The intern made the following specific observations about this field experience:

A. Positive Aspects/Advantages/New Learnings

I. "It was a very good experience. It gave me not
only an understanding of housing relocation but I learned a great deal about what was going on in the study of the highway itself. Also I gained insight on the effects the highway was having in Boston."

2. "My involvement with the BTPR lead to a number of other involvements in things connected with transportation/planning and in analyzing the cost and benefits in building highways. In fact in my second semester I did some field work with the Southwest Corridor Land Development Coalition. As one of several MIT graduate students we attempted to come up with alternative land uses for land originally cleared for interstate highway construction in Boston. I guess to some extent you could say that this first field work experience help to focus both the future course work I took and other practical experiences I got involved in."

3. "In the beginning of the experience I did some demographic studies. It wasn't the most exciting work that could be done but it was helpful because I hadn't done very many before."

B. Negative Aspects/Problems/Pitfalls

1. "If you are working on a very part-time basis it
is very hard to become totally involved in your work;"

2. "I did not get as clear an understanding of planning as I had wanted."

3. "The BTPR was a temporary organization that was dealing with issues very quickly trying to get one report written. It wasn't an ongoing process where they could easily assign you to a specific project. You had to find out what was going on in the organization on your own and from that decide what you were going to work on."

"The organization was working under such restrictive deadlines that it was very difficult for me to operate within their framework."

"For instance, I wanted to work on a project that would have been more useful for them during the first phase. What I would have gotten out of the project that I wanted to work on would have been more than I got out of the project that I did work on. But I couldn't work on the second phase project because they needed the work for the first phase finished right away. Thus instead of being able to work on a project that would have been useful for them during their second
phase, I had to work on the project that was most useful to them and not the one most beneficial for me."

4. "The organization was in such a constant state of flux with consultants coming in and out so that it was hard to keep track of what was going on day to day. It was hard to get a total sense of what was happening in the organization so you just had to focus in on what you were doing."

"I came in at a time when the people in the organization where trying to define their own roles and organized the study itself. Things tended to be rather confused."

C. Comments on Intern Seminar

1. "I did not participate in any seminar. It was an independent activity. Students who were doing field work had such diverse interest there was no way to get everybody together."

D. Integration of Course Work and Field Work

1. "I was not able to relate my course work directly to my field work during the first semester but during the second semester I had a transportation
course in which I was able to specifically relate the knowledge I had gained on the effects of highways on neighborhood."

2. "In a course which dealt with public expenditure theory I was able to used much of what I learn in the BTPR experience to help me in doing a cost benefit analysis of the effects of the highway."

E. General Observations about the Experience

1. "As to my role within the organization, I saw myself as performing a given function within the organization. I didn't see myself as just learning what the organization was doing. I contributed something important to the study. I think my report should have been more important. I say this because housing relocation was not considered by all people in the organization as the primary consideration for determining why the highway should be stopped or relocated."

2. "At first at the BTPR I was doing some general population studies now I did learn something from that experience but it wasn't as useful to me as doing the study on housing relocation. By the same token if I had been allowed to do a more specific study on the effects of housing
relocation on the individuals living in the corridor this would have been the best learning experience."

3. "I was looking for a planning experience that showed me how agencies went about the planning process in a specific project."

The intern made the following overall observations and recommendations about field work in general.

1. "I learned more from my field work experiences of trying to solve actual problems then in many of the sort of survey type courses which tend to deal with problems on a very abstract level."

2. "Field work gives you an opportunity to test how well you learned something by being able to apply it to a real life situation."

3. "The best way to improve field work is by improving the quality of the placements themselves. The department should help students find placements which are challenging and allow a student some type of significant involvement in what's going on in the agency. Students should be placed in positions where they can learn most about a given situation or gain some specific skill or expertise."
4. "For me a good field placement is one which is both challenging and interesting. I prefer working on a project that allows me to work on what I am interested in and not what needs to be done."

5. "I find it useful to apply things I am learning while learning them."

6. "A job task should be narrow enough that you can see it through to completion within the time span of one semester."

7. "My second supervisor was generally helpful. He told me about the objectives of the study, what he was interested in and what he was doing. He explained to me what kinds of data would be useful to the BTPR."

8. "My only real formal contact with the director of the DIP was when I went to find out what field work opportunities existed. This was back at the start of the semester. After that I was pretty much on my own."
The field supervisor had the following perceptions and specific observations about this field work experience.

**Overall Evaluation of Experience**

"It was a bad time for an intern to come aboard. There was really nothing but low level work to be done. I explained to her that what I had to offer her work wise needed to be done but may not necessarily contribute to any broader understanding of the field."

"She accepted what I had to offer out of frustration of not getting enough direction from her first supervisor."

"The intern basically performed an inventory of existing dwelling units in the Southwest Corridor - making distinctions of which were inhabited, which were not and which had been purchased or not by the BTPR or the City. Most of her assignments along this line required the analysis of past reports that had been prepared and the analysis of about 200 scale engineering plans of the corridor."

"The intern's involvement in field work here was meaningful because she performed a task important to the agency."
Benefits of Experience for Student

"She probably benefited from having to read to understand, and reading to apply the formal legal and administrative requirements we were faced with. She was also exposed to the problems we had encountered and the way they were being approached. She certainly gained an insight into the way the total BTPR looked at the relocation aspect of the study, the type of analysis we have to perform, the data sources that we used types of analysis were going to perform i.e. housing market analysis, and a sense of relationship between needs and resources in a relocation situation."

"I think reading and understanding the implications of 200 scale engineering plans is no small task and no small technique to acquire because you have to make judgements on which properties are effected in which ways. She was very much able to do that and its a difficult thing to do."

"The reality of the 'field' dashes the trickle down theory; it renders irrelevant the turn over notions and it makes you very much aware of what vancies really mean in the housing market."
Orientation of Student

"I gave her what had already been done by the BTPR to look at. I also discussed with her generally what I was doing and what type of tasks I had available for her to do. She was also given old staff memos to look at."

Supervision

"No formal meetings. Talked to her only as problems arose."

Reason for Taking Intern

"I had limited resources. I needed to capitalize off of any help that was available."

Problems of Field Experience

"She was not able to put in alot of time at a single stretch. She could only allow her self to do work tasks which didn't require too great of an investment of her time. Thus she worked on tasks which were less then what she was capable of doing. Her involvement in a task which might require her to use or develop more of her academic ability would also have required a greater investment of time. Consequently she did some small dark work tasks which weren't very interesting like many of us on the staff had to do. Some of the tasks she was
doing were probably hard to relate to course work."

General Observations

Role of Supervisor

"A supervisor must be able to identify a task appropriately designed to reflect the student's level of understanding of what needs to be done. The supervisor should not be a teacher. He has real problems to solve. A student can define his interest but the agency identifies the task which is meaningful to them."

Advantage of Having an Intern In Agency

"They don't have the bias about what can or can't be done that certain entrenched staff do."

View of Intern

"I see them as workers who through the action of performing certain tasks are advancing their understanding of things in a context that is not available to them through their formal curriculum."

"The intern benefits only by assuming responsibility in real way."

"It is unrealistic to expect that a student will receive a job that will equal their academic needs."
Improvement of Field Work

"Time is a real constraining variable. It is much more valuable if a student is committed to an agency full time. A intern can only do 15 hours of field work effectively in an agency after he has first been on the job full time."

* This is a very important point. It is really expecting a great deal to have a student on a part time basis during the course of one semester to orientate himself to an agency, complete a significant task for the agency and in the process gain or reinforce some practical skills or academic learning while taking a full load of academic courses. At some point in time a student's class work or field work will suffer neglect as he tries to balance the competing demands for his time and interest. Also the limits of time placed on a student forces him to define what task he will pursue not by what he can learn or get out of the process but by how much time will it take. The reality exist that if he can't see it through to completion in a semester its not worth the extra anxiety taking a chance getting involved in.
Case Study Notes

In reviewing this case study one finds as in the other case studies that the student because of problems of supervision and field design did not achieve as clear an understanding of planning as she had hoped. The intern was hampered in the beginning of this placement by a supervisor who wasn't providing the necessary direction she needed. She was able to find a second supervisor who gave her more specificity in her work but still in the final analysis even the second supervisor did not provide the student with the type of overall supervision and experience that she wanted. For in fact she became involved in a task assignment, that although helpful to the organization did not provide the student with the most productive learning experience that she desired.

Perhaps the crucial point to be made here is that the student except for a quirk of fate could have ended up with an even less productive field experience. It was only by chance that she found another supervisor willing to take her on as an intern within the same placement. This supervisor, as in so many of the other case studies, was just looking for some extra manpower but he did provide the student with more direction then
her original field supervisor. It seems clear that the academic manager should have been playing a more active role in assuring that the placement was set up properly. If he had properly structured the placement from the beginning much of the conflict and wasted time the intern had to suffer through while waiting to get a tangible field project would have been eliminated. (By structuring the placement I mean - (1) setting up a three party conference; (2) making sure the field supervisor was both capable and committed to providing the student with a valuable learning experience; (3) helping define and create the field project for the student; (4) making periodic checks on the development of the placement etc.)

It should be realized that when you are a student who has been placed in an agency it is quite difficult to take the initiative by yourself to tell your supervisor that you don't think he is providing you with enough supervision or enough project focus. Secondly, there is no way by yourself that a student can 'pressure' the supervisor into conceding to his wishes. In fact if the supervisor is approached in the wrong way he may even be further alienated from helping the student achieve his educational goals.
A student who is placed out in the field and is not given aggressive back up support from the sending institution can become intimidated by the situation and not seek help even when she needs it. The student may be intimidated in several ways: (1) the student has the feeling that he wants to 'make good' out on his own and does not want to give the impression that he has to run back to the school to get help to solve a problem so he does not press his academic adviser for assistance when problems arise; (2) the student feels that since he is new in this profession his field supervisor must know best what he should do and thus the student is reluctant to challenge the supervisor even when he is given busy work and/or (3) when an academic manager doesn't take time to hold three party conferences or make at least one visit to the placement in order to find out if the experience is operating properly then a student tends to feel that he is supposed to muddle through the experience on his own.

The overall realization here is that the academic adviser should not have to be prodded into giving help to a student. Rather he should be extending periodic help and checks on a field experience through out the length of the placement. An academic adviser who waits
to react to a crisis in a placement may find that by
the time he intervenes it is too late to salvage the
placement for the student's benefit. The academic
adviser must act first to assure that needless conflict
does not occur for the student. And to assure that the
student doesn't become intimidated by a feeling of being
placed out on their own with no help. Often times it
becomes easier for the student to accept the mediocrity
that exists and hope to make the best out of it rather
then try to apply pressure on the field supervisor or
seek the help of the academic adviser. Another interest-
ing point about this field experience is that the
student felt that the agency did not really look at
housing relocation as a major priority in stopping the
highway. The student felt strongly about this point
became the major part of her work involved analyzing
how much relocation had taken place because of the
highway. Perhaps if the academic advisor had played a
closer role with the student they could have strategize
ways of assuring that her work on relocation would have
had greater impact on the agency's final report.
Case Study III
Case Study Introduction

The respondent in this case study is a 23 year old female student whose undergraduate major was in History. She is the only Ph.D. candidate among the six students interviewed. The subject is a very mature and outspoken individual for her age. The meticulous detail in which the subject was able to resurrect her field experience is no doubt linked to the fact that it was a very productive and extremely rewarding experience for her. The high level of productivity of the experience was directly related to the fact that her field work was highly focused, well organized and coordinated with academic work she was taking at the same time. The clear link points between her academic and field work plus the close relationship with her field supervisor were the two important recurrent themes during this interview. During the interview the subject displayed her strongest emotions about the structure of field work seminars. She was quite adamant about the fact that field seminars to be productive have to be composed of individuals with a common interest in one field.

This case study highlights a number of significant facts and realizations about field work. First of all this case illustrates the positive benefits of a student having a close relationship with her supervisor and a
well defined task assignment. This case also demonstrates the positive effects of a systematic linkage of academic class work with field work. Depicted in this case study is the significant impact a field experience can have on focusing a student's career efforts. This case study reveals the advantages of a placement situation which exposes a student to real professionals who have an interest in helping a student to learn. Finally, this case study illustrates the increased learning benefits that can accrue to a student when linked to a field supervisor who is just as interested in the student's academic learning and growth as in the student's accomplishment of specific tasks.
The respondent's primary reason for becoming involved in the DIP was to attain credit for a field work project being done as a requirement for a specific academic course. The respondent, who was taking the course Urban Legal Issues, was informed of a field work project concerning an evaluative study of county training schools in Massachusetts by an MIT faculty member. (The faculty member also happened to be the Chairman of the Committee charged with the responsibility to study the county training schools.) The field work project besides fitting into the legal context of the respondent's course requirement also involved some remuneration. Since the field project would involved 15 hours a week of the student's time she was encouraged to register for academic credit through the DIP. The respondent's only contact with director of the DIP was just to clear her field work project through him.

Placement Narrative

The respondent served as an intern to the chairman of the Citizens Committee On County Training Schools. The Governor had given a committee from the Youth Services Board the powers to carry out a investigative study of
the County Training School. An M.I.T. faculty member was serving as chairman and the respondent was his assistant and staff secretary to the Committee. The intern's specific task was to help organize and write the final report to be turned out by the committee on its research. The report was supposed to present a case on the deficiencies of the Training School system which was strong enough to compel the legislators to close it down. Leading up to the creation of the finished report the intern was involved in several activities: weekly meetings with a group of 20 correctional professionals from all over the state; on site visits to the training school which involved talking to the superintendent, workers and kids and making contact with legislator and forming coalitions (Mass. Council of Churches, League of Women voters.) The intern was also responsible for following up behind committee members for the chairman to make sure they were keeping up with their particular responsibilities (i.e. informing other groups of what was going on, reading materials, making appearances, speaking to legislators etc.). Besides the weekly meeting of the committee the intern usually met with her supervisor once a week to discuss the progress of the committee. She also kept in close phone contact with him
The first problem the committee encountered was the refusal of the County Training School official to allow them to visit the faculty. The committee had to get a letter from the attorney general's office before they finally were able to make the visit to the school. Later on toward the end of the placement a woman filed a suit against one of the training schools and still later a man filed a brutality suit against one of the schools. The intern had to keep abreast of these various happenings and was instrumental in helping with any paper work or communications. The field placement ended with the intern editing and writing a draft of a final report concerning the information uncovered by the committee members.

The intern made the following specific observations about this field work experience.

A. Positive Aspects/Advantages/New Learnings

1. "This was a very valuable field work experience in the sense that there were several ups shots from it. The County Training Schools did get closed. As the result of its closing there was a need for community based programs. I was hired by Department of Youth Services to set up a conference on issues and strategies for alter-
native community based projects. I later worked with the Urban Institute in the area of criminal justice planning. I did a study on corrections in Maryland and in England."

"When I first came to MIT I was just interested in Social Service Delivery in the area of health but now a major area of my field of specialization is criminal justice planning. In fact I will most likely be doing my doctoral thesis in this same area."

2. "There was a clear objective to be reached. The people with whom I interacted were very skilled, very political and very professional. I also had an opportunity to interact with the professional planners at DYS."

3. "It was a real learning experience. The people on the committee knew I was a student. I was a secretary for the committee essentially. Because many of the people on the committee were professors and professionals they would take time to point out different things to me. And they would call me and talk about different issues on what was going on. I think it was because of the backgrounds of the people I served
with I was able to learn so much."

"The guy who was chief planner at DYS was also very helpful in making materials available to me and explaining data and resource sources."

4. "One of the things that intrigued me about the opportunity of DYS was the chance to do an evaluative study. This was because I was taking a Research Methods course under a teacher whose main interest was in evaluative studies. I was able to write two short papers for his class on my field experience and my teacher was very helpful in criticizing the methodology I was using."

"So, I guess a major part of what I got out of this experience was learning how to do a good evaluative study that would have some impact on policy makers."

5. "Educationally this field work experience gave me a very good grounding in criminal justice planning, administrative, organizational aspects particularly. It has been instrumental in forming my future interest and it definitely has had an impact in broadening my focus in my field of specialization."
"In writing the final report I really learned something. I had to do a lot of research. I really became aware of what was happening with children here in Boston."

6. "I made a large number of professional contacts in criminal justice planning."

7. "I also increased my skills in interviewing through my participation in this field work venture."

B. Negative Aspects/Problems/Pitfalls

1. "It really took a lot of time and effort on my part. It was very demanding on my time especially considering the fact that I was taking courses too. If it wasn't for the fact that I was getting money and credit for the field work experience I probably would not have gotten involved."

"The field work experience actually lasted longer than the one semester for which I got credit. The final report actually wasn't finish until March."

2. "Minimal frustrations from delays caused by some members of the committee who were not as active as they could have been."
C. Comments on Intern Seminar

"I didn't go to any seminar. I think I knew about the option. But I really don't see how someone could have had a seminar when each person who signed up for field work was doing a totally disparate project. I don't even know how one could get some common themes other than it is work outside of the department."

"The only thing I had problems with was coming up with certain alternatives to the training school system. Maybe a seminar could of help me by giving me a more theoretical understanding of juvenile services."

"I don't know if a seminar could have even helped me with that unless it was very specialized. It would have to deal only with criminal justice planning and non-institutional aspects of it. Also to be helpful the other people involved would have to have a great deal of experience in criminal justice planning."

D. Integration of Course Work and Field Work

1. "First of all the whole reason I got involved in field work was because it was required as part of my course in Urban Legal Issues. I had to turn in a paper for that course on my field experience."

2. "For a research methods course I did two short papers on the evaluative study aspect of my field
3. "I also gave a oral report on some aspects of my field experience in one class."

4. "I used my field placement generally as a place to experiment with ideas developed or learned in class. I also found I had more to contribute to some classes based on relating some of my experiences in the field."

E. General Observations on the Experience

   Supervision

1. "The supervision I received was very adequate and extensive. Most of the help I got from my supervisor was in illuminating certain kinds of ideas and operationalizing them."

2. "I used my supervisor mostly to give me insights on: How do you intervene in certain situations; How do you lean on the county superintendent; which legislators were influential in getting this report accepted and which of these people in the state were interested in dealing with a particular type of problem (Politics) and what resources people have some experience with working with kids and what kind of inputs can
they have."

3. "The type of field work I was involved in presupposed a specific level of competence to do research and to come up with a report."

The intern made the following overall observations and recommendations about field work in general.

1. "There should be a recognition that there are various types of field work activities. I think there should also be a clearer definition in the department of what constitutes a field work experience and some guidelines for individuals starting their own field work project. If I wanted to plan a neighborhood health center or something like that there should be some mechanism within the department by which I could present a proposal and do that. There should be some faculty input also. There should be more interest on the part of faculty in effectively supervising and establishing field work projects:"

2. "Field work broadens your knowledge of a specific area. In school you are really dealing with theoretical kinds of issues and perspectives and you don't have an opportunity to test them. Field work provides a practical proving ground."
"A lot of the things you learn about advocacy planning suggest you should let the people do things themselves but you often learn that the people don't have the capacity to do it themselves. A lot of the literature suggest that they ought to do it themselves but that's not necessarily true. So field work sort of gives you a realistic appraisal of a lot of the theory you learn in class."

3. "There should be some criteria or some process defined for Field Work. There should be more faculty support and enthusiasm involved in field work. Another problem with field work is that it's been handled like a step child with no clear notion on anybody's part of what's going on. Anything goes. I don't think we need to restrict what field work is about but we need to talk about it and define it more clearly some aspects of it. There should be more interaction with teachers and students involved in your area of field work."

"For example faculty members who are interested in criminal justice should have a seminar which meets once a week or once every two weeks that
deals with criminal justice and they should be keeping tabs on everybody who is involved in some field work project area about criminal justice. Field work needs to be categorized around topics and around specific areas. You just can't have all field work going through just one person."

4. "A good field work experience is one in which: (1) you are given a lot of responsibility in carrying out a particular task; (2) centers around a current political issue of importance to you and (3) you interact with people who are not attached to the academic community."

The field supervisor had the following perceptions and specific observations about this field work experience:

Overall Evaluation of Experience

"I raised with a number of students with in the department the possibility for getting them a placement with DYS with the possibility of their getting some remuneration for their involvement. I made contact with students because I was heading the Committee of the Youth Services Board to investigate the County Training Schools. Since I was Chairman of this Committee I was in a position to make a choice of the type of support I wanted. The
kind of study we were going to do would allow someone to
get a great deal of experience in this particular field.
In approaching several students with this possibility this
student said she would be interested:"

"With regards to the structure of the situation
both the student and myself were going into this process
some what cold. I saw the intern's role as providing some
research writing skills to the committee:" 

"We basicly built the job together. There was a task
that needed to be performed but we sort of built it in
a way that she could learn as much about what was going
on as possible. That meant she had to take a major share
of the responsibility in coordinating and organizing
meetings. Also the intern went along with the committee
when we visited institutions. She had to develop rela-
tionships with people on the committee and at DYS. She
played a general administrative kind of role and data
gathering:"

"One of the major reasons she was interested in this
particular venture was because of a course she was taking.
The course had to do with the administration of justice.
In fact the report - her interpretation of what was happen-
ing with the committee became a paper she presented for
her course:"
"She was given a major piece of responsibility for helping with the committee's work. She was a very competent person. Besides the new insights she gained from the experience she brought alot of things to the experience herself."

**Orientation of Student**

"She got propelled into reading background information and set in on all the discussions we had. We both started out together on this. Its' not like I was involved in something and brought her in. We both started out and had to catch up, reading the material and then organize the committee and move on. The material she read were previous reports done by other committees on the closing of the County Training Schools."

**Supervision**

"I was concerned about her gaining new knowledge, growth, exposure to new experience besides getting the report out."

"As her supervisor I: gave her resources for information she needed; look at and check over work she was doing; help her test out some theories we had but mainly was a resource in pointing her in the direction of people who could get her more information."
261.

Reason for Taking on Intern

"I know that a student would get valuable experience out of his involvement with this committee."

Important Aspects of Experience For Student

"One good thing about the experience was that it had a beginning and an end point with the document and the committee - it started at one point, knew what its objective were and came out with a finished product."

"Some other important aspects were: a chance for her to travel and see things first hand; the opportunity to do something directly related to course work; to be exposed to a number of different people in an area of a field she was interested in and she was able to get involved in another project as a result of her participation in the first project. Also after participating in both projects she had an opportunity to reflect on two phases of a change process."

"The experience also offered her the opportunity to develop skills in working through a problem, working on a joint writing project and organizing people."

Problems of Field Experience

"Most of the problems the intern faced were human problems of getting people to follow through on tasks for me and making sure people could meet at the same times."
It was difficult for her to try and get people with diverse backgrounds together, and get people with full schedules to devote time to do things."

"There were some other problems of trying to get the DYS staff to realize their need to play a more aggressive role in the process."

"We looked at some ways or strategies of getting people to follow through on certain issues and also who to put in contact with who in order that certain things would happen."

"Basically one of the things that became important was to make sure that people who were committed to a particular point of view came in contact with people who either had an opposite view or no view so that there would be some confrontation around the differences. The other thing was to line up people who were positively disposed to the positions we were taking. The tactic was to place certain people with views we wanted to change on sub-committees with people who were positively disposed to our way of thinking."

General Observations

Role of Supervisor

"He has to make constant checks on performance of a student. Not just in terms of a finished product but
in terms of learning too. The supervisor has to set out specific task for the student to do them evaluate not only what he accomplished but how he accomplished it:"

"A supervisor must: know in front what a student wants to get out of his experience; be available to the student; and check on what a student is learning as well as what he is accomplishing."

Field Structure

"A placement has to be structured in terms of what particular task has to be done."

"Then you have to structure in the kinds of on going relationships between the student and the academic advisor and the field supervisor that will assure a clear understanding of that task and the learning to be accomplished. There has to be some preliminary three party conferences if the field experience is to achieve some basic order or structure."

Seminars

"Seminars should be held depending on the placement. The seminars should be with people who have similar interests."

Student

"A student has to say clearly what he wants to get
out of an experience. He needs to put down on paper for his supervisor what his goals are. What a student wants to achieve out of an experience can be a variety of things: (1) it can be knowledge of how a thing works; (2) how to solve a particular problem and/or exposure or chance to see certain roles involved or work loads involved in a process."

"I don't believe a student has to come into a situation so set up that there has to be a completed project. The student has to look at the situation and say what can I take back from this experience. I think a completed project type of field work is a bonus. Because then you can evaluate that. But the student has to make a decision of what role he needs."

**Improvement of Field Work**

"I think the key to field work is clearly identifying a place where a student's needs can be met. That means you got to have a lot of available resources around that are willing to take part. One of the problems I have seen is that students go to placements because that is what's available and not because that's what they are interested in."
This case study represents perhaps the closest approximation to a well designed and supervised field experience. The first outstanding feature about this experience was that from its onset the field supervisor was desirous of having a student take advantage of a unique learning opportunity as well as being concerned with getting some specific work accomplished. This fact helped to pave the way for a close working relationship between the field supervisor and the intern. The most unique aspect of the experience was that the field supervisor was a member of the DUSP faculty. This fact helps to account for the supervisor's strong commitment to the intern. The faculty member was able to be both a field supervisor and an academic manager to the student. Acting in his primary role as her field supervisor he was concerned with the student's accomplishment of certain tasks. Also within this role he was interested in helping to resolve any conflicts or problems encountered by the student. Acting in the role of field manager or field instructor he was concerned about designing a field situation that would give her a wide variety of experience and expose her to interaction with other professionals. In this case study the field supervisor understood, accepted and carried out his dual role as task master.
and teacher. The field supervisor in fulfilling the latter role helped the student extract learning from the various situations and experiences that she was involved in.

The fact that the field supervisor was a member of the faculty increased the amount of informal and formal contact the student had with him (i.e. Both the student and the field supervisor use to attend weekly policy committee meetings within the DUSP. The student would often talk to field supervisor about the field placement after the departmental meetings). Close and constant contact with a field supervisor is the firm foundation upon which a good field experience is built. Another factor which added to the effectiveness of the supervisor—intern relationship was the fact that the field supervisor had had prior experience in supervising students in field situations. Consequently he had a concrete grasp of the needs and limitations of a student in the role of intern. The field supervisor was directly involved in the work process that the student was involved in. Consequently there was ample opportunity for both the student to observe the field supervisor in "action" and for the field supervisor to observe the student in "action" as she participated in meetings and different situations. Thus the student could not only develop
professional practice theory from observing her supervisor but could also get immediate feedback on her own professional functioning (in different situations) from her supervisor. The student also profited from the fact that the professional members of the committee (with which she was working) were interested and helpful in her academic growth and development of knowledge. They quite freely volunteered any information that would help the student to develop a more in-depth knowledge of the field of corrections and/or aid her in developing her class report and analysis on the committee.

A factor which contributed directly to the elimination of early frustrations for the student was the fact that her task assignment was highly focused and her role well defined at the beginning of the experience. In addition she was given a clear overview of the goals and purpose of the committee she was working with. To quote the intern "there was never any equivocation over what the purpose of the report or the committee was supposed to do as explained to me by my supervisor". The fact that the student's field work was related directly to two specific classes she was taking also help to give the experience added direction and focus. It was this coordination and continuity between action and theory which help make this experience most rewarding for the
student. With a specific class (the class that required her participation in a field project) to which she had to relate her field work, the student had to be constantly mindful of analyzing what she was experiencing. In other words the student had to be constantly cognizant of the bits and pieces of new learning that she could extract from her field work. In another class the student was able to develop theory on how to do an evaluative study. This information plus discussions with the professor guided the student in developing the methodology for the study she was doing in the field. Thus a precise educational loop was formed between the student's academic work and her field experiences.
Summary of Findings
In reviewing the specific information uncovered on the administration and operation of the DIP the following significant findings stand out:

1. There was a lack of program support or extra faculty resources backing up the operation of the program.

2. The lone staff coordinator of the program had neither the financial resources nor the proper time assignment (i.e. full-time status) to operate the program effectively.

3. The program coordinator did not adequately initiate, structure and monitor field placements.

4. The problems suffered by the students were a result of the inadequate initiation, structuring, and monitoring of field placements. (The DUSP did not establish or request the development of any guidelines or standards relating to these areas.)

5. The absence of any previous comprehensive review or policy guidelines or recommendations for structuring field work within the department is another indication of the secondary status field work programs were accorded by faculty and administration.
6. Relatively few individuals on the faculty outside of the program were devoting time and thought to structuring internships as part of the educational process.

7. Lack of adequate communication and coordination between the academic manager and field supervisors.

The first two students interviewed in the DIP met with the following problems:

1. Lack of adequate field supervision

2. Lack of a structured orientation to the agency or organization.

3. Supervisors viewed students more as volunteer workers then as interns placed in the organization to learn and in need of continuing supervision.

4. Work assignments that did not meet the total professional interest or needs of student.

5. Wasted time and motion at the beginning of the placement due to a lack of a developed and well organized field design or task assignment.

All three of the students interviewed experienced the following problems:
1. Lack of adequate supervision from the academic manager.

2. Time commitment conflicts between the amount of time demanded by field assignment and the actual time student was able to give in view of his academic course work responsibilities.

3. Students refrained from going to seminars on the grounds that a field seminar composed of many students with diverse fields of interest would not be of immediate value to their particular endeavors. In other words students only viewed a field seminar as being personally productive if it was specialized to deal only with their area of interest and composed of only other people interested in the same area or task field.

Students who participated in the DIP tended to benefit from the experience in the following ways:

1. Students were able to establish significant professional contacts in their field of specialization through the field experience.

2. Students were able to integrate their course work and their field work in the following ways: writing papers based on what they observed, learned or experienced in the placement.
- used contacts in agency to uncover information for a paper.

- raising questions in classes based on what they had observed, learned or experienced in the field placement.

- used field placement as a place to experiment with ideas developed or learned in class.

- took classes that were related to field work.

3. Gained specific knowledge about a particular organization, an understanding of its functioning or operation and experience in performing certain duties and task assignments of the agency.

4. Students' career and interest focus tended to be expanded and crystallized by the field experience. In other words the students developed a specific interest in a given general planning area as a result of their field exposure.

5. Students' field experience spawned their involvement in similar subsequent projects for pay.

6. Students were able to develop a sense of accomplishment out of the experience.
- Conclusions -
On the basis of the results of the interviewing survey, there does appear to be a positive correlation, as originally hypothesized between the type of problems encountered by student participants in both programs and the programs' lack of adequate staffing, structured organization and proper departmental status.

The findings seem to point to several tentative conclusions:

1. First there appears to be a relationship between a field work program's lack of a sufficient number of full-time properly qualified staff and its inability to adequately service the needs of student participants.

2. There appears to be a correlation between a field work program's failure to develop strong "triangular relationships" of field work organization and the occurrence of inadequate field supervision patterns and role-expectation confusion on the part of both the intern and field supervisor.

3. There appears to be a relationship between the lack of a common field of interest among students involved in a field seminar and the students' failure to perceive the seminar as being a productive adjunct to their field work.
This study is handicapped to some degree by the small number of subjects interviewed. However, the basic information generated by this thesis in conjunction with the studies cited earlier outline the nature of the problems confronted in field work and the administrative shortcomings which tend to exacerbate these problems. This study has also demonstrated that much of the developed knowledge, experience and concern of early planning schools on the proper operation of internships has not evolved over the years into a refined approach toward field work programs or resulted in an established body of knowledge on 'field' practice.

The information developed on the unique benefits or educational opportunities offered by field work tends to indicate that field-linked education is not only a desirable supplement to traditional planning education but a much needed aid for students without prior planning experience. Based on the significance of these opportunities is the assertion that field work is a valid and valuable professional education process deserving greater attention and departmental resources. The need for greater attention and departmental resources undergirds the major thesis of this study. The major thesis of this study is that field work can be a more valid and valuable part of the professional education process when
properly administered, structured and supervised. More specifically it can be said that successful internships require experienced internship administration under an "academic manager", careful placement based on defined criteria, educational structuring of the intern experience, and close integration with the academic and administrative resources of the university.
Notes Toward A Theory of Professional Field Work
To reiterate a point made earlier, within the planning profession there does not exist an established body of knowledge on 'field' practice. Specifically within the planning department at MIT there does not exist any operational guidelines, program goals, faculty requirements, student evaluation criteria, field instructor role definitions etc. concerning the proper operation and administration of field work programs. Since no simple laundry list of recommendations can fill this void, an attempt will be made here to offer some basic notes toward a theory of professional field work.

Operating a well structured field linked education program is a full time job. The constant communication that must go on between agency and sponsoring institution in order to assure a student is both being properly supervised and given viable learning experiences is not a part time job by any means. Proper administration of field placements requires constant contact with and evaluation of the learning environment in which the student has been placed. Simply placing a student in an agency setting does not guarantee ex post facto that a student will be exposed to the types of planning experience he desires or that real professional growth will take place. To quote the 1971 - 1972 final report and evaluation of HIP done
by its own program directors - "Most students made good use of their placements, but were hampered by the faculty having insufficient time to do the kinds of job needed to effectively link the field to the academic."

Likewise it follows that if two part-time directors can't do an adequate job then most assuredly then one part-time coordinator of a similar program (DIP) is hopelessly constrained by personal resources in his ability to do an adequate job of monitoring field placements. It also stands to reason that if two part-time people could not provide adequate supervision for 12 students, then one full-time and one part-time staff members can't serve the needs of 20 students as is the case of the present situation of the HIP. Also one or two full time people can't serve the needs of the 34 students as was the number of students participating in the DIP in 1971. There are no magic numbers but it seems that at least three or four full-time people is a rough quesstimate of the number of staff members needed to start assuring that a field work program can extend a reasonable amount of back up support to students.

However the problem is not simply a game of numbers. The quality of the staff is important too. Field work programs cannot just be staffed with any one an academic institution can draft from within its ranks for the job
(i. e. graduate students, junior faculty members etc.). The crucial significance of the need for a high level of competence in school field managers is the fact that "the student can be helped primarily through the supervisory relationship and content of field teaching to gain an awareness of his own behavior, attitudes and feelings in reacting to work centered relationships." 69 Furthermore innovative field work programs require new personnel with interdisciplinary backgrounds and field experience who do not easily fit within existing departments and the professional and pedagogical emphases they have developed.

It has already been noted in an earlier study quoted in the introduction that "the best preparation, assignment and supervision of interns can only be done by teachers who have themselves had extensive experience as participant-observers." However the academic world has neither the personnel of this type nor the will to provide optimum supervision of participant-observation. 70 For instance the present director of the HIP states - "There is not presently a sufficient number of DUSP teaching staff who are either interested or capable of executing a field work program on a departmental scale."
The relative lack of faculty interest and support for internships programs can be traced to a number of factors. Internship programs or any field work component is expensive in faculty time both in development and supervision, especially if administrative support is not provided by the university or some other agency. Faculty often have doubts about such programs because they feel that the extra support needed to make field linked education 'work' may not be cost effective. In fact they may intimate that the cost of offering a well structured field work program within a planning department is too high a cost to pay. However the significant question which is raised by this narrow view is what price competence? The old and perhaps trite cliche "you only get what you pay for" has some merit here. Although it may to some extent over state the situation it nevertheless drives home the point that unless you want to be satisfied with mediocrity you had better exhaust all your resources in trying to provide a superior educational experience. The end result of financial short sightedness in expending necessary amounts to guarantee a viable education program is mirrored in the deficiencies of the finished product turned out by the given institution. It seems clear that significant investment of both time and money in the adequate development of field work can only pay off
dividends in a higher degree of proficiency in producing competent planners.

Another problem is that the academic system as it ordinarily functions penalizes the faculty person who moves into field-related activities. He is not adequately compensated for field work participation as he is for standard academically recognized teaching and research activities. The reward structure for faculty, as perceived by many junior faculty members, does not encourage participation in labor intensive field programs or related curriculum development especially when it is added to normal teaching loads. While tenure policy at a university may be beginning to broaden to include such activities, junior faculty facing tenure evaluation often feel a competing need to demonstrate professional competence in their academic discipline. 71

If field work is to take its place as a viable supplement to traditional planning education these problems have to be solved. New, qualified staff members in appropriate numbers have to be brought in to operate field programs exclusively. Also the reward structure and tenure policy for faculty members involved in field work must be made to equal or even exceed the traditional payoffs to faculty for teaching and research.
It has been outlined earlier that a well designed internship program can afford many direct benefits to the student and the university as well as to the sponsoring agencies:

- Students appear to value most highly the opportunity for direct "involvement" and personal contribution to the planning process.

- Internships are widely regarded by participating interns, program faculty, and field supervisors as valuable learning experiences. Students develop a sense of reality appreciation and a process-oriented orientation toward social problems and their solution. Ideally, they relate what they have learned in the classroom to their work situation and develop an awareness of skill deficiencies and lack of academic background that they can satisfy in concurrent and subsequent formal training. In specific cases internships may be designed to incorporate direct field research opportunities.

- Besides providing skill training and personal contacts that can be useful to students in job placement, intern experiences can expose students to a variety of career roles or models that can be invaluable in the student's growth and evolving career choices. Students can gain an acquaintance with new interdisciplinary fields, with new allied services that are expanding traditional
career concepts, and with different organizational settings for work. In comparison traditional class room education usually exposes the student to only one professional role and setting, i.e. that of the teacher in the class room.\textsuperscript{72}

It should be obvious from the analysis of the DUSP two field work programs that to realize these and related benefits requires considerable advance preparation and some educational structuring of the field experience. Four general rules have been suggested for good internship administration:

1. The managers must have extensive advance knowledge of the planning environment in which the intern is to be placed. This means that the academic internship manager(s) should know in considerable detail the field supervisor and other persons who are the actors in and about the offices to which the intern is to be assigned. They should also have a general understanding of issues and problem areas with which the organization is dealing.

2. There should be clear advance understanding of the general responsibilities and expectations of the intern and field supervisor. The intern should know clearly when and to whom he is to report, and what his general role may be.
While the need for flexibility and trial-and-error is obviously important, attention to simple matters, such as who the intern's immediate on-the-job supervisor is to be, will greatly facilitate orientation and minimize confusion in the first few days.

3. During the internship period, there should be regular supervision of the intern by the academic manager. "Regular" need not be daily, of course, but periodic (at least once a week), direct communication between intern and academic supervisor should be provided for. Even more important than fixed visits or telephone conversations, both of which are common and necessary, is the provision for ready channels of communication between intern and academic supervisor. Generally, supervision means (a) providing aid to the intern in the mechanics of the internship (financing, hours, office role, etc.), and (b) maintaining the sense of the experience's academic relevance during the internship.

4. Finally, the ideal general rules of internship management require that the ultimate control of
the enterprise should remain in the hands of the academic manager. This means that, in the extreme case, the academic manager should decide (in consultation with the intern and the field supervisor) whether to terminate or drastically change an assignment. 73

This classical model of the internship is based on a clearly defined triangular relationship between the student, the academic manager, and the field supervisor.

Some further guidelines for good internship programs may also be suggested. The placement is an especially critical aspect of a successful internship. Some programs have developed a list of criteria to be applied in screening a large number of agencies for the best internship positions. For example some major criteria that have been suggested are: Does the experience provide the student with an opportunity for academic and intellectual growth? Does the experience tie in well with some of the student's major interests? Is the placement real, i.e. does it respond to a real need and is not an artificial response to the offer of manpower? Are the conditions necessary for the task to succeed either existing or likely to come into effect? Does the placement allow some flexibility and an opportunity for the student to redefine the task assignment? Are the supervisory arrangements adequate?
Is the particular person responsible for the supervision capable, interested and willing to invest the necessary time for a program of this sort? Does the job as described give the student opportunities for a full range of "desk work" and "activism", that is, an opportunity both to develop theory and to test it in the arena of reality?  

Perhaps the most exacting yet essential dimension of the successful intern experience is the overall educational structuring of the internship, i.e. how it is related to the student's formal academic program and progress. The faculty supervisor or academic manager has the immediate responsibility of helping the student perceive the academic relevance of his field experience. He is followed in importance by the field supervisor who serves as the professions role model and by the nature of the field assignment developed for the intern. Successful educational structuring of internships is obviously faculty and field supervisor intensive both in planning and continuing evaluation. A set of educational goals must to some degree be built into the learning experience by the academic manager if the internship is to be more than a spontaneous happening. A set of five simple objectives for class and field instruction can be used in guiding the development of more specific - short term goals for a particular placement. The following statement
of objectives may be set forth: The student is expected -

1. To develop his ability to use knowledge for practice and to enhance his understanding of theory and principles;

2. To learn to analyze and assess his own professional performance in the light of his knowledge and his understanding of the values of the profession in order to establish a basis for continued, self-directed professional development;

3. To experience, learn, and incorporate the discipline and self-awareness necessary to the development and use of purposeful professional relationships;

4. To attain a sense of professional identity through understanding and incorporating professional values to control his practice;

5. To develop curiosity, a critical approach to theory and practice, receptivity to new ideas and the need to test them, concern for the way new knowledge has been obtained, and responsibility for continuous learning.

These objectives have been stated at a level of generalization that makes them appropriate to the over-all aims of most schools of planning today. They are applicable to all methods or to new conceptions of practice, they permit letting in and letting out various ranges and levels of content (knowledge), they concern a way of
thinking as well as doing, they give educational status to the interpersonal elements in professional learning and professional practice. 75

"The first objective - to develop ability to use knowledge for practice and to increase understanding of theory and principles - emphasizes understanding and use of knowledge. This objective, by incorporating both knowledge and understanding, implies that knowing and doing mutually illuminate and reinforce each other. Subobjectives under this major objective identify, in a general way, the areas of knowledge to be acquired, understood, and put to use. The general objective embraces application of an orderly approach; the deepening knowledge and understanding of people, problems, and resources; and the application of collaborative principles." 76

"The second objective - to learn to analyze and assess his own professional performance in the light of his knowledge and understanding of the values of the profession - is essentially learning a way of thinking about practice. This objective can be simply stated as 'developing' skill in analysis of one's own practice and it is fostered through drill in the identification by the student of what he is doing, description of his actions and his purposes, and analysis of the outcomes."
of these. The purpose of this learning: to establish a basis for continued, self-directed professional development. To this must be added analysis in the light of planning knowledge and values, because a way of thinking about professional performance must have content beyond the details of one's own performance. A concentration on the details of one's own performance, unconnected to the basic substance of professional knowledge, may lead to a concentration on technical proficiency for its own sake. Furthermore, the major function of any educational endeavor is to establish a way of thinking that is transferable to any content and any doing. When a student is taught a way of thinking, when he reflects upon what he has done, both knowledge and the ability to do are expanded. The development of a way of thinking about professional performance requires certain kinds of teaching methods as well as certain kinds of learning experiences."

"The third objective - to experience, learn, and incorporate the discipline self-awareness necessary to the development and use of purposeful professional relationships - emphasizes experiential learning, which involves both mind and emotions in the use of knowledge and in the use of self. This objective states the central importance given to the use of the professional relationship in practice. It also asserts that it is crucial that each
professional understand this relationship in its various aspects, that he know himself, and that he be able to control (discipline) himself, his part in the relationship, and his use of it. It is clear that for this professional self learning to take place the student must experience himself in the professional relationship and must have instruction and help to develop this "consciousness of self" and discipline in the professional relationship. Field instruction is the only place in the curriculum in which this vital aspect of professional learning and development can be achieved. If these assertions are accepted, then there follow requirements of time for the repetition of increasing demanding learning experiences geared to attaining this objective."

The forth objective - to attain a sense of professional identity - is, of course, an objective of the entire curriculum. It has been emphasized that everything in a professional education should be directed toward this objective - atmosphere, faculty, curriculum, student - faculty relationships, mutual classroom and field instruction support - everything. The actuality of learning to be professional brings to life for the student the concept of professional identity. The beginning incorporation of the many facets of professional identity may occur only when the student in field instruction carries the
responsibility for professional service. It is in this situation that he experiences and learns the meaning of being a professional and the usefulness of knowledge. It is, perhaps, in relation to this objective that the student tests what he has been taught and what he is being taught. That is, it is in the field that he can test whether he really wants to be identified as a planner. It is also in relation to this objective of attainment of a sense of professional identity that the school of planning is most sorely tried. It is tried because the student sees conflicting models unless the school has a clear, unified idea of what a planner should be, and should be able to do.\textsuperscript{79}

There are three critical areas to which the educational success of field work seems to be inextriably linked. These areas are: the nature of the field assignment or field work design; the agency supervisory process and the school input system\footnote{This area includes the elements of academic field instruction, field seminar, and academic courses related to field work.}. All of these areas are obviously related. The quality of seminar instruction by the school field instructor, the skill of the agency field supervisor and the nature of the field assignment are all components which affect the student's performance.\footnote{Note - Although the school input system}
may suggest the interaction of several different elements, in reality it is the field seminar that represents the staging ground for the culmination of their interaction.)

As stated earlier in this thesis, planning education has always viewed field work as a means of helping students integrate theoretical concepts from the classroom with the demands of direct practice in agencies. However planning education has not devoted adequate attention and effort to designing field learning experiences which are relevant to today's professional concerns and which help students experience the application of theory and which enable them to view the profession with in the context of society. In fact traditional field designs or assignments have tended to restrict students to agency selected task and agency sanctioned modes of intervention rather than providing the academic freedom needed to make field work viable. The student can be of the greatest help to himself as well as to the agency if he is allowed to interact within the agency as a participant - reporter or participant - intervenor, who is analyzing and scrutinizing the work of the agency toward the end of not just learning to understand its function or how to perform some of its tasks but to raise critical questions about methodology, suggest new ideas and implement new approaches. It is only within this process of analyzing problems,
suggesting alternatives and implementing ideas that the student learns planning and does not fall prey to the simple completion of agency task.

A student is conceived of here as playing the role of participant reporter or participant-intervenor in field work. These two terms are used interchangeably here to denote that the student is not to be thought of as occupying a passive role or one that is concerned with one way communication of learning. The notion to be projected by field work is that it is a two way learning tool, with the student learning from the agency and the agency learning from the student. It is within this context of greater responsibility that the nature of a field work assignment can take on some semblance of professional practice and not be reduced to an agency training program. "Narrow technicians are the result of training or apprenticeship rather than of professional education. When a student learns the practice of a specific agency as if it were the whole of planning practice, he is trained, not educated. When a student perceives planning practice in terms of the accomplishment of specific, isolated tasks, he is trained, not educated". 80
Thus a student must be in the position to be able to work with his supervisor to structure within the agency setting the type of learning assignment that will be most beneficial to him and not be caught up in just the performance of mechanical job tasks.

Educationally, students need to be active participants in the design and implementation of the learning process. The agency setting should be conceived of as a field work laboratory where learning is to be achieved experientially through planning problem identification, data collection, suggestion of alternative, solutions etc. with field instructor inputs emphasizing transferable principles drawn from the students' experiences. It is within this process that field work provides an opportunity to demonstrate the reciprocal relationship of practice to cognitive and conceptual thinking. If the nature of a student's field assignment were approached in this manner it would represent a significant positive departure from traditional field work designs where students are faced with immediate service assignments in an agency and expected to concentrate on specific practice skills.

However the potential solutions to the problem of vestigial apprentice training in field instruction lies not only in the design of learning experiences with the student but also in the teaching methods by which the
learning experiences are proffered.83 "The problem of ordering learning in the field is clearly a problem of designing of learning experiences, but it is also a problem of equality of learning opportunity and degree of respect that all faculty members hold for the logic of organized knowledge and the logic of life. Sole dependence on the logic of organized knowledge in the design of learning experience in the field can lead to compartmentalized, fragmented learning or to a global, abstract view unrelated to the process of practice. Just as surely, a sole dependence on the logic of life in the design of learning experiences can lead to a narrow, technical view of the processes of practice or to a diffuse, undifferentiated view. The potential solutions to the problem of ordering learning in the field lie not only in the design of learning experiences but also in the teaching methods and the opinions that are held about the relation of theory and experience in professional education."

The problem of the student's development of professional self-dependence is partly solved by time, as well as by how the profession handles the issues of the individual planner's accountability and continuing professional growth. It is also a problem to be solved in the educational situation, in which patterns of professional learn-
ing and operation are laid down. Development of professional self-dependence brings together for the student confidence in his knowledge, ability to search for and take in new knowledge, and confidence in his ability to use knowledge and himself in practice. "The potential solutions to the problem of the student's development of professional self-dependence may well be found in a careful design of learning experiences, but the strength and direction of his development will also be affected by the way in which knowledge is transmitted (teaching method) and by the way in which the student is helped to learn to master the use of himself." 95

In summary it can be stated that a design of learning experiences cannot be worked out in specific detail by the school to cover the total range of field placements used. However a general design for learning experiences should be constructed as a guide to the field agency supervisor for what he is expected to teach and it should serve him as a way of thinking - a system - for his doing. For the school, this guide should constitute a guaranty of a minimum equality of learning opportunity for all students. A design of learning experiences is simply a framework by which to organize content in field teaching. It is, perhaps, similar to the course outline for classroom teaching. Such an outline is related to
course objectives; it indicates content to be covered to reach objectives. 86

*(Note - Recognizing the reality of the complexity of field supervision, the reader should understand that although attempts will be made within this discussion to define and characterize two distinct and separate field supervisory roles [one agency/one faculty] there will result some repetition in describing role responsibilities. This duplication or overlap however serves the purpose of illustrating the particular importance of certain role-tasks that need reinforcing by both field supervisors.)

"No two students could possibly have the same learning experiences with the same results, no matter what standardized assignments were required." 87 Thus learning to do field work as an individual enterprise is therefore inevitable, and this can and should be given positive value by rewards for improvement in effective communication with others about experiences that cannot help being idiosyncratic but that nevertheless may be brought to useful explicit statement as the student's own contribution to the improvement of the state of the art. 88 It is for this particular reason that the role of the school field instructor or school input system is so important in trying to assure a minimum equality of learning opportunity for all students no matter what their field placements or
who their agency field supervisors are.

An essential point to be made here is that the university field instructor or field manager teaches the student a way of putting knowledge to use. The fact that there may not be adequate experiences to cover all facets of planning practice in a particular agency or that an agency field supervisor may not be able to impart all the knowledge necessary for the student's needs becomes subordinate when the school field instructor is able to aid the student's learning how to put knowledge to use, how to go about getting knowledge he does not have, and how to raise questions about the efficacy of various agencies, solutions to traditional planning problems. 89

Thus a major requirement of field work method is that the school field instructor must seize the opportunities of real life and take responsibility with the student to identify the knowledge in them, to identify principles of practice from them, and to consider what is transferable, what is specific to the situation, what is unexplainable on the basis of current knowledge and what professional values have come into play. 90 Only as the student's individual practice is constantly related to the matrix of practice theory - incomplete though the theory now is - can planners be prepared to make use of developing theory by using appropriate concepts in their "practice thinking." 91
Operationally what this means for the field instructor is that he does not just look for a task or a set of tasks to give the student experience, or fill his time, but he looks for learning situations to teach the student something or extracts that something from the learning situations the student has.  

"Why stress the importance of teaching by principle and not by rote as in apprentice training? Field teaching, to be effective, has to be interrelated with and permeated by the total curriculum emphasis." For the student to attempt to achieve the integration of class and field learning by himself is difficult if not impossible. Thus the responsibility for developing this integration process falls most heavily upon the school field instructor. (As well as to a lesser degree on the agency field supervisor.) For he has responsibility to help to structure a stimulating learning situation by providing adequate supervision of field assignments and skilled methods of instruction appropriate to the level of experience, knowledge and skill of the students involved. This task confronting the field instructor in focusing the teaching material to the level of the student's ability and the structuring of the integration of field and class learning must not be minimized. "For it is precisely due to the nature of the complexity of the task before
field supervisors that students should be assigned to the most competent and experienced supervisors. It is only when the field instructor has truly mastered the art and science of supervision that he can make imaginative use of an array of teaching techniques found to be effective in this type of pedagogical situation." 

However one of the universal misconceptions often made by graduate schools is the belief that supervising students makes a lesser demand than a regular teaching position (or staff supervision). Except when there is a general educational commitment of the administration and board of an agency, we are faced with reluctance to assign senior staff to student supervision. Undoubtedly the rationalization is that the student knows so little that the field instructor need not be so knowledgeable and skillful. Yet we have, however, been making increased demands on the field instructors to assume a truly educational role and function. In addition to a body of knowledge, skills and values in planning and related content, field instructors are asked to teach within a methodology which is facilitating and not inhibiting to learning. Furthermore as we understand more of the anxieties and strains inherent in the very process of learning to become a planner, it is clear that only the more professionally mature and competent persons will
be able to carry out this teaching responsibility effectively. 98

Of paramount importance in understanding the crucial significance of the need for a high level of competence in academic field managers is the fact that the student is helped primarily through the supervisory relationship and content of field teaching, to gain an awareness of his own behavior, attitudes and feelings in reaction to work centered relationships. It has been found repeatedly that the field instructor or manager who lacks a breadth of professional planning experience and is not comfortable in the role of the teacher invariably focuses directly on student anxiety which may be normal to the learning situation. 99 "More over, by trying to superimpose awareness on the student instead of having it accrue to him gradually through the structured learning tasks and opportunities, the field instructor may increase the student's problems. Anxiety thus engendered has a profoundly negative influence on the student's subsequent pattern of learning. Defenses are mobilized needlessly to contain the anxiety and the student is often compelled to resort to accommodation to his mentors rather than being free to exercise his ability to think critically and analytically. It is incumbent on the field instructor to promote and guide the tempo of increasing self-awareness, as well as through assessment
of the student. To do so requires a high degree of competence in educational diagnosis and teaching. Another reason for the assignment of field teaching to the most mature and able staff is the fact that the field instructor or manager is intrusted with the responsibility of evaluating the student for the profession, i.e., the student's potential for becoming the professional person, rather than acceptable performance in the specifics of his current field placement alone.¹⁰⁰

The ideal arrangement between the intern and his academic supervisor is one in which the supervisor is close enough to be both personally and intellectually helpful on short notice, but distant enough not to intrude on the relationships that grow up between the intern and his field supervisor and/or office colleagues.¹⁰¹ For instance, when the perception of the student's role on the part of both the agency and the school are not congruent, the student must be helped to clarify his actual position with agency and school and not have to absorb all of the conflict himself.¹⁰² This is an area in which the role of the academic manager is of critical import. For the gap between expectations and reality is one which the academic manager must constantly consider. By recognizing the gap between agency expectations and the reality of student's needs (academic), expectations
(real life planning experience), limitations (time), readiness (ability level) and interest (chosen field of specialization) - the academic manager can offer support to the student through suggestions on: the nature of the field assignment; the timing or sequence of task (directly related to student learning rate) and extent or degree of involvement in different tasks. The academic manager by clarifying roles and defining the field work structure formalizes and rationalizes the level of expectation of all parties involved (students, agency and academic institution) over the student's role in agency field work and the agency's responsibilities to this role. 103

We give a very complicated assignment to the faculty field supervisor when we expect him to help the student to achieve both agency and professional identification, particularly when the student is located in an agency with non-planning staff or an agency with marginal professional standards and when adequate role models may be missing. In the process of developing a conception of the professional role, the student's identification begins with the agency supervisor as the role model. However when the student becomes over identified with the agency or conversely, when he is completely unable to identify with the agency, the faculty field manager faces a major educational responsibility of helping the
student broaden his perspective.\textsuperscript{104} It is in these ways that the academic field manager is responsible for imparting supervision and the structure needed to facilitate the learning related to field work practice for the student. Within his responsibility for teaching knowledge related to practice, the academic manager must help select learning experiences for students which cluster around practice theory. Out of this type of structure will flow experiences in using knowledge from other parts of the curriculum. "In this way, the organized knowledge of the total curriculum can be selectively related to the real life of practice. The underlying emphasis is that professional practice is not possible except through use of knowledge".\textsuperscript{105}

"The freedom to make full use of opportunity in field teaching opens the way for creativity in planning learning experiences, but it also demands great discipline and responsibility from the field instructor or academic manager. Creativity is possible because the real-life situations in the field offer the opportunity for the field instructor to teach and the student to learn anything and everything. Discipline and responsibility come into play in that the field instructor must subject the wide-open possibilities of the raw materials to
a constant connection to what needs to be taught and learned and why. If the field instructor can do this, learning experiences more or less design themselves. That is, if the school works out a flexible framework for learning to be achieved, the real life of the field placement can be exploited without either underscoring its disorder or sapping its vitality, because the field instructor knows, in broad outlines, what he is expected to teach, and he is free to seize the opportunities that the raw material represents.  

There can be planning from the simple to the complex in field teaching in the requirements made of the student in relation to what knowledge he is expected to have and put to use and how much professional responsibility he is expected to carry. "When real life demands more than has been planned, the field teacher has the responsibility to convey the knowledge, teach its use, and support and help the student to carry the temporarily added professional responsibility. When the simple to complex organization of field teaching breaks down, the field instructor's responsibility is to help the student deal with the disorder and to convert it into order by connecting the happenings to organized knowledge." 

Much of the formal learning that takes place in field work goes on in individual supervisor conferences and in
student group seminars. These two components of field-linked education are the foundation of the field learning process for students. It is within these two separate but equally important sessions that the student with the help of the field supervisor in the former and the academic field instructor in the latter, reviews his performance, clarifies his thoughts, and is enabled to begin to see connection between classroom theory and field application. In order for field work to truly be effective there must be structured within this organization the chance for students to pause, reflect and discuss the implications of those experiences he has been exposed to with his professional mentors (academic manager - field supervisor) and among his peers. It is during these critical interchanges that the student is forced to evaluate the soundness of his past and future actions in the field and begins to develop a theory of practice as he is challenged to articulate and substantiate the rationale for his actions.

In the tutorial method characteristic of field instruction, the individual conference with the student is the basic vehicle for teaching. The individual conference (after the academic manager has read the student's case study or field notes of his agency involvement.) enables the faculty instructor to understand the student's
particular learning needs and problems, the quality of his thinking and feeling and his potentiality for becoming a planner. Regular weekly conferences can be the medium through which the field supervisor or academic field instructor provides the individually planned educational experience that can be the heart of the field work teaching method in planning. It is also through this medium that the instructor and or field supervisor creates the kind of learning atmosphere in which the student can feel most comfortable. By means of the relationship established in the conference, the instructor offers the student the support and help he needs in trying himself out in the new and uncharted ways of planning.108

The academic manager has definite responsibilities in planning for the conference with the student: reading the student's case study and other assignments; reviewing and analyzing his written work; reading theoretical material that has a bearing on the case study problems and situations to be discussed; and identifying the student's learning capacities and problems and making an educational diagnosis.

The other important component of the field work learning experience is the field seminar or group meetings of all the students in field work. This part of a student's learning process in field work is very important in an
integrative and comprehensive sense. First of all since each student by virtue of his one particular agency or placement only views planning through the glasses of one field of practice (such as housing, health, transportation etc.) he is unlikely to achieve a comprehensive grasp of the realities of planning in its entirety. Thus via the field work seminar the student is allowed to vicariously experience and learn from the field placements of other students. Group meetings or seminars then offer excellent opportunities for different kinds of student learning experiences to be forth coming from a wide variety of individuals, situations and problems.

Next, the student who is presenting his case study in a seminar must exercise thought and discipline in organizing and preparing his material for group discussion. The actual experience of giving an oral presentation of material is one that he will be required to duplicate many times in his student and professional career. Being exposed to doing it in a student unit meeting can help reduce his anxiety later and can help him develop personal and professional poise in carrying out this type of endeavor. Group discussions of the case situations allows students to develop their critical thinking ability as they suggest what they might have done in a similar situation, challenge and analyze what their colleagues or
the agencies have done and raise critical question of the faculty supervisor of the knowledge to be drawn from the experience. There should be two types of seminars. One seminar should be on-going and involve only students who have common field work interest or involvements. There should also be a general seminar held less frequently (perhaps once or twice a semester) where students involved in various field activities come together to present case studies on their experiences.

"To consistently guide the student within the perspective of the program goals of field work necessitates the direction of an agency supervisor." The agency supervisor, who represents the main component of the field work administration process, has several specific tasks concerns. The first major responsibility the agency supervisor has is that of teaching the student planning practice in the field. "In general such a mentor advances his protege's perception of the broad dimensions of planning on all operational levels." In planning education of all mentors the agency field supervisor is the closest to the student in action, in feeling, in thinking and in behaving. He guides the development of professional competence and to do this he must impart knowledge as well as encourage the student in independent use and testing of the various content areas of the academic
curriculum. Indeed, "The agency field supervisor must be one who is able to communicate learning content not only didactically but also through the Socratic method of eliciting and drawing out from the learner his own ideas and knowledge, attitudes and feelings." However, it must also be realized that informal teaching in the field is carried on by an agency supervisor via his "role-model" performance. The way the supervisor performs his agency role is observed by a student. The student's observations are an informal aspect of the field teaching process which no doubt influences the informal learning.

The next major aspect of an agency supervisor's responsibility to the student is the supportive role he must play. By "supportive" is meant an understanding of what it means to be a student trying to learn from a new kind of experience, demonstrated through various forms of help. The actual ways through which the agency field supervisor can offer support to a student are by: carefully developing the nature of the agency assignment with the student; analyzing the basic amount of time the student can spend in the agency and then structuring what learnings and accomplishments can take place over time according to reasonable learning speed of the student and the creation of an emotional-intellectual set for field work comprehension which means that the supervisor
must create an atmosphere which promotes and reinforces the student's intellectual investigations of agency practice.

The third component which allows an agency field supervisor to effectively aid a student in field work is a high degree of awareness or sensitivity to: a student's ability to communicate his ideas and perceptions both verbally and in written form; the student's understanding and uninhibited use of the jargon of the field and the unique talents and limitations of an individual student. Without this awareness, the communication can go one-way from supervisor to himself with the student as uninvolved spectator to the process. The last but perhaps most crucial consideration that the agency supervisor has to deal with is the assessment of potential capacity or development of the student. There are a number of critical questions that come to mind however when contemplating measuring and assessing student development in the field. First of all - How do we measure development? Perhaps one possible answer to this question is the development of some generic model for field work that gives us some measures of adaptive behavior by the student in a process of development through the field work experience. For example a four part behavior development model for student field work evaluation might exist as follows:
I. Attitude

How do the student's feelings, values, and emotional responses change or not change during a field sequence? Some of the areas where this could be looked at include: his emerging sense of being both competent and confident in the new field situation; his emerging sense of feelings about the field of planning in which he is engaged, and his emerging sense of feeling about the agency in which he works.

II. Involvement

How does the student move into the new field situation? Is he able to begin to apply course concepts to field demands? Can he see beginning connections between theory and practice? Does he try to develop a problem-solving approach to the new field assignments?

III. Cognition

Does the student use the field setting to expand his base of knowledge? Does he use the supervisory process provided by the agency and by the school as additional opportunities for adding to his tools of learning? Can the concrete problems of the field assignment make any link-points to the classroom theory?
IV. Performance

How does the student synthesize the three previously noted pattern of behavior to a new pattern? Is there a process of growth which suggests development? If so, what strengths does the student exhibit? If not, what weaknesses are pinpointed? What is the balance of strength and weaknesses for a student? What, if any, remedial talks are suggested?

Assessment of a student's potential is critical to field work. The supervisor's ability to aid the student to recognize his own potential through evaluation may end up being one of the most critical facets of growth development in the student's field experience.¹¹⁵

The three part model of operation for field work practice depicted here attempts through definition and explanation to illustrate what is important in making field work a viable learning experience. Implicitly although not explicitly stated within my discussion of the critical variables of field work operation are three principles for the design of learning experiences in the field. These principles are continuity, sequence and integration. They may be applied to the operationalizing of field work instruction in the following general way: continuity is the thread through all the teaching in the field that makes clear that the objective is the student's
development into a professional planner; sequence is the ordering of experiences and content so that increasingly complex knowledge is put to use along with increasingly complex use of self by the student and integration takes place in so far as the field supervisor (both faculty and agency) and student work gradually to put together the knowledge, concepts and skills that make up planning practice. 116

The over all analysis to be made from just this cursory look at field work is that both the agency and the school must have an organized view of what they expect to teach or impart to a student and must have the knowledge to teach it. Above all else the professional planning school must accept the fact that since it is teaching for professional practice anywhere then field work teaching methods can do much to increase the comprehensiveness of these efforts. For it may well be that the genius of planning education lies in the difference between class and field and in how each is used to achieve a common end. 117
314.
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