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Background and Purpose of the Project

This consultancy project has been funded and supported by Family Care First (FCF) | REACT. FCF | REACT, led by the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY), is a network of organizations, financially supported by the European Union, USAID, the GHR Foundation, Save the Children Hong Kong and UNICEF. The network has 60 member organizations, including UN agencies, academic institutions and local and international NGOs, who are working to prevent children from being separated from their families and increase the number of children that are safely and successfully integrated into family care. This is achieved by strengthening systems and policies and working directly to provide services to children and families.

The purpose of this research project is to learn the current landscape of supervision practices within the FCF | REACT network organizations in context of their capacity, supervisory needs, achievements and challenges. In addition, consistent with the aim of mainstreaming supervision throughout the network and further in the social service sector in Cambodia, the research explores practitioners and key informants’ views on the recommended steps toward national standards for supervision and how they may be enforced.¹

FCF funded the Clinical Action Research Project in 2018, involving 17 participants who received training on strategies for managing job-related stress and emotions. From 2018, FCF | REACT launched a series of 3-day supervision training, reaching over 150 participants as of mid-March, 2020. The content of the training covers the effects of primary and secondary trauma, and strategies for managing emotions, transference, and projection among other psychodynamics. In addition, several documents have been developed by the FCF | REACT technical team, such as a sample of supervision policy, supervision record template, and sample of supervision agreement. So far, 8 FCF | REACT partner organizations have adapted a supervision policy.

To place this research in the larger national context, Cambodia is at a critical juncture in developing its social service workforce. In the past decade there have been strong indicators that leadership for social services is transitioning from being mainly embedded in civil society and traditional community structures to centralized government institutions under the leadership of the Ministry of Social Affairs, Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY). From various policies (including the recently launched Guidelines on Basic

¹ It should be noted that the original title of “Consultancy on FCF | REACT Clinical Supervision for Staff of Partner Organizations” was modified when agreement was reached between Save the Children and the consultant to cover the broader spectrum of supervision. This was partly in recognition that supervision has many functions that are often co-present and overlap, and that balancing the various functions of supervision is an important goal.
Competencies for Social Workforce), the establishment of the National Institute on Social Affairs (NISA) to train social service workers, and other initiatives to strengthen the workforce, the momentum is building. Another indicator is its recent announcement that MoSVY will accelerate its efforts to recruit professionals with degrees in social workers to work within MoSVY, and work toward a system of certification and licensure for the social service workforce.
Executive Summary and Recommendations

I. BACKGROUND
For the past two years the FCF | REACT network, facilitated by Save the Children, has been promoting supervision as an essential best practice method in the social services sector, particularly with agencies engaging in case management services. Following the 2018 Action Research on Clinical Supervision, it began a program of supervision training within their network, having trained over 150 supervisors as of the writing of this report. The purpose of this research project was to learn the current landscape of supervision practices within the FCF | REACT network organizations in context of their capacity, supervisory needs, achievements and challenges. In addition, consistent with the aim of mainstreaming supervision throughout Cambodia, the research explores practitioners’ and key informants’ views on the recommended steps toward mainstreaming supervision within their network and promoting national standards.

Following an extensive literature review, the project was designed in collaboration between the lead consultant and Save the Children. The project used a mixed method, to derive qualitative as well as quantitative information. Three main research approaches were used: individual written surveys, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews. A total of 59 practitioners (30 supervisors and 29 supervisees) from Phnom Penh, Kandal, Siem Reap, Battambang, and Sihanoukville participated in the research project, with data collection taking place between January 21 and February 6, 2020. Eleven key informants with national reputations and social service expertise were also interviewed. Quantitative data were analyzed by STATA software, and qualitative data were analyzed by thematic coding and analysis. The findings between the three different data groups (surveys, focus groups, and key informant interviews) have been synthesized in the body of the report by thematic threads for ease of flow and to minimize redundancy.

II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS
The Research Questions this project sought to answer were:

1. What are the characteristics of the supervisors and supervisees within the FCF | REACT network that are relevant to supervision?
2. How is supervision being utilized among FCF | REACT partner organizations?
3. What are the supervision strengths and needs of FCF | REACT partner organizations’ frontline staff?
4. What are the strengths and needs of current FCF | REACT partner organizations’ supervisors?

5. What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among the FCF | REACT partner organizations?

6. What are some essential steps to be taken before Cambodia can achieve a national standard in supervision for all social service staff?

7. How will national standards for supervision be enforced, assuming it can be achieved?

III. KEY FINDINGS

Based on the data collected from all three methods, findings are reported in detail in the body of this report. Here, the major findings can be summarized as follows:

- Social service supervision is in its infancy in Cambodia and within the FCF | REACT network, and its definitions, purposes, functions, benefits and limitations are just beginning to be understood.

- There is a strong sentiment that frontline workers in the social sector are dedicated, committed to their clients, and work with difficult cases under intense time and resource constraints, often leading to stress and secondary trauma. This highlights the need for effective supervision.

- Within the FCF | REACT network, there was a unanimous agreement that supervision is a positive practice and should be mainstreamed throughout their network and the nation.

- Most FCF | REACT agencies are engaged in some form of supervision, but the frequency, regularity, session lengths, and functions of supervision varied.

- The initial response to the FCF | REACT supervision training has been very positive, with the majority of supervisors and supervisees agreeing that it has helped them understand and implement supervision. This response is fostering a positive attitude toward mainstreaming supervision throughout the FCF | REACT network and with all social service workforce in Cambodia.

- Despite this positive attitude, there seems to be a wide range of supervision capacity, expertise, and styles among FCF | REACT supervisors. Given Cambodia’s extensive array of social problems and the shortage of trained social service workforce, there is a fundamental challenge of qualified personnel within the network.
The shortage of professional social service workers has a large impact in Cambodia and in the FCF | REACT network, since only 27.6% of the supervisors and 39.2% of the supervisees were trained in social sciences (social work or psychology). Notably, 43.3% of the supervisors were trained in business or management, and this explains why so many supervisors and supervisees asked for more technical training. When supervisors with relatively limited social work expertise are trying to supervise frontline workers who are similarly lacking training in social services (two-thirds of whom lack formal social service training), a wide range of problems can be anticipated. For one, there is seemingly an expectation that supervision should be filling the wide technical gap, and this is generally unrealistic given the current workforce configurations.2

Findings suggest that even some of those who have been trained should be followed up with additional training, observation, feedback, and practice. This may be a reflection of the educational and training background of many of the supervisors and supervisees. Those who do not have the knowledge and skills related to social service are likely less able to absorb and internalize the training in 3 short days.

Another major challenge is that either there is no supervision policy at agencies, or they are not followed faithfully due to high caseloads and/or prioritization of administrative demands. Supervision is generally not viewed as a quality assurance mechanism or a mandatory requirement of an agency’s responsibilities.

Supervisors and supervisees have different ideas of supervision, and there is indication that joint or separate training for supervisees would be helpful to facilitate the same understanding of the purposes, roles, and procedures of supervision.

There is wide agreement that the FCF | REACT network should mainstream supervision and then serve as part of the leadership in mainstreaming supervision at the national level. There is no doubt that within the network there are some of the best trained and capable supervisors, and this is a vision worth holding onto and carrying out in the future.

National level experts in government, civil society and academia agreed that the supervision initiative begun by FCF | REACT has been a significant catalyst for the mainstreaming of supervision within the social service sector in Cambodia.

---

2 Narrowing technical gaps through supervision is realistic only when both the supervisor and supervisee are trained in social service disciplines with basic competencies in the values, knowledge and skills attendant to those professions and supervisors have greater competencies than supervisees in their agency’s specific field or work. For example, social workers could never supervise accountants, but the reverse is happening in many of the FCF | REACT agencies.
including government and civil society agencies. However, it is only the tip of the iceberg with a long road ahead.

- There was extensive concern expressed by national experts about the lack of job descriptions and a system of supervision among the government social service sector. However, some plans are apparently afoot to collaborate with the FCF | REACT network to train the workforce.

- Once the social service supervision system is developed (with policy, structures, budgetary resources, monitoring tools, etc.), there will be a need for extensive training and long term strategy for filling civil servant posts with social work trained professionals for frontline work and for provision of supervision.

- Many experts linked supervision to transparency and accountability practices at the case and organizational levels. For example, it was recommended that supervision should be a required element of funding expectations and reports. Systems such as OSCaR and Primero are being used or under consideration to more efficiently track and facilitate supervision at the case level and to increase monitoring and evaluation.

- National supervision standards were discussed in focus groups and with key informants. While there was overwhelming agreement that such standards would be helpful, there was a sense that much study and consultations are necessary in drafting the standards, and they would need to undergo pilots and multiple revisions. In the absence of a critical mass of quality supervisors it may be prudent to first ensure that social work training is accelerated to produce trained social workers. In the meantime, a group of experts could begin to raise awareness and invite input from other stakeholders (such as the national association of professional social workers), keeping in mind it will be a multi-year effort.

- There was a strong agreement at both the FCF | REACT network level and at the national level, that supervision should be taught as part of the social work curriculum at universities, and that the process of mainstreaming should be led by government with the help of FCF | REACT leaders.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these findings and consideration of best practice models where they exist, the following are recommendations for the FCF | REACT network, and for the macro level of social service sector to consider regarding the promotion of social service supervision in Cambodia.
Recommendations for the FCF | REACT Network

- FCF | REACT organizations should complete their supervision policies and implement them as soon as possible. This policy should clearly spell out the definitions, roles, frequency, and procedures of supervision. The policy manual should also contain the forms and tools used in supervision, and there should be training at the agency level.

- Of critical importance is the regularity of supervision that line workers can rely on. Keeping supervision appointments should be a top priority, and not interfered with, except in cases of true emergency. Agencies should seek input from their line workers on their preferences on the various formats of supervision – one on one, group, peer, distance, etc. and evaluate the various methods on a trial basis before incorporating them.

- The FCF | REACT member organizations should review, and revise if necessary, their recruitment and promotion policies to gradually fill their positions with social service trained professionals to ensure basic competencies for supervisors and frontline workers.

- In the meantime, a two-tier system of supervisor training is recommended.
  - Those with social service training and experience could receive an initial 3-day supervision training with refresher courses each year.
  - Those from other disciplines should receive a 5-day training to include some basic theories on human motivation, problem solving skills, basic communication skills, case management principles and steps, basic dynamics of secondary trauma, self-care practices and effective responses to job-related stress. Another day could be spent on hands-on practice of the supervision skills, conducting supportive supervision, and identifying and making referrals for cases requiring technical expertise beyond their own, etc.
  - Supervisees should also receive at least a one-day training (one day of the 3 or 5 days could be for joint training, but since supervisor training is almost completed perhaps they can have their own).

- Keeping in mind adult learning methods, all training should include not only lectures, audio-visual presentations and discussions, but also live or video demonstration of supervision with a difficult case. Further, training should also

---

3 See detailed explanation of the learning pyramid here: [https://acrlog.org/2014/01/13/tales-of-the-undead-learning-theories-the-learning-pyramid/comment-page-1/](https://acrlog.org/2014/01/13/tales-of-the-undead-learning-theories-the-learning-pyramid/comment-page-1/)
include role plays and reverse role plays\(^4\) based on hypothetical dilemmas and problems that resemble the supervision realities. The forms, tools, and procedures should all be followed during training. In subsequent training those trained earlier should have opportunities to help train others.

- Even with the extended training for non-social service trained supervisors, network organizations should consider pairing a non-social work supervisor with an external supervisor who has technical expertise related to their agency’s work.

- There should be follow-up mentoring and coaching available to less experienced supervisors on an ‘as needed’ basis. Perhaps this could be a role for some of the most senior social workers in the network. It may also be possible to conduct follow-up training and set up a web-based library of materials including links to resources outside of FCF | REACT.

- It is recommended that organizations take a rights-based approach to supervision for their staff. Agency and employees should enter into a contract that specifies the employee’s right to supervision and spell out the terms of that right. This should also be a part of the agency’s supervision policy. A minimum guideline is to offer a one-hour supervision session every other week (or weekly if possible) by a specific supervisor. The roles of the supervisor and supervisee should be clearly spelled out and adhered to.

- It is recommended that donors include supervision as a requirement in all Requests for Proposals (RFPs), contract extensions, and review documents.

- Network organizations are encouraged to document their supervision efforts and conduct periodic evaluations when possible. This evaluation could be simple, perhaps a list of items that staff members can mark their degree of satisfaction on a Likert scale,\(^5\) followed by request for suggestions. These could then be discussed as a routine part of their organization’s internal review process and input should be incorporated as appropriate.

- Finally, the FCF | REACT network should assist in raising awareness about supervision, collaborate with MoSVY and academia in the process of mainstreaming social service supervision in Cambodia. One way to do this is to provide excellent supervision to social work interns and to model correct supervision methods that will become a template for them as they move on with

---

\(^4\) This means that a person would play one role (e.g. supervisor) first, then they would play the other role.

\(^5\) This is the most widely used psychometric scale that measures how people feel about the item they are responding to. It often provides a continuum from most favorable to least favorable. See Nemoto, T. & Beglar, D. (2014). Developing Likert-scale questionnaires. In N. Sonda & A. Krause (Eds). JALT2013 Conference Proceedings. Tokyo: TALT. Available online at https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jalt2013_001.pdf
their careers. At a macro level, the network should advocate for a rapid expansion of social service training at universities and training institutions to raise the basic competencies of the social service workforce and enlarge the pool of effective supervisors.

Recommendations at Macro Level

1. The government should take a strong lead in providing supervision training to its social service workforce, through NISA and other in collaboration with other training programmes. This should also be in collaboration with civil society, to ensure that supervision practices follow minimum standards across sectors.

2. As part of strengthening the social service sector, government should rapidly expand the pool of social work trained professionals through scholarships and partnerships with the universities.

3. All social service sector, including government, should make their best efforts to hire those formally trained in social work (and related fields when appropriate). For the government there should be detailed job descriptions, a system of classification for social service workers, and a structure of advancements for the social service workforce.

4. Academia should review their training content on supervision and incorporate it as a significant portion of a practice course, if not as a stand-alone course. In placing students for field internships, there should be a clear set of expectations for supervision.

5. Supervision should be included in the social work Code of Ethics as a professional standard. The association of professional social workers should collaborate on discussing supervision standards and review.

6. A process of collaboration between government, civil society, private sector and communities should be facilitated to develop national supervision standards.
I. BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO SOCIAL SERVICE SUPERVISION

Abundant research evidence around the world suggests that supervision is an essential tool for quality assurance and the wellbeing of supervisees.\(^6\) Not surprisingly, supervision has emerged in the past few decades globally as a critical component of professional development and enhancement of social service delivery (Bogo & McKnight, 2008;\(^7\) Carpenter, et al., 2015\(^8\)). Among the many available definitions of supervision, one that is used here is:

… a forum for reflection and learning. … an interactive dialogue between at least two people, one of whom is a supervisor. This dialogue shapes a process of review, reflection, critique and replenishment for professional practitioners. Supervision is a professional activity in which practitioners are engaged throughout the duration of their careers regardless of experience or qualification. The participants are accountable to professional standards and defined competencies and to organisational policy and procedures (Davys and Beddoe, 2010, p. 21).\(^9\)

Research has quite consistently shown the multiple benefits of supervision. For the individual practitioner, job-related stresses such as vicarious trauma and burnout can be reduced through effective supervision, and both job performance and longevity on the job are enhanced by good supervision. Furthermore, quality supervision can enhance the agency's overall performance and accountability, ultimately resulting in improved services to the clients (Carpenter, et al., 2015).\(^10\) Stated differently:

The overall aim of professional supervision should be to provide the best possible support to service users in accordance with the organisation’s responsibilities and accountable professional standards. Organisations are likely to achieve this aim through workers who are skillful, knowledgeable, clear about their roles and [are] assisted in their practice by sound advice and emotional support from a supervisor with whom they have a good professional relationship (Carpenter, et al., 2015, p. 3).

---


The Main Functions of Social Service Supervision

How does supervision deliver benefits at so many levels? It is through the multiple functions that supervision can fulfill. Although various models of social work supervision have been proposed (Holloway, 1995; Milne, 2008), the classic model conceptualized by Kadushin (2002) still serves as the widely accepted framework for supervision for most countries. According to that model, supervision serves three main functions: 1) administrative, 2) educational, and 3) supportive. To this classic model, a fourth function, that of 4) mediation, has been added by some authors (Kolb, 1984; Wonnacott, 2013). In this project, we have chosen to use all four functions as the basis for our exploration.

1) The first, the **administrative function**, is largely related to quality control over the supervisee’s performance and to maintain accountability to the agency, the public, and to funding sources. Milne (2007) calls this the ‘normative’ function, and others have called it the ‘line’ or ‘management’ supervision. Attention is focused on the standards of practice within the organization including client outcomes, and within the profession. Administrative issues such as managing caseload and compliance with documentation or budgetary issues may be reviewed. Although research shows that supervisees are not eager to participate in this aspect of supervision, this is often a necessary component. Beyond the realm of the agency, compliance with larger mandates such as the law or professional ethics could also be discussed (AASW, 2014).

2) The second, the **educational function** of supervision, is related to the provision of knowledge and skills that the supervisee needs in order to fulfill their roles competently. Milne calls this the ‘formative’ or ‘development’ function referring to the process of maintaining and facilitating the supervisee’s competence, capability and general effectiveness (p. 439). Attention is focused on exploring knowledge, theories, values and skills that can be applied to enhance the quality and outcomes.

---

14 For example, see the National Association of Social Workers (2013, USA). *Best practice standards in social work supervision*. Online at [https://www.socialworkers.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=GBrlbl4Buwl%3D&portalid=0](https://www.socialworkers.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=GBrlbl4Buwl%3D&portalid=0).
17 This is partly because the FCF | REACT training curriculum uses the four-function (aka 4x4x4) model. See Figure 1.
of the supervisee’s practice. The application of the new knowledge, skills, or values is monitored over time for sustainable changes in the supervisee’s capacity in service delivery.

3) Third, the **supportive function** of supervision deals with assisting the supervisee with job-related and personal stresses negatively impacting job performance and overall wellbeing. Milne calls this the ‘restorative’ function of supervision, and many authors have labeled this particular component of supervision as ‘clinical’ supervision. The NASW (USA) (2013)\(^\text{20}\) points out that the supervisory relationship is built on trust, confidentiality, support, and empathic experiences in a context of safety and respect. ‘Support’ can also mean constructive feedback, and guidance for corrective actions and self-care that is done in a nurturing, supportive way (NASW, 2013).\(^\text{21}\)

4) Finally, the **mediative function** refers to the role supervisors serve as a bridge between the supervisee, other staff members, and the larger organization. The supervisor in this setting communicates and elicits the supervisee’s compliance with organizational procedures and outcome goals, while conveying information upwards to the organization (Carpenter, et al., 2012). Some have expanded this role to one of **advocacy** in supervision, where the supervisor advocates for larger organizational change to improve the culture, policies and procedures of the agency to promote professional growth of the workers. The two functions – mediation and advocacy – are closely related, and is often simply referred to as **mediation**, as will be the case in this project (see Figure 1 below).


**Figure 1:** The 4 x 4 x 4 Model of Supervision.

In Figure 1, the 4 x 4 x 4 model is shown. On the outside are the four functions of supervision, while the middle ring shows the main supervisory tasks involved in a supervisory session. The inner square lists those that are impacted by the functions and tasks of supervision.
II. PROJECT METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework for Examining the Dimensions of Supervision

In conducting research on the current state of supervision among the FCF | REACT partners in Cambodia, the research team followed the four-function model shown in Figure 1, plus an analytic framework developed by Holloway (1995) (see Figure 2). While the model shown in Figure 1 informed the exploration of the four functions of supervision, the concepts in Figure 2 helped to define all aspects of individual and organizational contexts in which supervision occurs. In her seminal work on clinical supervision, Holloway proposed a systems approach to supervision with seven dimensions. These seven dimensions explore the relevant factors related to: 1) the supervision relationship (core factor), 2) the institutional context, 3) the supervisor, 4) the functions of supervision, 5) the tasks of supervision, 6) the supervisee, and 7) the client. Each of these seven dimensions can be broken down into further details, yielding a comprehensive overview of supervision in the organization and suggesting areas of improvement. These seven dimensions guided the parameters for the development of the research methodologies and instruments.

Figure 2: The seven dimensions of supervision in an organization

Source: Adapted from Holloway, 1995.
Research Questions

1. What are the characteristics of the supervisors and supervisees within the FCF | REACT network that are relevant to supervision?

2. How is supervision being utilized among FCF | REACT partner organizations?

3. What are the supervision strengths and needs of FCF | REACT partner organizations’ frontline staff?

4. What are the strengths and needs of current FCF | REACT partner organizations’ supervisors?

5. What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among the FCF | REACT partner organizations?

6. What are some essential steps to be taken before Cambodia can achieve a national standard in supervision for all social service staff?

7. How will national standards for supervision be enforced, assuming it can be achieved?

Research Methodology and Sampling

Data on research questions 1-4 above were collected by administration of individual surveys at provincial gatherings. For the survey sample, two supervisors and two frontline supervisees from each FCF | REACT partner organization were invited to participate. In selecting the participants, agencies were requested to consider the balance of gender and previous participation in the Action Research Project conducted in 2018 as well as the FCF | REACT training on Social Work Supervision among the FCF | REACT network organizations. The final sample consisted of 30 supervisors and 29 supervisees as shown in Table 1 below. The supervisors and supervisees filled out different surveys for each group, with some overlapping items in their surveys. Individual consents were obtained orally ahead of survey administration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Years in current position</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT SERVICE AREA</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phnom Penh</td>
<td>Kandal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>12 M 18 F</td>
<td>39.1 (26-75)</td>
<td>5.5 (0-27)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisees</td>
<td>12 M 15 F 2 not indicated</td>
<td>33.8 (24-61)</td>
<td>2.6 (1-10)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research questions 4-7 were explored in focus groups and through key informant interviews. The focus groups consisted of 1-11 group members inclusive of all who attended the data gathering event, in separate groups of supervisors and supervisees. Table 1 shows the sample for the focus groups in the various locations.

Key informant interviews were held individually with 11 professionals who are recognized leaders in social services, from government, NGOs, INGOs, and academia. From a list of 21 such individuals identified by Save the Children staff, the consulting team chose the interviewees based on their reputation and availability, keeping in mind the need for multi-sectoral perspectives, and interviewed them in person or via Skype. Data saturation was reached at about seven interviews (meaning that some of the later interviewees corroborated information shared by the previous interviewees but did not offer any new information). Due to this saturation rate, there is reasonable confidence that the perspectives shared in this report encompass the general opinion of leading experts in the social service sector.

Strict procedural safeguards of consent and confidentiality were maintained for all participants including key informants. All identifying information remain only with the research team under a firm commitment to keep names of individuals and agencies from being revealed.

**Research Procedures**

1. First, a desk review was conducted to contextualize the project vis-à-vis the information already available on social service supervision at global, regional and national levels.
2. The study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods. The lead consultant drafted the instruments in consultation with two national consultants and experts at Save the Children. These included survey instrument for supervisees, survey instrument for supervisors, focus group discussion guide, and key information interview guide. These instruments were developed in English and translated by the local consultants into Khmer.

3. Data collection meetings on the surveys and for the focus groups were held in Phnom Pehn, Battambang, and Siem Reap. Participants from Kandal traveled to Phnom Pehn to participate in the data collection in person, separate from other colleagues working in Phnom Penh. Those in Sihanoukville participated by Skype. No participant saw the survey instruments or focus group discussion questions ahead of their participation, to ensure maximum individual response. Further, their participation was premised on their existing understanding of supervision, as one of the goals of the project was to determine their knowledge of supervision. There was no pre-requisite regarding participants’ knowledge about supervision.

4. Surveys and interview notes were collected by the lead consultant who was present for the meetings for the Phnom Penh and Kandal data collection and focus group sessions. For the other locations, national consultants traveled to, or conducted skype interviews and focus group discussions, collected the surveys immediately upon completion and sent them to the lead consultant via email. English and Khmer surveys were identical in number, so the multiple choice or yes/no questions did not need to be translated for data entry. However, the open ended questions in the surveys were translated by local consultants. Their focus group notes and key informant interviews were also translated into English and sent to the lead consultant for analysis.

5. Data entry and analysis for the surveys were conducted using the STATA system of statistical analysis. The analysis of the focus group discussions data were done according to the classic qualitative framework developed by Ritchie and Spencer (1994),\(^{22}\) in which the key stages of analysis involve familiarization, identifying a thematic framework, indexing, charting, mapping and interpretation. Social science research contextualization\(^ {23}\) and Cambodia-specific perspectives were also considered in the interpretation of the comments.\(^ {24}\)


6. Key informant interviews were recorded on paper and were analyzed using similar methods as the focus group discussions.

7. All survey, discussion, and interview notes have been protected from anyone outside of the research team.

Data Analysis for Mixed Methods

1. Data entry and analysis for the surveys were conducted using the STATA system of statistical analysis. The analysis of the focus group discussions data were done according to the classic qualitative framework developed by Ritchie and Spencer (1994), in which the key stages of analysis involve familiarization, identifying a thematic framework, indexing, charting, mapping and interpretation. Social science research contextualization and Cambodia-specific perspectives were also considered in the interpretation of the comments.

2. Key informant interviews were recorded on paper and were analyzed using similar methods as the focus group discussions.

3. All survey, discussion, and interview notes have been protected from anyone outside of the research team. Once the report is finally approved, only the lead consultant will electronically store the data in a password-protected file for a maximum of three years.

III. RESEARCH FINDINGS

In this section, the research findings are presented following a thematic framework, corresponding to the seven research questions identified at the beginning of this report (see p. 13). Each research question is explored through the findings resulting from one or more data collection methods (surveys, focus groups, and key informant interviews) and then the data are synthesized to yield a holistic response to each research question based on all data collected. Additionally, some relevant interpretations of the findings are inserted as appropriate to shed light on the Cambodian data in light of global literature.

RESEARCH QUESTION #1: What are the characteristics of supervisors and supervisees within the FCF | REACT network relevant to supervision?

In this section, we report the various characteristics and attributes that supervisors and supervisees bring to the practice of supervision within the FCF | REACT member organizations, such as educational preparation, work experience, effect of prior training, levels of job-related stress and self-care, and opinions and preferences regarding supervision.

Educational Background

Tables 2 and 3 show the participant’s highest educational degree and their field of study.

**Table 2: Highest Level of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some University</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Field of Study for Highest Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Subject</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / Management</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is notable that 13.3% of the supervisors and 18.5% of the supervisees have completed secondary education only. It is not surprising that those with master’s degrees are heavily represented in the supervisor group. It is also notable, perhaps even alarming, that only 39.2% of the frontline workers have degrees in psychology or social work while 43% of the supervisors have their highest degree in business or management. This may account for the significant level of concern expressed by both supervisors and supervisees in focus groups about content expertise at case work level (the specific content areas are discussed under Research Questions #3 and #4). Key informants also expressed concern that most of the social service workforce is filled with frontline workers and supervisors who do not have the proper training to provide effective interventions or supervision. This concern gives rise to the need to focus on targeted recruitment of social service trained staff and developing a pipeline of supervisors who have the education and experience requisite to the work. These concerns are also discussed later throughout this report.

Experience in Social Service Work

Along with education, experience is another factor related to supervision. Less experienced supervisees are likely to require more guidance both on the professional and personal fronts – although this is not always the case. On the other hand, more experienced supervisees may be less open to new concepts and methodologies or to younger supervisors with higher educational status, although this is also not always the case. Supervisors who have less social service experience are more likely to struggle to empathize with their supervisees and less able to provide the educational functions of supervision.

Table 4: Social Service Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Social Service Experience</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No supervisor reported having less than 3 years of experience. While 80% of supervisors had more than 6 years of experience, the inverse was true for supervisees. (For reference here, supervisors’ and supervisees’ mean years of service in their current positions were 5.5 and 2.6 respectively as shown in Table 1).

A notable finding in Table 4 is the 22.2% of supervisees who have more than 10 years of experience. While there are no global or regional guidelines on time on the frontlines before becoming a supervisor, over ten years of time a frontline worker is likely to become a supervisor depending on the agency’s internal parameters and culture for promotions. The other outlier figure is the 20% of supervisors who have only 3-6 years of experience. When closely examining those individuals, it can be seen that they generally have advanced degrees in social service fields, or they have stayed with the agency for an extended period of time.

Further on education and work experience, in focus groups it was clear that there is a tension between the younger generation with formal social work training and the older cadre that, for the most part, hold unrelated degrees and have learned ‘on the job’. As shared by some in focus groups, this ‘upside down’ generational pattern can make supervision awkward if a younger person or a friend is assigned as one’s supervisor. The supervisor may feel reluctant, even when they have the skills to use a supportive approach, to point out mistakes, initiate corrective actions, require goal setting, or offer expertise.

At the macro level, with the new Guidelines on Basic Competencies for the Social Workforce some participants with less or non-social service training expressed worry that only formal education will be recognized as the basis for certification or licensing. At the same time, this should spark discussion about those certification and training processes in light of the massive workforce without formal training. In addition, many of the key informants agreed that there needs to be a massive infusion of degreed social workers into the workforce, both for the hands-on work now and to mature into effective supervisors later. In the meantime, these dynamics suggest balancing within the agency in terms of recruitment and promotion, and retro-fitting some employees, as well as longer term strategies in hiring and training.

---

28 Nearly two-thirds of the supervisors are not social service workers as shown in the table, but they seem to have understood ‘social service experience’ to mean working in an agency providing social services. It is also possible that they have in fact been providing social services without the requisite formal training. It should also be noted that some supervisees reported their supervisor as having less than two years of experience. Since individual supervisee-supervisor pairs were not the unit of examination, it is not possible to identify which is the most accurate.
Effect of Prior Training on Supervision

One of the goals of the project was to determine if and what type of difference prior participation in training had on the participants. Table 5 shows the number of supervisors and supervisees who attended previous supervision training.

Table 5: Previous Supervision Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Project</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Research</td>
<td>2 (6.9%)</td>
<td>3 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCF</td>
<td>REACT</td>
<td>23 (76.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
<td>5 (22.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two supervisors and three supervisees reported attending the Action Research project, while 23 supervisors and eight supervisees reported having attended the FCF | REACT training on Social Work Supervision. In addition, four supervisors had attended the training offered by TPO. Among those attending more than one training workshop, the two supervisors who participated in the Action Research had also received the FCF | REACT training, and one supervisor had attended both FCF | REACT and TPO training. No supervisees attended multiple training. Finally, 11 supervisors and five supervisees reported participating in ‘other training’ that occurred mostly at the agency level. (Note: the ‘other’ category of training has not been included in the multiple training count above).

T-tests were used\textsuperscript{29} to look for differences between respondents who had attended any prior trainings and those who had not. On average, supervisors who did attend the FCF | REACT training rated themselves slightly lower than supervisors who did not attend the training on every aspect of supervisory relationship (mutual trust, mutual respect, mutual positive feelings, sense of collaboration, sense of autonomy, sense of emotional safety and security), and on their confidence engaging in most supervisory tasks. None of these differences were statistically significant, however. Part of the reason for the lack of statistical significance is likely attributable to the low number of respondents; it is difficult to make reliable comparisons when comparing such small groups of people, even using t-tests. Another possible interpretation for this pattern is that the training has served to increase awareness of the skill set necessary for good supervision, bringing participants to the realization that more training is needed. There is support for this theory in the

\textsuperscript{29} T-tests are a statistical analytic method to control for other variables and tease out the difference made by a particular variable, especially when the sample size is small.
knowledge literature, that greater knowledge can generate deeper self-assessment and greater awareness of one’s limitations.\textsuperscript{30} However, without further exploration this is simply an unconfirmed conjecture.

The same is true for the Ragamuffin Action Research training – although those results should be taken even less seriously, as there were only 2 supervisors in the sample who attended the training. The three supervisees who attended either FCF | REACT or Ragamuffin trainings also tended to give lower ratings across aspects of their supervisory relationships. Again, this may be due to increased awareness of what ideal supervision looks like. It is also a possible indication that while they have gained some knowledge on supervision, they need much more practice to feel comfortable in participating in supervision.

**Job-related Stress and Self-Care**

All participants answered questions about individual factors such as job-related stress, self-care, and social support system. Two thirds of supervisors rated their job-related stress level as “moderate.” 26.7% of supervisors rated their stress level “low” or “extremely low.” No supervisors rated it “high” or “extremely high.” In contrast, 30.8% of supervisees rated their job-related stress level as “high” or “extremely high,” 30.8% rated it “moderate,” and 38.5% rated it “low” or “extremely low.” The reason for the difference is difficult to detect based on the collected survey data, but focus group discussions suggest that it is likely related to the high caseloads and the lack of empathy shown by some supervisors. Some frontline workers expressed feeling that they are expected to be ‘machines’ to pump out client numbers and outcomes by supervisors who did not understand ‘what it’s like in the field’.

Responses about self-care did not differ by group: approximately two-thirds of both supervisors and supervisees rated their self-care as “adequate,” while one third rated it as “not adequate.” Individuals with master’s degrees were more likely to say that they practiced adequate self-care than individuals with less education. Almost all respondents rated their social support system as “very strong” or “moderately strong.”

**Supervision Opinions and Preferences**

When asked their general opinion of supervision, 93.3% of supervisors rated it as “very helpful,” while the remainder rated it as “somewhat helpful.” No supervisors marked “little bit helpful” or “worse than not having any.” Responses from supervisees were somewhat

less positive: 85.2% of supervisees rated supervision as “very helpful,” while the remainder rated it as “somewhat helpful” or “little bit helpful.” None marked “worse than not having any.” Again, this gap between supervisors and supervisees indicate the need for better harmonization of supervision in terms of its definition, goals, expectations, and limitations.

Regarding internal and external supervision, the majority of both groups stated that they would prefer a combination of internal and external supervision (76.7% of supervisors, and 55.6% of supervisees). 20% of supervisors and 37% of supervisees would like only all internal supervision, while only 3.3% (N=1) of supervisors and 7.4% (N=2) of supervisees would like all external supervision. The main reasons given for using external supervision was the lack of expertise or the lack of supportive supervision within the agency, as expressed both in response to the open ended question on the survey and in focus groups. Some supervisees felt that a second opinion on difficult cases would be helpful. The need for combined external/internal approach seems based on filling the expertise gap at the agency while still performing the administrative and mediative functions of supervision within the agency.

RESEARCH QUESTION #2: How is supervision being utilized among FCF | REACT partner organizations?

In order to learn about the current practice of supervision among the FCF | REACT partner organizations, the research team sought to understand the institutional context for supervision, current supervision practices, and the various aspects of the supervisory relationship.

Institutional Context

On the survey, identical questions were asked of both supervisors and supervisees regarding agency policy, agency-provided supervision resources, and uses of supervision within the agency. Results from both groups were analyzed together, with some differences highlighted in Table 6 below.

Agency Supervision Policy: 56% of respondents reported their agency has a written policy on supervision. An additional 21% said that work on a policy has been started, while 14% said the work has not been started and 9% did not know. Of respondents whose agencies did have a written supervision policy (N=32), 19% did not know when it was written. Among those who did know, 56% said the policy had been completed within the past year, 8% said 1-2 years ago, and 36% said it had been completed more than two years ago. It appears that some agencies have had supervision
policies in place for some time (2+ years), most others have newly developed or are in the process of developing policies. Examination of those policies was not within the scope of this study, but the study revealed that the FCF | REACT network has developed a template for the policy, that member agencies can adapt. Regarding periodic policy review, 31% of respondents whose agencies had written supervision policies did not know if those policies were regularly reviewed. 47% said the policies were reviewed at least once a year, 19% said they were reviewed, but not every year, and 3% (one respondent) said the policy was not reviewed.

In focus groups, most participants indicated that their agency’s supervision policy was not followed strictly due to time limitation, other priorities, and unavailability of supervisors or supervisees at the appointed time. Ad-hoc supervision, i.e., asking supervisor questions with an urgent case issue, seems to be very common; and the maintenance of regular supervision schedule seems challenging for a majority of the agencies in the study.

**Content of Supervision Policy:** Respondents who reported that their agencies had supervision policies were asked to identify what the policy addresses, by marking items from the following list. Items are presented from most commonly addressed to least commonly addressed.

- Confidentiality of information discussed during supervision: 94%
- How supervision should be documented: 87%
- Responsibilities of supervisors and supervisees for supervision: 87%
- Types of supervision provided: 80%
- Frequency and length of supervision: 77%
- Dealing with violation of agency policy or professional ethics: 70% 

**Other Agency Policies Related to Supervision:** As delineated in the literature review, job-related stress is high in the social service sector, and supervision is relied upon to address it at the individual level. However, institutional policies related to mental health leave, promotions, anti-discrimination, and clear lines of authority are also closely related to job-related stress and hence, supervision. In this study, 84% of respondents (N=50) said their agencies have a clear written policy on promotions and raises. 95% (N=56) said their agency has a written policy on non-discrimination of staff and clients. About half of respondents (N=28) did not know their agency’s policies about paid mental health leave, but one quarter of respondents (N=14) said their agency does not provide paid mental health leave. The remaining quarter of respondents were split evenly

---

Note: In the absence of an official Code of Ethics for social service workers in Cambodia, it is difficult to speak of supervision as a forum for maintenance of ethics; however, many NGOs have developed formal or informal ethical guidelines they adhere to. Cambodia has developed a draft Code of Ethics that is slated to be field tested, but the exact schedule is unknown at this time (March, 2020).
between “1 day per month” (N=7) and “More than one day per month” (N=7). Every respondent (both supervisors and supervisees) said they know the line of authority in their agency and that their agency has a clear written job description for them. In the focus groups most of the supervisors said that providing supervision was a part of their job description, but many said that the details were vague as to time frame, goals, procedures, or methods of reporting supervision.

**Time and Resource Support for Supervision:** A large majority of respondents reported that their agencies provide necessary support for supervision. 88% of respondents said their agency provides time and resources to supervisors to help provide quality supervision. 84.2% of respondents said their agency provides private space for supervision. 96.5% of respondents said their agency has computers and other equipment for training purposes. On each of these three indicators, no significant difference was detected between supervisors’ and supervisees’ responses.

**Supervision Formats:** Respondents were presented with five common supervision formats and asked which types their agency provided. Responses were as follows:

- One-on-one, face to face: 97%
- Group (multiple workers with one supervisor): 46%
- Peer (coworkers without supervisor): 28%
- Distance (via skype or phone): 28%*
- External (by supervisor from different agency): 12%

*Supervisors’ and supervisees’ responses differed significantly only on distance supervision. 43% of supervisors reported that their agency provides distance supervision, while only 11% of supervisees reported the same. The difference may be related to the different perceptions of supervision between the two groups. Focus group discussions suggested that supervisees do not consider directives given to their supervisors on the phone as ‘supervision’, only as ‘orders’. In reality, such directives are in fact part of the administrative function of supervision but supervisees may understand only face-to-face supervision as ‘counting’ for supervision.

**Priority Content for Supervision at Agency:** Next, respondents were given 8 potential uses of supervision and asked to rate how highly each use was prioritized within their agency on a scale from 1 to 3 (1= high priority, 2= medium priority, 3= low priority). As shown in Table 6, supervisors’ and supervisees’ responses were quite similar except in two functions: on ‘dealing with numbers of clients served’, and ‘compliance with budget limits’. For ”number of clients served,” supervisees ranked it as 1.89, while supervisors ranked it at 1.5. In other words, supervisees felt that less priority was given to number of clients served than did the supervisors. For "compliance with budget limits,” supervisees

---

32 In the focus groups it was almost universally mentioned that a formal ‘mental health leave’ is not designated, but it would be allowed under their ‘sick leave’ policy.
ranked it at 2.05, while supervisors ranked it at 2.4. Here, the supervisors downplayed the importance given to budgetary compliance but the supervisees felt that more emphasis was given to that item. Attention should also focus on the low priority placed on providing educational materials, as receiving technical knowledge and skills was among the highest supervision needs expressed by supervisees. Clearly, the data show that the relative lack of social service knowledge and skills among the supervisors is impacting supervision practices within the FCF | REACT network.

Table 6: Supervision Priorities in the Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with client outcomes</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with job-related stress</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing emotional support</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients served</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching new work-related skills</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective action on staff mistakes</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with budget limits</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing educational materials</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Uses of supervision are arranged from high priority to low priority. Rows highlighted in gray represent areas with a statistically significant difference between line worker and supervisor rankings.

Supervision Practices

Assigned Supervisor: 78% of supervisees said they have a specific person who is their direct supervisor. Apparently, those who do not have a specific supervisor may access other more senior staff members in the agency who can serve as supervisors. Among supervisors, 90% of supervisors have an upline supervisor at their same agency, 6.7% (N=2) have a supervisor at a different agency, and 3.3% (N=1) have no upline supervisor. Having an unspecified supervisor is problematic in several ways: there is no guaranteed access to an assigned supervisor resulting in fragmentation of guidance, lack of a strong mentoring relationship, and diffusion of lines of accountability, to name a few.

Supervisor and Supervisee Ratio: Most supervisors were responsible for multiple supervisees, with 28% having 1-2 supervisees, 35% having 3-5, 31% having 5-10, and
7% having more than 10 supervisees. The ratio of supervisors and supervisees is highly sensitive to the agency context and the expertise and needs of supervisors and supervisees. As further detailed in the footnote below, there is no globally recommended ratio; in fact, suggesting such a ratio can be misleading as it should be individually determined at the agency level. What is suggested by the data in this project, however, is that the proportion of supervisors with social service training needs to be drastically increased, with competency in the tasks and skills related to all four functions of social service supervision.

Supervision Session Length and Frequency: Participants were asked about the average length and frequency of their supervision sessions. 63% of supervisees said they have a regularly scheduled supervision session with their supervisor but the frequency differed widely. Only 11% of supervisees said their supervision sessions were once a week or more, 22% said every 2 or 3 weeks, 37% said once a month, and 26% said less frequently than once a month. Reports of average session length ranged from 10 minutes to two hours, with about half of respondents reporting that their average session lasts more than one hour. Supervisors’ and supervisees’ estimates of supervision session length did not differ significantly. Assuming that each supervisee receives a one-hour supervision session per week, as is the recommended practice in social service agencies, the greater numbers represent a sizable commitment of time that must be set aside for supervision. 82.7% of supervisors and 70.4% of supervisees said that both supervisor and supervisee decide what is talked about in the supervision session. This slight difference was not statistically significant, but if agenda-setting is part of empowering supervisees, its implementation is being perceived somewhat differently between the two groups.

Preferred Formats and Tasks: Supervisors and supervisees also expressed similar preferences about types of supervision. On average, both groups ranked supervision options as follows: (1 – first preference) One-on-one with supervisor, (2) Group with one supervisor, (3) Peer (colleagues, no supervisor), (4) Electronic (phone call, texts), (5 – last preference) No supervision at all. Although an in-depth probe of the benefits and drawbacks of the various formats is beyond the scope of this project, global literature

---

33 Although there have been attempts to establish an ‘ideal’ ratio of supervisor and supervisees (see, e.g., Inter-agency Guidelines for Case Management & Child Protection, available online at http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM_guidelines_ENG_.pdf), this ratio is highly sensitive to the agency context. For example, in some agencies, seasoned workers may maintain reduced caseloads in order to provide high quality supervision to many frontline workers and/or to act as liaison between the frontline workforce and management, while other supervisors carry out mostly case work, combined with smaller supervision responsibilities.

34 It should be noted that this is the standard in the social work profession in highly developed countries, and there is no global recommendation. Again, the standards are highly contextual and must be determined at the agency level. See Reamer, F. (2002). Eye on Ethics. https://www.socialworktoday.com/news/eoe_070802.shtml
emphasizes one-on-one and group supervision as most beneficial, although peer supervision is also practiced where the first two forms are not readily available.

Supervisors’ Enjoyment of Supervision Tasks: Supervisors were also asked how much they enjoy four types of supervision activities: Administrative, Supportive, Educational, and Mediation / Advocacy (Scale: 1= very much, 2= enjoy, 3= do not enjoy). On average, supervisors rated their enjoyment highest for Supportive activities (1.17), then Educational activities (1.38), then Mediation / Advocacy activities (1.66), and lastly Administrative activities (1.83). Notably, 82.7% said they very much enjoy supportive activities, and 62.1% said they very much enjoy educational activities. No respondents said they “do not enjoy” the Educational or Supportive supervision activities. However, these findings are somewhat different from data reported in Table 6, where providing educational materials actually ranked as last priority. In fleshing this out in focus groups, it became apparent that supervisors would like to do more educational tasks in supervision but often lacked the knowledge and skills or could not access appropriate materials.

Supervisory Relationships

Research has indicated that the supervisory relationship is the most influential factor in producing positive outcomes for the supervisee. Supervisors and supervisees rated aspects of their supervisory relationship on a scale from 1-5, where 1 meant “very bad” and 5 meant “excellent.” Average ratings from supervisors were slightly higher on most aspects. However, the only statistically significant difference between groups was on “sense of collaboration,” in which supervisees on average rated their supervisory relationships better than supervisors did. See Table 7, below. All supervisees except for one said that if they made a mistake on a case, they would tell their supervisor and seek guidance from him or her, which may indicate a sense of trust and safety, although this sense of trust was portrayed as being lower by more in focus groups.

In focus groups supervisees reported that the FCF | REACT training was changing the understanding of supervision so that it is increasingly being viewed as a collaborative process. The supervisors also viewed it as leveling the power differential between supervisors and supervisees; however, they felt that some supervisees are still reluctant to trust them (based on former cultural patterns), and some still expected the supervisor to take complete charge of the sessions.

Table 7: Ratings on Supervisory Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of collaboration</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual trust</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional safety and security</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual positive feelings</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of autonomy</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Aspects of supervisory relationship are arranged from best to worst, based on supervisees' ratings. The only statistically significant difference between supervisees’ and supervisors’ perceptions was on "sense of collaboration."

Challenges in Supervisory Relationships: Participants were also presented with a list of common challenges to supervisory relationships. Supervisors and supervisees were given different, but overlapping lists, based on factors thought to be most relevant to each group. The findings are presented as percentages in Table 8. More supervisors than supervisees identified issues with cultural differences and age differences, while more supervisees identified issues with gender differences. Interestingly, 41% of supervisors identified their own lack of motivation as a challenge to their supervisory relationship. Some supervisees complained that their supervisors had not explained their (supervisees’) roles in supervision but expected them to fulfill those expectations. Overall, it seems that the supervisory relationships are developing into positive and collaborative direction; but it is taking time for a new conceptualization and procedures take root. Sexual attraction/harassment was noted as a challenge by 4% (N=1) of supervisees and 13.8% (N=4) of supervisors. While these were the least significant concerns for each group, it is regrettable that they were not separated and explored further.36

36 Participants who indicated this item as a problem were not willing to discuss it further in the group setting or individually. According to research ethics, they were not pressured to disclose.
Table 8: Challenges in the Supervisory Relationship (based on total responses from each group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Lineworkers (N= 25)</th>
<th>Supervisors (N= 29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality clash / tension</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>48.3% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s lack of motivation</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>41.4% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult power dynamics</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
<td>34.5% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural differences</td>
<td>16% (4)</td>
<td>27.6% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee is older</td>
<td>8% (2)</td>
<td>24.1% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender differences</td>
<td>32% (8)</td>
<td>13.8% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual attraction / harassment</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>13.8% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s poor expertise</td>
<td>24% (6)</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor’s attitude toward supervisee</td>
<td>20% (5)</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of authority / power</td>
<td>8% (2)</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Challenges are arranged in order of frequency cited by supervisors. Lineworkers and supervisors were asked about some of the same challenges and some different challenges. Also note, only 25 lineworkers and 29 supervisors responded to the question, and the percentages correlate with those who responded.

Perceptions of Supervisor Expertise: Notably, half of supervisees who knew how much experience their supervisors have in social services said their supervisor had 2 years of experience or less. Nevertheless, most supervisees perceived their supervisors’ expertise to be greater than their own: 44% of supervisees reported that their supervisors have “much greater expertise” than them, 30% said “somewhat greater expertise,” and 22% said their supervisor’s expertise was “about equal to their own.” Only one respondent said their own expertise was greater than their supervisor’s. In other words, less than half of the supervisees felt their supervisors had ‘much greater’ expertise, which is seen as the level to engender strong confidence in their supervisor’s guidance and advice. Although ‘somewhat greater’ expertise is positive, it does not promote that

---

37 Generally, in social work, ‘expertise’ is defined as the level of knowledge, skills, and experience. However, this definition was not provided in the survey. Going forward, it is recommended that the national standards include minimum set of knowledge, skills, and experience for the supervisor; however, in the meantime, this can be done at the network or agency levels.

38 It is interesting that no supervisor in the research project listed their experience as less than 3 years. This is one of the natural disadvantages of self-report surveys but the discrepancy sheds some light on the supervisors’ desire to be seen as being more experienced. Furthermore, self-reports are deemed to be a standard data collection method.
strong sense of confidence across the board. At the bottom of the scale, when the supervisor is perceived as having equal or lower level of expertise than the supervisee, the quality of supervision is likely to suffer – most notably in the educational function.

Most supervisors (69%) reported their expertise was “somewhat greater” than their supervisees in working with the type of cases their supervisees have. When measured on average, supervisors and supervisees had similar perceptions of supervisor expertise. Again, these findings are likely an accurate reflection of the training and current expertise of the supervisors.

RESEARCH QUESTION #3: What are the supervision-related strengths and needs of FCF | REACT partner organizations’ frontline staff?

Strengths of Frontline Workers

Although the findings have shown that only about a third of the frontline staff in the FCF | REACT network have received formal training in social sciences, many national experts observed that frontline workers in general are incredibly committed and are excellent at establishing quick rapport with their clients. During focus groups and key informant interviews, it became very clear that the frontline staff of the FCF | REACT network are, for the most part, enthusiastic about their work. Experts also agree, and it was confirmed in focus groups, that the frontline staff are eager to learn and try different and new methods of intervention. They have very positive attitudes toward supervision, and many feel that they have already benefitted a great deal in dealing with job-related stress and difficult client cases.

Additional comments shared in focus groups by supervisees included:

1. A significant number of the supervisees stated that they were able to manage their cases with the help of supervision and consultations among their peers.
2. Many supervisees also took pride in their strong commitment and willingness to learn, so that they can serve their clients and advocate for them. Some mentioned gaining the skills to empathize with clients through supervision.
3. Respecting and supporting each other in managing job-related stress was also mentioned by several participants.
4. Being able to collaborate with partner stakeholders, having independence at work, and having the opportunity to give and receive feedback to/from supervisor and donors were also mentioned as strengths.
Needs and Challenges of Frontline Workers

At the same time, the frontline workers expressed many challenges and needs associated with supervision in context of their work. First, in the survey, two major bundles of information provided background: the degree of challenge they felt with each type of client case they encounter (Table 9), and their need for technical training to deal with cases (Table 10).

Challenging Cases/Issues for Supervisees: Supervisees were given a list of types of clients and asked to rate how stressful each one was to deal with. Supervisors were given the same list and asked to rate how stressful each one was for their staff to deal with. Table 9 compares the perceptions of supervisees and supervisors. In all cases where perceptions differed significantly, supervisors rated client groups as more stressful for their supervisees than the supervisees themselves did. These ratings of client stressfulness may serve as an indication of where additional training is needed for supervisees and also for supervisors.

Table 9: Challenging Client Populations or Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Stressfulness</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers with mental health issue</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly demanding clients</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients who are hostile / resistant</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers with substance abuse</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of trafficking / exploitation</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients with low mental capacity</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice clients</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children / youth with mental illness</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children / youth with disabilities</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child victims of abuse and neglect</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers with domestic violence</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregivers who are not motivated</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children in residential care</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisees’ Needs for Technical Training: Supervisees were asked which of a list of topics they would like to learn more about in supervision. Using the same list, supervisors were asked which topics they would like more training on to help their supervisees with. Table 10 shows the percentages of each group that wanted to learn more about each topic. “Handling difficult cases” stood out from the rest, with about 93% of supervisees and 87% of supervisors desiring additional training. It is also notable that nearly every topic was requested by more than half of the respondents.

Table 10: Need for Technical Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Training Wanted</th>
<th>Supervisees</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Handling difficult cases</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General knowledge and skills</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling job-related stress</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for resources for clients</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for better work environment</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along with colleagues</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling personal stress</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing time</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subjects are arranged in order of most to least frequently requested by supervisees. No statistically significant differences between supervisors and supervisees were found.

Focus Group Discussion on Supervisees’ Needs and Challenges: Against the backdrop of challenges with their cases and technical needs collected from the surveys, supervisees were asked to discuss the needs that they had with regard to supervision. Supervisees were very vocal and spent the bulk of time discussing their needs and wishes for supervision on this topic, and these findings are summarized as follows:
1. A most common concern was not having a clear definition, purpose, benefits and limitations of supervision, so that they are not sure what to expect or plan for. They did not clearly understand the roles for the supervisor and supervisee. Even when supervisors had attended the supervision training, they had not shared what the supervisees are expected to do to participate in effective supervision.

2. As supported by the data under *supervision length and frequency*, a prominent need was to have regular, predictable, and dedicated supervision sessions. Even when the agency policy dictates weekly sessions, supervision was often the first thing to be cancelled when there are pressing administrative deadlines imposed on supervisors and/or supervisees. Even ‘regular’ sessions tend to be too short, and it is difficult to prioritize which cases should be dealt with first. Issues of communication and transportation challenges related to field work often interfere with scheduled supervision meetings.

3. Another frequently mentioned need was to receive technical training in working with specific populations of clients (see Table 9), and in intervention methodologies (see Table 10). This intense need for technical training is likely the result of staff who may have been hired without a broad social service formal training (such as in social work) or in a specific area of social services (such as psychology, child development, or juvenile justice). While it is unrealistic to expect that supervision alone can systemically fill this large technical gap, supervision can provide some targeted knowledge or skills.\(^39\)

4. Within their agencies, 20% (N=5) of the supervisees would like to feel more respect and support from supervisors and managers. See Table 8. This was especially the case with regard to case outcomes when supervisors did not recognize the strengths of a client and considered the case a failure. Sometimes supervisors humiliated them in front of their clients and peers, because the supervisors have not tracked the whole case over time. Some line workers talked about how their supervisor does not understand measuring client progress, because their business background has not trained them to look at positive behavioural or emotional changes as progress. Some said that many supervisors try to cover up their lack of knowledge by acting like ‘they know it all’.

5. To some supervisees, supervision still felt like a ‘blaming session’ where the supervisor blames them for things that have gone wrong in their cases, or ‘traditional’ in tone, meaning authoritarian use of top-down power. This is supported by data in Table 8 where 20% (N=5) of the supervisees reported supervisors’ attitudes toward them as a challenge, and 8% (N=2) reported abuse.

\(^{39}\) As there is a shortage of formally trained social service professionals, this is a dilemma that needs concerted leadership and a strategic plan at the highest level of government.
of power by supervisors. Even more revealing, 48.3% (N=14) of the supervisors reported ‘personality clash, tension’ as the top challenge in the supervisory relationship, and 34.5% (N=10) supervisors reported ‘difficult power dynamics’ as a challenge in the supervisory relationship.

6. For some, age, gender, and personal relationships impact the dynamics in the supervision context. As shown in Table 8, some supervisees (32%, N=8) expressed discomfort with opposite sex supervisors. Others felt uncomfortable when their supervisor was younger (8%, N=2) or had less experience with case work (24%, N=6). These concerns were shared also in focus groups. Finally, one or two people shared that having a personal friend as a supervisor was uncomfortable.

7. Several supervisees mentioned that supervisors should maintain better professional boundaries; i.e. the supervisor should not discuss his or her own problems or turn the session into a friendly chat not related to the cases, or complain about other employees. In addition, they should protect the confidentiality of the supervisee.

8. Other concerns, less prevalent among the participants, included being confused between supervision and counseling, inconsistent documentation expectations within the agency, poor communication skills from supervisors, expecting too much of new employees to create supervision agenda, and the need to monitor supervisors’ performance following training. One suggested an occasional use of external supervisors for dealing with personal challenges. It should be noted that the use of external supervision was more frequently associated in the surveys with lack of supervisor expertise.

9. Asked for a wish list to show their supervisors, the supervisees mentioned the following:
   I. Reduced caseload and higher quality of work were mentioned by participants in three out of five locations. Some reported having caseloads as high as 50.
   II. More material support such as equipment, communication and transportation support, and mission allowances.
   III. Better career support with promotions and raises. This request is likely related to the one-fifths of the supervisees with more than 10 years of experience in their agencies, and raises an issue with the agency policy on promotions and attendant requirements. One mentioned that there should be a human resources officer in their agency to administer such a policy.
IV. More understanding from supervisors when they cannot return calls promptly from the field, as they are out of cell range.

V. Several mentioned formal qualifications should be established for supervisors and more training required of their supervisors. Also, there should be a budget set aside for training.

VI. A couple of groups mentioned that they would like to see a licensing system for frontline social workers.

RESEARCH QUESTION #4: What are the strengths and needs of current FCF | REACT partner organizations’ supervisors?

Supervisors’ Strengths

Based on feedback from both supervisors and supervisees on the survey and focus groups, there are many strengths being felt and demonstrated by FCF | REACT supervisors. First, on the survey, two bundles of information provide background and context for supervisors’ strengths.

Supervisors’ Confidence in Performing Supervision Tasks: Supervisors were asked to rate their confidence in performing specific supervision tasks on a 3-point scale where 1= very confident, 2= somewhat confident, and 3= not confident. On average, supervisors were especially confident in their skills with active and empathic listening and ensuring ethical behavior; while feeling they were not tending toward ‘somewhat confident’ or ‘not confident’ about ensuring accountability, monitoring use of resources, demonstrating new methods, knowledge or skills. Overall, supervisors were ‘very confident’ or ‘somewhat confident’ on all categories, but they are only ‘somewhat confident’ on most categories. Demonstrating a new method, offering new knowledge and skills, performing staff evaluations, or critiquing staff demonstrations are areas where they are less confident.
Table 11: Supervisor Confidence in Conducting Supervision Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Confidence in Supervision Tasks (N=30)</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
<th>Somewhat Confident</th>
<th>Not confident</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active and empathic listening</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring ethical behavior</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with problem solving</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring accountability</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring use of resources</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating new method</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering new knowledge &amp; skills</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing staff evaluation</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critiquing staff demonstration</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors’ Perceived Competence in Guiding Staff with Specific Client Populations: Supervisors were asked to rate their competence in guiding their staff when dealing with a variety of client issues. Competence ratings were analyzed only for supervisors who said that their supervisees currently had cases dealing with that issue. As a whole, supervisors expressed particular strength in guiding staff on cases of child neglect (65%, or 17 out of 26, rated themselves “very competent”) and child verbal / emotional abuse (60%, or 15 out of 25, rated themselves “very competent”). Over one quarter of supervisors whose agencies deal with cases of mental illness and juvenile justice rated themselves as “not competent” in guiding staff on these issues, showing significant need for training and growth in these areas. Supervisors with master’s degrees rated themselves more competent in guiding staff to deal with clients with mental illness and disabilities, indicating that increased formal education level is helpful.
Table 12: Supervisor’s Competence in Guiding Staff on Client Risks

Supervisor Competence Guiding Staff with Specific Client Risks
1= very competent, 2= somewhat competent, and 3= not competent

(note: only participants who had each type of case responded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Very competent</th>
<th>Somewhat competent</th>
<th>Not competent</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child neglect</td>
<td>65% (17/26)</td>
<td>35% (9/26)</td>
<td>0% (0/26)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child verbal / emotional abuse</td>
<td>60% (15/25)</td>
<td>40% (10/25)</td>
<td>0% (0/25)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child sexual abuse</td>
<td>63% (12/19)</td>
<td>32% (6/19)</td>
<td>5% (1/19)</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child physical abuse</td>
<td>57% (12/21)</td>
<td>38% (8/21)</td>
<td>5% (1/21)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>47% (9/19)</td>
<td>53% (10/19)</td>
<td>0% (0/19)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child victims of violence</td>
<td>46% (11/24)</td>
<td>50% (12/24)</td>
<td>4% (1/24)</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative care</td>
<td>50% (9/18)</td>
<td>39% (7/18)</td>
<td>11% (2/18)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>43% (10/23)</td>
<td>52% (12/23)</td>
<td>4% (1/23)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child trafficking / exploitation</td>
<td>44% (8/18)</td>
<td>44% (8/18)</td>
<td>12% (2/18)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>27% (6/22)</td>
<td>55% (12/22)</td>
<td>18% (4/22)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>24% (4/17)</td>
<td>59% (10/17)</td>
<td>17% (3/17)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>28% (5/18)</td>
<td>44% (8/18)</td>
<td>28% (5/18)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>14% (2/14)</td>
<td>50% (7/14)</td>
<td>35% (5/14)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to look at the data in Table 9, where most supervisors felt that mental health, substance abuse, and disability were the most challenging client cases, and compare those findings to data in Table 12. In Table 12, they repeat these same concerns in terms of their ability to supervise those cases. They say that they are only ‘somewhat competent’ or ‘not competent’ to supervise disability case (73% for both categories), substance abuse (76%), and mental illness (72%). In addition, supervisors feel only somewhat competent or not competent (total of 85%) in supervising cases involving juvenile justice.

Fleshed out further in focus groups, the following points summarize supervisors’ comments on supervision-related strengths:

- Most supervisors saw themselves as competent (‘very competent’ or ‘somewhat competent’) to supervise, including expertise (knowledge, skill, experience) at the case level (see Table 12), with some notable exceptions.
Many supervisors felt their understanding and confidence in facilitating supervision were greatly increased by the FCF | REACT training, and their immediate supervision skills were enhanced through the tools provided (forms, planning templates, supervision agreement, etc.).

Supervisors felt that supervision had improved the quality of work on individual cases through supervisors providing new knowledge and skills to line staff in line with the educational function.

There was wide agreement that supervisors were meeting the supportive needs of staff, boosting their morale, building trust and confidence, enhancing the relationship between supervisors and supervisees, and preventing secondary trauma. Some mentioned as strengths their commitment to good supervision, use of communication skills, and their ability to empower supervisees (e.g. through allowing them to set their agenda). It should be noted, however, that in Table 8 supervisees pointed out several major difficulties in the supervisory relationship, and some of those points were reiterated in focus groups although less prominently.

The focus group discussions strongly suggested that most supervisors have a very positive attitude toward supervision and toward their supervisees. Since there is some contradiction in the supervisors’ overall perspective and that of the supervisees’, some open and honest reflection and dialogue may be in order.

Promoting supervisees’ self-care was also mentioned as a supervision related achievement, with some expressing pride in their ability to exemplify life/work balance to their staff, and to provide support to staff to achieve it. But this was balanced by their acknowledgement that improvements were needed. As previously discussed, 61.6% of the supervisees reported their job-related stress as being ‘extremely high’ or ‘high’, and three-quarters of them would like training to handle job-related stress better. In contrast, only about a third of the supervisors reported their job-related stress as 'extremely high' or 'high'; however, as shown in Table 10, they would like more training on how to help supervisees do this better. There is apparently an understanding by most supervisors that their frontline staff are facing much more stress than supervisors and a sense of responsibility to work harder on supporting the staff.

---

40 It should be remembered that individual surveys are generally more reliable in generating honest answers due to their confidential nature. Although we had all group members sign a confidentiality agreement, focus groups are, by nature, less secure in maintaining confidentiality.
Some supervisors also noted that supervision training had made a difference in how supervisees approach supervision with trained supervisors implementing the tools provided. Specifically, they are now empowered to create their own agendas, and are showing much more confidence that supervision will provide new tools and personal support.

A few mentioned that having clear organizational structures and/or budgets that allow supervision was a strength in their organization. The majority, however, lacked this strong support as shown by data on the frequency and regularity of supervision and wide complaints about supervision not being a high priority. The lack of a supervision policy in the majority of the participants’ (56%) agencies is a focus of improvement.

Mention was made that supervision is building a bridge between top management, line management and supervisees in line with the mediation function; that supervision is also helping supervisors engage in more self-reflection; and that donors are happy to know of active supervision practices.

Importantly, it was mentioned by one supervisor that their desire to learn more and being open to improving their supervision skills was strength. Indeed, the desire for more training was widespread among the supervisors, as discussed further under the ‘needs’ section below.

Participating supervisors, in general, felt that they would like to play an active role in mainstreaming supervision within the FCF | REACT network and in Cambodia. Their enthusiasm was quite palpable.

Supervisors’ Challenges and Needs

Despite the very enthusiastic response to supervision and an overall positive perception of their ability to supervise, the participating supervisors also shared their needs and challenges related to supervision.

In Table 9, it was shown that supervisors’ and supervisees’ perceptions about the stressfulness of case categories differed significantly. This has implications on which cases are prioritized in supervision and the type of expertise needed for both groups.

In Table 10, data show that half or more of the supervisors felt a need for technical training on major areas of expertise, particularly in ‘handling difficult cases’ (86%), general knowledge and skills (60%), handling job-related stress (60%), etc. Please refer to Table 10.
In Table 11, many supervisors felt only ‘somewhat competent’ or ‘not competent’ in many key areas of social service; and would have difficulty guiding their staff in supervision. They felt especially less competent in performing staff evaluations, demonstrating new knowledge or skills, and critiquing staff demonstrations, all critically important supervision competencies. This gap in expertise is likely contributing to the feedback by some supervisees that their supervisors do not understand or respect their work with clients, and may even heft blame on the workers for case outcomes that differ from their own business-oriented vision. Please refer to Table 11.

Fleshing out these concerns more, and exploring agency supervision contexts, supervisors shared the following in focus groups:

- The top challenge shared by a clear majority of the supervisors was time limitation. This is a cross-cutting challenge among all of the research locations, and this was a topic concern expressed by supervisees also. It is also related to high caseloads. One mentioned that their staff have more than twice the ideal caseload per staff, and it is difficult to provide adequate supervision even if the focus is on the most problematic ones. This is highly corroborated by findings in three out of five data collection locations where supervisees reported that high caseloads were reducing the quality of the work.

- Related to the time limitation, many find it challenging to adhere to a regular supervision schedule. Often, urgent case needs arise and must be dealt with, and cannot wait until regularly scheduled supervision session. One disadvantage of such ad hoc supervision was noted as the lack of formal procedures such as simultaneous documentation. Sometimes management request for reports create time crunches that preclude supervision sessions. These findings were also shared by supervisees. Even among agencies with a supervision policy in place, regular supervision was noted as one of the top challenges by both groups.

- Some mentioned that they would like to see supervisees become less suspicious of supervision and invest in supervision with more trust and proactive engagement. Perhaps for the above reason, some supervisors believe that supervisees should also receive training so they are on the same page with regard to expectations and roles in supervision.

- A clear majority of supervisors also expressed that they need to develop better expertise (knowledge and skills) related to their agency’s work in order to assist more effectively with difficult cases. This is clearly supported by data in Table 10 in which 86.7% of the supervisors requested more
training on handling difficult cases as their #1 training need. With only 27.6% of the supervisors being formally trained in social services (social work or psychology), it may be difficult to fill this gap through informal or on-the-job training. For some, this may mean educational retooling and/or field experience for some supervisors to develop the necessary competencies.

- Many would like to learn more about helping with staff’s job-related problems due to the bureaucracy within their organization (advocacy skills), and gain better skills to assist with staff’s personal problems or make effective referrals (supportive skills).

- There was a wide agreement that the supervisors would like more supervision training, and some specific requests were made, including:
  - More clear ‘definition’ of supervision, often referring to professionalism over ‘cultural’ or ‘traditional’ ways of relating in the supervisory relationship. This professionalism would be enhanced by clear roles of supervisors and supervisees. This concern was also mirrored by supervisees who felt the definition and scope of supervision as the most critical need, and also felt that in some cases supervisors still used a top-down authoritarian model of interaction in supervision.
  - More clinical training (supportive supervision skills such as listening, emotional support, giving encouragement, etc.). To make a comparison with findings in Table 11 where supervisors felt ‘very confident’ or ‘somewhat confident’ (total of 97%) in engaging in empathic listening, one should keep in mind active listening is only the first step to effective supportive supervision.41
  - How to prioritize and make effective use of limited time.
  - Although many supervisors felt that they were engaged in good self-care, many felt that they needed to develop greater self-awareness and reflective practice.42

41 As briefly described in the foregoing literature review, supportive supervision also includes giving constructive feedback, guidance for correction actions, and competency in supporting staff’s self-care.
Other training-related suggestions were more tangible, such as:

- There should be an annual refresher course after the basic training by FCF | REACT.
- Training should include real-time observations and feedback.
- In addition to what has already been developed, FCF | REACT should have a supervision checklist and standardized forms and agreement templates.
- Supervision should be taught in universities as part of curricula.

Key Informant Insights: On this issue of challenges in supervision, some key informants suggested that the role of supervision needs to be elevated to an accountability mechanism, so that funding is premised on and renewed on mandatory supervision. Another mentioned that there is a need for video demonstrations of supervision done in Khmer. This could be used as a training tool to supplement the lectures, forms, and tools; and it could also be used in tandem with case studies and supervision role plays. Many experts mentioned the need to teach supervision in all social work training programmes.

**RESEARCH QUESTION #5: What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among the FCF | REACT partner organizations?**

There were very open discussions about the achievements and challenges with regard to supervision among the FCF | REACT organizations. In contrast to earlier questions about individual supervisors and supervisees, this question sought to learn about their perceptions and opinions at the agency and network levels.

**Achievements in Supervision Among the FCF | REACT Organizations**

First, findings from the supervisee groups are presented. They included:

- A good majority of supervisees saw benefits of supervision at the case level, including problem solving in difficult cases, often facilitated by the supervisors’ greater expertise and welcoming attitude. Supervision helped to identify gaps in the line worker’s knowledge and skills and helped to fill those gaps. They felt that this difference at case level is likely to improve the organization’s profile and client outcome.

- Supervision, when well done, was adding a new dimension to their organization’s objective to create a better working environment. There was
agreement that supervision provided a forum where staff could share feelings, build relationships, work together in trust, and receive support on personal problems. Learning and applying self-care was also viewed as a positive aspect of supervision.

- Some supervisees from a particular location felt that their voice was important in guiding the development of their organization, because supervisors and management welcomed their input. They were invited to share concerns and ideas regarding agency policy and administration (this was not shared by many others, however).

- Many organizations are undergoing a transformation regarding power relations within the agency, often influenced by empowerment principles learned in supervision training. A few others specifically stated that their supervisors did not abuse their power (although a small minority noted abuse of power as a challenge in the supervisory relationship in Table 8), and in fact, supported them with mental health needs, sometimes making referrals to experts outside the agency when needed.

- Several pointed out that the friendly and genuine personality of the supervisor made a difference in how comfortable they felt about engaging in supervision. As noted by supervisors in Table 8, personality clash or tension in the supervisor/supervisee relationship is a key factor, as is the supervisor’s level of motivation.

The supervisors also discussed the achievements they have noted within their own and other FCF | REACT network organizations. Their discussion can be summarized as:

- Supervisors agreed that supervision training was enhancing the agency’s working environment where the supportive needs of staff were being enhanced through boosting morale, building trust and confidence, and preventing secondary trauma. Promoting supervisees’ self-care was also mentioned as a supervision related achievement.

- Supervisors believed that supervision had already improved the quality of work on individual cases through the new knowledge and skills provided to the line staff and better stress management.

- There was majority agreement that supervision training facilitated by the FCF | REACT network was a major achievement for the network. Many positive comments were made about the benefits of training, including the usefulness of forms, tools, and models of supervision, which gave
confidence to supervisors, helping them learn skills to support the staff and learning to advocate for them.

- Some also felt that belonging to the FCF | REACT network itself was a strength as it is pioneering supervision efforts in Cambodia. Many felt that they were part of a privileged group to be among the first to be trained on supervision in Cambodia – there was a palpable sense of pride.

- The development of supervision policy by some agencies was viewed as another achievement (although implementation needed improvement).

- Mention was made once each on the observation that supervision is building a bridge between top management, line management and line workers; that supervision is also helping supervisors engage in more self-reflection; and that donors are happy to know of active supervision practices.

Key informant interviews pointed out that while supervision had been practiced by a number of agencies, the FCF | REACT initiative was putting supervision on the national discussion radar. Some key informants shared how the MoSVY has agreed to join efforts to roll out training for government social service workforce and viewed this as a notable achievement.

Challenges in Supervision Among the FCF | REACT organizations

Despite the significant achievements in supervision among the FCF | REACT network thus far, it also faces many challenges. This question sought to explore the supervision-related challenges at the agency level (not at the individual level).

The challenges shared by supervisees include:

- The lack of a policy, or the lack of understanding what is in the policy with regards to the definition, purposes, roles, and limitations of supervision.

- The irregularity and unpredictability of supervision sessions. At times supervision seemed to be merely a check-off item, as supervisor sometimes call for a supervision meeting after hours or even on weekends to get it done. For some supervisees, weeks and even months went by without a proper supervision session.

- The need in some organizations for more supportive supervision to enhance a common vision and mutual support. Some frontline staff shared a sense that supervisors did not understand the supervisees’ work and attendant challenges, resulting in a feeling of being overburdened on the frontlines.
Supervision relationships that were awkward due to ‘traditional’ (vs. professional) approach to discussing problems, gender or age issues.

The supervisors shared the following organizational level challenges:

- The top challenge shared by a clear majority of the supervisors was time limitation available for supervision. This is a cross-cutting challenge among all of the research locations. It is also related to high caseloads. One mentioned that their staff have more than twice the ideal caseload per staff, and it is difficult to provide adequate supervision even if the focus is on the most problematic ones.

- Related to the time limitation, many find it challenging to adhere to a regular supervision schedule. Both the time limitation and the irregularity of supervision has organizational underpinnings, as both supervisors and supervisees complained that supervision is not prioritized enough. Often, urgent case needs arise and must be dealt with, and are not re-visited at a regularly scheduled supervision session. One disadvantage of such ad hoc supervision was noted as the lack of formal procedures such as simultaneous documentation and planning. Sometimes management request for reports create time crunches that preclude supervision sessions.

- Some agencies do not yet have supervision policies, and even when they do, they are not followed well.

- Agency bureaucracy sometimes makes it difficult to address supervisee’s work-related problems or supportive needs (heavy demand on record keeping, lack of promotions, etc.).

- The acutely felt lack of technical expertise, especially relevant to some of the most challenging cases, is affecting supervision network-wide. This is a challenge that needs to be the focus of strategic planning in terms of recruitment, hiring and promotion policies to rapidly enhance baseline expertise.

- There is limited awareness regarding the benefits and procedures of supervision. A few supervisors expressed that since supervision is relatively new in many organizations, it will take time for supervisees to feel comfortable bringing problems to discuss with their supervisors. Hence, some frontline workers are still suspicious or defensive, and are not able to accept constructive feedback.
Perhaps for the above reason, some supervisors believe that supervisees should also receive training so they are on the same page with regard to expectations and roles in supervision.

The network partners seem to be struggling with the proportion of older, qualified and experienced supervisors in their agencies. Many older workers, with relatively long years of service are not serving as supervisors and this is creating a generational problem in some agencies. Some younger supervisors find it difficult to supervise someone who is older or is a personal friend, even when the supervisors have greater expertise.

**Key Informant Insights**: Some key informants pointed out that the FCF | REACT effort had been an important start for Cambodia, but it has only reached a very small proportion of the social service sector in the nation. Further, they felt that a 3-day training is not sufficient to internalize all of the necessary knowledge and skills to produce effective supervisors. They hoped that in the future funding would be available to extend the training for additional hands-on coaching and longer term mentoring, as well as for training supervisees to maximize the benefits of supervision.

**RESEARCH QUESTION #6: What are some essential steps to be taken to mainstream social service supervision within the FCF | REACT network, and nationally?**

**Mainstreaming at the Network Level**

The participants voiced strong support for mainstreaming supervision among the FCF | REACT network. The steps, synthesized here from many different comments, would involve:

1) Learn from this project what are the strengths and needs of supervisors and supervisees, and their organizations; then implement the recommendations throughout the network.

2) Ensure that each agency completes or develops their supervision policy, using the templates provided by the network. Since there are many existing policies at various agencies already, pool them together and create a new 'ideal' policy for the network.

3) Share standardized tools, forms and procedures for supervision, including planning forms, documentation procedures, etc.
4) Create a system of information sharing and mentoring among the network members. Some of the more senior supervisors could do more in-depth training and mentoring as Save the Children staff is working on casting the net wider and collaborating with the government.

5) Develop a culture of respecting supervision as a mandatory requirement, and perhaps a required element of grants and contracts.

**Mainstreaming at National Level**

*Opinion of Focus Group Participants:* For the discussion of mainstreaming supervision at the national level, the research participants clearly saw the FCF | REACT network providing the impetus and leadership throughout the process toward achieving national standards. This was largely due to their positive experience in the FCF | REACT supervision training and what they were able to implement back in their agencies. They saw their experiences as captured in the research as informing the standardized policy, and they – especially the trained supervisors – saw their role as trainers for other NGO and government sectors. These are indications that the FCF | REACT supervisors feel a strong sense of ownership and responsibility toward national mainstreaming.

*Opinion of Key Informants:* Many key informants expressed concern that the thousands of government social service staff were not receiving supervision other than perhaps to be disciplined through the administrative function. In terms of the other functions of supervision, such as enhancing quality of service through the educational function, providing emotional support, and advocating for a transparent and merit-based system, they are lacking in their opinion. However, there was some discussion that MoSVY planned to join efforts with FCF | REACT to train their staff later in 2020, and supervision will become an integral part of increasing transparency and accountability in government services. As one indication of initiating this process, 17 professional social workers had been placed in government offices and the current plan is to hire them as civil servants or contract workers as an initial cadre of core trainers and supervisors. The need for an overarching multi-year plan to recruit, train, and nurture the workforce, both in civil society and government was strongly emphasized by the key informants.

*Steps to Mainstreaming Supervision at National Level:* The focus group participants and key informants were also very strong in their support of national supervision standards, although pointing out that the standards would need to allow for specific agency contexts. Those mainstreaming steps would involve (synthesized from many comments):

1) Under MoSVY leadership, nation-wide awareness raising campaign should be initiated, to increase public demand for this accountability mechanism in social services.
2) Starting immediately, there should be a strong push to increase enrollment of students entering social work and related professions, to strengthen the workforce and create a pipeline of excellent supervisors.

3) Universities and other social service training programmes should include supervision as part of their curriculum. Ideally this would be a stand-alone course, but even a few sessions would be helpful combined with receiving good supervision in their field placements.

4) MoSVY should make a concerted effort to fill civil service slots with well-trained social workers for both frontline and supervisory positions as appropriate to their training and experience.

5) A task force of national social service experts should work with the professional association of social workers to review existing supervision policies and draft a template for national consultations, led by an international social work expert.

6) After sufficient consultation, the draft national supervision standards should be adopted by MoSVY and tested among its social service employees.

7) After a testing period a follow-up evaluation of the standards should be done and revised according to the evaluation team’s recommendations; then the standards should be approved as a prakas to apply to all social service workforce.

**RESEARCH QUESTION #7: Assuming national supervision standards can be achieved, how will they be enforced?**

To the question of how the national supervision standards (if adopted) could be enforced, focus group participants and key informants offered the following ideas, in synthesized form:

1) Once the national supervision standards are adopted, there should be training for everyone to be familiar with it and to be held accountable to it. Training of government staff should be done by FCF | REACT in collaboration with MoSVY and perhaps academia.

2) Educational institutions should incorporate a course on supervision, based on the standards.

3) The standards should be reviewed once a year and revised if needed.
4) The standards themselves should include authority for enforcement of the standards. There should be a budget for enforcing it by a person or group. Some felt that the Ministry should enforce it among government staff, and some felt that there should be a multi-sectoral national ethics committee for social service workforce that ensures compliance, and is supported by MoSVY. Most felt that this issue can be addressed at the time that supervision standards are being discussed.
IV. CONCLUSION

This research project sought to answer essential questions related to the strengths and challenges related to supervision practices at the level of individual supervisees and supervisors within the FCF | REACT network, as well as the strengths and challenges related to supervision at the organizational and network levels. The data were collected through the use of individual surveys, focus group discussions, and key informant interviews, based on seven research questions designed to explore the answers. The data were analyzed using STATA for quantitative data and thematic coding and analysis for qualitative data. Confidentiality protocols were meticulously followed. Detailed findings are shared throughout this report, while overall findings and recommendations are presented in the Executive Summary. It is hoped that the report will contribute to the wide and effective use of supervision throughout Cambodia’s social service sector.
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## ANNEX A-1: SUPERVISEE SURVEY (KHMER)

ការស្ទង់មតិអំពីការធ្វើស្ ៊ូធ ើវីហ្សិន (SUPERVISION) របស្់កមមវិ្ី FCF I REACT

ស្ម្រាប់ស្ ៊ូធ ើវ៉ាយហ្សសី (អនកដែលធ្វើការធៅជួរមសខ)

| ឈ្មោះ | អាយុ | ទីត្រំង | បញ្ហារឿយៈ | ប្រជាជនប្រឹក្សាមកបណ្តោយធម្មជាំង | ធនសង៍ | ភាពធ្វើការបចចសប | បរិញ្ញាដែលប្រឈមជូនខៀមរើ | ផ្ទៃរឿយៈ | ធនសង៍ប្រឈមជូនខៀមរើ | 
|-------|-------|----------|----------------|-----------------------------|-------|----------------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------|----------|
|       |       |          |                |                             |       |                |                                  |        |                 |          |

1. នាមជាអក្សរខ្មែរ: [ ]
2. អាយុ: [ ] ឆ្នាំ បើម៉ូដ[ ] ឆ្នាំ
3. បញ្ហារឿយៈ: [ ]
4. ជីវតថ្មី: [ ] បែបដែលបាន [ ] បែបសារ [ ]

5. អតិថិជន[ ]
6. េ.[ ]
    - ប្រការបុគ្គលិក (Supervisor)
    - ប្រការបុគ្គលិក (Line worker)

7. ទីត្រំង[ ]
8. ប្រឹក្សាមកបណ្តោយ[ ]
9. ភាពធ្វើការ[ ]
10. បរិញ្ញាដែលប្រឈមជូន[ ]
11. ផ្ទៃរឿយៈ[ ]
12. ធនសង៍[ ]

---

**ក្នុងរយៈពេលបចចសប**

- ១-៣ ឆ្នាំ
- ៣-៦ ឆ្នាំ
- ៦-១០ ឆ្នាំ
- ១០-១៥ ឆ្នាំ
- ១៥-២៥ ឆ្នាំ

---

**ការប្រឈមជូនខៀមរើ**

- ១-៣ ឆ្នាំ
- ៣-៦ ឆ្នាំ
- ៦-១០ ឆ្នាំ
- ១០-១៥ ឆ្នាំ
- ១៥-២៥ ឆ្នាំ
13. ដោយលោកទៅកាត់សំណ្រាក្រពេលក្នុងការងារច្រើនមានឆ្នាំប៉ុណ្ណ៍ប៉ុន្មាន់? (សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ ប្រឹង ប្រៀង និង)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ការបញ្ជាក់ខ្លះ</th>
<th>ឆ្នាំ</th>
<th>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Clinical Supervision) ជាមួយ R (Ragamuffin)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការធ្វើសំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការដោយ FCF</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការធ្វើសំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ (Supervision) ដោយ TPO</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការធ្វើសំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ (supervision)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ដំឱ្យ ដោយជូនរូបរាប់បាំង៖ ____________________________

ដំឱ្យប៉ុន្មាន់រូបរាប់បាំង៖ ____________________________

14. ដោយឱ្យទៅកាត់ពែក់មេរៀបរាងរបស់អ្នក ការធ្វើសំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ (supervision) មានប៉ុណ្ណ៍ប៉ុន្មាន់?

14b. ដោយឱ្យទៅកាត់ពែក់មេរៀបរាងរបស់អ្នក

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ការបញ្ជាក់ខ្លះ</th>
<th>ឆ្នាំ</th>
<th>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(របស់សក់ប្រឹងប្រៀងរបស់មេរៀបរាងរបស់អ្នក)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការប្រការក្នុងរយៈពេលក្នុងរបស់អ្នក (types of supervision)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការប្រការក្នុងរយៈពេលក្នុងរបស់អ្នក (supervisors)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការប្រការក្នុងរយៈពេលក្នុងរបស់អ្នក (supervisees)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការប្រការក្នុងរយៈពេលក្នុងរបស់អ្នក (supervision)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14c. ដោយឱ្យទៅកាត់ពែក់មេរៀបរាងរបស់អ្នក (supervision Policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ការបញ្ជាក់ខ្លះ</th>
<th>ឆ្នាំ</th>
<th>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(របស់សក់ប្រឹងប្រៀងរបស់មេរៀបរាងរបស់អ្នក)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការប្រការក្នុងរយៈពេលក្នុងរបស់អ្នក (supervision)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ការប្រការក្នុងរយៈពេលក្នុងរបស់អ្នក (supervision)</td>
<td>រាប់</td>
<td>សំណ្រាត្រូវឈ្មោះរៀបការ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការងារភារកិចចក្នុងសាលាវិទ្យាល័យ។

16. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

17. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

18. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

19. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

20. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

21. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

22. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

23. ពេញចិត្តលេខនាយកតារូបមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ (job description) និងបញ្ហារឿងមកអំពីការទទួលខាងសំខាន់ដែលបានក្លាយតែង។

(បញ្ហារឿងមកអ្នកគ្រប់គ្រងប៊ីសែ)
ពីច្រេយ (skype ឬទៅរស់ប់) ដំបើប់ម្រើនេះថ្មីរបស់អតិថិជន

24. ការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន (Supervision) បញ្ហារកស្ទីម្របញ្ហារកម្រិតខ្ពស់បានមានពោះម៉ូ (កន្លែងដែល: 1=ដោយអំពីការងារ, 2=ដោយ៖ ការបញ្ហាចាត់ក្រាមញ្ញ, 3=ដោយសម្រាប់ការងារ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន</th>
<th>ការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន</th>
<th>ការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន</th>
<th>ការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ត្តមរយៈ</td>
<td>ការងារ</td>
<td>ចុងក្រោយ</td>
<td>ការងារ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

វិធី ២: ប្រតិបត្តិការពារព័ត៌មានអតិថិជន

25. អតិថិជនបានបញ្ហារទាយទៅ៖

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>បញ្ហារកម្រិត</th>
<th>បញ្ហារកម្រិត</th>
<th>បញ្ហារកម្រិត</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>តាមតាម</td>
<td>ទេ ទេ</td>
<td>ទេ ទេ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. យើងស្គាល់ ប្រតិបត្តិការបានបញ្ហាផ្លូវចង់ដោយបំពេញក្រុម (ឬអតិថិជន):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ធនបធនប</th>
<th>ធនបធនប</th>
<th>ធនបធនប</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>តែងតែ</td>
<td>ស៊ូួត៊ួត</td>
<td>យើងស្គាល់</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. ប្រតិបត្តិការពារព័ត៌មានអតិថិជនបានបញ្ហារកម្រិតរក្សាស់ ក្រុមបែបខ្ចើយខ្លួនឯង។

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ប្រតិបត្តិការពារព័ត៌មាន</th>
<th>ប្រតិបត្តិការពារព័ត៌មាន</th>
<th>ប្រតិបត្តិការពារព័ត៌មាន</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ប្រតិបត្តិការពារ</td>
<td>ប្រតិបត្តិការពារ</td>
<td>ប្រតិបត្តិការពារ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. អតិថិជនបានបញ្ហារកម្រិតវិធី (supervisor) បញ្ហារកម្រិត:  

(អតិថិជនអោយប្រភេទអតិថិជន៖)
29. ការជួបមសខដល់មួយទល់មួយ ជាម្រកុមទ៊ូរស័ពទឬធាន្ើរសារដស្ាប(Skype)(Email)

30. ភាពយន្ត កាល់ព្រៃយុះធ្វើមសខដល់មួយ( supervision) បញ្ចប់ត្រូវ
    ___ បានខ្លួនឯងទំនើប
    ___ ពីរដោយ 2 ឬ 3 យប្រយួត
    ___ amation ពីរដោយ
    ___ សង្គមទំនើប
    ___ រដូវរបស់បញ្ចប់ត្រូវ (លំហាត់ឈឱ្យបញ្ចប់ត្រូវ): ________________

31. បញ្ចប់សួរាជាតិយុះបញ្ចប់ដម្រាស់ពីរដោយ: ____ កុម្មា

32. បញ្ចប់សួរាជាតិយុះបញ្ចប់ដម្រាស់ពីរដោយ: __ ស៊ូមធម្រ __ ស៊ូធើវិយហ្សឺ __ ស៊ូធើវិសីទំងពីនាក់

33. ប្រការភូមិធ្វើចំណែកបញ្ចប់រំពឹងមានកម្មភាព កាល់ព្រៃយុះ(ស៊ូមធម្រស៊ូមធម្រថ្មី)
    ___ បេះត្រូវស្ដីបកុត បង្ហាញពីរដោយបញ្ចប់ដម្រាស់
    ___ បេះត្រូវស្ដីបកុតបញ្ចប់ដម្រាស់មោកប់ស៊ូមធម្រថ្មី
    ___ ស៊ូមធម្រថ្មី បញ្ចប់ដម្រាស់បញ្ចប់ដម្រាស់

34. សម្រាប់ការស្វែងរកការពិនិត្យសួរាជាតិយុះ (supervisory) បញ្ចប់សួរាជាតិយុះដូច្នេះបន្ទាប់ពីបញ្ចប់ត្រូវ
    (5 = មិនបាន, 4 = មិន, 3=ស៊ូមធម្រ, 2=ឈើដូច្នេះ, 1 = បានបញ្ចប់)
    ___ រំពឹងស្តីបកុតសម្រាប់ជើង
    ___ រំពឹងស្តីបកុតសម្រាប់មកវិញ
    ___ រំពឹងស្តីបកុតសម្រាប់មកវិញ (ដម្រាស់បន្តិបត្តិឈើសម្រាប់ជើង)
35. ស្ថិតន័យថាជាផ្លូធាតុដុះបានគ្នា ជាទូទៅប្រើប្រាស់យ៉ាងឆ្លាញ់សំបូរកោត្ត់? ដើម្បីសម្រេចបានប្រុងប្រាណទៅកាន់ការងារទាំងអស់សម្រាប់អនក អាចធ្វើបានដ៏ខ្ពស់បំផុត?  (ស្រេចដាច់គ្នបាន៖ ២ = ខ្ពស់បំផុត, ១ = មធ្វើបាន បំផុត)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. តើពណ៌នធម្មតាគ្រប់ក្នុងការងារបានប្រុងប្រាណមួយ ដ៏ខ្ពស់បំផុត? (ស្រេចដាច់គ្នា ១ = ខ្ពស់បំផុត, ស្រេចដាច់គ្ន ២ = មធ្វើបាន បំផុត)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36a. ពណ៌នធម្មតាក្នុងការងារបានប្រុងប្រាណមួយ ដ៏ខ្ពស់បំផុត?  

វគ្គទី IV: កត្តា ធនសងៗអំពីស៊ូធើវ៉ាយហ្សឺរ (Supervisee)

37. តើការងារធនសងៗចុងក្រោយបានកាន់តែប្រសើរជាងមុន ៖  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. ពណ៌នធម្មតាគ្រប់ក្នុងតែស្តាប់បានដ៏ខ្ពស់បំផុត? (ស្រេចដាច់គ្នា ២ = ខ្ពស់បំផុត, ២ = មធ្វើបាន បំផុត)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. ពណ៌នធម្មតាគ្រប់ក្នុងការងារធនសងៗអំពីស៊ូធើវ៉ាយហ្សឺរ  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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40. ការបញ្ជាក់ចំណីមនុស្សដែលមានការចូលរួមក្នុងការបង្កើតប្រក់បង្ការរបស់ព័ត៌មានយឺត: ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូផលប៉ូល

41. បញ្ហារវាយចំនួន (ការពិតជាមួយនឹងសេចក្តីដើម្បីយើងមានព័ត៌មានយឺត)
   ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង

42. សេចក្តីពិតចំនួនការណោះដែលមានរយៈពេល (ការពិតជាមួយនឹងសេចក្តីដើម្បីយើងមានព័ត៌មានយឺត)
   ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង

43. ការពិតជាមួយនឹងសេចក្តីដែលមានរយៈពេល (ការពិតជាមួយនឹងសេចក្តីដើម្បីយើងមានព័ត៌មានយឺត)
   ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង ដើម្បីស្វែងយល់ប្រការ៖ ដំបូង

43a. សេចក្តីដែលមានរយៈពេល

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________

44. សេចក្តីដែលមានរយៈពេល (ការពិតជាមួយនឹងសេចក្តីដើម្បីយើងមានព័ត៌មានយឺត)

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
រំលែងចិត្តត្រូវឱ្យសុខិត្យឱ្យការសំខាន់ៗ។ (1=ល្អ, 2=ឈ្មោះ, 3=ជាប់ដំណោះស្រាយ, 4=មិនបាន, 5=មិនបានឱ្យបញ្ហាដូចជាការសំខាន់ៗ។)

___ មួយទល់មួយជាមួយស៊ូធើវីហ្សិនដកបាន
___ ម្រកុម (ានស៊ូធើវីយហ្សឺរានក់)
___ មិតា (ស្ហ្ការីធហ្ើយោមនស៊ូធើវីយហ្សឺរធទ)
___ ធអ ិចម្រតូនិច (ការទ៊ូរស័ព្ទ, ធន្ើសារ)
___ ោមនការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិនអវីទំងអស់

54. ធ្វើការឧស្សាហកម្មមក់ (supervision) ទៅមក់ ៖

___ ការរំធលាដែលរៀងរាល់បំពានធលើរាងកាយកសារ
___ ការរំធលាដែលរៀងរាល់នា៊ូវធើវទកសារ
___ ជំងឺនា៊ូវចិតា/ជាពាកយស្មោីចំធពាបោះកសារ
___ ការមិនធអើធពាបោះកសារ
___ អំធពើហ្ិងាកនសងម្រគ្ួសារ

55. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន

56. ចូលចិត្តច្រើនក្នុងការប្រកួតប្រជែងរបស់អនុក្រមសិនោះហើយឱ្យរកឬស្មោះរូបំបែកពីការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិនដូចជាគ្មិតិជនសម្រាប់អនុក្រមសិនោះ? ៖

___ ចាស់/បាស
___ ធទ

57. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន

58. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន

59. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន

60. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន

61. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន

62. ប្រការី៖ ប្រការីពិសោធរណ៍អនិងការធ្វើស៊ូធើវីហ្សិន
49. បង្ហាញដំណើរការនិងវិធីធ្វើការការងាររួមមានស្រស់ស្អាតនៃការសុខភាពមន្ត្រាប់អនុវត្តន៍។
(1=ការបង្កើតបញ្ហាដែលខុសត្រូវតែបង្រៀន, 2= ការបង្កើតបញ្ហាកម្រិត, 3=អនុវត្តន៍ដែលពិតជាជាជាង)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. បង្ហាញដំណើរការវិធីធ្វើការរួមមានស្រស់ស្អាតនៃការសុខភាពមន្ត្រាប់អនុវត្តន៍។
(1=បញ្ហាសំខាន់, 2=បញ្ហាសាស្ត្រ, 3=អនុវត្តន៍ដែលមិនពិតជាជាង)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. បង្ហាញដំណើរការដល់ប្រការបន្ទាន៍ដែលអនុវត្តន៍បានការសុខភាពមន្ត្រាប់អនុវត្តន៍
(មន្ត្រាប់អនុវត្តន៍ដែលអនុវត្តន៍មានការសុខភាពមន្ទីរប់អនុវត្តន៍)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. បង្ហាញដំណើរការដែលអនុវត្តន៍មានការសុខភាពមន្ត្រាប់អនុវត្តន៍ការធ្វើការសុខភាព (supervision)
(អនុវត្តន៍ដែលអនុវត្តន៍មានការសុខភាព)
ក្រុមអរគ្នា

៣

មកប្រែ
# ANNEX A-2: SUPERVISEE SURVEY (ENGLISH)

FCF | REACT SUPERVISION SURVEY  
For Supervisees (Frontline Workers)

## SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name:</th>
<th>2. Gender: M or F</th>
<th>3. Age: years</th>
<th>4. Work Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. Organization: | 6. Position:  
--- | --- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Highest level of Education
- ___Secondary School
- ___Attended ___ yrs of University
- ___Associate degree (2 years)
- ___Bachelor’s degree
- ___Master’s degree
- ___Ph.D. or other doctorate degree

9. Current job sector
- ___Government
- ___NGO
- ___CBO
- ___Other

10. Primary focus of current work
- ___child protection/child welfare
- ___child labour and trafficking
- ___other (please specify):

11. Your highest degree is in:
- ___Sociology
- ___Psychology
- ___Social Work
- ___Education
- ___Other
  (what)__________________________

12. Total Social Service Experience
- ___1-3 years
- ___3-6 years
- ___6-10 years
- ___10-15 years
- ___15-20 years
- ___More than 20 years

13. Have you participated in any of the following? (Circle yes or no)
- Clinical Supervision Action Research with Ragamuffin Yes No
- Training from FCF | REACT Yes No
- Supervision training from TPO Yes No
- Other training about supervision Yes No

If yes, who provided it? __________________________ How many hours total? __________

## SECTION II: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT (about your agency)

14. Does your agency have a *written* policy about supervision?
___Yes (answer questions 14a., 14b, &14c) ___The work has not been started
___No, but the work has been started ___I don’t know

14a. How long ago was the policy completed?
___ Less than 6 months ago ___ More than 2 years ago
___ 6 months to one year ago ___ I don’t know
___ 1-2 years ago

14b. The policy addresses (check all that is present in the policy):
___ Frequency and length of supervision
___ Types of supervision provided (individual, group, peer, distance, etc)
___ Responsibilities of supervisors and supervisees for supervision
___ Confidentiality of information discussed during supervision
___ How supervision should be documented
___ Dealing with violation of agency policy or professional ethics

14c. The supervision policy is reviewed periodically and staff input is sought.
___ Yes, at least once a year ___ No
___ Yes, but not every year ___ I don’t know

15. Agency has a clear written job description for me.
___ Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know

16. Agency has a clear written policy on promotions and raises.
___ Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know

17. Agency has a written policy on non-discrimination of staff and clients.
___ Yes ___ No

18. My agency’s paid mental health leave policy is:
___ No paid mental health leave ___ More than 1 day a month
___ 1 day a month ___ I don’t know

19. I know the line of authority in my agency. ___ Yes ___ No

20. Agency provides time and resources to supervisors to help me receive supervision.
___ Yes ___ No ___ I don’t know

21. Agency provides private space for supervision. ___ Yes ___ No

22. My agency has computers and other equipment for training purposes.
___ Yes ___ No

23. Types of supervision provided by the agency (check all that apply):
___ One on one (face to face with supervisor) ___ Group (workers with one supervisor)
___ Peer (co-workers without supervisor) ___ Distance (via skype or phone)
___ External (by supervisor from different agency)

24. Supervision is used in my agency for dealing with (1=high priority, 2=medium priority 3=low priority):
___ Compliance with client outcomes ___ Compliance with budget limits
___ Number of clients served ___ Corrective action on staff mistakes
SECTION III: SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP

25. I have a specific person who is my direct supervisor.
   ____Yes      ____No    ___ I don’t know

26. My supervisor has approximately ____ years of experience in providing social services:
   ___ Less than one year      ___ 5-10 years     ___ I don’t know
   ___ 1-2 years              ___ 10-20 years
   ___ 3-5 years              ___ 20+ years

27. Compared to me, my supervisor’s expertise in working with the type of cases and work I do is:
   ____ Much greater than mine
   ____ Somewhat greater than mine
   ____ About equal to mine
   ____ Less than mine

28. I interact with my supervisor by (check all that apply):
   ___ One-on-one in person
   ___ Skype
   ___ In a group setting
   ___ Email
   ___ Phone call or text

29. I have a regularly scheduled supervision session with my supervisor:
   ____ Yes      ____ No

30. The average frequency of my supervision sessions are:
   ____ More than once a week
   ____ Once a week
   ____ Every 2 or 3 weeks
   ____ Less frequent than once a month
   ____ Other (please specify): ____________________________

31. The average supervision session lasts approximately _____ minutes.

32. Who decides what is talked about in supervision?
   ____ Supervisor    ____ Supervisee    ____ Both

33. If I have made a mistake on a case, I would most likely: (please choose ONE)
   ____ tell my supervisor and seek guidance from him/her
   ____ try to resolve it by myself without telling supervisor
   ____ just ignore it and go on

34. Rate your supervisory relationship on each of the following:
   (5 = Excellent, 4=Good  3=Fair  2=Bad  1= Very bad)
   ____ Mutual trust
   ____ Mutual respect
   ____ Mutual positive feelings
   ____ Sense of collaboration (having input into problem solving)
   ____ Sense of autonomy (freedom and independence)
   ____ Sense of emotional safety and security
35. Which of the following are challenges in your supervisory relationship? (mark all applicable)

___ Gender differences
___ Supervisor is younger than me
___ Cultural or social differences
___ Supervisor’s poor expertise
___ Supervisor’s attitude toward me
___ Abuse of authority/power
___ Sexual harassment/attraction
___ Other (please explain):_________

36. My supervisor is: (please choose ONE)

___ Internal (in my same agency)
___ External (in a different agency)
___ I don’t have a supervisor

36a. If you have an external supervisor, please explain the reason

SECTION IV: SUPERVISEE FACTORS

37. I feel that my job-related stress level is:

___ Extremely high
___ High
___ Moderate
___ Low
___ Extremely low

38. How much do you practice self-care methods (such as exercise, time off, engaging in hobbies, etc)?

___ More than adequately
___ Adequately
___ Not adequately

39. My social support system is (people you can talk to about problems):

___ Very strong
___ Moderately strong
___ Not strong

40. My confidence in my ability to do my job is:

___ Extremely high
___ High
___ Moderate
___ Low
___ Extremely low

41. On my job, I have (please choose one):

___ quite a lot of independence in my work schedule and how I do things
___ some independence
___ no independence

42. I would like to use supervision to learn more about (mark all applicable):

___ Managing time
___ Documentation
___ More knowledge and skills in general
___ Handling personal stress
___ Getting along with colleagues
___ Advocating for resources for clients
___ Advocating for better work environment
___ Handling job stress
___ Documentation

43. Regarding external supervision (supervision by someone outside of the agency):

___ I would like all external supervision
___ I would like a combination of both
___ I would like all internal supervision
43a. Please Explain why:

44. Please rank the following models of supervision in order of how much you prefer for your own supervision. (1=first preference 2=second preference 3=third preference 4=fourth preference 5= last preference)

___ One on one with supervisor  ___ Electronic (phone call, texts)
___ Group (one supervisor)  ___ No supervision at all
___ Peer (colleagues, no supervisor)

45. So far, my general opinion of supervision is:

___ It is very helpful  ___ Little bit helpful
___ Somewhat helpful  ___ Worse than not having any

46. Would you like training on how to get the most out of supervision?
___ Yes           ___ No

SECTION V: SUPERVISION CONTEXT

47. Which of the following are experienced by your current clients? (Check all that apply)

___ child physical abuse  ___ domestic violence
___ child sexual abuse  ___ mental illness
___ child verbal/emotional abuse  ___ substance abuse
___ child neglect  ___ disability
___ child trafficking/exploitation  ___ homelessness
___ juvenile justice  ___ other: ____________________
___ child victims of violence
___ children in alternative care

48. Rate how competent you feel in working with the following:
   (1=very competent; 2=somewhat competent; 3=not competent)

___ child physical abuse  ___ domestic violence
___ child sexual abuse  ___ mental illness
___ child verbal/emotional abuse  ___ substance abuse
___ child neglect  ___ disability
___ child trafficking/exploitation  ___ homelessness
___ alternative care  ___ other:
___ juvenile justice
___ child victims of violence
49. How stressful are the following clients for you to work with?

(1=most stressful, 2= somewhat stressful, 3=not stressful)

___ child victims of abuse/neglect
___ juvenile justice clients
___ children/youth with mental illness
___ children/youth with disabilities
___ victims of trafficking/exploitation
___ children in residential care
___ caregivers with domestic violence
___ caregivers with mental health issue
___ caregivers who are not motivated
___ clients who are hostile/resistant
___ clients with low mental capacity
___ overly demanding clients
___ other:

50. How confident are you in interacting with:

(1=very confident; 2=somewhat confident; 3=not confident)

___ medical professionals
___ police/law enforcement
___ judges and judicial workforce
___ juvenile justice personnel
___ mental health experts
___ substance abuse experts
___ domestic violence experts

51. Which of the following problems are you encountering in your work? (check all that apply)

___ clients live long distance away
___ transport support not enough
___ need communication support
___ too large a caseload
___ not enough supplies
___ need equipment, work space
___ others:

52. Please add any additional comments that you would like concerning your supervision needs or how supervision can help you in your job. THANK YOU!!

Comments:
## ANNEX B-1: SUPERVISOR SURVEY (KHMER)

ការស្ទង់មតិអំពីការធ្វើស្ ៊ូធ ើវីហ្សិន (SUPERVISION) របស្់កមមវិ្ី FCF | REACT

ស្ម្រាប់ស្ ៊ូធ ើវ៉ាយហ្សឺរ (Supervisors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>១. សញ្ចរៈ</th>
<th>២. របាយការណ៍</th>
<th>៣. សម្រាប់</th>
<th>៤. ជូនស៍</th>
<th>៥. តួរូបនេះ</th>
<th>៧. សំនួរចុងក្រោយ</th>
<th>៨. រូបភាពការងារ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>១</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>២</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>៣</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>៤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>៨. ការយកសម្រាប់អ្នកប្រឈម៖</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>១. វិទាល័យ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>២. បានច៊ូលធរៀន</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៣. បរិញ្ញា ប័ម្រត</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៤. អនសបណ្ឌិត</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៥. ភាពរដ្ឋាភិបាល</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៦. អងគការស្ហ្មន៍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៧. អងគការមិនដមនរដ្ឋាភិបាល</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៨. ដំណើរការក៏បានចូលធរៀន</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៩. ដំណើរការមិនបានចូលធរៀន</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>១០. ការយកសម្រាប់អ្នកប្រឈម៖</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>១. វិទាល័យ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>២. បានច៊ូលធរៀន</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៣. បរិញ្ញា ប័ម្រត</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៤. អនសបណ្ឌិត</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៥. ភាពរដ្ឋាភិបាល</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៦. អងគការស្ហ្មន៍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៧. អងគការមិនដមនរដ្ឋាភិបាល</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៨. ដំណើរការក៏បានចូលធរៀន</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៩. ដំណើរការមិនបានចូលធរៀន</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>១២. ការប្រាកដប្រឈម៖</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>១-៣ ឆ្នាំ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៣-៦ ឆ្នាំ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>៦-១០ ឆ្នាំ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>១០-១៥ ឆ្នាំ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>១៥-២០ ឆ្នាំ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ជាតិ 20 ឆ្នាំ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>១៣. ការប្រាកដប្រឈម៖</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>១. អ្នកធ្លាក់បានចូលប្រឈម៖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>២. អ្នកធ្លាក់មិនបានចូលប្រឈម៖</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ទិញចាស់ពិសេស ស្បែកដាក់ពិសេស ៖ ឆ្នាំ*
(Clinical Supervision) មានប្រទេសប្រទេសឈឺប្រឈឺ (Ragamuffin) ៣៨ អំពី
ការបញ្ចប់វិធីសាស្រ្តទៅ FCF | REACT ៣៨ អំពី
ការបញ្ចប់វិធីសាស្រ្តទៅពីប័ត្រពី (Supervision) ៣៨ អំពី
ការបញ្ចប់វិធីសាស្រ្តទៅពី (supervision) ៣៨ អំពី

ប្រឈឺដ៏មានសញ្ចេតនាត្រូវបានគោរពរៈ? ________________________
ទំនិញរបបធម៌្វ៍ប្រឈឺមាន? ________________

ទិនេស្សៈ និង ប្រៃប្រៃធោ (ឈឺដ៏មានជ្រឿងមិត្តភាព)

14. ទំនិញរបបធម៌្វ៍ប្រឈឺមានសញ្ចេតនាត្រូវបានគោរពរៈ (supervision Policy) ដ៏មាន?  ែ
  ឈឺដ៏មានជ្រឿងមិត្តភាព ១ ២ ៣ បី

14a. ទំនិញរបបធម៌្វ៍ប្រឈឺមានសញ្ចេតនាត្រូវបានគោរពរៈ?  ែ
  ប្រវត្តិ ២ សី ថ្មី ៣ ម្របៃធោ ៤ មិនែឹង

14b. ទំនិញរបបធម៌្វ៍ប្រឈឺមានសញ្ចេតនាត្រូវបានគោរពរៈ (ឈឺដ៏មានជ្រឿងមិត្តភាព)

  ែ

14c. ទំនិញរបបធម៌្វ៍ប្រឈឺមានសញ្ចេតនាត្រូវបានគោរពរៈ (supervision Policy)

  ែ
15. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ ដែលអាចបញ្ហប្រការកិច្ចការងារច្រើន ។

   —អំពីការងារ ។

16. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ ដែលអាចបញ្ហប្រការកិច្ចការងារច្រើន ។

   —អំពីការងារ ។

17. ការអំពីចំណាត់ថ្នាក់ខ្មែរ និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ 

   —អំពីការងារ ។

18. ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ 

   —អំពីការងារ ។

19. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ ដែលអាចបញ្ហប្រការកិច្ចការងារច្រើន ។

   —អំពីការងារ ។

20. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ ដែលអាចបញ្ហប្រការកិច្ចការងារច្រើន ។

   —អំពីការងារ ។

21. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ ដែលអាចបញ្ហប្រការកិច្ចការងារច្រើន ។

   —អំពីការងារ ។

22. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ ដែលអាចបញ្ហប្រការកិច្ចការងារច្រើន ។

   —អំពីការងារ ។

23. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ 

   —អំពីការងារ ។

24. អំពីសំណលេងប្រការកិច្ចការងារ (job description) និង ការបង្កើតសញ្ឹង្គ្រាយ 

   —អំពីការងារ ។
ភ្លេងបែបអធិការីតួតេស្តិស្ថានប្រការមួយ៖

25. អតិថិជនដែលបានបញ្ចប់ការងារ ដូច្នេះនាក់

(1-2 នាក់ / 3-5 នាក់ / 6-10 នាក់)

26. អតិថិជនត្រូវបានចំណាយការងារទៅជាអតិថិជនដែល

(1-2 នាក់ / 3-5 នាក់ / 6-10 នាក់)

27. អតិថិជនដែលប្រការមួយគឺត្រូវបានចំណាយការងារទៅជាអតិថិជនដែល

(1-2 នាក់ / 3-5 នាក់ / 6-10 នាក់)

28. អតិថិជនដែលប្រការមួយគឺត្រូវបានចំណាយការងារទៅជាអតិថិជនដែល

(1-2 នាក់ / 3-5 នាក់ / 6-10 នាក់)

29. អតិថិជនដែលប្រការមួយគឺត្រូវបានចំណាយការងារទៅជាអតិថិជនដែល

(1-2 នាក់ / 3-5 នាក់ / 6-10 នាក់)
(1 = ក្រាហេ 2 = អាចស្រើស្វែង 3 = ស្រើស្វែងឈ្លាឈ្មោះ)

31. ដៃរឹងការរៀបចំ: អ្នកត្រូវឈ្លាជំនួស់ ពីការធ្វើឱ្យមានសេវារបស់អ្នក(ដែលមានការអនសធលាមត្តមនិងគ្ណ្ធនយយភាព)។

32. អ្នកត្រូវធ្វើឱ្យមានសេវារបស់អ្នក( supervisor) ដែលត្រូវធ្វើឱ្យជាមួយអ្នកតាមត្រូវ។

33. អ្នកត្រូវធ្វើឱ្យជាមួយអ្នកដែលសមារមននិងស្ងគម្ោន

34. អ្នកត្រូវធ្វើឱ្យជាមួយអ្នកដែលសមារមននិងស្ងគម្ោន ស្តីពីអតិថិជន្ោះ (supervisee) ដែលត្រូវធ្វើឱ្យជាមួយអ្នកតាមត្រូវ។
35. ជីវៈាករការរីករាលដាលក្នុងកិច្ចប្រការ (តាមរយៈការធ្វើវិស័យបច្ចុប្បន្ន និងការអនុវត្តការបង្កើតបច្ចុប្បន្នរូបភាព)?
   ___ មានមិត្តបង្កើត  ___ មានមិត្តបង្កើត  ___ មានមិត្តបង្កើត

36. បង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង៖ (បង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែងលើការធ្វើការបច្ចេកវើនប្រកួតប្រជែង)?
   ___ មានចម្លើន  ___ មានចម្លើន  ___ មានចម្លើន

37. ការបង្ការការប្រកួតប្រជែង៖ (ការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែងសម្រាប់ការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែងទៅកាន់ការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង)
   ___ ដែលមានស្ថានភាពទាប  ___ ដែលមានស្ថានភាពទាប  ___ ដែលមានស្ថានភាពទាប
   ___ ដែលមានស្ថានភាពទាប  ___ ដែលមានស្ថានភាពទាប  ___ ដែលមានស្ថានភាពទាប

38. បង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង៖ (ការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែងសម្រាប់ការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង)
   ___ ត្រូវបានបង្កើតមកដលើការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ ត្រូវបានបង្កើតមកដលើការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ ត្រូវបានបង្កើតមកដលើការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង
   ___ ត្រូវបានបង្កើតមកដលើការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ ត្រូវបានបង្កើតមកដលើការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ ត្រូវបានបង្កើតមកដលើការបង្កើតការប្រកួតប្រជែង

39. ស្ថានភាពរបស់អ្នកមានការងារក្នុងការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង៖
   (ការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែងសម្រាប់ការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង)
   ___ មានស្ថានភាពការងារដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ មានស្ថានភាពការងារដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ មានស្ថានភាពការងារដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង
   ___ មានស្ថានភាពការងារដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ មានស្ថានភាពការងារដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ មានស្ថានភាពការងារដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង

39a. ស្ថានភាពរបស់អ្នកមានការងារក្នុងការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង៖ (មានចម្លើនការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង) ដូចជា: 
   ___ ដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង ដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ ដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង ដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង  ___ ដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង ដូចជាការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង

39b. ស្ថានភាពរបស់អ្នកមានការងារក្នុងការបង្កើតប្រកួតប្រជែង៖ 

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
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40. ប្រឈមប្រាន្តស្ថានស្រស់ស្អាត់នៃកម្រមិតស្រីប្រឆាំង
បញ្ជាក់បានទៅនឹងអំពីអំពីគំរ៊ូននការធ្វើស៊ូធាំពីហ្សិន
(1=ណោន់ 2=មិនណោន់ 3=ទាក់ទង 4=មិនទាក់ទង 5=មិនទាក់ទងដែលបាន)

___ មួយទល់មួយជាមួយស៊ូធាំពីយ៉ាយហ្សឺរ
___ ធអិចម្រតូនិច (ការទ៊ូរស័ពទ, ធន្ើសារ)
___ ម្រកុម (ានស៊ូធាំពីយ៉ាយហ្សឺរានក់)
___ ម្រៅមឺនស៊ូធាំពីអវីទំងអស់
___ ធគួយស្ហ្ការីដែលានមសខតំដណ្ងម្របហាក់ម្របដហ្លោន
___ ធខាោរណ៍ស្ហ្ការីដែលានម្របធោជន៍ធរីដែរ
___ ធោស្ចក់ជាងការធ្វើស៊ូធាំពីអវីទំងអស់

41. ត្រូវបានបញ្ជាក់: ម៉ារាយបំពាក់របស់អនកមិនមានកម្រមិតស្រីប្រឆាំង
dុំទៅវាត់ទៅទៅវាស់កម្រមិតស្រីប្រឆាំង
(1=ការរំធលា បំពានដននករាងកាយកសារ; 2=ការរំធលា បំពាននា៊ូវធ ទកសារ; 3=ការរំធលា បំពាននា៊ូវចិតា; 4=ការមិនធអើធពើចំធពាោះកសារ; 5=ការជួញែ៊ូរ/ធកងម្របវ័ញ្ចកសារ)

42. ត្រូវបានបញ្ជាក់: តើស្រុកស្រីនៃកម្រមិតស្រីប្រឆាំងដែលមិនមានកម្រមិតស្រីប្រឆាំងទៅវាត់ទៅទៅនា៊ូវស៊ូធាំពីអវីទំងអស់
(1=ការរំធលា បំពានដននករាងកាយកសារ; 2=ការរំធលា បំពាននា៊ូវធ ទកសារ; 3=ការរំធលា បំពាននា៊ូវចិតា; 4=ការរំធលា បំពានរិទ្យាធារសារ; 5=ការរំធលា បំពានរិទ្យាធារេក)
ការរំធលាយបំពាននាំូវធានា ត្រូវការអំធពើហ្ិងាកនសងម្រគ្ួសារ

ការរំធលាយបំពាននាំូវចិតា/ជាពាកយស្មោីចំធពាោះកសារ

ជំងឺនាំូវចិតា

ការមិនធអើធពើចំធពាោះកសារ

ការបំពានសារធ្លតសធញៀន

ការជួញែ៊ូរ/ធកងម្របវ័ញ្ចកសារ

ពិការភាព

ការដថទំជំនួស្

យសតាិ្ម៌អនីតិជន

ធនសងៗ៖____________________

44. ដំណើរការបំណងដែលមានកើតមកពីការរំធលាយបំពាននាំូវធានា ត្រូវការអំធពើហ្ិងាកនសងម្រគ្ួសារ ឬការមិនធអើធពើចំធពាោះកសារ អនាគតប្រាកដូតឯកជនប្រភេទណាដែលប្រសើរបាន?

(1=ការធនាគារប្រាកដូតឯកជន 2=ការដឹកជញ្ជូនប្រាកដូតឯកជន 3=មានទីក្រុងក្នុងប្រទេស)

ការរំធលាយបំពាននាំូវធានា ត្រូវការអំធពើហ្ិងាកនសងម្រគ្ួសារ

អនាគតប្រាកដូតឯកជនដែលនិងមានប្រសើរបាន

45. ដំណើរការបំណងដែលមានកើតមកពីការរំធលាយបំពាននាំូវធានា ត្រូវការអំធពើហ្ិងាកនសងម្រគ្ួសារ ឬការមិនធអើធពើចំធពាោះកសារ អនាគតប្រាកដូតឯកជនប្រភេទណាដែលចូលរួមការធ្វើការណាម្តង់បាន?

(1=មានការប្រកួតប្រជែង 2=មានការប្រកួតប្រជែង 3=មានការប្រកួតប្រជែង)

ការរំធលាយបំពាននាំូវធានា ត្រូវការអំធពើហ្ិងាកនសងម្រគ្ួសារ
46. ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ជីវិតប្រកួតប្រជុំ (ប្រកួតប្រជុំ) និងភាពជាមួយនៃកម្រិត

ប្រយោជន៍!!
# ANNEX B-2: SUPERVISOR SURVEY (ENGLISH)

## FCF | REACT SUPERVISION SURVEY

For Supervisors

### SECTION I: DEMOGRAPHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name:</th>
<th>2. Gender:</th>
<th>3. Age:</th>
<th>4. Work Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M or F</td>
<td>years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Line Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended ___ yrs of University</td>
<td>NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree (2 years)</td>
<td>CBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. or other doctorate degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Your highest degree is in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(what)__________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Total Social Service Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Have you participated in any of the following? (Circle yes or no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Supervision Action Research with Ragamuffin Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training from FCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision training from TPO Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other training about supervision Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, who provided it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours total?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT (about your agency)

14. Does the agency have a written policy about supervision?
   ___Yes (answer questions 14a, 14b, & 14c) ___The work has not been started
   ___No, but the work has been started     ___I don’t know

14a. How long ago was the policy completed?
   ___Less than 6 months ago ___More than 2 years ago
   ___6 months to one year ago ___I don’t know
   ___1-2 years ago

14b. The policy addresses (check all that is present in the policy):
   ____Frequency and length of supervision
   ____Types of supervision provided (individual, group, peer, distance, etc)
   ____Responsibilities of supervisors and supervisees for supervision
   ____Confidentiality of information discussed during supervision
   ____How supervision should be documented
   ____Dealing with violation of agency policy or professional ethics

14c. The supervision policy is reviewed periodically and staff input is sought.
   ___Yes, at least once a year ___No
   ___Yes, but not every year ___I don’t know

15. Agency has a clear written job description for me.
   ___Yes ___No ___I don’t know

16. Agency has a clear written policy on promotions and raises.
   ___Yes ___No ___I don’t know

17. Agency has a written policy on non-discrimination of staff and clients. ___Yes ___No

18. My agency’s paid mental health leave policy is:
   ___No paid mental health leave ___More than 1 day a month
   ___1 day a month ___I don’t know

19. I know the line of authority in my agency. ___Yes ___No

20. Agency provides time and resources to supervisors to help provide quality supervision.
   ___Yes ___No ___I don’t know

21. Agency provides private space for supervision.
   ___Yes ___No

22. My agency has computers and other equipment for training purposes.
   ___Yes ___No

23. Types of supervision provided by the agency (check all that apply):
   ___One on one (face to face with supervisor ___Group (workers with one supervisor)
   ___Peer (co-workers without supervisor ___Distance (via skype or phone)
   ___External (by supervisor from different agency)
24. Supervision is used in my agency for dealing with (1=high priority, 2=medium priority 3=low priority):
   ___Compliance with client outcomes
   ___Number of clients served
   ___Compliance with budget limits
   ___Corrective action on staff mistakes
   ___Providing educational materials
   ___Teaching new work-related skills
   ___Help with job-related stress
   ___Providing emotional support

SECTION III: SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP

25. I am a direct supervisor over:
   ___1-2 staff
   ___3-5 staff
   ___5-10 staff
   ___More than 10 staff

26. The average supervision session lasts approximately ______ minutes.

27. Compared to my supervisees, my expertise in working with the type of cases my supervisees have is:
   ___Much greater than theirs
   ___Somewhat greater than theirs
   ___About equal to theirs
   ___Less than theirs

28. Who decides what is talked about in supervision?
   ___Supervisor
   ___Supervisee
   ___Both

29. Rate your supervisory relationship with your supervisees on:
   (5 = Excellent, 4=Good  3=Fair    2=Bad    1= Very bad)
   ___Mutual trust
   ___Mutual respect
   ___Mutual positive feelings
   ___Sense of collaboration (having input into problem solving)
   ___Sense of autonomy (freedom and independence)
   ___Sense of emotional safety and security

30. How much do you enjoy providing each type of supervision activities?
   (1=Very much     2=Enjoy    3= Do not enjoy)
   ___Administrative: Making sure about compliance and accountability
   ___Educational: providing information and teaching new methods/skills
   ___Supportive: listening to problems, helping with emotional support
   ___Mediation/Advocacy: advocating for my supervisee within the agency

31. Which of the following are challenges in your supervisory relationship? (mark all applicable)
   ___Gender differences
   ___Supervisee is older than me
   ___Cultural or social differences
   ___Supervisor’s lack of motivation
   ___Personality clash/tension
   ___Difficult power dynamics
   ___Sexual attraction/harassment
   ___Other: _______________________

32. As a supervisor, do you also have an upline supervisor?
   ___Yes, I have a supervisor at my same agency
   ___Yes, I have a supervisor, but they work at a different agency
   ___No, I don’t have a supervisor
33. If you are providing external supervision to staff from a different agency, please explain the reason why their own agency is not doing the supervision:

SECTION IV: SUPERVISOR FACTORS

34. I feel that my job-related stress level is:
   ___ Extremely high   ___ Low
   ___ High             ___ Extremely low
   ___ Moderate

35. How much do you practice self-care methods (such as exercise, time off, engaging in hobbies, etc)?
   ___ More than adequately  ___ Adequately  ___ Not adequately

36. My social support system is (people you can talk to about problems):
   ___ Very strong         ___ Moderately strong  ___ Not strong

37. My confidence in my ability to provide good supervision is:
   ___ Extremely high      ___ Moderate       ___ Extremely low
   ___ High               ___ Low

38. I would like more training on how to help my supervisees with (mark all applicable):
   ___ Managing time       ___ Handling job stress
   ___ Documentation       ___ Handling personal stress
   ___ Handling difficult cases ___ Getting along with colleagues
   ___ More knowledge and skills in ___ Advocating for better work
   general environment
   ___ Advocating for resources for clients and supervisees

39. My general feelings about external supervision (by someone outside of the agency) is:
   ___ I would like all external supervision for our agency staff
   ___ I would like all internal supervision for our agency staff
   ___ I would like a combination of both

39a. Please Explain why:

40. Please rank the following models of supervision in order of how much you prefer for your agency. (1=first preference  2=second preference  3=third preference  4=fourth preference  5= last preference)
   ___ One on one with supervisor   ___ Electronic (phone call, texts)
   ___ Group (one supervisor)       ___ No supervision at all
   ___ Peer (colleagues, no supervisor)

41. So far, my general opinion of supervision is:
   ___ It is very helpful                 ___ Little bit helpful
   ___ Somewhat helpful                  ___ Worse than not having any
SECTION V: SUPERVISION CONTEXT

42. Which of the following are experienced by your agency’s current clients? (Check all that apply)

___ child physical abuse
___ child sexual abuse
___ child verbal/emotional abuse
___ child neglect
___ child trafficking/exploitation
___ juvenile justice
___ child victims of violence
___ children in alternative care
___ domestic violence
___ mental illness
___ substance abuse
___ disability
___ homelessness
___ other: ____________________

43. Rate how competent you feel in guiding your staff with the following: (1=very competent; 2=somewhat competent; 3=not competent)

___ child physical abuse
___ child sexual abuse
___ child verbal/emotional abuse
___ child neglect
___ child trafficking/exploitation
___ alternative care
___ juvenile justice
___ domestic violence
___ mental illness
___ substance abuse
___ disability
___ homelessness
___ other:

44. Which clients are the most stressful for your staff to work with? (1=most stressful, 2= somewhat stressful, 3=not stressful)

___ child victims of abuse/neglect
___ juvenile justice clients
___ children/youth with mental illness
___ children/youth with disabilities
___ victims of trafficking/exploitation
___ children in residential care
___ caregivers with domestic violence
___ caregivers with mental health issue
___ caregivers who are not motivated
___ clients who are hostile/resistant
___ clients with low mental capacity
___ overly demanding clients
___ other:

45. How confident are you in engaging in the following tasks in supervision? (1=very confident; 2= somewhat confident; 3=not confident)

___ Monitoring/correcting staff
___ Ensuring accountability
___ Ensuring ethical behavior
___ Monitoring use of resources
___ Active and empathic listening
___ Offering new knowledge and skills
___ Helping with problem solving
___ Demonstrating a new method
___ Critiquing staff demonstration
___ Performing staff evaluation
46. Please add a few comments (you would like to), on your needs as a supervisor

Comments:

THANK YOU!!
ANNEX C: FOCUS GROUP GUIDE AND TRACKER (ENGLISH)

Structured Guide for Focus Groups

1. Focus groups will consist of no more than 10 people per group.
2. Two groups will be held for Phnom Penh, one group in Phnom Pehn for Kandal Province, one in Battambang, one in Siem Reap, and one will be held via Skype for Sihanoukville.
3. Each group should consist of about equal numbers of supervisors and supervisees, except in Phnom Pehn, one group will be for supervisors and the one for front-line workers.
4. The group members will introduce themselves, and all will sign the Consent and Confidentiality Agreement.
5. The facilitator will go over the ground rules:
   a. Everything will remain confidential; report will not name any individuals or agencies
   b. No one will discuss what was said in the discussion with people who did not attend the group.
   c. No one will monopolize the conversation or make unkind remarks about someone else’s comments. All perspectives are welcome on the table.
   d. The facilitators will control the time, approximately ten minutes per question (there are four questions in all). The facilitators will determine if adjustments are needed.
6. The facilitators will facilitate the discussion. The groups should feel free to brainstorm and generate their own ideas. The ‘potential ideas’ listed in the Discussion Tracker (next page) are provided in case they might help guide the discussion, but only if needed.

Focus Group Questions

8. What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among the FCF/REACT partner organizations?
9. What are the strengths and needs of current FCF/REACT partner organizations’ staff and supervisors? Consider:
10. What are some essential steps to be taken before Cambodia can achieve a national standard in supervision for all social service staff?
11. How will national standards for supervision be enforced, assuming it can be achieved?
# FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION TRACKER

## 1. What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among the FCF/REACT partner organizations?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- a. FCF/REACT training to XXX people
- b. Training capacity at various organizations (Save, TPO, Others?)

## 2. What are the strengths and needs of current FCF/REACT partner organizations’ staff and supervisors?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- a. Resources (time, pay, space)
- b. Trained supervisors
- c. Supervisor expertise on common case difficulties
- d. Others?

## 3. What are some essential steps to be taken before Cambodia can achieve a national standard in supervision for all social service staff?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- a. This study
- b. Examples from other countries
- c. An MSW course on supervision?
- d. Consultations among social service organizations
- e. Working group
- f. Government endorsement/launch

## 4. How will national standards for supervision be enforced, assuming it can be achieved?
Potential Discussion Ideas

a. Agency self-monitoring and yearly certification
b. Staff annual certification
c. Professional organization monitoring
d. Educational programs monitoring students

CONSENT and CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

We the undersigned, agree that we are participating voluntarily in the focus group on supervision. Further, we agree to keep our focus group discussion confidential once we leave the group. We understand that the report on the group will not name any individual or agency, and we will not experience any negative risks for having participated in the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structured Guide for Key Informant Interviews

7. Key informants are experienced social service experts and those in positions of decision making, policy advising, and in academia. Between 10-12 people of national prominence should be interviewed.

8. Each key informant should be contacted and requested to be interviewed. The purpose of the interview is to gather expert information on four questions, as part of the study being conducted by the FCF/REACT network on supervision. Read these questions to them.

9. Each key informant should be interviewed separately and provided assurance of confidentiality.

10. The interviewer will ask questions and request clarification, but never argue with, or challenge the key informant.

11. Before starting the interview, ask for permission to take notes.

Key Informant Questions

(these are similar to the focus group questions but wider in scope)

12. What are the strengths and needs of current social service providers in Cambodia, and how can supervision improve their services?

13. What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among social service providers in Cambodia?

14. Many countries already have supervision standards. Although Cambodia just launched the social work standards, there is a need for detailed supervision standards. What are some essential steps to be taken before Cambodia can achieve a national standard in supervision for all social service staff?

15. How will national standards for supervision be enforced, assuming it can be achieved?
### 5. What are the strengths and needs of current social service providers in Cambodia, and how can supervision improve their services?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- e. Resources (time, pay, space)
- f. Trained supervisors
- g. Supervisor expertise on common case difficulties
- h. Others?

### 6. What are the major achievements and challenges in supervision among social service providers in Cambodia?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- c. FCF/REACT training to XXX people
- d. Training capacity at various organizations (Save, TPO, Others?)

### 7. What are some essential steps to be taken before Cambodia can achieve a national standard in supervision for all social service staff?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- g. This study
- h. Examples from other countries
- i. An MSW course on supervision?
- j. Consultations among social service organizations
- k. Working group
- l. Government endorsement/launch

### 8. How will national standards for supervision be enforced, assuming it can be achieved?

**Potential Discussion Ideas**

- e. Agency self-monitoring and yearly certification
- f. Staff annual certification
- g. Professional organization monitoring
- h. Educational programs monitoring students