

RINO PATTI
Interviewed by Frances Feldman
In Dr. Patti's Office at USC
January 5, 1995

FELDMAN: Rino, what I'd like to have you start with is something about the kind of family you were in and then how you came to enter the field of social work. This is my old theory that families have something to do with this.

PATTI: Well I think that my family experience probably had a great deal to do with the choice of field. As I think about it in retrospect, my family was--my mother and father were from Cicely and came to the United States and settled in New Orleans. In the fashion of those days, my mother followed her brother who had settled in New Orleans. He was a mason

FELDMAN: Did he go to New Orleans because that's where the ship went?

PATTI: No.

FELDMAN: Because that was one of the two major points.

PATTI: This was Uncle Pasquale, the oldest of the brothers on my mother's side of the family, and since he was the first to come, and since there was--nobody ever kind of systematically picked up his part of the history, we only speculate, but we believe he came to New York, and that he was probably part of one of the Patrone system, that contract laborer that brought other immigrants to New Orleans. Because he was a mason, and because New Orleans has so much masonry and Southern European kind of influence, so, as you know, with the Quarter and so on, we suspected that's the reason he was brought there. But nobody has ever confirmed that. All we know is that he came through New York and went, for some reason, to New Orleans. The reason could have been family

because he was the first on either side. My mother and father went to New Orleans. My mother was pregnant with my oldest brother at the time. From 1921 to 1936, the family decided in New Orleans. In that period of time, there were six children born. Two died of Mediterranean Anemia, very shortly after birth. One was an infant and one was a toddler. I was the last of the six. There were four of us that remained: two sisters, and brother and myself.

In 1936--by that time the rest of my mother's family had come and also settled in New Orleans--one of the brothers, my Uncle Alfred went from New Orleans to California and settled in Escondido, and he implored my other sister, my aunt and my mother to come to California because it was such a wonderful, wonderful place. So in 1936, the family packed up and came to Southern California with great objections. My father, at that time, had been quite successful in the XXXXXX Corporation, which was the beginning of Progressive Foods. So they came to San Deigo. My father set up an import/export; and Italian import/export--I'm giving you the sort of basics...

FELDMAN: I think it's of interest. We never know quite enough about how people got to be what they are.

PATTI: Right. So we were in San Diego. Shortly after we moved to San Diego, my mother began to have serious emotional problems and that was attendant--one doesn't know for sure--perhaps a causal reaction to my father's behavior, which was very prolitarian and very abusive to both her and--physically abusive. In fact, the family folk lore is he knocked her down the steps when she was pregnant with me, and I was born prematurely, as a result. Not much prematurely, but some. In any case, she began to become emotionally unraveled. That would have been about 1938, 1939, when she was

first admitted to the hospital of very severe mental illness which involved hallucinations and illusions and severe deterioration. (Frances, there is pretty serious skipping on the tape at this point, but it's something like---We came home and had to search and find her - ----- preaching with a bible on the corner, and so on. So it was a source of some humiliation, and of course, concern about her.

My father left, returned to New Orleans, and a divorce was in process and through some mediation of the family, there was an effort for reconciliation. She got temporarily better, he returned to San Diego and for some time, I would guess about a year or so--I was just a baby at the time--there was (skipping). From about the time, 1940 to 1942, really everything became unravelled. My brother and sister left and went to live on their own. Who was left was my younger sister, my youngest sister, and my mother. Well my mother once again decompensated and had to be placed in a hospital (skipping). At that point, my father left again and returned to New Orleans. SKIPPING----divorce settlement, purchased a home and in that home, my older brother and sister and then my younger sister and I, established a residence. This would have been about 1941 - the War--my brother was called into the service SKIPPING ----was taken about 1942 by an aunt to a place called Ramona, a little town in ??? County. She cared for me during the war years while my brother was away. My mother was still in the hospital during this time. It was a time of great turmoil, and I think in some ways that experience had very formative effect on me because I early on knew what it was like to live in a highly unstable situation and to SKIPPING---and throughout the process, there was always a sense that the family was very important, that one, specifically I, the youngest, would be taken care of SKIPPING---associated with bad things--SKIPPING. I credit LOTS OF SKIPPING ---

about this time SKIPPING----- We tried to maintain contact with ??? at this the time, but she was by this time, completely and utterly psychotic, and her medication SKIPPING. My father, meantime, returned to New Orleans and re-married and had two children there.

After the war, my brother returned and went to college on the G.I. Bill. We still had the family home in San Diego, and he felt that, as is so typical in Italian families, that he was now the head of the SKIPPING---- -----for my education to be SKIPPING---- back to San Diego where I thought I could get SKIPPING -- ---my aunt was a loving, wonderful person, but she was an Italian immigrant who had a third grade education SKIPPING--- ---her and my two sisters, starting about what must have been 1936, with them from the time I was ten until I was SKIPPING -- ---my sisters got married, my brother never married, so he and I bachelored, essentially, for most of that ten years. It was a very important time in my life because it was the most consistency I ever had. He cared a great deal about me and took it upon himself to make sure that I had an education; more than just the sense that I was going to school, but by the time I was ten, he would SKIP-- ---One of the things that was so important about that time SKIP --- ---so my notion of the role of government, the importance of New Deal--LOTS OF SKIPPING HERE -- established long before I even knew about social work, those are very much a part of discourse in our family. We talked about that a lot, and I remember his extraordinary anger that he had about the Taft-Hartley Bill, and things like SKIP--- I think that that sort of added to this sense of responsibility for caring SKIP--- to that earlier experience, I think it had kind of a political edge to it. So in college, I was SKIP--- -history, mostly, SKIP SKIP

I college I got interested in sociology. I just sort of moved from history to sociology and as a junior, I walked into that class as you did all others, expecting that it would be the usual class with the instructor lecturing; in those days, very formal and very distant. Irving Peabord (??SP), who turned out to be a social worker, who went to get a Ph.D. in sociology at the University of Oregon, taught a class like I had never had in my life. He was interested in us as people, he was SKIP--after classes, he was interested SKIP-- So there started a series of encounters with him, and he said, "Well, have you thought about social work?" And I said SKIP--- about the field, and that caused me then to switch to what was a brand new major in social welfare, and I think was one of the very first undergraduate social welfare programs. I think the middle part of my junior year SKIPP

FELDMAN: San Diego State.

PATTI: San Diego State. The major was an interesting major, and I've often thought that we've gone wrong in social work education in creating these very technically oriented BSW programs. SKIP --major required a distribution of like three courses in economics and three courses in political science and four courses in psychology and so many in sociology and so on. It was a broad social science education. It was a wonderful education. as well as a course on the field of social work. Arthur Finks book, you recall, SKIPPING There was a practicum of six months - a semester long volunteer sort of SKIP you did with the Urban League, and they had such a profound effect on my because at that time in Southeast San Diego, whole neighborhoods were turning over. This was circa 1956 SKIP--- the first black and SKIP and the whites would mobilize to try to keep the blacks out, and then there would be a second black family moving in, and then before you

know it, the whole neighborhood would go. The Urban League, headed then by Percy Steele, who's been around and still alive, and active, was interested in trying to mediate and SKIP and to racial SKIP-- So they sent this young Howard senior out to do a survey of people in SKIPPING --- told me that there was SKIPPING -- It was really off of that experience that I became convinced that social work was--sociology lost interest for me at that point as a pursuit for my in itself-- so in these continuing discussions with Irv Kebores (??sp?), which my kind of sensibility and my direction was being shaped, he said, "You must go to the school of social work." I said there was none in San Diego at that time, so where does one go? He said there was only one school. I said what's that, and he said the University of Southern SKIP ---well he said there was another school at UCLA, but I don't think he SKIPPING -- --not unless I tried to go to school, because I didn't know if I would get in, here, and SKIPPING --- -- I think it was Howard, but we never saw Howard, who we saw was a woman named Mary Durham (SP??) SKIP ---were in some barracks or something, and then not to long after that, I got a call from Arlien Johnson. She said SKIPPING --- --- you know SKIP --tower over her, she seemed really symbollicly she towered over me. She was as--I've heard other people say that she could be very tough--but in that interview, I felt a great warmth, a great sense of support, a great sort of enthusiasm about the profession and what it could accomplish. So that was a done deal. From that moment forward, I knew I was coming. That would have been maybe SKIP spring SKIP ---I worked at a social center; Bayside Social Center in San Diego, which served largely the italian community of San Diego. SKIPPING --was kind of my practical personal experience, it wasn't clinical, you worked with families to handle the problems SKIPPING ---the Bayside Center was a place where people could get

access to opportunities they literally would not have at home, especially young Italian women, who in those days, were in the kitchen and sewing and learning domestic skills. When they came to the Center, they were people. They could talk about education. They could talk about doing other things in life than getting married and having kids. My sisters were SKIP-- -- SKIP --

SKIP---USC. It was that I had, even though I had these exposures that I talked about, my education was a very bookish education. I mean I really SKIP--- --- discourse as to what books you've read SKIP -- --and for the first few months it really threw me SKIP -- was SKIP --required that I put myself, that I introduce myself in my mind and my feelings SKIP -- and then putting myself in the context of what I had learned SKIP --- -- in Hamilton's book, twice, before the first day of class. I really didn't understand it. SKIP -- education SKIP --- I'd understood SKIP -- I took the SKIP -- and what had worked for me to well previously in education SKIP --LOTS OF SKIPPING ----

FELDMAN: SKIPPING (I heard your voice for a second)

PATTI: -----and I think that the first field placement, Margaret Cook at the Bureau of Public Assistance, was really where it began to come together. In this sense, like hundred of thousands of social work students, it's that interaction between self-examination that the classroom begins to stimulate, and then the intersection between that self-examination and your experience with clients, that then you begin to kind of LOTS OF SKIPPING HERE. SKIP --- you know, I'd get there in the morning and I would go out and doing something with a young boy or take, she had a hearing-impaired daughter, and I got her connected with vocational rehab, and I would drive her to Los Angeles. So going out

there in the morning, became our way of working together, only to find out that she had this other (I couldn't pick this part up).

FELDMAN: How did you find out?

PATTI: It was thought that we had, and I think in retrospect, in some ways we did have a good relationship, but in those days, when -----

FELDMAN: It's unquestioning on your part.

PATTI: That's right. That's right. It never, never occurred to me that SKIP -- at least withholding that information. And so I had long, long conversations with Mrs. Cook about that, and she said, "You know, part of your responsibility is to SKIP -- and to SKIP -- What had been an entirely facilitative and supportive relationship, my work with this family, now became a limited one and a SKIP --turns out decided to quit her job SKIP -- -- those were --- and there are many other cases which were---

FELDMAN: What a way to learn about human behavior.

PATTI: Oh, boy, yes. SKIP --- -- the side of me that--the side of me that liked to study and my scholarship research and so on, remained, but I think the part of me that began to use myself in practice, was really what grew and developed in a quite extraordinary way in those couple of years. SKIP SKIP ---piece of discipline. That's about up to my USC time.

FELDMAN: Okay. But I can see where you get your interest in immigration and family problems, family preservation, but all of the consciousness that things aren't always what they seem to be.

(phone call - interview stopped and resumed at this point)

PATTI: We can start over. As I was saying, we had to return to Ohio because Nadine had the obligation to pay back to the State of Ohio, and the mental hygiene department wouldn't relieve her of that obligation, so we returned. The State of Ohio had frozen jobs, so there was no job in the mental health system. She went to work for the Hamilton County Welfare Department, and I went to work with the Veteran's Administration. It was the highest, it was the Zenith of the Veteran's Administration, the health care system. It was SKIP--- in terms of care SKIP-- health care programs as well. And so I worked for four years on the psychiatric service at VA Hospital. One of those years in the mental health, the outpatient mental health section and it was a rich experience. I want to say Martin Levine, but it wasn't Martin Levine. It was Maurice Levine, who was the head of the department of psychiatry then. I think he very nearly equaled Franz Alexander in his world-wide reputation. SKIP--over that department of psychiatry like a lord in a manor; a wonderful man, but he took a personal interest not only in the psychiatric residents, but all the people really who were working with him. We had rounds twice a month, and I think he was really ahead of his time. Social workers would present at rounds, and there were, I know, a number of times when I participated in presentations on mostly families of schizophrenics SKIP-- three times a year, would hold forth in her flamboyant fashion. So it was a wonderful place to learn. I worked with the psychiatric residents who rotated through on a six-month basis, and those were the very, very early days of beginning to treat schizophrenic families.

FELDMAN: What year was this?

PATTI: It was 1960. I had been at--my second-year placement had been at the psychiatric unit. There's an interesting side there, but I'll tell you about that later. All my

work at the psychiatric unit had been with individuals, and in the early first year or two at the VA, the psychiatric interns would see patients, and social workers would see families. Well it was the early years when they first began to think about treating schizophrenic families as families, rather than the individual and the family. It was the early work of Murray Bohlen (??sp?) and Thomas Zahs (??sp?) and another psychiatrist who really was on the leading edge of family work. I began to read about family work and discovered that actually, social workers were the first ones to really work with families. The psychiatric residents, and indeed some of the psychiatrists were very interested in this. There's very little in psychiatric literature. And so Francis Shures (??sp?) and William Gomberg (??sp?) and oh, the other fellow who wrote--his name escapes me now. But there were a number of social workers who had written significant pieces about family work. So we, together with several of the psychiatrists, we had a number of interesting cases where we teamed together and saw the family as a group and wrote some papers with them. It was a wonderful, wonderful place to learn and learn to grow.

The thing I regret about that period, professionally, and it has disturbed me for all these years since, is that the theories that explain families' contribution to schizophrenia, largely blamed mothers for creating schizophrenia in their sons. Fathers were also to blame, but usually because they were absent, psychologically absent.

FELDMAN: They didn't get credit.

PATTI: They didn't get credit. Although there wasn't a mean intent or anything like that, still, intrinsic to the explanatory model was the notion that in order for, in our case was the son because all we saw were young men, that in order for the son to get well, there had to be some change in the dynamic between the mother and the son. I regret very

much in looking back now at my own life experiences, the limitation of parenting and the fact that you can't blame parents for everything. I regret very much the labeling and the blaming I think that was implicit in those days. That's why I'm so really heartened and pleased by the re-immersion of the family in mental health as a partner, as an aide, as a resource for people with mental illness rather than as an object; a sick object, to be treated so as to create a better environment for the patient to get well in. I think we've come a long way in that respect, and it's morally healthier, and I think therapeutically, makes much more sense. You work with what theories you have.

FELDMAN: But we build on that earlier knowledge. If we hadn't gone through that stage, we wouldn't have known it was wrong.

PATTI: Sure, sure. That's right. There were a number of really important, almost present (?) things that happened. As you know now, there's the prevailing model for the treatment of persistently mentally ill is to try to normalize their lives as much as possible with work, with family relations, with access to and use of community resources, friendships networks, and so on. We started in that hospital something called a work therapy program where we took what were very, very sick young men, and as soon as their symptoms were not so intrusive that it would alarm everybody else, we would put them in work assignments, and really very responsible work assignments: cashiers, helping with maintenance, repairing light bulbs, and so on. We studied very closely, because this was a training center, kind of research-related to everything that was done, we studied very carefully the conditions, the circumstances which seemed to support the success in these placements. The extraordinary insights we got were that the situational nature of psychology and if you had people who were actively, luridly hallucinating and

delusional, who could connect to a job, who could get themselves focussed on a task, and who could act more or less appropriately in that contact, they would go back to the ward, and they would be just like everybody else.

That for me was a powerful learning. I never really forgot that. It always reminds me, and of course, it's sort of back-seat management of social work, you always need to understand somebody in a situation. You do not sort of extract people from the situation. You understand them in interaction of the situation, their perception of the situation and how the situation actually turns out. So I remember that. I always remember that, for example, when people come here to apply for jobs. The faculty are great on sort of making twenty-minute interviews and developing these into fancy theories of the person's lifetime potential, and I always remind myself and others that the situation--people who come here to apply--it's an extraordinarily stressful situation. It requires of them behavior that many of them have not had a chance to experiment with. You try to extrapolate from this highly situational circumstance what this person might be like under less duress in a culture where the norms and the expectations are clear. Most times, people really are quite different; sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. Anyway, just an aside. That was for me a very powerful kind of reinforcement of the notion that you can't understand people outside ecology (?), a term they use now.

The four years while I was at the department of psychiatry, we had twice monthly consults with the psychiatrists, and they were teaching us in a way to be therapists, ala psychiatrists. It always used to trouble me. I never found the meetings very satisfying because there was nothing you couldn't say--I guess in the analytic position--about a case, about your intervention or about your reaction to a piece of behavior that didn't have

transferential or counter-transferential (?) implications. I mean, you couldn't get away from it. There were times when I would say, "Can we just talk about her anger," without looking at my reaction to her anger (laughter). I confess that although we did it religiously, you know, twice a month you go in for your two hour session, I confess I never quite got on the band wagon with that.

I did student supervision the third year out of school, which I enjoyed greatly and had great fun with. And then---

FELDMAN: What university was that with?

PATTI: The student was from Smith.

FELDMAN: Your long-distance placement.

PATTI: Right. Smith, in those days and I suspect they still do, used Cincinnati agencies a lot.

FELDMAN: They still do.

PATTI: They still use Cincinnati Family Service, I suspect. She was a fine young woman. Her husband was a neurosurgical resident at the University of Cincinnati, and so it was convenient for her to be there at the same time. It was a great challenge, great fun, but it was also sort of a first confrontation with the enormous gaps in my knowledge because students ask about everything. They don't ask questions that nicely conform with what you know. I was sort of--always felt one down. I couldn't quite anticipate all the things she would need to know. But it was a great experience and confirmed my desire to go back to school. I liked the idea of teaching and learning.

It was about at that time, now having had our second child, that we decided that we would try to return to school before life got more complicated with kids in school, and

so on. It was then that we applied for doctoral programs. I remember applying at the University of Chicago and Berkeley and USC and was accepted all three places. But I wanted to come back here and shift my focus more to policy and politics, policy. I knew that probably a lifetime of clinical practice was not for me. That was also the time of just the early stirrings of the war on poverty, the march on Washington. Although the VA tended to be somewhat buffered from what was going on generally in the community, you couldn't help but be very effected by all of that was happening. This was even pre-war on poverty, but still, much going on. I think that that sort of fed my natural inclination to be interested in macro matters; policy and such. Of course, I had a good relationship with Norrie and respected him a good deal. Nadine and I had done a joint masters' thesis with Norrie. That had been intellectually a very satisfying experience. To this day I still think it's a pretty good masters' thesis. So I thought it would be worthwhile to come back and study some more. At that time, I thought--I suspect it's in the nature of young people that you approximate to what you are doing at that moment in time. I remember writing my personal statement for the doctoral program, saying that what I wanted to be was a field instructor. I thought that by coming back to school and getting a doctorate, I could be a much better instructor in the field. I still hadn't quite made the jump to a full-time academic career. So we came back to Los Angeles with two kids, ages four and one at that point, and I started the doctoral program. It was a real shocker!

FELDMAN: In what way?

PATTI: Well, it was a shocker in a couple of ways. One was the amount of work. It was just--about two weeks into the program, I just shook my head. My God, how was I going to do all this. A month or six weeks into the program, I just really doubted that I

would be able to keep up. It was a shocker in the sense that almost everybody in my class was--I was twenty-five--everybody in my class had been out for fifteen years or more, had been a faculty member in the School of Social Work. You recall some of the names: Frank Pierce, Boyd Oveat (?sp?), Jerry Pepper, Bear--what was Bear's first name?--but Bear was a high-level official, and Harvey Rowetzer(?sp?) had been out in practice for three or four years, and Carl Schafer, an independent private practitioner making oodles of bucks and all this clinical experience. I felt, I really, really felt intimidated by this cast of characters. There were among them--not everybody in the group--but there were among them quite exceptional people, people with really good minds, and so on. So the amount of work, the company I was keeping, and the third part was the expectation to create something, to take from books and articles and researchers and make something new, sort of fashion some new notions, which really in a certain kind of way hadn't been so much a part of the education at the master's level. The emphasis there was to take what was known, what we thought we knew, and to apply it in a clinical way. That was its own kind of challenge. But now it was to take what was unknown, really, and create some new of understanding it or some new way of conceptualizing it.

FELDMAN: Put your own imprint on it.

PATTI: That's right. All of those things were somewhat intimidating. I think it was really--it wasn't until--you recall in those days we had the general exams at the end of the year, and I just was sure that I was going to flunk that. I never have before or since worked as hard as I worked preparing for those exams (laughter), and I was just sure that I was going to flunk. It wasn't until I passed the examination that I felt I actually belonged there. I always felt I was sort of an intruder. From that moment forward, I

began to get in touch with what became my potential. There are a couple of things about the program that really stood out for me. I was very, very stimulated by the idea that social science could be not psychology or psychiatry, the application of that, the utility of that was clear, but that social science could be harnessed and adapted, translated in a way that would enable social work to kind of break, really break around a new kind of theory of practice for itself. You recall those were the years we spent a lot of time talking about social class and social role, stratification and those sorts of things. I found that extraordinarily stimulating and really opened up a kind of a whole world for me in a way that I hadn't had before. That was important, and I think I mark really that exposure to social science, probably one of the important, sort of developments in my own head, one of the important shaping developments in my own head about how I think about scholarly things. I draw on that frame of reference, during that time, to this day. That was important. The relationship with Norrie, of course, was central, and I always felt so alternately charmed and terrified (laughter). But you know, it's a funny thing. I had many student colleagues who were always terrified and never charmed, and there were some who were always charmed and never terrified; there were a few of those. I always felt with Norrie, somehow--maybe you did as well--that as critical as he could be, sometimes as sharp as he could be in his dismissing something, that there wasn't this interaction with him. There were times you would get annoyed with him, times when I felt he was more demanding than one should reasonably be, but on the whole, I always had consistently this feeling that his criticism, his demands, his expectations, were truly in the service of developing my potential. And that was a certain kind of love, a kind of love that a teacher expresses.

FELDMAN: Right. He didn't have that patience with people who were not bright and intellectually curious. But when he found someone who was, he wanted to develop that to a maximum. And that's one reason he would respond to you, you see.

PATTI: I didn't know that at the time, but I think in retrospect, I got a sense of why that was. The other thing he did that was so--it's sort of that subtle process of socializing somebody to a lifestyle, the lifestyle of a scholar and just the turns of phrases. He used to say to me--I never did learn how to play bridge very well--but he used to insist that I had to play bridge. Playing bridge--did he play----

FELDMAN: No, but he had the same impact on me in playing poker (laughter). He would spend---

PATTI: It was like everything, really everything, he was a whole man in some sense that most of what he was interested in, even if it didn't have to do with social welfare, was part of the scholarly role in life. He approached everything from a scholarly perspective. I was very much influenced by that, although I will tell you that when I went to the University of Washington, I hadn't been so influenced by him. I had in my mind's eye the kind of instructor I wanted to be, and it was very much patterned along Norrie's line. It didn't work for me. I couldn't--I used to imagine that I could stand up and regale students for two hours and have their mouths hanging open and them wanting more. But that wasn't my style. My style was much more interactive, much more personal, and the early couple of years teaching were very painful. I had--Norrie had--this is another thing. He said, "You always want to do your note cards on issues SKIP-- -- but he told me that I should always do my cards on little three by five note cards, and they should be SKIP-- I did that and I felt really honor bound to make sure that every word that I had written down on

these note cards was delivered in class. I had students climbing the walls. It wasn't me.

But, that was all right. It's sort of the process of discovery. But he's a wonderful guy.

FELDMAN: It was a good point from which to begin and feel your own way.

PATTI: Yes, and to have that--you know, even if you don't turn out being one, it's such an enriching thing to have somebody in your mind's eye, to have really SKIP--- the doctoral students, I loved the courses, the policy courses, the one of rising federal responsibility and the one on children--both wonderful. SKIP--- renewed my interest in SKIP--- I learned about the tension between professional norms and values and bureaucratic rules and regulations and how not to SKIP--- that was all very important to me. Another experience with which you were involved was the SKIP --- the reasons it was SKIP--- it wasn't often the case that one had the opportunity to actually do any research pertaining to your dissertation. The very fortunate thing about that was they had an opportunity to be a part of a research enterprise and the Eurogradens (??sp??) and with Helen Olander and Frank Pierce. It was a rich learning opportunity. I actually got a chance to see how, what the importance of the use of chi squares (laughter) with real data, which is something I confess I didn't learn as much about as I should have from Edith Tufts. I had a tough time with Edith SKIP--- I'd never performed so badly in a class as I performed in that class. I felt just dreadful about it, really SKIP--- So that project was very formative and gave me a sense that I actually could apply some of the stuff that was being learned in Norrie's research class and even the statistic class to SKIP --- he was very hard to watch SKIP -- and we were together, because we thought there was some safety in numbers (laughter).

I remember learning that one of the tricks of the trade was to do all of the interviewing in the morning, before noontime, because after noontime, all the local crowd came out. Those were the days when white faces were not welcome in Watts. That was a SKIP project SKIP-- in the area. That was formative as well SKIP -- probably don't remember this SKIP---

FELDMAN: Now it's going. Okay.

PATTI: You probably don't remember this, but the semester before I taught as career teacher, you probably don't remember this, but one day---

FELDMAN: For some reason it---

PATTI: It's moving----

FELDMAN: Maybe it -- yes -- that flipped up when --

PATTI: I remember one session in particular where there were just a wide variety of questions being asked. It was some aspect of history, I don't remember what. But you were in the front of the class. There were lots of questions coming at you, all sorts of questions asking for minor details about house of refuge or something like that, and how kids and families actually got to these places and what were they like inside. And you were carrying on and answering these questions, you seemed at great ease, and my idea, up to that point, my idea of teaching was you got up and gave a lecture and then there were a couple of questions at the end; all along Norrie Class. Well, your was--you lectured, but yours was also much more interactive with the students. I remember we were walking back from the class to the School, and I remember asking you that I don't think you understood the question or why I was so concerned about how in the world you can anticipate all the kinds of questions the students asked. You said something like well,

you know, I've been doing this for a while and I have some idea, something like that, but it was very casual, very natural and normal for you to have done that. I thought to myself, I didn't, I wouldn't, I couldn't ever imagine that I would be that comfortable and have that kind of a grasp of a subject matter that I could sort of comfortably let students just have at the subject matter and be able to respond. All that was important. The doctoral program was a fun time and the most transforming educational experience I ever had. I'd been effected by a lot of things, but that was the most important, hands down, the most important educational experience I had.

FELDMAN: You were ready for it.

PATTI: Well I didn't know it then, but I think I was.

FELDMAN: In retrospect.

PATTI: Yes, yes. I think I was. It really gave me, it pointed me to what I'd really wanted to do and wasn't quite sure about. It helped me to understand how to best use myself, my talents. So it was terrific.

Following the doctoral program--do you want me to keep going like this?

FELDMAN: Yes. Yes, I think it's helpful for other people who might be looking at this when we get it transcribed, or hearing it, to get some sense of what is involved, because I think it helps them to form--if they're younger people--to form directions for themselves and to deal with anxiety that you have and that you come past that.

PATTI: Yes. You spend a lot of energy dealing with my own sense that I wasn't quite ready to do it and I don't know, that's the only way I could have done it. I couldn't have been more self-confident. I couldn't have been more self-assured. I was who I was. But to be able to accomplish things in the face of self doubt and self reservation. So following

school in the Halcion days when there were all these jobs available in schools of social work, I began inquiring and inquired at UCLA and San Diego and the University of Denver and the University of Washington. We wanted to stay in the West. I was hoping that we could stay in California. The job in San Diego paid very, very poorly and just struck me that that would be hard. The (???) with UCLA was so impossibly arrogant (laughter), it was as if they didn't care. "Oh, well, oh, were you interested? Well, fine, you know."

FELDMAN: I can imagine who you saw there.

PATTI: It was a very kind of unpleasant experience. The people at the University of Washington were very nice and very warm, and the school there was headed by a fellow named Chuck B(??). Did you know Chuck?

FELDMAN: Yes.

PATTI: Charlie was a lovely man, and Chuck had, I think, a sense of what it took to build a good school of social work. I think he had a good sense of that. It wasn't (???) then. It was a reasonably good institution, but very parochial. They were still, in 1967, still doing casework, casework, casework. He had brought Florence Styer (??sp??), Florence Rae Styer, and he had brought Henry Mayor. So there were beginnings of an emergence of a maturity of more cosmopolitan and more relevant view of social work that was emerging. He brought on, in those years, I think--I'm now doing the sixtieth anniversary keynote for the University of Washington, so I've had occasion to think about some of these names. The years 1960 to 1970, they added twenty or more, an incredible amount in a very short span. A lot of that had to do with Chuck and the trust that he was

able to build with the University. So I arrived there in '67. Jim Herrick and Jerry Tepper had preceded me, so there was a little bit of a USC ---

FELDMAN: An alumni group.

PATTI: An alumni group. It was a wonderful, exciting thing to be part of a school that had scent -- you could tell that this could really be a great school of social work. A lot of the energy and a lot of the recently added people, all of whom were newly minted Ph.Ds from around the country. They had been in the habit in earlier years of recruiting--but then we had Jack Parsons, and they would have--

FELDMAN: Yes. He was in Chicago when we were there.

PATTI: There were a few of those folks around.

FELDMAN: And Fred Lewin was there.

PATTI: Fred Lewin, but Fred Lewin came in the Sixties. So in the--up to the Fifties, there were a few Ph.Ds, a few people who'd been in other places. By and large they recruited locally. If you knew, and I'm sure you did, Seattle in those days, it was a backwater, it was a very, very--a pleasant, nice town, but a real back water. So the schools become more cosmopolitan, more diverse. Chuck had the good sense to bring on in the cohort that I started with in 1967, three African-American men; quite extraordinary in those days. One of those was Jim Lane (?). Do you know him?

FELDMAN: Yes.

PATTI: Jim had been in family services in (???) . And another was a fellow named Jim Goodman. He was actually a Los Angeles product. He didn't go there; he went to the University of Minnesota. A young, black man---

FELDMAN: A small man.

PATTI: A small man--

FELDMAN: Slight

PATTI: Very articulate, very bright.

FELDMAN: He came several times to talk with me.

PATTI: Yes, yes. He was Morehouse University, Morehouse--where did he get his MSW? Maybe it was Atlanta, and then a Minnesota Ph.D. So Chuck saw the writing-- this was '64--saw the writing on the wall, that social work needed to address the diversity question and couldn't do that if it didn't have a diverse faculty. So there we were in 1967. The war on poverty really hit Seattle a little late, but really hit Seattle and the sense of--- there's a wonderful naivete about Seattle--that if there was a will, that you could do anything you wanted to do. It was a kind of a (Frances, I couldn't tell if it was regressive or progressive) rationality about Seattle, even with its parochialism, that sort of a ????? that with good will and with clear thinking, you could create an environment that would help everybody. In addition to the opportunities that were awarded by federal legislation, there was this incredible surge of community spirit and energy and a booming place to be for a young person interested in policy. I got very early involved with the Department of Social and Health Services. I consulted with the welfare rights organization, did a lot of kind of policy analysis for the state legislature. I was there a year and didn't know what the hell I was doing. I was writing analysis on legislation, going down and testifying. It was a wonderful learning experience.

At the school proper, we in three years--when I say we, the whole cadre of people that had come on in the Sixties--created a brand new curriculum in what had been a curriculum, a pretty constant curriculum, over two decades prior to that time. The new

curriculum had generic social work. We stopped doing group work and casework within the organization, and we started doing social work practice with all of those elements in it. We started teaching our own human growth and behavior. We started, even in those early days, we started the beginnings of specializations: aging, child welfare, and so on. They were not well articulated like ours, but we had a number of course offerings, and then we gave students choices of these offerings, which enabled them to put together a policy course, an advanced practice course in child welfare--that kind of concentration. So, quite different, quite new for all of us, and transformed considerably, the school. I've often thought back --you mentioned Fred Lewin--Fred Lewin was very bright but an erratic character. (Laughter)

FELDMAN: I know that from his beginnings in the doctoral program. (Laughter)

PATTI: Fred, as you recall, loved to fight.

FELDMAN: And he did fight with---

PATTI: Jack Parsons.

FELDMAN: Jack.

PATTIE: Oh, yes. They were--well Fred--Fred recruited most of us and Chuck gave him most of the responsibility for recruiting this cadre of young Turks that came on. Fred sort of got us all positioned to do these fights. We were more or less conscious participants in all of them, but Fred had the notion that the old school, the Jack Parsons and Marguerite (couldn't get last name) school was the school they had in the Forties and the Fifties, and that the University and the city at the time needed a school of social work that was driven by social science and was out there in the community, and so on. There really was a significant change in the political power structure of the School. This was added to by the

fact that--you may recall that there was such a need for doctoral-trained people, that folks were hired, myself included, straight out of school, as associate professors with tenure. I think about it now--what an extraordinary thing. They were picking up twenty-nine-year-old people like myself who really hadn't had much in the way of experience at all, and giving them a life-time (sinecure??). But one of the effects of that was that it opened all of us to being what we-----

FELDMAN: Because you were safe.

PATTIE: That's right. And Fred used that, and Chuck, too, for that matter, used that to--this sort of political autonomy that these young new faculty had, to good advantage. In fact, the School did change quite dramatically, and poor Jack Parsons, who I never particularly got along with--but I say "poor" now because I think it was very tough for him. The University of Washington School of Social Work had been his school, and he had---

FELDMAN: He was in the undergraduate field. I think it was a hard transition for him to make; to go from undergraduate teaching to graduate. I think he always at heart remained a teacher of undergraduate students.

PATTI: Yes, yes, yes. He began to handle the sense of loss status by doing more and more actual travel, and I guess before he retired--he retired some time in the early or middle Seventies--between the time I came and the time he retired, I don't think he was there more than two or three years. He was off to Ceylon, he was in Cypress, any time, any place, just testing people around the school. He was such a terrible curmudgeon; terrible about everything. Completely--you probably knew the good side of Jack.

FELDMAN: Yes, because this side I didn't know, except when he would talk about Fred.

PATTI: Yes. Oh, they were, they were, well, to my surprise, I think after we were there four or five years, Jack invited a bunch of us--I guess he decided that if these characters were going to be around, he'd make peace with them--he invited a bunch of to his house. A more charming, urbane, literate, interesting host you did never see.

FELDMAN: He was in his own setting.

PATTI: Making wine downstairs, and he showed us with great pride all the wine he had put up. Very political, well-read. So it was good to know that there was this other side of him because what you saw at School, was a completely angry, hostile, cynical man who would just grit his teeth when he came in the morning and leave just as soon as he could.

FELDMAN: You know, he was a little that way in the doctoral program in Chicago. He would not talk with Fred; the other way around, also. They couldn't talk to each other.

PATTI: What I feel proudest about the University of Washington is that it really did change from a respectable, regional school to a school of some national stature in the some twenty years that I was there. Chuck Brent laid the foundation. Chuck gets all the credit for having brought that school along, but I quite honestly say that Chuck Brent laid the foundation, had the vision and provided the tools for----I was reminiscing about him in preparing this paper and remember Scott coming on and saying, and he was asked, "Why are you coming to the University? Why do you want to come to the University of Washington?" I think this was in 1971. "Oh," he said, "I'm not really interested in administration. I never wanted to be a dean. But I figure I could come here and I think it's the kind of school that I'd be comfortable being a faculty member in." (Laughter)

Such arrogance. I mean, the man was--and he had around him this cadre of people that had been recruited in the Twenties. A lot of them had gone on to quite illustrious careers: Jim Whitaker among them. It was somehow that he couldn't acknowledge that what he inherited, whose reputation was still modest, but that had the means, had the building bonds for what then was to be created. But he was too arrogant to allow for the fact that there could have been anything before him, before he was there. I never liked Scott much. He was as a person, very difficult to like and uncomfortable to be around. You could sit down with him and have not a word exchange for ten minutes. He was challenging, confrontive, combative, on anything that mattered to him at all. His idea of discourse was to win, literally, whomever he was talking to. It didn't make a difference if it was friend or foe. The issue was the most important thing for him. And that gang that he worked with at Berkeley was Martin Wallins and Irving Togliana (???) and Tony Capote, that whole gang that he grew up with in the late Fifties, early Sixties in Berkeley. I mean, they were about as hostile a bunch of people that you can imagine. So he came straight out of that condition. He believed that casework wasn't doing anybody any good, he believed that the salvation for social work was to breed clinical scientist--his word. He believed that really social work had nothing to learn from social scientists, that knowledge for practice in social work needed to grow from social work, empirically. Everything I had learned before that was--you know, forget that--was sort of old stuff. We needed to create a new intellectual infrastructure. So, there were some thing--he was an exceedingly bright man. One of the brightest men I've ever run into; extremely tactical, a real creative mind in many ways, but a miserable man. In all the years, in 1972, I became director of the Social Welfare Research Center, which had been on paper until that time--there had

been no grants or projects. From 1972 through 1985, I was--sometimes overlapping-- I was the director of the research center, director of the doctoral program, chair of the curriculum committee, and chair of the faculty council, always in some combination during that period. In that fifteen-year period, I got one note from him saying, you've done a great job--I've forgotten what it was--thank you.

FELDMAN: That was quite a concession.

PATTIE: I remember being at a party one evening. We'd had a couple of drinks, we weren't drunk, and we had just graduated the first of our doctoral students. I was director of the doctoral program, so he was carrying on about one of the recent graduates, and I said--only in a way that Scott could do--if you had been create in his image, then you were wonderful. There was nothing that you weren't capable of. If you had been created in his image, a direct reflection of his own ego needs. This evening we were talking about one of doctoral students, one of the first students to graduate. And he was, "Oh, she'll do the definitive work on social work treatment, depression. This is the brightest, this is the most creative, empirical mind that's been created." I looked at him and I said, "Scott, you know, I like--and I named the person-- I like her very much myself, and I think she'll be quite capable, but this really is guilding a little. She's nothing like that at all." I saw in the next five minutes, the most vicious, mean and really destructive person. He turned on me and just, for five minutes, vilified me, my motivation, my commitment to the school and the doctoral program. I mean in the most--it was so--I didn't have time to be hurt because I was so dumbfounded by it. My mouth fell open. So bad was it, that his wife, Cathy (???) prevailed upon him to call me the next morning and apologize. That was only

probably the second encounter that I ever had with him. But what it did was reflected this man's soul. I never did forget that.

Notwithstanding, I think for all the years that we co-taught the doctoral program together, I but was always quite willing to lend myself to anything that could develop the School. I worked very hard in this School. In retrospect, at some little cost to my own scholarship, because as much time as I devoted to School, if I'd had half of it on (I just couldn't get what he was saying here - something about the growth of my own scholarship, I'd have done more). What finally happened is that it was almost a Dorian Gray transformation. The ugliness inside of him slowly but surely infected him to being his whole approach, and as he became nationally better known, as he got more and more credit for bringing the University of Washington into the spotlight of schools of social work, he became more and more arrogant and found it necessary to--you know how it is in any faculty, you have some people who are with the program and some who aren't. People have different degrees of investment and even disagreements about the direction of the school--for Scott it became important to literally destroy anybody who wasn't fully consistent with his idea of what the School should be. So if you didn't happen to be empirically oriented, if you didn't believe in creating clinical scientists--it wasn't enough that you would agree to disagree--you had to be discounted, you had to be ridiculed, you had to be made fun of. While this never happened to me because I was very dedicated to the doctoral program and very dedicated to scholarship research and to the research center, dedicated to curriculum development and so on, while it never happened to me, it happened to a good many of my friends. I began to, for a period of time in the early Eighties, began to try to mediate between this increasingly diseffective, disenchanted, very

hostile faculty cohort, among whom was--included Jim Herrick and Henry Mayor, Calvin Tataki (??sp?) and people like that. So I tried to mediate some and never with much success, till finally, in 1984, my friend, Mike Austin--do you know Mike?

FELDMAN: I met him, yes.

PATTI: My friend Mike Austin, who had by then become the director of the research center and who'd been one of these people that Scott saw fit to destroy, was summarily dismissed from his directorship from the center without benefit of conference, without benefit of feedback, without benefit of so much as a "how do you do." That was finally the end of it. I thought at that point that I'd be so morally compromised to not speak, so I came and I told him that I thought his deanship was over, that he really needed to step out, that we were becoming a good school too slowly, that we were being corroded by the distrust and the anger and alienation that we were incurring in our own rights. Of course, he didn't buy that. The dissonance, the ill-will the School ?????????????? where finally he, in 1987, a couple of years later, he decided to resign or retire after seventeen years of having that position. So in one sense I really am quite proud of what happened over those years and feel that I was very much a part of it, and grew enormously proud of myself and contributed significantly to the emergence of the School. In another way, it was a very unhappy and tragic thing because in the process of becoming a good school, it became a school without a heart, a school without a sense of decency and caring and respect for one another. We literally were at the point where the direct-practice people never spoke with the macro-practice people, where the undergraduate people had no idea whatever what was going on in the master's program and vice versa, where most of the faculty felt shut out of the doctoral program, unable to work in the doctoral program, where there were

faculty members who would not speak to on another, just literally would not speak to one another, and toward the middle Eighties had become a very, very uncomfortable place to live.

I applied in 1985-86--I was away at Hunter--when I came back Scott announced that he would retire, so '86, '87 was a search. I announced for the deanship and the other internal person was Nancy Hoyman and then we had several outside people: Stuart Kirk, others among them. Nancy was chosen for the job, and I knew at that point that I really had to leave, I had to find something else to do because the sickness of the place had really gotten the better of me as well, and I didn't like being in a place where there was so little honesty and so little comradeship and so little sense of common purpose. I thought as the dean there, I might have been able to do something to change that. But that wasn't to be. I began applying elsewhere and came here.

It's bittersweet. We love Seattle and have many friends there, and I think for most of that time, it was a good opportunity for me and for my scholarship to grow. I had many wonderful students. It was a good experience in that sense. It really is too bad that it couldn't have been both a good school and great accomplishment, and at the same time a school with some cohesiveness and some internal glue that kept people together moving in the same direction. I think we have our problems here, but if the faculty at the University of Washington had the collegial sense that we have here, there's no telling what they could do up there because they have such resources. The State has been very generous with the University. They've got resources coming out of their ears. Nancy, the current dean, has a good sort of workmanlike to her deanship. She works very hard at

it. But the forces that were unleashed and kind of set in the character of the School in the prior deanship are still there today. I don't think they've quite overcome it.

FELDMAN: I think that kind of hostility and acrimony are hard to dispel.

PATTI: The two of my closest colleagues and dearest friends who I (cannot make this out - could be "who I saw again" or who are Cy and Sam or something like that) and I said, are you coming to the Sixtieth Anniversary? I'm hoping to have a chance to chat with you and it'll be fun and we can celebrate old times, and so on. Toom (???SP???) said, "I will not be there." I was taken back a little and I said, "Why not?" "Because Brier (??SP??) is going to be there." This is now seven years since he's been gone from there.

FELDMAN: And they still have that feeling.

End of tape I

Tape II

FELDMAN: Second cassette is an interviewed continued with Rino Patti on January 20, 1995. The preceding cassette to point 220, deals only with family life and growing up.

FROM HERE ON, TAPE II IS BLANK ON BOTH SIDES.

TAPE III:

FELDMAN: Cassette number III.

FELDMAN: During those years, what kind of national involvements did you have?

PATTI: Well, I was involved in the early-middle Seventies in the movement to bring administration more squarely into social equivalent, and I was on the original KFW Task Force to develop recommendations on that. Then I started collaborating with Cy Slavin

(?) to create the Administration on Social Work Journal. I worked hard to get that going under his leadership. The whole kind of thing to move administration, to formalize it, to make it more mainstream was great preoccupation. You may recall there were grants from HEW during those years. You had one here, we had one at the University of Washington as well. For three years we worked very hard on that, including a complete curriculum revision. We experimented with something, a management lab where we, instead of putting students in agencies because there were so few--the idea of training administrators in field education sites was so new that we weren't quite sure what it was they should learn or how well they could be supervised since most of the people were agency administrators who had themselves not had any form of preparation. We created a management laboratory, which I think in its day was a quite innovative approach. Rather than put students in the field, what we would do is we would work out with agencies' projects. It could be a needs assessment or it could be a study of a personnel system or it could be an evaluation of their agency's program or whatever the needs might be. We would put teams of students to work on those things and then they would make reports and recommendations back to the agency. Sometimes they were involved in carrying out some of the things. It was carefully structured, but it was an interesting way to come at it in those early days. The introduction of administration social education really, as you recall, took off and those years of '75 to roughly '85, I think the number of schools that offered specializations in the area probably tripled. But you know what? It flattened out. Nothing has happened since then. You can count, if you look at CSWE statistics, the number of schools with macro concentrations, and more importantly, the number of students actually registering in macro concentrations is absolutely a flat line, even while

the application, the enrollment in schools has gone up, enrollment in those programs has stayed flat. It doesn't seem to be--it hasn't generalized, it hasn't really caught on.

FELDMAN: What do you think accounts for that?

PATTI: I think a lot of it has to do with the fact that we can't, in our field, get past the dilemma--and it is a true dilemma--that a person twenty-six years old has just finished a two-year master's degree in administration, could be hired by a social agency to direct a program. Unlike our colleagues in public administration who believe that management is a craft unto itself that can be moved around. We've always believed in our field, and I think most social workers and agencies believe that you've got to have worked in the primary business of the agency in order to manage it. So just that belief system alone--it's been reaffirmed time and time and study after study, and you ask almost any social worker and they will say before a person administers and supervises in an agency, they should have worked in the front line. I think as long as that systems prevails, a twenty-five, twenty-six-year-old person with no practice experience after an MSW but with a degree in administration or community organization, whatever, puts him or herself at great risk in a job out there. I think it pushes people with that potential, and even some people with those plans to do that work practice, firm that base and then worry about whether they'll be promoted, get that.....

FELDMAN: By that time they decide to go into private practice and manage themselves.

PATTI: Many do, many do. As often, they move into administration without really any formal understanding of finance and budgeting, of personnel systems. Then some learn it because they're able, but many, many don't. It continues to be a big problem. I don't think we've really resolved it.

Anyhow, we came here to Los Angeles at a time when the housing market was at its absolute highest. Nadine and I have often chuckled about that. In the course of our lives since Seattle, we've had four houses, four residences. We lived in a lot of apartments in the meantime. Every time we moved, we've managed somehow to come into the market at exactly the wrong time. We were true to form. We moved here, bought the place in Marina del Rey. That condo was twice what we sold our house for. Twice. Bob Biller, bless his heart--I remember him saying, "Don't worry about it. The housing market will continue to escalate. Think of this as an investment." (Laughter) Real estate appreciation.

FELDMAN: Bob Biller is the ultimate.

PATTI: I actually thought, who knew when that boom was going to top out? Well, it's topped. Anyhow, we came—I guess the current theme of my professional life is that I never—even though I may feel prepared at a particular juncture—I never end up feeling prepared. Transitions are not easy for me. The first two years here were just extraordinary. I never worked harder in my life as I worked those first two years.

FELDMAN: Even as a new doctoral student?

PATTI: It exceeded that. In its own way, the anxiety was as high. There were a number of times in those first few years when I tell you I really did not think that I would make it. What I knew at the time and what I could understand at the time was that the old leadership of the School had gone and that what the School had inherited was the culture of the old 'SC. That culture was still here. There were many, many aspects of it that were still here, and I could see continuity between when I was a student and what was here in 1988. It was a new culture with an increasingly new cast of characters who didn't own

that culture, who weren't thoroughly socialized in it and in many instances didn't believe in it, didn't know what it was about, they didn't know where it had come from. And you recall we did a couple of sessions to try and introduce the young faculty to some old faculty, to try to build those bridges. But it was very new. When Morrie retired, the absence of senior leadership that both was skilled and committed to the whole School was simply not there. There was a cadre of associate professors who'd been here for some time. By and large those folks were not perceived as leaders by junior faculty, and themselves had almost sort of withdrawn from the fray and several were looking into early retirement. Between this sort of teeming group of young people, more than fifty or sixty percent of the faculty and ????? leadership, there was not much in the way of a stabilizing, maturing group of senior people that could help the School mature and grow. I thought there were two things that I could contribute. One is that I wanted to keep the best of what I've always admired about this place; that sense of collegiality, the sense that people, regardless of what their specialty in social work, understand, appreciate the contribution of each specialty to the whole. That always seemed to me a very special thing about this School. So I tried to maintain that, keep that sense alive. I thought that the doctoral program had come into a sad state of affair, that were the School to retain its standing, that actually that had to be built back up. Thirdly, in order to position the School in a University that was now seeing itself increasingly as a research university, the School had to produce more scholarship, more funded scholarships, and so on. Well I had two fairly recent senior people who were the prime movers. To them, in a way, fell the task of providing senior leadership to the very young, anxious and in some ways, intimidated young faculty who were concerned about would they get promoted, and so

on. So the first three or four years, I think the atmosphere in this place soured greatly. I didn't get—I mean I always knew at some level and have since come to learn this and know it here—that a dean can't make a school. It's in the collaboration between faculty leadership, in collaboration with the dean, that you create a kind of a motor force that moves and shapes a faculty. There were two things wrong in my early time there. One was that I assumed too much responsibility myself, and the senior faculty leadership that I had to work with, I think didn't understand the role that senior faculty should play in shaping, nurturing, mentoring, and so on. So we had some difficult times till, I would say, about the third or fourth year of my deanship. I was really quite worried about it. I thought several times about ending at the end of the fifth year of my tenure's gain because even though we were making progress on strengthening and building the doctoral program back to some respectable level and doing quite well with grants and articles and stuff like that, it wasn't often fun to be around here. What's changed? I think the single most important—well the absence of certain people has helped. But I think the single most important things that's changed is the development of governance structure, which has faculty very, very squarely involved in the decision-making of the School. I mark that about three years ago when we first developed the elected faculty council. That was a stroke, to get that going because in addition to wanting to kind of let the Dean take care of things, there had been, for a long while, maybe ten or more years, a sense in the faculty that they didn't want to be bothered with the hard business of governing the collegial system.

FELDMAN: They didn't see that as a part of their academic responsibility.

PATTI: That's right. I mean the constant and incessant complaining about committees, the definition of anything that didn't involve teaching or research as relevant, the cynicism about the place that service played in one's promotion—not entirely cynical because it's true, it's the lesser of the criteria. But it took a long while to get to the point where people understood that you get about as good a school as you're prepared to work for. I don't think that collegial systems happen naturally. I think they're desperately difficult, hard things to make work well. And they work well when people participate in them and really take on rights and responsibilities of citizenship. Citizenship is not coming in a day and a half a week and staying home and sitting in front of a computer. I think we've made the transition now to the idea that the governance really is a joint responsibility of the faculty and the dean. The curious thing about it is that in a system like that, I am more empowered. I am much better at what I do now by virtue of that than I was before. And the faculty is more empowered. It's like it's not a zero-sum game.

FELDMAN: It's a reciprocal.

PATTI: It's a reciprocal, and usually reinforcing business. We're just now, as a faculty, beginning to see that. The ambiance around here is so changed. It's really—people are much more willing to volunteer, they take much more sense of ownership for the visitations, when people visit here for jobs. They take a deadly serious way for recruitment of the new faculty coming on this year. They understand that their investment in those decisions is something that will benefit them for the rest of their time here. It's the major insight of my time here, that that collegial system really works when you have a true sharing, a true power sharing between the faculty and the dean. Neither has to be weak. Both can be strong, and together their much stronger than either would be

independently. We're beginning to get—to reinvent the culture for ourselves—what works with this new cast of characters. Next year is going to be a very major challenge for this. We will have, in academic year '95-'96 at least five, or as many as seven new faculty members.

FELDMAN: Full time?

PATTI: Full time, tenure track.

FELDMAN: That's a remarkable proportion of the whole----

PATTI: It's a third of the faculty. So, if we had had to do this four years ago, I think it would have been disastrous. But I think that there is a bed of sorts that's been created. There's a foundation we can work with. While it won't be easy to absorb all those people, there's a nice blend of continuing commitment to educational influence, to scholarship, and to community collegiality. That blend is working. I really feel that in my gut: it's working. Right now it's pretty good. Talk to me in a year from now.

FELDMAN: That's good. That's encouraging to hear.

PATTI: Yes. I'm really delighted with how it's come along.

Nationally, I've been pretty involved. I was for two years the president of National Association of Deans and Directors. During that time, we created the Institute for the Advancement for Social Work Research; so called ISWR. It's a creature of NASW, CSWE, groups for the advancement of doctoral education, the doctoral program directors and the National Association of Deans and Directors. Those five organizations, together, have invested \$100,000 as seed money for this Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research. What the Institute does is actually very simple. It represents the scholarly interests of social work in Washington, D.C. It means that there is a social work

presence at the meetings of the NIMH National Advisory Council. It means that when the congressional language, appropriation language is being crafted, and they ask for input about what research needs are in one or another federal agencies, that the role that social work can play is inserted at the appropriate time. It means that when NASW lobbyists go to the Hill, and they're asked, well, what proof do you have that more services to the seriously mentally ill will result in the reduction of hospitalization, that NASW can then turn to the Institute, who can then assemble evidence from among people who are working in that area. It means somebody to advocate for doctoral stipends, and so on. It's kind of extraordinary.

FELDMAN: How long has it existed?

PATTI: It was founded and actually started in the fall of 1993. Between about 1990 – well, the sequence was NIMH in 1988, appointed a National Task Force on Social Work Research. Barbara Solomon served on that. The product of that task force was a set of recommendations central among which was the idea that there needed to be in Washington, D.C. an organization whose purpose was to represent, to characterize ???????????? of Congress and other Federal agencies; the need for continued investment in research on the kinds of problems that social work deals with. When I became president of NAN(?), we took that on as our main project, and in the course of two years, got an agreement and five sponsoring organization. NIMH gave us a grant of about \$350,000 to an additional \$100,000 we got from the five organizations. We're now in the second full year of operations. It's made an extraordinary difference. We're now in continual discussions with NIMH. We're having continuing discussion with the National Institute of Drug Abuse. We've got the planning grant from the Department of Defense

to do some research on ways to improve services to dependents on military bases. Social work research was written in the appropriations language for this year's budget. I guess the number of other things—in two weeks, in Washington, D.C., in the Capitol Building, there will be a social work research poster session. We will have a raid in this room in the Capitol Building, probably a hundred and forty different social workers who will do research on delinquency and violence and mental illness and poverty, and so on. We've invited Senators and Congress people and their staffs to come and see and become more familiar with what social work research is doing. It's really—I just feel very proud.

FELDMAN: It's very exciting.

PATTI: Yes. It's like as we get—as we visit around different agencies—they're puzzled about why social work hasn't been represented in that way.

FELDMAN: They should be.

PATTI: They should be. And really on the whole, delighted that we're there at the table, contributing our perspective, this recent perspective that we bring that nobody else does. On the other hand, it's a little despairing to see how little we have done as a profession to better represent our interests. The psychologists are there in droves. You go to one of these NIMH National Advisory Committee Meetings in a typical Washington meeting room with a table in the middle and chairs around the outside, the place will be teeming. It's teeming with representatives of the Social Science Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Anthropological Association, and they've all been there. It's like an old boys club. We've only been there the last two years, and it makes an enormous difference. So, I'm proud of that.

Then for the last two years, I've been President of the Board of the Institute for Social Work Research, so I've been very involved in seeing it being implemented. Our friend, Kathy Ell, she went to NIMH in fall of 1983, I think, and she was a fellow at the National Institute of Health. We hired a person to be the director of the Institute. She was there not three months and she had to resign. So we prevailed upon Kathy to come over and take the job on an interim basis. She's actually done a splendid job. It's a perfect venue for her. That's been important.

The other thing I've been very much caught up in is an effort to—as we did with the research interest in the profession—an effort to pull together the interest of all the despair of social work organizations into one overlapping lobbying effort. What happens now is—it's almost hard to believe—but the Council on Social Work Education barely talked to National Association of Social Workers--barely talks to the National Association of Social Workers means the director. So whenever any issue comes up, if it has to do with educational stipends—any of that stuff—he doesn't touch it. I mean, it's silly. If on the other hand it has to do with cutting back child welfare funds or foster care, CSWE doesn't touch it. So in the last year-and-a half or so, building on this sort of national coalition, we actually have now an agreement wherein each of the four organizations will contribute to NASW to augment NASW's legislative staff, and that legislative staff will staff a national council, who, in addition to the individual agendas of the organization, will have a common agenda that will cut across educational research, practice, service, and so on. That council is now beginning to operate. We've already developed a congressional fellows program. We'll be putting two social workers in congressional offices each year. Each of the organizations is contributing to that. We've got somebody—we've got a

fellow named Gary Sandefer (??SP??) in Senator Wellstone's office now. We'll be adding—putting two people in this year, yet to be chosen. So, we'll have people working inside who can help us understand how to get better access. We plan to that every year and try to build that. I think it's important. I just hope it isn't too late.

FELDMAN: One of the things I find exciting about that, because I had not heard these details before, is the fact that social workers are ready to be more assertive through the professional organizations. That has not been the case before. We've been far too retiring.

PATTI: We are not good public relations people. We don't---

FELDMAN: We're only good advocates for clients.

PATTI: That's right. Just for clients.

FELDMAN: Not ourselves.

PATTI: This world—I gave a speech to the NASW Valley Chapter a couple of weeks ago. Everything is spin in this world anymore. It's like who can say the first thing and say it first about NASW. We're not spinmasters. We believe that our deeds speak for themselves. There's something about that that I've always admired very much. On the other hand, everybody else is not at all hesitant to talk about what social work doesn't do or does do. We have to be in the discourse. We have to be out there. If we're not, other people will define us. So, I'm particularly proud of that. We worked very hard on trying to create this partnership with the child welfare agency, the three schools, and it's been a very, on the whole, a very satisfying collaboration. Peter Devrie (??), a current director of the Department of Children's Services—I find quite extraordinary in his continuing, undiluted passion of commitment to children's interest. It's really quite unusual to see

somebody who's still so close, feel so intimately tied to what happens at the front line where children get well served or not. He's been a strong advocate of training social workers, professionalizing departments, and so on. It's been really very good. We're now in the third year. We will have produced just at 'SC, probably forty-five or fifty social workers. Between the three schools, we probably will have produced near a hundred social workers.

FELDMAN: Now that's all with the ----

PATTI: Department of Children's Services. It's the old system where every year you get supported to the end of the year. Then there is a parallel development with the State of California. A consortium of eleven schools that work under sub-contract with CalSwek (??) which is located at Berkeley. Federal money or stipends for those programs flows through CalSwek out to the eleven schools. That program supports about twenty students a year as well. So that is part of the overall thing of strengthening the public social services. I think, even though there's a lot of revisionist thinking about whether government can adequately deliver anything, I think the basic services through the cores to the most wonderful people in our society had to be a public responsibility, and administered by the public. You could have a better child welfare program in a voluntary agency, but you can't have enough voluntary agencies offering enough service at a uniform level to make sure that everybody gets--every child gets adequate foster care, every child gets adequate protection. You simply can't do that.

FELDMAN: This commitment to the public sector is what made our School strong to begin with. One digression----

PATTIE: Absolutely. When we went through the Sixties and early Seventies and one stayed in federal levels as well as county and then dropped off altogether.

FELDMAN: One point at which it did not build is when Rex Thompson, who had been the Chief Administrative Officer and in military service, came back. He didn't believe in any of this stuff. So for a couple of years we were busy—I was no longer in the de---no, I guess I still was there, but we were constantly reinforcing what we had done before. But then he retired, and Archer Will came in as the Chief Administrative Officer, so it flourished.

PATTI: How interesting. I didn't know that. The first I—was there any stipend work being done in the profession?

FELDMAN: There were different kinds of stipend. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration provided scholarship money that is really straight tuition for social work study. Because Harry Hopkins maintained that you keep political interest out if you have a trained social worker in every office. That was the beginning. The administrators had to be trained social workers. We had fourteen districts in Los Angeles. Each one had be a trained social worker. There just weren't enough. And so FERA put a great deal of money into helping people go to school.

PATTI: Did you say fourteen trained social workers in the whole of Los Angeles?

FELDMAN: Yes, there were a few more. These were recruited out of private agencies. Did you know Arthur Greenley?(?SP?) Charles Schotland was his brother-in-law. Arthur Greenley was hired by the Board of Supervisors as a trained social worker to head up public welfare in 1937. They'd never had anyone but a political appointee up to that point, and I remember seeing him at the World's Fair in San Francisco in 1939. He said,

“I’ve been here two years and nine months. I thought I would last only two years.” The next month he was fired. So, again, until I came in 1943, they had no trained social workers. I was what Wil called “the new blood.” (I know you have to go now). End of tape III side A)

Tape IV

FELDMAN: This is an interview with Dean Rino Patti on the date of 4/22/95. This is a continuation of an interview with Dean Rino Patti regarding his coming to the School of Social Work as Dean.

PATTI: Well, we came in June of 1988, which was—actually I think we arrived in Los Angeles on June 27th or something like that, which had been a real chore because I didn’t finish at the University of Washington till the first week in June. We sold our house and had garage sales and all the rest and then said goodbye to the kids and hopped in our car and had three days of vacation on the way down. On July 1, we were on our way, and it’s been a bumpy ride as Betty Davis used to say. (Laughter) The last seven years have been really something.

I found a School that really was quite good, I think. Solid as any school in the country as far as it’s master’s curriculum. Having spent a lot of years chairing curriculum committees and accreditation reviews, I had a feeling that the historic strength of the School at it’s master’s level really persisted into this time. The design of the curriculum, the combination of the generic first year and the specialized second year in these five areas of concentration was an optimal curriculum design. It blended the idea, on the one hand, of making sure that every student had a firm identification from base of social work

practice values ethics, and so on. At the same time, in having a second year of concentrated study in a certain area, it spoke to the importance these days of being fairly sophisticated about different service sectors. The service sectors had each on their own become so complicated and have diversified so much in terms of finding sources and practice methodologies and policy infrastructure, that it's necessary for people to have some fairly in-depth knowledge of the fields into which they will practice. I thought at the time that the combination of the two was about as well done in Southern California as any place. There were two issues that it seemed to me—three issues that it seemed to me at that time that needed addressing at the School. One was the doctoral program, which in my time, I think, through the Seventies, was one of the very best in the country. My perception was that it had fallen into some, oh, kind of disarray maybe through inattention. I wasn't quite sure what, but the characteristics of it were that the vast majority of students were coming part time, the program, itself, didn't seem to have a clear mission. That is, it was not clear whether it was a Ph.D. program to train people to do advanced clinical practice, or whether it was to prepare them to become scholars and go into academia, or some combination. In fact, as I began to become more familiar with it, it was clear to me that students really were all over the map and the program was trying to accommodate a great variety of missions and purposes. There was no money being given for doctoral stipends. Beside the Feldman and Northen endowments, there was not one dollar of financial aid going to doctoral students.

FELDMAN: There was no more NIMH.

PATTI: No more NIMH.

FELDMAN: That had been a mainstay.

PATTI: Right. No external funding of any kind and no internal funding with the exception of those two. Whether that's a cause or an effect, it almost required that we have a part-time doctoral program because virtually everybody was working. Many were working part time in full-time practices and agency positions which added to the sense of (sounds like incoedness??) of the program. People were dropping in, but not in residence, they weren't working with faculty collaboratively on projects.

FELDMAN: They weren't working with each other either.

PATTI: That's right. So I have had the feeling for a long time that the strength of the School is very, very much related to the strength of its doctoral program in ways that are not entirely obvious. But it has to do, I think in the end, it has to do very much with the quality of scholarship that faculty themselves do, because whether or not doctoral students work with faculty members, if you have students who have serious scholarly aspirations, that pushes faculty in a way they otherwise are not pushed in their own scholarly work. If, as well, you have doctoral students working collaboratively with faculty on research projects, scholarly projects of one sort or another, it's really that kind of synergy works well for both the doctoral students and the faculty person. So, there were a lot of reasons why it didn't seem to be working well. Among other things, the research training in the doctoral program had not grown, hadn't developed as I think the state-of-the-art of research methodology required. That was one of the things that needed to be changed. So year-end, I asked Bill Mezian (??sp?) to take on responsibility for the doctoral program. We worked for two years to re-design the doctoral program and to make it clearly a program that would prepare people for careers in scholarship. In fact, the logo of the program is a Ph.D. program that is concerned with preparing professional scholars.

The idea that more and more people would go into academia, we disavowed any intention to train people for advanced clinical practices, and we advised people away from the program and began gradually to build the financial commitment of the School to the program and simultaneously, as we brought people in, as we committed more to students and made it possible for more people to be full-time students, then that enabled us to link students up with faculty who were beginning to develop funded research, and the two things interacted so as to produce even more full-time students. Not too—I would say about two or three years in—we were giving \$50,000 out of School funds to students to off set expenses, but we had virtually every student supported in some fashion through connections with one or another of the projects. It changed dramatically the ambiance of the program and improved some of the qualities. I'm very, very proud of that. I think we've got much more to do. Bill Mezian (?sp?) had finished his term and John Brekey's taken it on now. John has a real strong mentoring impulse, and he works very well with students.

I think one of the ways in which the change in the doctoral program has begun to reflect itself is the attention of other schools to our doctoral graduate. In the last couple of years we had Columbia Social Service School, the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago, and GWB at Washington University have competed for our students. One begins to see more national recognition of the quality of the students. I think we're moving along about as well as we should in that meridian.

That relates to the second issue I thought needed to be addressed in the School, and that was to increase the amount and the quality of scholarship that is being produced here. We had faculty that had always known for its scholarship, but most of the people

who had made names as scholars, were now gone. Morrie Hamovich was really the last of the generation that built the School and established it as a center for both excellent education and scholarship. We had, at that point in 1988, nine or ten assistant professors and a faculty of about twenty-four—excuse me, I think it was more than that. It may have been as many as twelve or fourteen, but it was very, very substantially a junior faculty. There were a very, very few full professors. I think at that time, Morrie and Bruce Jansen and Bill Mezian were it. Then there were, oh, maybe eight or nine associate professors who had been here for many years, but they were not active as scholars at the time—for the most part—there was some variation in that. Bill Finch was doing some work, although at a diminished rate, but most of the others had peaked in their scholarly work and really were not producing a great deal. The interesting challenge was—I don't want to over-characterize this, because I don't mean to dismiss or discount the associate professors who were the senior faculty for the most part—but the dilemma was how in a year when the University of California was rapidly escalating its requirements and its expectations for scholarly productivity among faculty—and it was palpable, it was all over USC—how in a year when the University was upping its expectation, you could bring along a junior faculty who did not have, for the most part, senior mentors who could help guide and stimulate their careers. There wasn't a complete absence of that by any means, but if the numbers had been reversed, and we had fifteen senior faculty, half of whom even had been active scholars or active researchers, and we had maybe five or six junior people, it would have been quite easier to do that. It put a particular burden on the research staff, and in a certain way, the research center became kind of an institutionalized expression of the School's interest and encouraging for junior faculty to develop their

research agendas. A great deal of importance in a way, lay in the research center as a vehicle for stimulating and guiding and mentoring these junior faculty people whose in for ?????????????? thing that happened. It happened before I was even quite aware that it was happening. The research center became, in a sense, the “guardian” of these junior people, the promulgator of the scholarly ethic in the School. In the process of that happening, the message conveyed to many of the people at the associate professor rank was that they now had no scholarly standing in the School. They were sort of persona non grata in a culture that now valued after scholarship in addition to teaching. So in an effort to push more scholarship and to push more research through the research center, in which I was an active and enthusiastic supporter, we created a division, or at least a concern that there would be two kinds of incentive systems in the School. One incentive system for people who were junior faculty members and active in research, and one for those who were senior and not so active. Happily, I think we hashed that, we passed that divide. It was a time, 1991, '92, '93, right in that time frame. It was a time when there was a fair amount of acrimony. It roughly grew out of this sense of a kind of a two-tier, two-class faculty that people thought was developing. I think a lot of that sense has passed now and it's partly passed because many of the people in that assistant professor cohort are now senior folks. So the expectations, the norms, the scholarly norms that they were socialized to and the standards they were held to in their own early careers, had now become a sort of a standard norm for their expectations. One shouldn't talk personalities here. It's probably not important, but suffice it to say that I think the School now has moved to a comfortable—the faculty has moved to a comfortable acceptance of the idea that we are here to provide first-rate education for master's-level practitioners, but we're also here to

do research and scholarship on pressing issues, practice and policy issues of our time. The School has an obligation to do both. That's a widely accepted proposition now. It wasn't easy to make that transition. I sense that some of the arguments that we used to have about epistemology (?) and whether there was too much quantitative and not enough qualitative, and all of those arguments which really were surrogates for the concern about there being the research-active faculty and the non-research-active faculty and some people getting rewarded and others not. I think those concerns now passed with a sense that the faculty as a whole has a responsibility to contribute to the desperate need for knowledge to inform practice and policy development. I think we're on a good trajectory in that respect, and I hope it—and as we resolve those issues, the climate, the interpersonal climate of the School has changed quite dramatically for the better. It's been a win-win situation. The faculty is more accepting and more supportive of scholarly activity. At the same time, they seem to be more accepting and respectful of one another. I'm keeping my fingers crossed that that continues.

The third issue that I felt keenly when I came was what I characterized early on the need to kind of keep faith with the culture of the traditions of the School—to keep faith with the traditions of the School, but to reinvent the culture of the School that reflected the current circumstances and the new cast of characters who were here. When I arrived in 1988, my characterization of it was the USC School of the Fifties, Sixties and Seventies was pretty well intact with a fairly well articulated set of norms and expectations, right down to if you don't come to a committee meeting, we'd better know why. I was struck with the fact that we had a culture that we'd inherited from the Fifties, Sixties and Seventies. Now, a culture being enacted by and large by a group of youngish faculty

members who hadn't been there at the creation, who were confronted objectively by a different set of circumstances that had been true earlier, but who wanted, non-the-less, a culture in which they knew the rules and where the norms were clear and ways of interacting with one another were, if not prescribed, at least roughly understood. Morrie was very, very instrumental in that period, as I said. In a way, Morrie, as I said at his retirement ceremony, Morrie was the carrier and the interpreter of the old culture. He was the last and oldest keeper of that set of ideas about the place. But when Morrie left, it created an enormous vacuum. Again, there were the associate professors, some of the associate professors whose time extended back to that period, but they weren't gatekeepers, they weren't people who actively sought to shake the climate of this place. There was some confusion, some ambiguity about what was required, when it was required, what your obligations were to the faculty, what your obligations were to the School. So in some ways the process for the last seven years has been a search for a new—I don't like to use paradigms—a new way of thinking about faculty members' responsibilities to one another and to the School and to crafting a new set of expectations and norms that fit with today's realities. That's been sometimes a torturous and difficult process.

There are a couple of things that have happened that makes me very delighted. The emergence of—I guess the re-emergence—of the faculty in the governance process of the School. This School, as I know it historically, always had strong faculty presence in governance. It was always conceived of as a co-administered School: by the dean and the faculty. When you look at the documents, the historic documents to see that major documents were not produced by the dean. They were produced by the faculty. The

faculty have now, I think, reluctantly have come to the view that they have a stake in how this place is run: it's not simply the dean's business. Administration of the School, the governance of the School is a responsibility that everybody performs, and we now have a mechanism in the last four years, called the Faculty Council where the faculty really do grapple with the pressing issues. I work very closely with them, and I think we're coming now to kind of a modis operandi (?sp?) that's beginning to work and give life to a new culture, a new way of thinking about the responsibility of the School. So I feel really good about that. The curious thing is that as much as faculty complain about having to grapple and deal with these difficult issues, some of which involve a lot of tension because they're issues that have to do with the allocation of resources and continuation of employment. I think they now understand that the quality of life in the School is a product, in large measure, of their involvement. It's not something that's created by what the dean does or doesn't do or whether the dean plays a role in it. It's a product of what people collectively contribute, and I think that idea is beginning to be clear in people's heads, even though they kick and scream about the time they spent doing it and agonize that they should be home working on their manuscripts or something. Those three issues, I think, there's been a lot of—there's one other actually, but those three issues have really been in some sense very central in my time here.

The fourth is the involvement of the community. The dilemma in this new time, given these expectation for scholarship, is whether the dilemma is how much time can I reasonably spend in working on community service projects that are not narrowly related to my self interest? And my take on that was that the time probably has passed when faculty, with a few exceptions, can give large, large amounts of time to the developing of

community programs and other institutions, and so on, unless they can find some way to intercept their community service activities with their scholarship. In a way research and scholarship become community service if it's connected to something that's going on. That looks more as if the service that the faculty member provides to the community is in the form of the particular scholarly or research expertise they have to contribute to that effort. It may involve other things. It may involve other kinds of leadership as well. I've been looking for ways in which we could intersect what we do with our principle business, education and research, how we can intersect that with community service. For better or worse, the School's involvement with the Department of Children's Services training program we do for them is an effort to bring to bear what it is we do educationally, here, to community service. The neighborhood resource center is another effort to do that, though I think we still have some ways to go in getting faculty more involved in the neighborhood resource center.

The other professional initiative which I think I talked about in a previous tape, is yet another way to try to bring scholarly expertise and faculty to bear on community service issues. I think I would like to see more and more of that done all the time. The constraint on it is that—you and BoBo (??) I needn't tell this to, but for the sake of the tape—the constraint on it is that it takes a tremendous amount of time to work with community agencies, to hammer out agreements to decide on ways to work together, to find a fit between what the agency needs and what the faculty member can provide, to say nothing of finding money to support those things. It's had to—although there are a lot of faculty members who would like to do more of that, it's often hard to get those arrangements developed to the point where faculty feel comfortable doing them without

enormous sacrifice of time and without a clear goal or product in mind. A good case in point is Karen Suberonian (?SP?) has been working for two years with the social service dad (?) at USC County, and she sits with him like every other week for two hours, and they have hammered out in the most painstaking way, they hammered out a definition of their service center prize (?) over there and ways of measuring everything they do: with whom? with what results? at what cost? and so on. It really is quite a magnificent thing, but it's taken Karen two years to do that. Now to the point where Jim Pizola (?SP?), who's the director over there, is so pleased with what's been done that he's actually going to buy a quarter of Karen's time to continue to work and develop that thing. It's a wonderful service for them and indeed it will be model for them. But now Karen could not have done that when she was an assistant professor because there's been no literary product from it. A great deal of work done and in-house documents and so on. She'll now be able to write on this and have a very nice book out of it in maybe two or three more years. But as an assistant professor, she wouldn't dare to do that. It's an example of the constraints that one sees in these days.

Finding a way to have the School involved in community service that is not so distracting, so diverting from these increasingly exacting standards for publication. It is a real trick, and we're still working on that, we're still trying to figure a way to do that with some success.

What else should I tell you about---

FELDMAN: Well, you mentioned four important arenas or activities as dean. Maybe you might go over some of the contributions, specific contributions you think the School

has made in your time, to the University, to social work education, and to the larger community.

PATTI: To the University--- I would have to say that of the things that have been done here, probably two have stood out during my tenure. One is the leadership that we've taken in trying to give expression to interdisciplinary work on campus through the form of the inter-professional initiative. That was not the rhetoric of interdisciplinary collaboration. The rhetoric of interdisciplinary collaboration far exceeded the actual presence of it, partly because the revenue center management system really provided a lot of disadvantages for people to collaborate together. As accident would have it, Gib Henchke and I started at the same time as Dean of the School of Education, and we both had some natural interest in this. So there was a kind of an ease of collaboration between he and I which created a base of trust which enabled us to start this thing with the School of Education., which now has involved seven other units on campus: Public Administration, Dentistry, Nursing, the marriage and family counseling people over at Sociology, and Psychology. So we now have students from those units involved in community sites, three this year and probably six next year. We're going together as teams of interns, placed as teams and working on either common client load or common community projects. That project has acted as a context for a great deal of interaction between their faculties and ours for joint projects. The inter-professional initiative was the first, to my knowledge, the first time that the University put forth to Irvine for Irvine's bi-annual institutional grant to USC, the first time they'd put forth anything that involved social work education. It's become a bit of exemplar something that the Provost is very, very pleased with, and he has really facilitated the discourse on why inter-professional

education is needed, how more of it can be done, and how it can be achieved, and so on. I feel real good about that.

FELDMAN: What joint degree programs do we have now?

PATTI: We currently have Public Administration, Urban and Regional Planning, Law, Hebrew Union College, and Gerontology. The biggest programs are Gerontology and Hebrew Union College: anywhere from six to fifteen students in those programs-- much smaller, virtually non-existent with Urban Planning, always two or three with Public Administration, and an occasional one or two with Law.

FELDMAN: None with Business?

PATTI: None with Business, no. This last year we've had several discussions with the School of Business about areas of collaboration. So we're looking to—especially thinking about how we can involve the School of Business more with the industrial social work program and vice versa. ??Bacamo Baracas?? has been very active in talking to the folks over there: Warren Bennis and Professor Coffee, who's head of the management organization, (???) Coffee, and Ann Mitroff (??SP)) over there. There's some interesting sort of ideas floating around there. I think there'll be something.

So the inter-professional education has been good. I feel very proud of our involvement with the Department of Children's Services. We've taken responsibility for the management training part of that contract, and we had the top forty managers in the Department in a year-long training certificate program. We had them twice a month for two days, or for a day each, for a nine-month period, and very, very extensively brought in the best social work management talent in the country to teach them, and interact with them. I think that made quite a contribution to their thinking about their organization.

Jacquelyn Crosties (??SP?) had made an enormous contribution to the Department in the form of helping them think through their family preservation plan. Do you know about that? They now have this family preservation networks in twenty-three different locations in the County, and she's been very, very instrumental in helping them.

FELDMAN: Why don't you tell us for the sake of the tape what that project is.

PATTI: Okay. When Peter Nagrie (??SP??) came here in about 1989 or '90, the foster care caseloads in the County were zooming up in an astronomical rate, especially among African-American kids. To his credit, he understood that unless something was done at the front end to get to families earlier and in a much more substantial way to maintain them, that that would continue to happen. So he got—I think it was about 1991, maybe '92—he got a waiver from the State which enabled him to take a pot of money—initially it was \$7,000,000—from his foster care budget and invest it in what he called community preservation networks. The Department contacts with a lead agency in some designated area. The lead agency is responsible for developing a network of other voluntary agencies that offer various kinds of services to families in trouble. So it can be the lead agency will contract with the Department, but then in turn with a day-care center, with a training program, with a mental health center and so on. That network is locally based in a neighborhood, although it tends to be a little larger than a neighborhood. Every child now who is referred to the Department of Children's Service and who's found wanting or in need of some protection, is referred to a network. The network takes responsibility for that family and provides these community-based services. Now, the particular genius of that is that it has re-activated local community responsibility for families. It used to be if you had a family in trouble, well that's the Department of Children's Services. With these

networks, now, you have churches. Churches are very actively involved the troubled family, a variety of local associations and other grass roots organization. I don't think moving service in a more timely and culturally relevant way to these families, but it's also in the process of reconnecting these institutions with some of the most troubled families. Now, he started initially seven of those family preservation networks. There are now twenty-three across the country. Jacquelyn, Frances Capel (?), June Brown, Jacquelyn Croskie (??), myself, at some points along the way, participated in groups. Jacquelyn's been really quite key to that. Incidentally, they now approached us to do the evaluation for the twenty-three family preservation networks. I'm trying to put together a response to that. Barbara Solomon was part of that too. I left her out of the list of people who contributed to that. The School has had some presence in this whole thing and contributed well to it.

In mental health, we have once again been curriculum innovators in a training program for social workers to prepare them to work with the chronically mentally ill. What's happened in the mental health arena is that there's now fairly substantial agreement that services to severely and persistent mentally ill need very much to impact the communities in which these folks live and develop opportunities for employment, for membership in institutions or social support or recreation, and so on. To try to infuse in the lives of the severely and persistent mentally ill, all of the kinds of array of activities that most of us, quote, normal people, have access to. It's called the psycho-social rehab model. Well, then, the mental health community has moved more and more to adopt that approach to treating this population. They don't call it treating anymore. It's working with this population. There's a peculiar thing that's happened. The schools of social

work, by and large, are continuing to train social workers to work with mentally ill people using therapeutic models. This psych-social rehabilitation model is not therapy in the sense of sitting down and talking with someone. It's therapy in the sense of designing an environment which is supportive and lucid and calls on the most normal attributes of people. Several years ago, I asked—it was the year after Morrie retired—I asked Morrie if he would head up a little task force and take a look at what was going on in the mental health area and make recommendations to us regarding what we might do differently in the training of people for this new kind of practice that was occurring. He did that and brought the recommendations back to faculty and advised then a sub-concentration, a mental health concentration, a sub-concentration for students that were interested in working with that population. We give them field placements in these areas and we do much more with them in helping them to understand psycho-pathology. They had to get much more exposure to psycho-oncology and medication. They do much more in the way of case management and advocacy and brokering to clients in the community. We now routinely have about fifteen students here in this concentration, and I think clearly, we're leading in the State. Everybody now is calling us and finding out how we're doing it. Los Angeles County Mental Health is very, very appreciative of our leadership in that. We now teach, every year, to the Los Angeles County Mental Health personnel a nine-month certificate course in this rehabilitation model. So they send us thirty of their employees every year, and we train them in this new approach. That's John Brekey and Helen Land and Mickie Lackey, Michelle (couldn't get the last name), who's a faculty member for the doctoral students now, have been very instrumental in that. That's been a really good contribution.

FELDMAN: Have we been involved at all in formulation of social policy? State or national or even county?

PATTI: There are a couple ways. I have been very supportive of the Department of Children's Services and have testified a number of times for the Board of Supervisors. Usually to argue for various programs that are under threat by the Board of Supervisors—or being threatened by budget cuts at the Department of Children's Services. That's been some involvement. My involvement on the national scene has been mostly with, as I explained earlier, has been mostly with the Senate and the House and trying to get more attention, more authorization for money for social work research, and with some success. Jacquelyn Crostis, I think, probably has been the most influential academic in the children's services area in probably ten years. I'm not guilding the lily to say that she's probably been a central player. We have housed and supported the children's round table, and she was closely connected with that. For a number of years, we did some of the early studies for children's, the County's children's budget. She also studied the not-for-profit children's sector to try to understand how much was being spent there and where the gaps in services were. Those reports that she generated in connection with the children's round table, really had a profound effect of bringing attention to the need for a better coordinated, more rational system of services for children. But now she sort of graduated from that to the Los Angeles County Children's Commission, Children Planning Commission, which is a Board of Supervisors entity that is chaired this year by Gloria Molino and last year by Brinkley Burke (?). Around this table sits Rita Cole and Peter Gree (??) and heads of other County departments that are connected to children. Every

week for the first time, fashioning a coordinated County-wide approach to services to children, and Jacquelyn was very much in the lead on that.

FELDMAN: She and Celeste had given me a paper for use to the extent we want to in our history. It's the Children's Round Table and what they had done, and Jacquelyn's given me a supplementary piece.

PATTI: Yes, yes. Angela Stoner (??not sure about that) was really quite a vocal spokesperson for homeless people, and she's been very active in the Santa Monica community on those series of questions. She's also worked down here with—Johnson is her last name. I've forgotten her first name—at their center for the homeless. And then she's managed to bring our students in to work with the homeless and to involve our students in that, so I credit Angela for taking a real big role in the whole homeless area.

Having said those things, I think that one has to say that the School's presence in the policy arena has probably diminished over the years, on the whole. I think there are probably a variety of reasons for that, including who's here. Mostly, I think it's that the School's major thrust has been clinical services. Most of the people we have working here, most of them really good, smart, bright, capable stars we have working here are people who concern themselves pretty much with clinical program levels around them. I think we need more people whose practice is the policy area. So people like Jacquelyn and Madeline and (I just couldn't catch the next two names nor anything he said right after that) nationally and he's advocated with congress people in health, particularly with minority health issues. But the profile of the School has not been as large in that respect as it should be. I think a challenge for us in the next few years will be to bring on the faculty people whose scholarship is more directly related to these policy issues because we

haven't been as much a part of the discourse as, for example, the School was fifteen, twenty years ago. That's an area---

FELDMAN: Especially in a climate like today with the negative attention to ?????? (can't hear it). But we're not putting anything into that.

PATTI: That's right. It's not as much of an area of focus as it has been in the past. We need to give more time and attention to that.

FELDMAN: What about the international arena? Do we have any involvement there? We're not getting students from other countries.

PATTI: Not many. We have a few that come from time to time, but most of the international involvement, such as it is, has been in the form of people going abroad. Karen Subawani going to India for a Fulbright year, Bill Meziand going to the Baltic States for a year, Macamo Baranca, this year actually got the Lady Davis Scholarship which is a very prestigious scholarship that's given by Technion, which is, I think, one of these Israeli Universities. She's the first social worker ever to be appointed by Technion, which is a kind of MIT technical organization. We had that kind of involvement, but a systematic connection so that we have students coming or we sending students, hasn't evolved. We need to work on that.

FELDMAN: We have graduates who are ??????

PATTI: Yes. Ken Chou and I are going to meet this summer and talk about—

FELDMAN: Going to Hong Kong to do that?

PATTI: He said he was coming back this summer, so I said, "When you come, let's sit down and talk about it." We've hired this young Hong Kongese woman, Winnie Chung, who's a real bright light, I think, and she might be a really good player in this

effort to develop—the options are Korea. We've had Sung Yee Kim, who's the director of the school of social work in Neewi (??Sp??) University in Seoul here as a visiting scholar for a year. He's interested in seeing if we can do something. There's the Hong Kong possibility with Ken Chou. And you and Marlene have talked about a woman from Japan who is apparently a social worker graduate of this School. The interest (not sure about "interest") is a little farther away, but the possibilities might be there.

FELDMAN: Yes. And we have this graduate who is the Deputy Program Director for UNISEF in New York, and he included a comment in his response to a survey that he'd like to see more involvement in international. I think we have leads.

PATTI: Yes. Right. They need to be developed.

FELDMAN: We could bring people here.

PATTI: I'd like very much to find also some way to get some collaboration with Mexico, Mexican social workers. I think that's a really good opportunity for us as well.

FELDMAN: There was a time when we did have some—yes, they sent social workers to us. I can't off hand—I hadn't thought about it for years. I can't tell you just when that was, when we had five or six in a period of a couple of years who came to us for their professional education. We have had people go down there. Don Lomas went down and spent a summer in a psychiatric clinic working with adolescents, because he wanted to know what they were confronted with. Somebody on our faculty at one time went down to teach at the University of Mexico, but that's vague in mind, now, what that was and who that was.

PATTI: Well maybe I could talk to Don and follow up on that. I haven't found a place to connect on that, but I think in the next three or four years in the international scene, in a

sense we've been kind of goaded into it by the University. It's now a central piece for the University. It's something that hasn't been cultivated around here for a long time, and I think it's time that we did.

FELDMAN: Well, I think so, and I think this fellow, Judd, at UNISEF might be—he really would like to be involved.

PATTI: Does he come to Los Angeles?

FELDMAN: No, but there do seem to be ways in which we can reach out and do something internationally. Now we have a lot of graduates around the world, actually, who might be brought together by correspondence or fax or some of these modern, magic ways, who would have some ideas that could be tapped.

PATTI: Yes. I suspect next year we'll put together some kind of a committee and start to work on that and really get a purchase on it, because it's something that needs to be moved along.

FELDMAN: And that might be also a way of making a connection with the School of Business because it's international focus is on the Pacific Rim and a lot of the cultural problems that they run into are the kind of things that we can cope with. I used to talk with Bob Coffee about it, but not for a long time. He followed me as President of the Senate, and we stayed friends.

Do you think of any significant contribution other than you've already mentioned that might be noted. Of course you don't have to think of them all now. You can always jot them down.

PATTI: There are many others. One would have to acknowledge the role that Barbara's played at the University.

FELDMAN: You will be interested in the interview. She told me yesterday—she asked me if I'd seen the oped piece that she wrote that was published in the San Francisco Chronicle. Did you see it? I didn't see it. Do you have it? She said she was going to send one over.

PATTI: I saw it, but I think Marlene has it.

FELDMAN: I think this kind of thing--and she does a tremendous amount in the administration--builds our case.

PATTI: Very important.

FELDMAN: So she's a major contribution that the School has made, both to the University and a wider community.

PATTI: No question. No question. Both as a representative of the profession and as a representative of the School. Let me see what other contributions I can talk about.

FELDMAN: I think we need to have something on the counseling service.

PATTI: The Staff/Faculty Counseling Center?

FELDMAN: Because it started as a unique activity and continues in many ways still to be unique among the University. I'd like us to be able to get more information for the history about how it's been supported and the kinds of services that are rendered that include retired faculty, as well. This is unusual, and our involvement is significant.

PATTI: It's been a big contribution. The University has been reluctant to really give the resources that the Staff/Faculty Counseling Center would need to develop. There are many, many things the Staff/Faculty Counseling Center could potentially do.

FELDMAN: Is it still supported with funds from the employee reserves?

PATTI: Yes. The fringe benefit ????

FELDMAN: Yes. Right. It can only be used for employee benefits and that how they worked out the initial funding.

PATTI: That was smart to do and it continues. The budget for the Staff/Faculty Counseling Center is probably half what it was five years ago. The pressure on the fringe benefit rate has just been excessive to keep it down, and there are more and more claims against it. There are many, many things that the Staff/Faculty Counseling Center could do if it had more staff, but the way it is now, there's Linda who is part time, and a full time staff person. It's really a two-person operation. They see maybe four hundred clients a year over there.

FELDMAN: They don't use any volunteers?

PATTI: They use contract workers, but I don't think Linda is using any volunteers.

Well, that's another story.

