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COMMUNITY CONTROL OF SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION
A HISTORICAL EXAMPLE

Philip R. Popple,
University of Tennessee School of Social Work
Nashville Branch

ABSTRACT
From 1901 to 1924 social work education in the mid and southwest was provided by the Missouri School of Social Economy (MSSE). In 1924 the MSSE suddenly closed and was almost immediately replaced by an entirely new program, the Washington University Training Course for Social Workers. This paper explores the reasons for the demise of the MSSE, finding that it was apparently too liberal for the taste of university administrators and not responsive enough to the needs of the local practice community. The case of the MSSE provides an interesting and useful example of community control of social work education.

Histories of social work education generally discuss the four "pioneer schools" of social work - the New York School of Philanthropy (1898; now the Columbia University School of Social Work); the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy (1903; now the University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration); the Boston School for Social Workers (1904; now the Simmons College School of Social Work) and the Philadelphia Training School for Social Work (1908; now the University of Pennsylvania School of Social Work). Few make note, however, that there was a fifth school, the Missouri School of Social Economy, that opened in St. Louis in 1901. The Missouri School provided professional social work education to much of the mid and southwest until 1924 when it suddenly went out of business and was immediately replaced by the Washington University Training Course for Social Workers (now the George Warren Brown School of Social Work). The strange fact is that there was absolutely no connection between the two programs. The Washington University course was different in affiliation, administration, faculty, and curriculum. The story of the development and eventual failure of the Missouri School of Social Economy and its replacement by the Washington University program provides an interesting and useful example of community control over social work education.
Influences On Early Schools Of Social Work

During the early years of the twentieth century when professional education was first moving into the university, every profession experienced conflict regarding the move. University faculties, and professional practitioners were not certain if business, law, nursing, and teaching belonged in the university. Social work experienced an even harder time due to a number of divisions of opinion regarding the basic form and structure of the social work profession and of social work education. Severe problems resulted when the practice community, the school of social work, and the university took different sides on one of these divisions.

The first division was over whether social work education should be academic or practical. The academic community and the practice community generally took different sides on this issue. The practice community, because of its need for competent practitioners, naturally exerted pressure for social work education to have a practical focus, with a large amount of time devoted to "how to" courses. The academic community, because of its commitment to knowledge building, placed a high value on research and scholarship and therefore often deemphasized a practical focus and applied pressure for a more rounded curriculum.

The second major division that caused problems for social work education, and continues to do so, is the classic cause/function dilemma. One segment of the profession feels that social change as the solution to social problems (cause) should be a primary focus of social work and another segment feels social workers should concentrate on helping individuals "adjust to a recognized reality" (function). Following Flexner's famous 1915 paper, "Is Social Work A Profession", the practice community was fairly well united on the feeling that the development of expert individual treatment technique was the direction social work should head in order to become a recognized profession. The academic community was also receptive to this focus due to the fact that universities were generally very conservative and suspicious of schemes to change society.

A third division of opinion during the early years of social work education was whether it was possible for an urban school to provide training for rural workers. The general feeling among the practice community was that an urban school could not. Jesse Steiner, for example, concluded that students in urban schools rarely see their careers in terms of a long stay in a rural area.

For this attitude of mind the professional schools in the cities are largely responsible . . . the rural students acquire the city point of view and find themselves out of sympathy with the more conservative and slow moving community from which they came and where they had expected to return to work.
Universities preferred to prepare workers for the type of community in which the university was located. Urban universities preferred to train urban workers and agricultural universities preferred to prepare workers for rural areas.

During the early years of social work education there were a number of battles between the university, the school of social work, and the practice community over the direction that social work education should take. In 1910 Samuel McCune Lindsey resigned as director of the New York School following a long standing disagreement with the Charity Organization Society's Committee on Philanthropic Education regarding the future direction of the School. In his letter of resignation Lindsey stated:

A university professional school seemed to me from the beginning our proper aim, whether on or near the campus of Columbia University... like Teachers College, or the law and medical schools of the University... (but) our general program has been halted by the recurrent proposal of a very different type of school... a training school, much more limited in scope, devoted to the development of a finer technique in a few lines of work - perhaps exclusively in the activities of a charity organization society.

In 1914 Harvard University withdrew from the Boston School because the school was not felt to be academic enough. Jeffrey R. Brackett, a Harvard Alumnus, had established the School in affiliation with Harvard and Simmons College and had struggled since the Schools founding to keep Harvard involved. The University, however, was never comfortable with the applied focus of the School, and when the Russell Sage Foundation withdrew financial support in 1914, Harvard severed its ties. In 1920, after a long struggle, Edith Abbott succeeded in establishing social work as a graduate school on par with other graduate schools in the University of Chicago. Because of her belief that social work should strive to be an academic discipline as well as a profession, and that it should be concerned with social change as well as individual treatment, Abbott was considered a rebel by the practice community and the school was the subject of much criticism.

When one analyzes the amount of control of social work education the practice community and the academic community have been able to achieve, the not surprising fact emerges that control is directly proportionate to financial leverage. In the case of the New York School, a grant from the Kennedy family gave full control to the Charity Organization Society's Committee on Philanthropic Education. Therefore, the practice community reigned supreme. In Boston, Harvard University was willing to be affiliated with the Boston School only so long as the Russell Sage Foundation bore the cost. When the Sage Foundation withdrew, so did Harvard. In Chicago, the social work program was able to escape dominance by the practice community because of a large grant from the Laura Spelmen Rockefeller Foundation that was encouraging the development of innovative
approaches to social work education, in this case an academic, macro practice, approach.

All of the early schools of social work that survived sided with either the practice or the academic communities on the issues discussed above, most siding with the practice community. Therefore those schools were able to maintain a continuous base of support and to survive and even flourish. The Missouri School of Social Economy, however, chose to go its own way rather than to compromise with either the practice or the academic community. The result was a very shaky existence and eventual failure.

The Missouri School of Social Economy, 1901 - 1924

The history of the Missouri School of Social Economy is interesting in its own right for a number of reasons. Many aspects of the school were significant - it was for many years the only school west of Chicago, it was influential in the move for a mother's pension in Missouri, it was interested in the civil rights of blacks during a time when blacks were an almost invisible segment of American society. In addition, and significant to the focus of this paper, the Missouri School was the only pioneer school to be affiliated with a public university. This created unique problems for the School. Schools that were independent or affiliated with private universities had to be responsive mainly to the desires of urban private agencies. The Missouri School, however, had to be responsive to a rural dominated legislature as well as to urban private agencies. No attempt will be made in this paper to give a detailed description of the development of the School. Rather, this analysis will focus on the effects of community pressures on the program.

In a manner similar to all schools of social work the Missouri School grew out of the needs of the local practice community. In New York, Boston, and Philadelphia the programs were begun by local Charity Organization Societies. In St. Louis the agency most responsible for beginning social work education was the Provident Association, an agency that was founded in 1860 as a part of the Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor movement. It appears that the original impetus for the establishment of the training school came from the visitors employed by the Provident Association, rather than from the agency administration. In the winter of 1901-1902 the visitors began a series of discussion meetings aimed at elevating their level of knowledge and skill. These meetings soon expanded into a series of fortnightly conferences which were open to all charitable and social workers of the city.

In the winter of 1903 the administration of the Provident Association became formally involved in the training with the founding of the Provident Association School of Philanthropic Work. The school consisted of classes given twice a week by W. H. McClain, General Manager of the Provident Association and other "leaders in the field", and were open to workers of all St. Louis social agencies. The Provident Assoc-
iation administration was very enthusiastic about the school, reporting in the 1905 Annual Report that the school had not only "bound the workers together" but had also given them "new and higher ideals of modern scientific charity". The classes apparently were of high quality and filled a need for the region as evidenced by the fact that McClain was requested to teach similar classes at Washington University, the University of Missouri, and the University of Indiana.

It did not take long for the academic community to become involved in the School of Philanthropic Work and to begin to try to change the school's nature to meet their own needs. The opening came in 1905 when Dr. Walter L. Sheldon, leader of the Ethical Culture Society and a board member of the School decided that the curriculum needed some enrichment. Toward this end he contacted Dr. Charles Ellwood, Chairman of the Sociology Department at the University of Missouri, and invited him to cooperate in the work of the School by delivering occasional lectures. Ellwood agreed and came to St. Louis presenting a lecture titled "The Importance of Having Scientific Knowledge in Dealing with the Problems of Charity and Philanthropy". The committee in charge of the School was so pleased with the lecture that they not only published it as a monograph, but Dr. Sheldon opened correspondence with Ellwood on the subject of the University's permanent involvement in the School. Ellwood was delighted, and later described his reaction to this proposal.

This gave me the opportunity that I had been waiting for. I had long seen that it was impossible for the (sociology) department to function effectively either in the scientific world or in the public service in the State of Missouri with only one man on its teaching force. I took Dr. Sheldon's letters and laid them before Mr. Walter Williams, then Chairman of our Executive Board, and President Jesse. They both agreed that this was an opportunity not to be lost and that they would try to get the Board of Curators to provide an instructor in the department who would give a part of his time to teaching in the University at Columbia and part to organizing and conducting a training school for social workers in St. Louis.

Ellwood's plan was approved by the Board of Curators and negotiations were begun with Dr. Thomas J. Riley, a social economist with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, for the new position of Director of the Missouri School of Philanthropy, and Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Missouri. The plan was then presented to the Board of the School of Philanthropy. Here it ran into some difficulty as Dr. Sheldon had apparently meant for the university to cooperate by providing occasional lectures and exchanging credit for courses. He had never intended for the University to coopt the whole school, and attempted to block Ellwood's plan. W. H. McClain, General
Manager of the Provident Association, however, favored affiliation. Ellwood later recalled

I appealed to the McClain faction as against the Sheldon faction. The Sheldon faction was out-voted in the committee on organization, and the School was organized in affiliation with the University of Missouri, though with a distinct Board of Directors, and with the understanding that Dr. T. V. Riley should be its Director. 8

When the School had been run by the Provident Association it was purely practice oriented with all of the courses taught by local social workers. After affiliation with the University of Missouri the School changed rapidly. Riley and Ellwood applied for, and received, a Russell Sage grant in the amount of $5,000 per year for three years beginning in the fall of 1907. The grant was for the purpose of facilitating the research work of the school. It did not include any money for practice courses. With this money a second faculty member, Dr. George B. Mangold, was hired. Mangold, like Riley, was a social economist with a Ph.D. Also in 1907 Roger Baldwin (who later went on to found the American Civil Liberties Union) became a member of the board of the School of Philanthropy and a part time instructor. Riley, Mangold, and Baldwin were all social actionists with little regard for an individual treatment approach to social work. Baldwin, for example, when speaking of his early years in social work recalled

...... I met in national conferences or in my travels all the leaders throughout the country. I was drawn most to those who occupied their professional obligations with a social philosophy and political crusading. They were not numerous. Most were preoccupied with techniques which I minimized or accepted as routine. The 'art of casework' goal of so many social workers, left me cold and scoffing. 9

For Mangold's part, casework did not leave him "cold and scoffing", he simply did not feel it was as important as what we now think of as macro social work. He once wrote

The man or woman whose education is limited and whose outlook is narrow must always remain in a subordinate position. He cannot lead or direct the forms of social progress; he must confine himself largely to the handling of details, and especially to the task of working with the individual . . . Such persons are mostly in need of understanding the technique of social work . . . . The leaders of social work on the other hand can subordinate technique to an understanding of the social problems that are involved . . . 10
Unfortunately for the future development of the School of Philanthropy the profession of social work was moving in the opposite direction. Social workers were beginning to view the development of an individual treatment technique focus as the key to the professional status they so badly desired.11 What's more, both Riley and Mangold were academics with little interest in social work practice other than as an area of research. After the affiliation with the University of Missouri and the receipt of the Russell Sage Grant there is little evidence of any extensive involvement in the School by the local practice community.

The School of Philanthropy and the University of Missouri maintained a positive relationship for only a few years before problems arose. The difficulties of Riley and Mangold teaching both at the University's main campus in Columbia and in St. Louis soon became evident. Also, the uses of the Sage funds were strictly limited, mainly to research fellowships for students and to the salary of faculty supervising the research. Because attempts to raise funds from the community had met with failure, the Board of Trustees of the School of Philanthropy came to look to the University for support. Unfortunately, the legislature of 1909 cut the University's appropriation, and the President, Dr. A. Ross Hill, decided that the University could no longer afford to maintain the School of Philanthropy. Therefore, at the end of 1909 the School of Philanthropy ceased to be a part of the University of Missouri and had to seek a new source of support.

When the relationship between the School and the University of Missouri began to deteriorate the School began to look for an alternate means of support. It is interesting that the School did not look to the practice community for support, but rather approached Washington University. Roger Baldwin, a faculty member at both the School of Philanthropy and at Washington University had long favored their affiliation. During February of 1909 Carroll M. Davis, a local clergyman and President of the Board of the School of Philanthropy wrote to Chancellor Houston of Washington University asking his opinion as to the feasibility of an affiliation. Houston replied:

I have felt that before Washington University could act officially in the matter it ought, perhaps, to know that the University of Missouri would not object to the transfer of affiliation. 12

Houston went on to say that if the Board of the School of Philanthropy could settle this problem, Washington University would assume responsibility for the School. He concluded.

"-155-"
I may say in general that the social and charitable work, which the School has in view, seems to me to present to the city university an unusual opportunity to render very great service to the city and to humanity.13

Following a letter from A. Ross Hill, President of the University of Missouri, in which he endorsed the plan for the School of Philanthropy to be taken over by Washington University, Chancellor Houston presented the matter to the Board of the University. During April of 1909 the Board voted to approve the affiliation between W. U. and the School of Philanthropy; to appoint Mangold as Assistant Professor and Associate Director of the School and pay part of his salary; and to provide quarters for the School and meet certain contingent expenses. Beginning fall semester of 1909, the School officially became affiliated with Washington University and its name was changed to the St. Louis School of Social Economy.

The School of Social Economy was affiliated with Washington University for five years. During this time it was very productive, maintaining a student body of over twenty full time and fifty part time students; awarding up to ten certificates and seven Masters degrees a year; publishing a series of eight research monographs on social problems in Missouri; and its Associate Director, Dr. Mangold, published a book titled Child Problems in 1910 that quickly became the standard child welfare text in America.

In spite of the fact that the School was very productive, it quickly began to run into problems with Washington University. The reason for these problems appears to have been basically the same as one of the reasons for its problems with the practice community - its social philosophy was too liberal for the prevailing social norms. Washington University was a private school supported entirely by gifts and endowments and as such could not afford to be controversial. Some of the activities of Mangold, who in 1912 became Director of the School following Riley's resignation, and Baldwin were frowned upon by the University's administration. For example, in 1913 Baldwin invited the principals of two black high schools to speak to his social problems class on the subject of race relations. Baldwin later recalled

The newspapers got the story, displaying it by glaring headlines -- "WHITE WOMEN STUDENTS FORCED TO HEAR NEGROS" "WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR ADVOCATES MISCEGENATION".14

Following this incident, the Chancellor's office received a number of letters from irate alumni demanding Baldwin's dismissal. For Mangold's part he frequently pressed the Chancellor with schemes such as providing classes for black social workers, when he was aware that Washington
University was tightly segregated, or for having radical speakers address the student body. One such speaker that Mangold wished to invite was Emma Goldman, "the notorious anarchist", who was so far to the left that, according to Baldwin, she wasn't even "considered respectable in reform circles".

During its five years of affiliation with Washington University the School of Social Economy was supported approximately 50/50 by University funds and Russell Sage Foundation funds. In 1913 the Sage Foundation advised the University that it was cutting back the School's grant for the 1913-1914 academic year and the 1914-15 year would be the last year of funding. Thus, the University was put in a position of having to cover all of the cost of the School if the School was to continue. In order to have data upon which to make a decision, Chancellor Hall requested that a study be made of the School by Professor W. F. Gephart, a business economist who had been hired to organize Washington University's School of Business and Public Administration. Gephart's report, while not totally uncomplimentary, reflected the concern of the University that the School of Social Economy sometimes presented a public relations problem. Regarding research, which Gephart felt should be a primary function of the School, he said:

... there are a great number of very delicate subjects for investigation. . . . (therefore) careful supervision of the methods of investigating the subject should be exercised . . . . There are many questions for investigation by the research students of such a school, and the selection of the particular question should be decided on the basis of its importance . . . . (and) the position which the school and its sponsor -- the University -- occupies in the community, as well as the prevalent social ideas of the people. The simple ability to discover and make public unpleasant and regretful facts of the social organism is not difficult and it is certainly not constructive social work.

During the Fall of 1914 the Board of Directors of Washington University requested that Chancellor Hall make a study of the affairs of the School of Social Economy. Hall did so and reported to the Board on February 5, 1915, that he "... had not been able to find any substantial evidence of interest in the School on the part of citizens of St. Louis." Accordingly, Hall recommended that the School be dropped from Washington University at the end of the 1915 academic year and the Board accepted his recommendation.

The School of Social Economy limped along for one year as an autonomous unit. Exactly how it was supported is unknown, as most records for this period are lost. It received some assistance from Washington University (the use of the library and one course taught by a W. U. faculty member) but apparently received no help from local agencies.
During this independent year Mangold and the Board of the School made overtures to return to affiliation with the University of Missouri. The budget of the University had loosened since 1908 and the Board of Curators voted to again receive the School into affiliation with the University of Missouri. In recognition of its new status, the name was changed to the Missouri School of Social Economy. The School remained under the University of Missouri from 1916 until it closed for good in 1924.

The School of Social Economy made some effort to follow the general trend in social work education toward individual treatment technique following the 1915 Flexner paper by adding practice courses, such as Methods of Family Treatment, and Practical Problems of Case Work, which previously had been almost non-existent. However, its emphasis remained on macro, social reform issues. The majority of the courses continued to deal with subjects such as Problems of Poverty, Labor Problems, Race Problems, and the like. The treatment and practice courses were generally taught by the minor, part-time members of the faculty while Mangold and the full-time faculty members taught the macro, reform oriented courses.

During the early years of the 1920's the School of Social Economy was growing and prospering. It appeared as though the School and the University of Missouri were to enjoy a long and productive relationship. However, with no apparent warning the Missouri legislature in 1923 dealt the School a blow from which it was unable to recover. On March 6, 1923 Acting President Jones wrote to Mangold saying

I learned last night . . . that the House Appropriations Committee was insisting upon putting into the Appropriations Bill a provision that no part of the Extension Division appropriation was to be used for the support of the Missouri School of Social Economy. For some reason this committee feels that it is not a proper use of University funds . . . I cannot imagine what influences brought about this situation.

The "influences" appear to have initially had nothing to do with the School of Social Economy per se. A rural faction in the legislature was fiercely attacking the budget of the University of Missouri and, it appears, the appropriations committee was seeking to cut items in the budget that might be difficult to defend. When the item for the School of Social Economy was brought up no one on the committee had even heard of the School and thus the budget item was eliminated. The University had been under pressure to begin a rural social work program for several years. When the School was cut out of the budget, members of the sociology department quickly moved to have their budget increased to enlarge their offerings in rural social work, undercutting any chance of the School of Social Economy item being placed back in the budget.
The Board of the St. Louis Provident Association was very concerned over the prospect that St. Louis would have no facilities for social work education. In 1923 the Association's Executive Committee voted that because of the "intimate connection" between the Provident Association and the Missouri School of Social Economy, a discussion of the fate of the School would be pertinent. The outcome of this discussion was a resolution that the newly founded St. Louis Community Council should be asked to make a study of the needs of St. Louis and its hinterlands for the training of social workers, the facilities existing to fill the needs, and to formulate recommendations for the development of the necessary equipment and training.

The actual report of the Community Council was not preserved, but documents containing references to it were, and from these it is apparent that the report did not regard the School of Social Economy favorably. In one letter the report's author, Ellwood Street, is quoted as saying that opinion of the School was so low that "the large social agencies here will not employ graduates of the school". On the other hand, Street was quoted as saying that "they'd have the sort of school they need here somehow".

Following the unfavorable Community Council report, support for the School of Social Economy ceased. The advisory committee of the School had been negotiating with Chancellor Hadley of Washington University hoping that W. U. would resume responsibility for the School. The Board's two main representatives were Forrest C. Donnell, a St. Louis lawyer, and Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, a prominent St. Louis clergyman. On May 7, 1924 Donnell wrote to Acting President Brooks of the University of Missouri advising him that they had been "informed by Chancellor Hadley that in his judgment it is not worth while for us to attempt further to secure from Washington University the taking over of the Missouri School of Social Economy". Lacking support the School closed its doors at the end of Spring semester, 1924.

After the decision had been made not to support the School of Social Economy, a special committee was convened by the Community Council to consider plans for social work education in St. Louis. Beginning Fall semester, 1924, social work courses were taught at Washington University by local social workers on a voluntary basis, while the committee made plans for the implementation of a formal program. On December 30, 1924 the committee Chairman, J. Lionberger Davis, wrote to Chancellor Hadley and stated the committee's final recommendations as follows.

As a result of the year's investigation and because it is the opinion of all who are familiar with the whole situation, the committee suggested that Washington University establish a Chair of Applied Sociology and call a man of outstanding ability to fill it. Such a man of high academic standing combined with wide practical ex-
perience has been difficult to find, but through your cordial and sympathetic cooperation, it has been possible to obtain the consent of Professor Frank Bruno of the University of Minnesota.24

The letter went on to state that the committee would guarantee Professor Bruno's salary of $7,000 per year for a period of three years. The new social work program under Bruno was given no more financial support from Washington University than the previous program under Mangold. The Chancellor, in appointing Bruno, stated that "... after the expiration of the period of three years for which the guarantee is given, I cannot make any definite conditions or commitments...".25 That the new program, now The George Warren Brown School of Social Work, survived and grew is because it mustered community support, something the Missouri School of Social Economy had been unable to do. The interesting question is, why was the new program able to generate support while the old program had not been able to generate any? The School of Social Economy apparently lost support from the practice and academic communities for reasons that derived from the same basis factor - the School was too liberal for "the prevalent social ideas of the people" to use Professor Gephart's phrase. Washington University did not wish to be affiliated with the School because the University was conservative and derived its financial support from a conservative constituency. The practice community became disenchanted with the School when, in pursuit of professionalism, social workers began to court community support via defining themselves as agents of individual rather than social change and the School did not follow suit.26 The School lost support from the University of Missouri because it was an urban program, serving an urban constituency, while the University and legislature were more concerned with rural affairs. The program that replaced the School of Social Economy was an urban program supported by an urban university, and was far more conservative. It was also heavily practice oriented. During its last year in operation (1923-24) the curriculum of the School of Social Economy was comprised of less than 20% practice technique courses and more than 80% social problem and reform courses. Two years later the curriculum of the Washington University Training Course for Social Workers was exactly the opposite - over 80% practice technique courses and less than 20% reform courses. Frank Bruno neatly stated the views of the practice community when, in 1928, he wrote

The name of the first St. Louis project in training for social work -- the Missouri School of Social Economy -- indicates the trend of thinking in social work less than a generation ago. It was largely conceived as an effort in the field of economics, ... the problem of wealth and poverty, the making and the distribution of wealth were the
objects of concern and determined the training of the social worker. While the social worker still is equipped with such discipline as economics affords, it has ceased to play a primary function in his training or technique.

Bruno felt that the modern training program should be concerned with

... processes ... with all technical methods from the activities of boards of directors to the means used by a probation officer to rectify the conduct of a delinquent child.27

Replacing the economics and reform oriented program with one dominated by the apotheosis of technique was probably what the author of the Community Council report meant when he stated "that they'd have the sort of school they need here, somehow".

Conclusion

Referring to the historic relation between the social work profession (professional associations and schools) and the social welfare institution (agencies) Richan has said

One might anticipate inherent strains between a professional community seeking desperately to achieve social acceptance in its own right and a complex of bureaucratic institutions ... But the early history of the relationship between social work and social welfare is notably free of serious conflict.28

The case of the Missouri School of Social Economy indicates that perhaps the history of this relationship is not nearly so free of conflict as Richan assumes. It appears that there was conflict but that the distribution of power was so unequal that early schools of social work had little choice but to follow the lead of either the academic or the professional communities if they were to survive. Further research into early schools that failed, such as the Dallas Institute for Social Education and the Houston School of Philanthropy would be very interesting. Further research into early schools that succeeded to see what compromises they made with the academic and professional communities would also be profitable.

Curriculums of schools of social work have changed a great deal since the era of the Missouri School of Social Economy. The greatest changes have occurred during the last fifteen years in response to factors such as the social activism of the sixties, the growth of public welfare agencies, and the pressure for bachelor and doctoral level programs. The
curriculums have broadened away from the traditional casework focus to include macro methods as well as social problem/social action content. It is ironic that the programs of many current schools of social work are remarkably similar to the one that led the Missouri School to its demise, containing as many courses on macro methods and social action as on micro methods and psychopathology.

Although there have been significant shifts in power, schools of social work are still subject to the same pressures as the Missouri School of Social Economy was. Community practitioners still exert pressure for the curriculum to be more practice oriented. The clinical social work movement is a dramatic example of this type of pressure. The universities with which schools of social work are affiliated still exert pressure for the curriculum to be more academically oriented. The development of BSW programs located in schools of arts and sciences, the establishment of Ph.D. (as opposed to D.S.W.) programs, and the development of joint masters degree programs have all increased the university's influence over the school of social work, to the extent that the academic community is probably the most powerful single influence over social work education. However, the fact that both CSWE and NASW have recently been pushing for more practice community involvement in schools of social work indicates that this situation may be changing.

Community agencies with some control over school finances continue to exert a significant influence. Private, individual treatment agencies such as the Provident Association (which is now a Family and Children's Services agency) no longer contribute a significant amount of money to social work education. The agencies that now have financial clout are the state welfare departments with their control of Title XX funds. The amount of influence of state welfare departments was clearly illustrated by a recent conversation the author had with a senior faculty member of a large state school of social work. The author commented on how much relations between the school and the welfare department had improved. The faculty member responded

Yes, after the protest movements of the late sixties when our students organized sit-ins at the welfare department, the department and the school were barely speaking. Then one day the Deputy Commissioner came over and presented a plan that essentially amounted to the departments coopting the school.

After a thoughtful pause, he continued

We needed their money so we went along with the plan.

While this faculty member was obviously speaking in a tongue-in-cheek manner, his point was clear. Although schools of social work are
now firmly rooted in their academic environments, they must still be responsive to the practice community if they wish to avoid the fate of the Missouri School of Social Economy.
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