



SECTION 1 – BASW Program

AS 7 – PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

AS 8.0 The program has an assessment plan and procedures for evaluating the outcomes of each program objective. The plan specified the measurement procedures and methods used to evaluate the outcome of each program objective.

AS 8.1 The program implements its plan to evaluate the outcome of each program objectives and shows evidence that the analysis and continuously to affirm and improve the educational program.

The School of Social Work uses multiple forms of assessment, both qualitative and quantitative. To garner data from students, questionnaires and input forms may be delivered through electronic surveys or by hard copies. This section presents the various ways the School has received assessment data, and it includes results, reviews, and discussions of results. The data and information received from these questionnaires and surveys have been utilized continuously through the years to make adjustments, corrections, and additions to courses, programs, policies, procedures, and practices.

BASW Program Assessment

The BASW Program provides a liberal arts-based, generalist social work education. The objectives are to educate students who will have the needed knowledge and skills to practice at an entry level as a social worker. Specifically, the objectives state that students will have:

1. Commitments to principles of equity and social justice.
2. Informed empowerment perspectives.
3. Understanding of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination.
4. Knowledge of and appreciation for human diversity and cultural differences. An understanding that cultural competence is a lifelong process.
5. Comprehension of and commitment to social work values and ethics.
6. Knowledge and understanding of the foundation areas (social policy, social work

- practice, human behavior and the social environment, research and evaluation, and field education) necessary to engage in entry level generalist social work practice.
7. Analytic/critical thinking, problem-solving, and practice skills to serve various types and sizes of client systems and work directly with or on behalf of clients at multiple system levels.
 8. Foundation knowledge and skill in research to evaluate one's own professional social work practice and, under supervision, engage in program evaluation and social work research.
 9. Oral and written communication knowledge and skills needed to be an effective enabler and change agent with a variety of client populations, colleagues, and members of the community.
 10. Ability to apply strategies of change that advance social and economic justice.

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

The methods of measurement used to assess the achievement of BASW program objectives are:

1. Baccalaureate Education Assessment Package (BEAP)
 - a. Social Work Values Inventory
 - b. Alumni Survey
 - c. Exit Survey
2. Field Education Evaluations
3. Field Instructors Survey
4. Junior BASW Survey
5. Senior BASW Focus Group
6. School Alumni Survey

See Appendix A for full BASW program assessment plan and feedback plan including methods and timelines for data collection, as well as timeline for feedback information to be given to faculty and students.

Figure 1 below visually depicts which of the outcomes measurements assess the various program objectives. An in-depth description of each outcome measurement follows Figure 1.

Figure 1

BASW Objectives	BEAP	Field Education Evaluation	Field Instructors' Survey	Junior BASW Survey	Senior BASW Focus Group	Alumni Survey
Commitments to principles of equity and social justice.	x	x	x	x	x	x
Informed empowerment perspectives.	x	x	x	x	x	x
Understanding of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination.		x	x	x	x	x
Knowledge of and appreciation for human diversity and cultural differences. An understanding that cultural competence is a lifelong process.	x	x	x	x		x
Comprehension of and commitment to social work values and ethics.	x	x	x	x	x	x
Knowledge and understanding of the foundation areas (social policy, social work practice, human behavior and the social environment, research and evaluation, and field education) necessary to engage in entry level generalist social work practice.	x	x	x	x	x	x
Analytic/critical thinking, problem-solving, and practice skills to serve various types and sizes of client systems and work directly with or on behalf of clients at multiple system levels.		x	x		x	x
Foundation knowledge and skill in research to evaluate one's own professional social work practice and, under supervision, engage in program evaluation and social work research.					x	x
Oral and written communication knowledge and skills needed to be an effective enabler and change agent with a variety of client populations, colleagues, and members of the community.		x	x		x	x
Ability to apply strategies of	x	x	x	x	x	x

change that advance social and economic justice.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

BASW Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Objective 1: Commitments to principles of equity and social justice.

This objective was measured using the BEAP, the Student Surveys and Focus Groups, the Field Education Evaluation, and the Field Instructors Surveys. Two items from Juniors Survey that would best address social justice are:

- Diversity and non-discrimination covered in the curriculum
- Values, ethics, and mission of social work covered in the curriculum

Students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with how the program addresses these two items. On a 5-point Likert scale (with 1=not at all satisfied to 5=very satisfied), the mean score for both was 4.53 which shows that students were generally satisfied with how the program addresses diversity and non-discrimination as well as the values, ethics, and mission of the social work profession. Responses to the open-ended questions also demonstrate that the courses covered social justice adequately. Students pointed out that these themes were not only reflected in the course content but also in the diversity of the student body and the safe environment maintained in the classroom to discuss different perspectives. Social work values, including social justice, were discussed adequately in class. Others pointed out areas of improvement particularly in terms of having more content on aging and international issues and providing more examples or case studies that reflection social justice. The Second Year Survey also included an item asking students to rate their level of satisfaction with the degree to which the School’s mission, which includes social justice, is reflected in the course content. On a 5-point Likert scale (with 1=not satisfied at all to 5=very satisfied), the mean score ranged from 3.50 to 3.63 which shows the relative satisfaction with how the program promotes social justice.

In the focus group held with second-year students, the participants cited the following content areas as being adequately address: social work theories, social movement and action models, empowerment theories, social and economic justice theories, the strengths perspective, older adults, children and adolescents, families and communities, advocacy, group work, community organizing, and macro practice. In terms of areas of improvement, the students expressed wanting to have more coverage of these topics: couples and families, refugees/immigrants and internally-displaced persons (IDPs), disability, international social work, mental health, indigenous communities, and spirituality. These topics will help develop social justice literacy among students. Furthermore, they identified courses that they would like to have covered more.

Objective 2: Informed empowerment perspectives.

This objective was assessed using the BEAP, the student surveys and focus groups, the field education evaluation, the field instructors' survey, and the alumni survey.

The items in the student survey that best addressed this objective were: 1) Diversity and non-discrimination covered in the curriculum; 2) Values, ethics, and mission of social work covered in the curriculum; 3) Knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes; and 4) Specific social work practice skills and results stemming from the program. Students were asked to rate these items on a five-point Likert scale (with 1=not at all satisfied and 5=very satisfied). The mean scores for these items ranged from 3.53 to 4.53. This indicates the students' rating of the program as covering these items, all of which inform an empowerment perspective, as moderate to high. The qualitative responses also reveal that students were exposed to content covering an empowerment perspective in their courses.

In the alumni survey, the questions that would measure this objective were the following: 1) To what extent did your course work prepare you to enter many fields of practice serving multiple sizes of systems, including individuals, families, groups, communities, and the broader society? 2) To what extent did the BASW program prepare you to be a versatile, creative, and effective work in serving the peoples of San Francisco? 3) To what extent did the BASW program prepare you to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities? 4) How well did the BASW program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? 5) How well did the BASW program educate you to be a social workers who renders direct service to people in need and assists communities in their struggle for self-determination and empowerment? And 6) To what extent did the BASW program prepare you for your career after the BASW program?

The mean scores ranged from 3.75 to 4.33 on a 5 point Likert scale, thus showing that graduates of the program attribute the perspective they now have in their practice of client empowerment to the BASW program. The qualitative responses offered mixed views with most respondents indicating that the program aided in giving them an empowerment perspective in their practice. Other respondents indicated that they already had this perspective prior to coming to the program.

Objective 3: Understanding of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination.

The assessment tools used to address this objective are the student survey and focus groups, the field education evaluation, the field instructors' survey, and the alumni survey. Results from the BASW Juniors Survey showed the rating of student satisfaction for the curriculum was high for oppression and discrimination Responses to open-ended questions indicate that issues of oppression were covered sufficiently in class. Results of the BASW Seniors Survey and Focus Groups likewise indicated that students had increased knowledge about oppression and increased skills in analyzing oppression and discrimination. In terms of areas for improvement, one student maintained that "populations including the elderly and international topics are not covered as much".

Qualitative responses for the alumni survey also indicate the graduates of the program maintained the program's emphasis on issues of oppression and discrimination. A number of responses added that this was a positive feature of the program and made it unique among social work programs.

Objective 4: Knowledge of and appreciation for human diversity and cultural differences. An understanding that cultural competence is a lifelong process.

This objective was assessed using the BASW Surveys and Focus Groups, the Field Education Evaluation, and the Field Instructors' Survey. The results of the BASW Junior surveyed showed that students were highly satisfied with how the curriculum addressed diversity and cultural competence. On a 5-point Likert scale (1=not at all satisfied, and 5=very satisfied), the mean score for the BASW Juniors survey was 4.53. Responses to the open-ended questions also show that cultural competence was covered adequately in all classes. Respondents from the Juniors Survey state in the over-all evaluation that the program's coverage of diversity was one of the key strengths of the BASW program and one the key learning components of the students. Findings from the Seniors Survey also reveal that one of the strengths of the program was its focus on diversity and cultural competence. The courses were clearly designed to enable students to hone their competency in relating with social differences. In the focus group with Second Year students, the respondents indicated that the program prepared them to be culturally competent social workers.

While the results of the Juniors and Seniors Survey demonstrated that the BASW program's approach to addressing diversity and cultural competence was one of its key strengths, the respondents from the Seniors focus group also cited some areas for improvement. The focus group respondents stated that the diversity course (SW 470 Social Differences in Social Work Practice) was one of the least helpful courses in honing their cultural competence skills. Some pointed to the way that the class was taught.

Objective 5: Comprehension of and commitment to social work values and ethics.

Objective 5 was measured using results from the BEAP, the Students Surveys and Focus Group, the Field Education Evaluations, and the Field Instructors Survey. The Juniors Survey results show that students were highly satisfied with the way the program addresses commitment to the values and ethics of the social work profession. On a 5-point Likert scale (1=not at all satisfied to 5=very satisfied), the mean score for student satisfaction in this area was 4.53. The responses from the open-ended questions were mixed. Some responses revealed that this area was covered sufficiently, thoroughly, and clearly in the classes. One student claimed that "our classes focus [on] social work values, ethics, and mission since the first day of instruction". Another student stated that she or he "feels that they have a comprehensive understanding because they have exposure to the mission across the curriculum". Other responses indicate that the values and mission of social work was covered only in the first Fall semester of the program. Overall, the Juniors Survey results state that students identify the

program's approach to the mission and values of the social work profession as one of its key strengths.

Responses to the open-ended questions of the Second Year Survey stated that the program was very helpful in their understanding of social work values, the Code of Ethics, and the mission of social work. The History of Social Policy course, field seminar, the Group Work class, and the Practice class were cited as particularly integral to gaining knowledge of the profession's values and mission.

Objective 6: Knowledge and understanding of the foundation areas (social policy, social work practice, human behavior and the social environment, research and evaluation, and field education) necessary to engage in entry level generalist social work practice.

The assessment tools used to measure Objective 6 are the Student Surveys and Focus Groups, the Field Education Evaluation, the Field Instructors' Survey, and the Alumni Survey. In the Juniors Survey, the item that asked students to rate their level of satisfaction with knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes had a means score of 4.18 indicating that students were generally satisfied with how the program addresses this objective. Responses to the open-ended questions substantiated this further. Students stated that course content focused on micro, mezzo, macro, and global levels of practice. One student claimed that "we are learning a very broad system of social work. We get to see and learn many skills to apply to our profession". Participants of the focus group with second-year students stated that policy advocacy was covered adequately in the courses. Some students further added that perhaps the class could provide more examples, role plays, or scenario-building. Another student suggested requiring students to attend Lobby Days as part of their policy courses. In the focus group with Seniors, the respondents indicated not being as prepared in policy advocacy as they were in other competencies.

Results from the Alumni Survey also presented additional evidence of how this objective is address. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their course work prepared them to enter many fields of practice serving multiple size of systems including individuals, families, groups, communities, and the broader society. On a 5-point scale (1=poor and 5=excellent), the mean score was 3.9 (n=87). Responses to the open-ended question were rather mixed. On the one hand, some alumni of the BASW program thought that the program was helpful in giving them a strong foundation and thus preparing them for a career in social work. Some examples of comments are indicated below:

"I felt that the program at SFSU was fantastic. I had practical skills for entering the Social Work (and other public service) fields."

"The BA program, in many respects, exceeded the Master's program I attended in depth and application of knowledge."

“The internship was the best component of the experience! Other undergraduate programs do not require an internship.”

On the other hand, some alumni did not share this feedback. They felt that the program was wanting in a strong foundation. One alumni commented that “It did not really prepare me for graduate school as I moved on to graduate school Fall 2006. Most students who were in the advanced standing program like myself knew terms and theories that I had never heard of while a BASW student at SFSU”.

Objective 7: Analytic/critical thinking, problem-solving, and practice skills to serve various types and sizes of client systems and work directly with or on behalf of clients at multiple system levels.

This objective was measured using the Student Surveys and Focus Groups, the Field Education Evaluation, the Field Instructors Survey, and the Alumni Survey. The Juniors Survey asked students to rate their level of satisfaction on how the BASW program addresses knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes. On a 5-point Likert scale (1=not at all satisfied to 5= very satisfied), the mean score was 4.18 which indicates that the students were generally satisfied. Responses to the open-ended question stated that the program helped equip them with requisite analytical/critical thinking, problem-solving, and practice skills to serve clients at multiple system levels. The group work and role plays conducted in class encouraged hands-on experience and provided opportunities to practice techniques taught in class. One student commented that “we are learning a very broad system of social work. We get to see and learn many skills to apply to our profession”. Another claimed that “the curriculum includes systems of all sizes and populations.”

The Alumni Survey provided additional data supporting how the BASW program addressed this objective. The items that were most relevant to the objectives were:

- The extent to which the BASW program prepared students to be versatile and creative workers in serving the peoples of San Francisco Bay Area (5-point scale with 1=not at all and 5=to a large extent).
- How well the BASW program provided learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired students to become advocates for economic and social justice. (5-point scale with 1=poor and 5=very well).
- How well did the BASW program educate you to be a social worker who renders direct services to people in need and assist communities in their struggle for self-determination and empowerment? (5-point scale with 1=poor to 5=very well).

The mean scores for these items ranged from 4.09 to 4.20 (n=85) which indicates that the alumni respondents thought that program prepared them to be effective in working with under-served populations in the Bay Area and beyond. Other responses to the open-ended question added that the preparedness went beyond the Bay Area. Other comments are indicated below:

“Through the internship program, we got valuable on the job experience working with various communities in the SF Bay. Our classes (diversity, gender, etc.) were fantastic in teaching us to appreciate all that the Bay Area has to offer”.

“The internship prepared me to work with a versatile group of individuals and systems (CBO). In addition, it provided the opportunity to explore how systems work together and what changes are needed to help clients.”

One response from the open-ended question held that being advocates for economic and social justice is to be expected of all social workers. That was why they were in this profession. One respondent shared that she/he “spent a wonderful 30 years in Law Enforcement, and the skills adopted from schooling saved her/his life more than once. She/he practiced as a psychotherapist from 78-84 part-time”. Another respondent expressed that it was the program’s focus on working to empower clients that attracted her/him to the program.

Objective 8: Foundation knowledge and skill in research to evaluate one’s own professional social work practice and, under supervision, engage in program evaluation and social work research.

Objective 8 was measured using the Student Surveys and Focus Groups, the Field Education Evaluation, the Field Instructors Survey, and the Alumni Survey. Some of the items in the Second Year Survey and Focus Group (Note: Research is taught the senior year of the program, thus, gathering feedback about foundation knowledge and skill in research is more appropriately done for the Second Year assessments.). None of the items asked specifically about research but about foundation courses in general. The items in the Second Year Survey included the following:

- Assess the curriculum and class content (5-point scale with 1=not at all and 5=very satisfied).
- Indicate the degree to which the School of SW follows its Mission in class offerings, course assignments, etc? (5-point scale with 1=not at all and 5=very satisfied).

The mean scores for these items ranged from 3.5 to 4.0 indicating that students were generally satisfied with the curriculum and classes attended. One of the responses in the open-ended questions referred to the research course. This was a recommendation to offer the research class in the Fall as it is too stressful to have it in the last semester. There were no further comments on Research in the Second Year focus group.

The alumni survey specifically asked respondents about their areas of employment which included research. About 6.1% of all respondents reported they are employed in the area of research. Clearly, research is utilized by SFSU Social Work graduates in a variety of ways: to enhance practice skills, to conduct research in specific practice areas, and to publish professional social work research to develop the field of evidence-based practice.

Objective 9: Oral and written communication knowledge and skills needed to be an effective enabler and change agent with a variety of client populations, colleagues, and members of the community.

The assessment tools used to measure Objective 7 were the Student Surveys and Focus Groups, the Field Education Evaluation, the Field Instructors Survey, and the Alumni Survey. The items in the Juniors Survey that addressed this objective were the item asking students to rate their level of satisfaction for specific SW practice skills and results stemming from the program. On a 5-point Likert scale (where 1= not at all and 5=very satisfied), the mean score was 4.35 which indicates that students were generally satisfied with how the program addressed this objective. Responses to the open-ended question stated that the course on interviewing skills and direct practice courses were helpful in providing students with the requisite skills and knowledge. The role plays conducted in class were particularly key in gaining not only practice skills but confidence. The over-all practice skills covered were highlighted in the Juniors Survey:

Several practice skills were particularly highlighted as critical learning components:

- Interviewing clients, using different theoretical framework and research.
- Communication skills, honesty/integrity, strong work ethics and team work skills.
- Listening skills, clinical thinking and values analysis.
- Values, dignity and worth of a person, social justice and service.
- Equality to all society.
- Cultural diversity, cultural competency, political advocacy.
- Practice confidence, experience for future practice.
- Role play that helps us practice our skills.
- Client-therapist relationships.
- The basics of practice skills.

The Second Year focus group results show that the Group Work class was particularly crucial in providing the requisite skills and knowledge. Respondents indicated being very much prepared in making treatment plans and policy development and advocacy. They were not as prepared in analyzing poverty and oppression, capacity-building, campaigns, and program coordination. The focus group participants further stated that they had sufficient coverage of the strengths perspective, working with older adults, child welfare, families and communities, community organizing, macro practice, and multicultural practice.

The Alumni Survey asked respondents to rate how well the BASW program prepared them for a career in social work. On a 5-point Likert scale (where 1=not at all and 5=to a large extent), the mean score was 4.33 (n=84). Responses to the open-ended questions indicated that the BASW program provided a good foundation not only for practice but for graduate education in social work whether that was at SF State or in another university. Others added that it prepared them for professions other than social work. One respondent maintained, “Even though I have left the field to become an educator, my social work training has allowed me to create health

education programs for the various schools in which I work. I have learned the skills to meet the needs of other, be they "clients" or now "students". One comment summed up what the impact of the program on the graduate's requisite knowledge and skills:

"One of the things I learned at SFSU was that the areas/fields of work that I initially had the most bias against/fear of, were some of the most rewarding work experiences I have had. Throughout my programs at SFSU, my instructors/professors challenged me to try work/experiences outside of my comfort zone. It wasn't easy. At times it was emotional quite painful. But I learned a lot--not only as a professional, but as a human being. To this day, I use that lesson to challenge myself."

Objective 10: Ability to apply strategies of change that advance social and economic justice.

The assessment tools used to measure Objective #1 are the BASW Surveys and Focus Groups for Juniors and Seniors, the Field Education Evaluations, and the Field Instructors' Survey. Results from the BASW Juniors Survey showed the rating of student satisfaction for the curriculum was highest for diversity and non-discrimination. Responses to open-ended questions indicate that diversity and non-discrimination were covered sufficiently in class. One respondent commented that many of the classes focus heavily on diversity issues. Results of the BASW Seniors Survey and Focus Groups likewise indicated that students had increased knowledge about empowerment and increased skills in analyzing oppression and discrimination. In terms of areas for improvement, one student maintained that "populations including the elderly and international topics are not covered as much".

Detailed Results of BASW Assessment

Results of the Junior Year BASW Students Assessment

Student Focus Groups

In the Spring 2009 the school conducted two focus groups with junior year BASW students and graduating BASW students. An announcement went out to all students to recruit for the focus groups and six students participated in the focus group voluntarily. The qualitative instrument used for the focus group is located in Appendix E and will become an annual measurement tool each Spring for the School. All data collected from the group were anonymous. The focus group was utilized to gather outcome data related to Program Objectives #1, 2, 4, and 5 above. Yeon-Shim Lee, PhD, BASW coordinator for school year 2008-2009 synthesized the results of the student assessment for junior year students. Lisa Hines, PhD, who also teaches in the BASW program, synthesized the results from the student assessment for senior year BASW students.

Purposes

- To assess strengths and weaknesses of BASW curriculum and content, with focus on competency areas for 1st year BASW students.

- To assess general satisfaction of 1st year BASW students about curriculum, content, course schedules, and overall experiences with BASW program.
- To obtain feedback and comments to be used for self-assessment and renewal.

Evaluation Instrument

- Survey (both quantitative and qualitative) (see Appendix E)
- Total number of 1st year BASW students: 25 (24 admitted and 1 returning students)
- Survey participants: 17
- Collection of survey instrument: March 12-March 19, 2009.

Findings

The overall average of 1st year BASW student satisfaction on curriculum and BASW program is **4.23** on a scale where “1” represents “Not at all satisfied” and “5” “Very much satisfied.”

Generally, all competency areas of curriculum and contents were positive, with mean scores ranging from 3.53 to 4.53. The area of weakest satisfactions (lower than 4) was “Class schedule and course sequences organized and coordinated” (mean score: 3.53).

Average scores in other areas showed student satisfaction at a level higher than “4 (satisfied).” Highest satisfactions were indicated in the following areas:

- Diversity and non-discrimination covered in the curriculum (average score: 4.53)
- Values, ethics, and mission of social work covered in the curriculum (average score: 4.53)

The items about “effectiveness and availability of faculty and staff” as well as “overall experiences with the BASW program” are found to be slightly higher than 4 (satisfied), 4.35 and 4.12, respectively.

Rather than attempt to summarize or analyze the comments provided by 1st year BASW students, this report provides all comments and feedback as it was in the responses.

PART I: QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

A. BASW Curriculum, Content, and Schedule

1. Diversity and non-discrimination covered in the curriculum

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses	0	0	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	10 (58.8%)	4.53

(N= 17)						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. Values, ethics, and mission of social work covered in the curriculum

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	0	2 (11.8%)	4 (23.5%)	11 (64.7%)	4.53

3. Knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	0	2 (11.8%)	10 (58.8%)	5 (29.4%)	4.18

4. Specific SW practice skills and results stemming from the program

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	9 (52.9%)	4.35

5. Curriculum on theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	9 (52.9%)	4.35

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

6. History, philosophy, social policies, and influences covered in the curriculum

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	0	3 (17.6%)	7 (41.2%)	7 (41.2%)	4.24

7. Introduction of social service organizations, nature of social service agencies, and service delivery covered in the curriculum

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	2 (11.8%)	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	8 (47.1%)	4.18

8. Field education and field placement are informed and arranged.

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)	3 (17.6%)	3 (17.6%)	8 (47.1%)	4.18

9. Class schedules and course sequences organized and coordinated.

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of	1	2	5	5	4	3.53

Responses (N=17)	(5.9%)	(11.8%)	(29.4%)	(29.4%)	(23.5%)	
---------------------	--------	---------	---------	---------	---------	--

B. Effectiveness and Availability of Faculty and Staff

10. Experiences with the SSW faculty, staff, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director.

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	1 (5.9%)	1 (5.9%)	6 (35.3%)	9 (52.9%)	4.35

C. Overall BASW Program

11. Overall experiences with the BASW program

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=17)	0	1 (5.9%)	0	12 (70.6%)	4 (23.5%)	4.12

PART II: QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. Diversity and non-discrimination covered in the curriculum

Strengths

- Provided opportunities to learn not only from instructors but also from classmates who are of different genders, ethnicities, race, class, and ages.
- Classes provide the right amount of knowledge about social work.
- Diversity and non-discrimination were covered in detail in all courses. Every class offered perspectives on ethnicity and culture. There was a big emphasis on cultural competence.
- The classes maintained openness to students' ideas and biases without judgment.
- I have learned so much in these areas. My eyes have been opened a little bit wider and some of my own biases have been addressed.

Weaknesses

- Populations including the elderly and international topics are not covered as much. I am not sure if international affairs are extremely relevant though.
- I feel that we have not covered much about international affairs.
- Some teachers do their work (correcting papers) during class time.
- Some instructors do a little bit bad for class, as partner instructors.
- I feel it could be less redundant.
- Not all professors can take criticism when it comes to their own ethnicity.
- We don't talk about it much, or stated in syllabus or in class much.

2. Values, ethics, and mission of social work covered in the curriculum

Strengths

- We have covered these topics very well.
- Well covered.
- Our classes focus in the social work values, ethnics, and mission, since the first day of instruction. Our classes also analyze and research about social policies and different theories.
- Values, ethics and mission were very clear and stressed often.
- Thorough review and discussions of values, ethics, and missions.
- Great explanation about SW.
- I feel we have a comprehensive understanding because we have exposure to the mission across all curriculum.
- These topics were covered (values, ethics) slightly.
- Same answer, much new information for me.
- Very well: the curriculum covered in class is very detailed.
- Very specific in lectures as well as in text.
- We have repeated them over and over.

Weaknesses

- Not many male faculty, can be slightly biased.
- Need more examples to explain more.
- I think that they only time we talked about the mission of social work was 1st fall semester only.
- Gets boring to learn this every day.

3. Knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes

Strengths

- There is much group work that encourages hand-on experience. Also, role playing in class helps so much and that technique is implemented often.
- Using role plays to practice the different skills and techniques taught.
- We focus on the micro, mezzo, macro, and global levels affecting human behavior.

- Very well done! Learned a lot.
- Right emphasis on appropriate use and coverage of generalist practice.
- Yes, we can learn most the knowledge and skills of SW from the BASW curriculum.
- I feel confident about the generalist practice.
- Greatly covered for larger systems.
- Social work topics and concerns are discussed on the micro, meso, and macro-levels.
- We are learning a very broad system of SW. We get to see and learn many skills to apply to our profession.
- The curriculum includes systems of all sizes and populations.
- Well informed.

Weaknesses

- Not enough practice, more different scenarios.
- Students also need the real examples.
- Design in my opinion was geared to government policy, etc. not community service or grassroots.
- Gets boring to know them and hear them every day.

4. Specific SW practice skills and results stemming from the program

Strengths

- Interviewing clients, using different theoretical framework and research.
- Some SW practice skills are communication skills, honesty/integrity, strong work ethics and team work skills.
- Listening skills, clinical thinking and values analysis.
- N/A.
- Values, dignity and worth of a person, social justice and service.
- Equality to all society.
- Cultural diversity, cultural competency, political advocacy.
- Classes offered direct practices, interviewing skills, practice confidence, experience for future practice.
- We get to do a lot of role play that helps us practice our skills.
- Interviewing skills as well as client therapist relationships.
- Know the basics of practice skills.

Weaknesses

- Not enough.
- Did not spend much time on it.

5. Curriculum on theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence

Strengths

- Empirical evidence is always to use in order to support theoretical frameworks: this is implemented always.
- Empirical evidence were well used to provide different examples and cases to support each theoretical framework.
- BASW uses the frameworks of maintaining the integrity of the profession, such as knowledge, ethics, and values. The SW profession has a general community service and the development of knowledge is a lifelong learning needed for a professional practice.
- A wide variety of frameworks are explained.
- N/A.
- I feel we need more exposure to empirical evidence.
- Class was based on empirical data plus our assignments were all referenced impartially.
- A lot of the instructions are very informative regarding empirical evidence.
- All types of theoretical frameworks are used to support lectures and readings.

6. History, philosophy, social policies, and influences covered in the curriculum

Strengths

- Well-covered.
- Well covered; the film about the various major social workers is a great film to learn about the history of social work profession.
- In all our classes we learned about the history, philosophy, and social policies that influence, change, and affect people's lives at the micro, mezzo, macro, and global levels.
- Male students understand a lot.
- Well covered.
- Very well covered.
- Classes are offered and very satisfying on history and social policy.
- The details are very well shown in these classes. They have the most updated information.
- The details are clearly mentioned in order to understand new and recent material.
- Learned how SW was developed and is important.

Weaknesses

- N/A.
- There is not too much of it covered in courses.
- Not very good in grabbing all my attention.

7. Introduction of social service organizations, nature of social service agencies, and service delivery covered in the curriculum

Strengths

- These topics are covered very extensively.
- Visits to different agencies are a great experience.
- We have a interview class in which we learn about different agencies, their mission, and functions. We also learned about the importance of supervision and teamwork.
- Nice introduction.
- Good instructor.
- A class was dedicated to this purpose.
- Once introduced to any agency, experience is great.
- Social services classes are very informative.
- Gives student opportunity to find out what they want to go into.
- We have a class based on that.

Weaknesses

- N/A.
- The teacher seemed more interested in doing therapy with students than the curriculum.
- N/A.
- Need better background of organization of all agencies in Shapiro's class Fall semester 1st year of program.
- More visits would have been helpful.
- Could be more agencies, only saw about 3-4 agencies introduced to.
- Not enough agencies were visited and discussed.
- Not well informed.

8. Field education and field placement are informed and arranged.

Strengths

- We attended a field fair in which we were introduced to many diverse agencies. We were trained in how to present ourselves and agency placement for all students are well organized.
- The field fair was a great experience to meet different agencies.
- Dianne M. is helpful and knowledgeable.
- We have a introduction class about the different functions of the agencies around our school area. We also research and interview the ones that we were interested the most. We have a field instructor who help us with our interviews and advice us about different opportunities and possibilities we can take. We go to a minimum of 3 interviews; then we choose.
- The field education is well and enough.

- Well organized.
- Not my experience yet.
- They are informative, but at times was not very clear.
- We had a fair.

Weaknesses

- N/A.
- No well informed in the first year of the program what the expectations of an internship requirement: 16 hours. Does not take into account that students work to survive + class + internship hours = stress! Not enough time between class for lunch.
- The placements still unknown yet, so no not know good or not.
- N/A.
- Very well organized, all the information provided all questions are answered when needed.
- Not clearly described at beginning of semester. Not given the opportunity to choose field placement.
- The fair was not well organized. Most of the folks were for masters, not any for SF that interest my field placement.

9. Class schedules and course sequences organized and coordinated.

Strengths

- I like the way it is structured, organized, and coordinated. Classes do not too early and students do not have classes until too late. Our schedule is great! Two dates a week is wonderful! And so is a 9:30am-3:30pm schedule!
- It is great that it is not a heavy load.
- They are well organized. The first semester is introduction and general direct practice. The second is more intense and we got into more detail of history, ethnics, and values of social work. We have classes only 2 days a week which allows me to take other classes for my cluster or/and work.
- Class schedules are fine.
- All classes grouped into small amount of days to allow students to work as much as possible.
- All classes in 2 days.
- Poorly organized with only 10 min to get to next class with no lunch time.
- I am happy with our school schedule.
- They are scheduled at the same time and days each semester.
- Only a two day class.

Weaknesses

- N/A.
- Classes are “back-to back” so no lunch break—but we get eat in class and get 15 minutes break in class.

- Most classes are back to back, therefore no lunch break.
- No break time for lunch. 10 min is not enough to eat.
- More communication among teachers regarding schedule and more course available at evening times.
- Is it possible to set the same class in each class?
- Only 10 min break in between classes not enough very long, tiring day—difficult to focus in afternoon classes.
- More time in between classes.
- Breaks between 2 classes, which are 3 hour (each) only 10 min.
- No flexibility for people who work to take them other days.
- Awful class schedule. No time for eat, bathroom, relax, talk to teachers, move to another class.

10. Experiences with the SSW faculty, staff, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director.

Strengths

- I like how all staff members seem to be really available for students who need to stop by for advice and school business.
- Most experiences are communications with instructor and field placement supervisor. Otherwise, I do not have any contact with other faculties or staffs.
- I have not problem with any of my instructors or field supervisor. They are very knowledgeable and respectful people. I have great appreciation for all of my instructors.
- Most SSW faculty and staff are nice and kind.
- All helpful and accommodating.
- Good communication.
- All are available upon request.
- Always available upon request for meeting /visit. Great via email.
- The staff has been great!
- Faculty have been open to questions and helpful in contributing to my knowledge.
- Ms. Knox very attentively has taken her time to sign our internship papers because other teachers have not been available.

Weaknesses

- Still having few instructors not very well teach the classes.
- Prof. Lemmon did not discuss class material during class time to any extent that it proved beneficial to attend class; very disappointing. I feel as though my money was not well spent on these units.
- N/A.
- Do not know staff. Never met with one except to sign one piece of paper.

11. Overall experiences with the BASW program

Strengths

- The faculties are so nice and helpful. The classes are so informative and structured well to provide a maximum learning environment for students.
- I feel I have a lot of reading to do and a lot of essay to write but I understand the purpose of having each assignment. I have to analyze, discuss, and research, so I would improve my knowledge. When I first got into the program, I did not what to expect but as time pass, I am finding it fascinated. I like the fact that I am going to be able to practice as an intern before I graduate. I really like the program, and I am very lucky to be in it.
- Learn more, practice well.
- Very organized, enthusiastic professors.
- My experience has been great so far.
- Some professors take student very seriously.
- Learned the basics of SW duties.

Weaknesses

- More helpful information should be available for students online. Online classes should be available, as well as summer classes and “inter-break classes.”
- N/A.
- More in-depth practice skills and theory.
- Availability of classes would make it easier to attend.
- Few professors give only general information, feels as we not as important as MSW.
- Too long! Classes too long!! Period between classes only 5 min toooo short!!

12. Recommendations/comments for changes

- Summer classes should be available.
- Winter break classes should be available.
- Online classes should be implemented for students who work during the day/weekdays.
- To explain in more detail during the initial orientation all of the expectations for completing the internships. Not enough emphasis placed on the amount of time required during senior year.
- Take closer look at professors’ syllabuses and what are they offer to student in their classes.
- Class schedule: too little time between classes. No time for bathroom, food, mind relaxation. This made classes so boring b/c of the continuous back to back 3 hour classes. Teachers need to give less HW b/c we do have other classes and commitment. Shorten class time too long to listen to one person and sit there bad for our bodies. We don’t interact with the seniors, faculty. Also teachers need to be more comprehensive and understanding. They need to respect us and have patience. They have to realize we have lives, kids, and family also.

- I feel that I am learning more through the books. I feel that without books I would not learn enough. Some of the teachers don't give good lectures and spend a lot of time talking about other things other than the subject of the class.

PART III: RECOMMENDATION

Both the tabulated data and the comments made by 1st year BASW students indicate satisfaction about curriculum, contents, and services provide by instructors, faculties, and staff, whereas satisfaction about course schedules are relatively low. Additionally, the results of the survey showed the substantial number of requests and recommendations that changes of some areas are necessary and critical for effective learning. Those areas include: course schedules with possibly longer break between classes; implementation of summer, winter, and online courses; and quality teaching.

The vast majority of 1st year students pointed out the strengths of curriculum in the areas of:

- Diversity and non-discrimination (in terms of ethnicity, international affairs, gender, sexual orientation, class, and age) (mean score: 4.53);
- Values, ethics, and mission of social work (mean score: 4.53);
- Social work practice skills and results stemming from the program (mean score: 4.35);
- Theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence (mean score: 4.35).

Several practice skills were particularly highlighted as critical learning components:

- Interviewing clients, using different theoretical framework and research.
- Communication skills, honesty/integrity, strong work ethics and team work skills.
- Listening skills, clinical thinking and values analysis.
- Values, dignity and worth of a person, social justice and service.
- Equality to all society.
- Cultural diversity, cultural competency, political advocacy.
- Practice confidence, experience for future practice.
- Role play that helps us practice our skills.
- Client-therapist relationships.
- The basics of practice skills.

Emphasis must continuously be placed on mission of social work, diversity, social justice, and values, while strengthening knowledge and skills in all areas of BASW curriculum. Some comments drew attention to weaknesses of the 1st year BASW curriculum in the areas of international affairs and aging contents. Additional attention should be paid to students' comments about their dissatisfaction about quality of teaching and instructors. Revisiting course syllabi and class schedules in the BASW program may provide a starting point to make great strides.

4. Results of the Student Assessment for Senior BASW Students

Assessment: 2nd Year BASW Students

Purposes

- To assess strengths and weaknesses of BASW curriculum and content, with focus on competency areas for 2nd year BASW students.
- To assess general satisfaction of 2nd year BASW students about curriculum, content, course schedules, and overall experiences with BASW program.
- To obtain feedback and comments to be used for self-assessment and renewal.

Evaluation Instrument

- Survey (both quantitative and qualitative) (see Attachment F)
- Total number of 2nd year BASW students: 24.
- Survey participants: 8 students (2008); 4 students (2009).
- Collection of survey instrument: March 05-April 02, 2009.

Findings

The overall average of 2nd year BASW student satisfaction on curriculum and BASW program is **3.64** (2008) and **3.99** (2009), on a scale where “1” represents “Not at all satisfied” and “5” “Very much satisfied.”

Average scores in other areas showed student satisfaction at a level higher than “4 (satisfied).” Highest satisfactions were indicated in the following areas:

Spring 2008

- Accessibility of the Director of the School, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director have been to your academic questions/ concerns? (average score: 4.14)

Spring 2009

- Accessibility of faculty/instructors/field liaison/advisor have been to your professional development questions and concerns (average score: 4.50)
- Experiences with the application and admission process (application information, notification, questions answered, responses, etc.) (average score: 4.25)
- Experiences with the SSW staff (instructors, liaisons, field supervisors, administrators, and field director) (average score: 4.25)
- Experiences with the curriculum and class content (average score: 4.00).

Rather than attempt to summarize or analyze the comments provided by 2nd year BASW students, this report provides all comments and feedback as it was in the responses (2008 and 2009).

PART I: QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. Describe your experiences with the application and admission process (application information, notification, questions answered, responses, etc.)

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N= 8)	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	0	3.00

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N= 4)	0	0	0	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4.25

2. Assess the orientation processes (orientation meetings for incoming and prospective students, meet and greet, field orientation, related handouts, etc.)

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=7)	1 (14.3%)	0	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)	3.29

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=3)	0	0	2 (66.7%)	0	1 (33.3%)	3.67

3. Address your experiences with the curriculum and class content.

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=8)	0	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	3.81

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=4)	0	0	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4.00

4. Indicate the degree to which the School of SW follows its Mission in class offerings, course assignments, etc.

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=8)	0	2 (25.0%)	0	5 (62.5%)	1 (12.5%)	3.63

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=4)	0	0	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	0	3.50

5. Specify how accessible your faculty/instructors/field liaison/advisor have been to your professional development questions and concerns?

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=7)	1 (14.3%)	0	1 (14.3%)	3 (42.9%)	2 (28.6%)	3.63

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=4)	0	0	0	2 (50.0%)	2 (50.0%)	4.50

6. Identify how accessible the Director of the School, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director have been to your academic questions/ concerns?

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=7)	0	0	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	2 (28.6%)	4.14

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=4)	0	0	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	1 (25.0%)	3.75

7. State your experiences with the SSW staff (instructors, liaisons, field supervisors, administrators, and field director).

Spring 2008

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=8)	0	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	3.88

Spring 2009

	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Not Satisfied (2)	Neutral (3)	Satisfied (4)	Very Satisfied (5)	Average Score
Number of Responses (N=4)	0	0	0	3 (75.0%)	1 (25.0%)	4.25

PART II: QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

1. Describe your experiences with the application and admission process (application information, notification, questions answered, responses, etc.)

Description

Spring 2008

- My appreciation and admission process was fine-my experience applying to the MSW, on the other hand, was terrible, it is 5/14 and I still have not heard from them.
- I was supposed to start the years the BASW program was almost cancelled. I was in and I was out—very stressful and glad the program stayed and it seems less confusing now.
- It was terrible. I was accepted but a notice was never sent. I had to advocate to get myself into this program with everyone against me. It took me making phone class above the BASW coordinator to get answers, then when I got in and had a meeting with her. She told me not to go above her. I said that it was necessary I found this conversation to be appalling.
- Felt like I was apply for a grad school program. A lot of material was requested.
- My experience with the application process was very good. I was notified in a timely manner.
- I applied right before the deadline and had a good experience everything went smoothly.

Spring 2009

- Notification of admission status was timely, sufficient information in orientation.
- People were quick to return emails/phone calls.
- Responses by staff, when first coming in, were very slow. No one answers the phones.

2. Assess the orientation processes (orientation meetings for incoming and prospective students, meet and greet, field orientation, related handouts, etc.)

Strengths

Spring 2008

- N/A. I did not attend.
- These processes existed.
- Very organized and detailed.
- Orientation was very complete.
- Good prep for field orientation.

Spring 2009

- Timely, helpful, relevant to what is needed for student
- I did not attend.
- At least it gets done because you have to.
- Teacher involvement

Weaknesses

Spring 2008

- Sometimes confusing—often there was not enough time to do paper work.
- Short notice. How can you expect students who live far away to attend, who also have a financial burden?
- N/A.
- We should have had more information about segment III.
- Need more meet and greets.

Spring 2009

- Did not specify SFSU's, only social works, requirements
- There has to be an activity in meet and greet where students interact with each other talk to know future classmates.
- No meet and greet with prospective students and/or prior students in program.

3. Address your experiences with the curriculum and class content.

A. Strengths

Spring 2008

- Well rounded and experienced professors.
- Theories behind oppression.

- Diversity.
- Some professors really took time and effort to create safe learning environment.
- Good classes.
- Thorough, some needs updating.

Spring 2009

- Professors are knowledgeable, relevant to SW.
- 1st year was good and chill start.
- The looks were great.
- Field experience.

B. Weaknesses

Spring 2008

- No choice in classes or schedule. Bad scheduling.
- How to work with people who have mental health and addiction issues.
- Lack of teaching going on, lack of passionate teachers, lack of challenging assignments.
- Lack of different class sessions to choose from. Small faculty body professors were not prepared for the class.
- Maybe consolidating into a 1 year program.

Spring 2009

- Not all teachers were prepared with class work.
- Not all SW I felt were going to apply to my field and class content wasn't relevant to teaching in many of the SW classes.
- We hardly even discuss the readings most students did not buy or read the books.
- Seminar should be 2 a month. Teachers should demand more from students. Prepare by quizzes, in-class reading.

C. How were they helpful to your learning specific SW values, Code of Ethics, SW skills, social policy/programs, social change/actions, cultural competency, mission of SW?

Spring 2008

- I definitely learned a lot!
- It was very helpful.
- Helpful.
- Not helpful causes most of them were prepared to teach their class.
- All the concepts were difficult, but time went along.
- They were helpful.
- The History of Social Policies, Seminar, and SW practices were helpful. Also, the group class was important.

Spring 2009

- Discussed Code of Ethics, cultural competency, and role of social workers.

- Helpful enough.
- We should write paper topics in all of course to learn them at a deeper level. Just as cultural competency paper we did. Just talking about them and forget about the content.

D. How did the assignments assist you in your field placement?

Spring 2008

- The social work practice class was VERY helpful with learning practice things.
- More background info provided the practical stuff was in the internship.
- They did not.
- All my assignments helped me with my field placements.
- I was able to apply classroom material in the field.
- Adequate.

Spring 2009

- Let see and address social problems and how to implement social work code of ethics.
- Some helped as far as communication and interviewing skills.
- The interviewing class was the only class that felt helpful.
- Very good. Writing papers about agency we liked and visiting agencies helps.

4. Indicate the degree to which the School of SW follows its Mission in class offerings, course assignments, etc.

Strengths

Spring 2008

- Diversity
- Did emphasis on cultural competency.
- Knowledgeable.

Spring 2009

- Discussed diverse populations of minorities (whether they be racially or social minorities)
- Diverse populations of students. Talked and write cultural competency.

Weaknesses

Spring 2008

- Lack of cohesion amongst faculty, lack of teaching material read (stated on syllabi).
- Some professors were not properly prepared to teach certain class.

Spring 2009

- Failed to address the experiences for majority (specifically white population).
- More paper on relevant topics for a SW student to know.

5. Specify how accessible your faculty/instructors/field liaison/advisor have been to your professional development questions and concerns?

Strengths

Spring 2008

- The faculty has been very accessible.
- She is an amazing listener and advocate.
- None.
- Most faculty was available all the time.
- They are available.
- Thorough, easy to talk to, very knowledgeable.

Spring 2009

- They helped, very knowledgeable.
- Easy to access, willing to talk to students.
- Some teachers respond better with email (than others, but overall helpful).
- They all care about you in every aspect.

Weaknesses

Spring 2008

- I never met my advisor—never returned calls.
- N/A.
- My advisor was extremely hard to get a hold of. Never had chance to talk face to face.
- My advisor was difficult to meet with.

Spring 2009

- Unable to answer.
- More office hours for those teachers and staff such as Dianne Mahan, who are fragmented a lot.

6. Identify how accessible the Director of the School, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director have been to your academic questions/ concerns?

Strengths

Spring 2008

- Yes, now that the programs together again.
- Rita pours her soul into this school. I was not able to notice this until a one-on-one experience with her.
- Field director was really accessible if any issue came up at internship or during internship. Choosing process.
- The Director, Coordinator, and Field Director were always accessible to me.
- Good. I know that they are available and needed.
- Timely.

Spring 2009

- Field director was great.
- Very accessible, willing to answer academic questions.
- Professional, responsible and committed. Field director has to place a student at a different agency if is not a match.

Weaknesses

Spring 2008

- Needs more student input, rather than relying on faculty.

Spring 2009

- Director and BASW coordinator I have never met this person.
- Are available usually during the month of February.
- Decisions that affect students need to be summarized. Many emails with too much information there is not time to read.

7. State your experiences with the SSW staff (instructors, liaisons, field supervisors, administrators, and field director).

Description

Spring 2008

- Some good some not so good.
- Very receptive.
- Mixed but mostly negative experiences. Most faculty were not available.
- Good.
- Good. I felt that my needs were met.
- Everyone was very helpful and supportive and went out of their way.

Spring 2009

- Despite their personal animosity with each other (that we often heard about) they were good to students.
- Communications with students, willing to help.
- Instructors are helpful when needed. Advisors and administrators were not so much.
- All of them are good people. But they should demand a little more from themselves and the students.

8. Provide comments/suggestions for changes for the BASW program and curriculum.

Spring 2008

- Expand the schedule. Let people have choices. Research class should be the 1st year. too stressful for a last class.
- Make sure you keep instructors that have practice experience working with clients.

- Need more class sessions than just one for each course. Advisors NEED to make themselves available.
- Short classes both in duration and term. More field work and seminar.

Spring 2009

- I wish teachers did not talk bad about each other. I wish more students involved themselves in the learning process.
- Provide information about populations within majority and recommend teachers be prepared for every class meeting.
- I think the field experience classes are not necessary and very repetitive. Something like more interviewing skills classes should be replaced with the field experience class.
- Papers are great tools to teach students about important subjects to students.
- Field class 2 a month to current students.
- Evaluations should be done at end of every school year to make positive changes.
- Lobby days should be implemented in the policy class.

BASW Program
COURSE CONTENT, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL
ASSESSMENT
2nd year students

An MSW student assistant conducted a 1-hour focus group to identify social work course content taught, as well as, knowledge and skills acquired by 2nd year BASW students. BASW students identified several types of anticipated professional employment areas over the next 5 – 10 years including:

working in a non-profit organization
child welfare, mental health
seniors
private government agency
youth, immigrants
attend graduate school

Three courses were identified as having best met their needs in moving towards their future goals.

I liked the Group Work Course. It taught us how to work with various groups and it had a lot to do with the teacher.

The Child Welfare Class, SW 350, because I will go into Child Welfare.

SW 402 that we took was very helpful just because they gave real life scenarios of what we may encounter in our professional lives.

Of all the courses completed, the students identified the human behavior, social differences, and seminar and policy courses as the least helpful.

The Human Development course I know is something we will need but it's important to have a professor who can teach the course.

The Human Development course, it would help to have the psychological background but we, I didn't learn anything and that's sad.

Seminar, I know they say we should get parallel learning but maybe if it's once a month or something.

Social Differences, I don't think they taught us enough

The class on policies was not up to par.

I'm sure some people like the class but if class were made a little more structured so we would know just what we need to be doing. I think is it important to not have classes that we just have somebody talking. You don't know what your next assignment is going to be and we're here to learn and not just come here to listen.

Students expressed that they were **very prepared** in the following: Interviewing, Conducting an assessment, strategies and tactics, mobilizing resources, diversity and multiculturalism, social group work, community organizing, advocacy, resource development.

Prepared in: Treatment planning, policy analysis and development

Not at all: in analyzing poverty and oppression, capacity-building, program coordination, campaigning

BASW students assessed that they received a great deal **of knowledge in the following areas:**

Social Work Theories

Social Movement and Action Models
Empowerment Theories
Social and Economic Justice Theories
Strengths Perspectives

BASW students agreed that they received a sufficient amount of knowledge about social work practice in the following areas:

Aging adults
Children and adolescents
Families and Communities
Advocacy
Group Work
Community Organizing
Macro Practice

BASW students stated they **did not receive enough** knowledge and skills and would have liked more knowledge of social work practice in the following areas

Couples and families

LGBT issues. We briefly talked about it (but not enough).

Refugees/immigrants/IDPs
Disability
International social work
Mental health
Indigenous communities
Spirituality and social work

BASW students identified coursework that they would you like to have (or have had) more knowledge, exposure, and information about:

Theories

History of Social Work

Community Development

Case Planning, I would like to see more of

Treatment planning

Aging

stages of change

I think they should have incorporated more theory in the interviewing classes because I learned the theories and I wrote papers on them but we didn't display too much about our interviewing process in the field and as I was remembering these things it's like to actually apply them in our specialties I feel I did not get.

BASW students were asked to identify any other comments, recommendations, or suggestions:

Lecturers

I think by using Lecturers rather than Professors is a disadvantage for us because I feel the Lecturers are not prepared or knowledgeable about certain subjects they are expected to teach. And for example last year, we had a Professor at last minute, she was supposed to teach a course and that was not fair to us. If she was had more preparation, I don't know what the problem was.

Harder Classes

I believe the students and the Professors should be held to a higher standards just because in all honesty I coasted through the first two years and I'm just being real and a lot of it was because we had teachers who were just put in there and there seemed to be a lot of structural problems going on and I didn't know what was going on. I know when I stated my internship I was blown away, I started reading my textbooks trying to relearn things I should have gotten in classes. I mean I don't want to make excuses but I absolutely feel that school should be doing more. When I came into this major and going through the whole process to apply for this major and I expected to get in and work hard but then I got in and I completely slacked up and have been a downhill slope since I got in the program. They said it was jobs in this field but the school has no standard whatsoever and when I get out there it will not be feasible to be ready.

Field Placements

As far as the internship, I feel most of us were unaware that from the previous classes they did evaluations on the internships and I think that would have been helpful. There are a few of us who are just dissatisfied with our placements.

Yeah also on the same topic if the students state they were dissatisfied the program should get right on it.

And if they are teaching us advocacy they should advocate the teachers should get right on it and advocate for us.

I feel the professors should have gone out to our internships much earlier to kind of see what's going on to I guess to advocate for us just in case we need to be placed somewhere else instead of coming out so late in the semester so we can do a transition in our internship.

Administrative Decisions

I also agree with the other student as far as changes and classes and if one instructor can't teach it, there needs to be better screening of the instructors and they cannot just put people there last minute because it is unfair to both the teacher and the students.

Yeah, I just think they put anybody in there and that's not fair.

Yeah, I don't know, the feel of the class was just dreadful and nobody wanted to come and it was just very monotone, it was just....

I know that I'm responsible for a lot of it however the way the whole program is set up it could be so much tighter so that the classes are set up to be relevant to one another, and the lesson were more exciting. I feel like the lesson plans and lectures should all be on the same page with one another so that we won't be jumping all around and not knowing what the class is about. There just seems to be no organization at all in the program. I had a great time in it but it's just not organized.

The Spring, 2009 BASW assessment data was presented to the faculty and students in the school meeting and the BASW Program Committee meeting in the Fall 2009 term to assist with curriculum and faculty teaching development. Additionally, the results will be presented in the Fall 2009 term to the BASW student-led group 'SWAVE' (Social Work Advocates for Visions of Equality). The data are a part of the BASW Self-study and are used for program improvement and enhancement.

BASW Alumni Survey

A School of Social Work Alumni Survey was conducted in the Spring term of the 2008-2009 academic year. The survey was conducted on-line using Survey Monkey to approximately 684 students who graduated with a BASW between 1948 and 2008. The survey was utilized to gather information about the program including: the usefulness of the program in respondents'

professional development, strengths of the program, weaknesses of the program, and reputation of the School in the community. The study also sought information about the graduates such as: whether they had pursued higher education beyond the degree received, advancement in the profession, involvement in community activism and advocacy, participation in professional organizations, publications, and grant writing activities. This instrument (see Appendix) measures outcomes from Program Objectives # 4-7 in the BASW program. (See Figure #1)

Survey Results

The survey consisted mostly of closed-ended questions and a few open-ended qualitative questions. There were 87 responses used for analysis. The surveys were coded and analyzed using the Survey Monkey's analyze functions. Descriptive statistics were used primarily to present the survey results.

Of the BASW respondents (n=87) 45.5% later pursued a master's degree from another institution. This information is helpful as it notifies the School that a percentage of students not only pursued a masters degree, but a degree in social work specifically. A little more than half of respondents (n=87) 57.5% indicated that geographical proximity was the main factor for choosing to come to SF State for their undergraduate program.

Student future work-related activities are extremely important measurements of the achievement of Program Objective #6. Approximately 63.8% of BASW survey respondents reported that they secured employment in social work within three months after they graduated from the SFSU Social Work School. In terms of employment, 45.5% of respondents were in clinical practice, 39.4% work in government or the public sector, 37.9% are in advocacy work, 27.3% are in administration, 22.7% are in community organizing, 18.2% are in academia, 10.6% are involved in policy work, 6.1% are involved in research, 6.1% are in a doctoral program, and 1.5% are involved in international social work practice.

In terms of the extent to which the BASW program addressed its stated objectives, the respondents' mean scores range from 3.70 to 4.19 (scale: 1 = not at all to 5 = to a large extent). In terms of how the program prepared respondents for careers in social work, the mean scores ranged from 4.09 to 4.33 (scale: 1=poor to 5=very well).

It is often difficult to assess whether BASW students are able to utilize research in their practice upon graduation. The alumni survey specifically asked respondents about their areas of employment which included research. About 6.1% of all respondents reported they are employed in the area of research. Clearly, research is utilized by SFSU Social Work graduates in a variety of ways: to enhance practice skills, to conduct research in specific practice areas, and to publish professional social work research to develop the field of evidence-based practice. These results measure Program Objectives # 6 in both the BASW and MSW foundation program. Jocelyn Hermoso, PhD developed the questionnaire and synthesized the results.

Results of the BASW Alumni Survey are as follows:

What influenced your decision to attend SFSU SSW for your BASW? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
School reputation	34.5%	30
Program concentration/emphasis	37.9%	33
Faculty	11.5%	10
Recommendation from a friend or colleague	20.7%	18
You were an SFSU alumnus/alumna	4.6%	4
You were an SFSU field instructor	0.0%	0
Geographically close	57.5%	50
Financial package	12.6%	11
Other (please specify)	14.9%	13
<i>answered question</i>		87
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Additional comments:

- One respondent wanted to live in San Francisco.
- Another respondent was already at SF State and simply switched majors.
- One respondent was drawn to the SSW through the program description in the catalogue.

To what extent did your course work prepare you to enter many fields of practice serving multiple sizes of systems, including individuals, families, groups, communities, and the broader society?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Excellent	29.9%	26	
More than adequate	39.1%	34	3.9
Adequate	27.6%	24	
Less than adequate	2.3%	2	
Poor	1.1%	1	
Additional comments		7	
<i>answered question</i>		87	
<i>skipped question</i>		0	

Additional comments:

Areas of strengths

- The program was fantastic in the way that it provided students with practical skills needed to enter the social work profession and other public service fields.
- The BASW program exceeded the graduate program that one respondent attended in depth and knowledge application.
- Field education was the best component of the program.

Areas of improvement

- One respondent preferred having professors who stayed connected to communities and the practice world.
- Another respondent held that they, as students, were not encouraged to ask questions about how they should handle problems in their field agency.
- The courses could be designed such that they resonated with the field experience.
- One respondent shared an experience of being mis-advised about how to build on internships as a springboard towards graduate school.
- One respondent expressed that the BASW program did not prepare her/him for graduate school. While at graduate school, the respondent learned of theories or terminologies which here classmates knew but she did not.

In the process of going through the program, how supported were you by your advisers?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Excellent support	31.0%	27	
More than adequate support	23.0%	20	3.75
Adequate support	37.9%	33	
Less than adequate support	5.7%	5	
Poor support	2.3%	2	
Additional comments		13	
<i>answered question</i>		87	
<i>skipped question</i>		0	

Additional comments

- Some respondents expressed that their advisers had been excellent mentors. Advisers were instrumental in providing students with suggestions on how to get into graduate school. One respondent shared regretting not taking advice from a former advisor to minor in gerontology. The respondent has worked in the field of aging since graduating from the program. Another respondent was appreciative of the incredible support from her adviser whom she assisted as a Teaching Assistant.
- Other respondents did not share the same experience of having supportive advisers. One respondent admitted not getting enough support being an older student. Others also had advisers who were “unhelpful and sometimes hostile” and insulting. Another respondent narrated an unfortunate experience of being sexually harassed by a department chair back at a time when the word sexual harassment did not exist.

To what extent did the BASW program prepare you to be a versatile, creative, and effective worker in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	
To a very large extent	49.4%	42	
To some extent	35.3%	30	4.19
Neither a large extent nor small extent	8.2%	7	
To a small extent	2.4%	2	
Not at all	4.7%	4	
Additional comments		15	
		<i>answered question</i>	85
		<i>skipped question</i>	2

Additional comments

The program generally prepared graduates to work in the social work profession not only in the Bay Area but in other regions and countries. The program's emphasis on grassroots community needs was particularly useful. The field education experiences as well as the classes in diversity were conducive to students' learning.

There were also alumni who ended up not going into the social work profession.

There were a number of additional comments reacting to the limited scope of the question. The focus on the Bay Area was questioned numerous times when a considerable number of alumni actually worked successfully outside of the Bay Area. This question was based on one of the stated objectives of the BASW program. In the succeeding surveys, perhaps the question could be reworded to include social work practice in other areas nationally and globally.

To what extent did the BASW program prepare you to take on a global perspective of social work practice that appreciates the interconnection of local and international issues?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a large extent	21.4%	18	
To some extent	45.2%	38	3.70
Neither large nor small extent	17.9%	15	
To a small extent	11.9%	10	
Not at all	4.8%	4	
		<i>answered question</i>	84
		<i>skipped question</i>	3

To what extent did the BASW program prepare you to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Excellent	40.0%	34	

More than adequate	35.3%	30	4.12
Adequate	21.2%	18	
Less than adequate	3.5%	3	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		5	
		<i>answered question</i>	85
		<i>skipped question</i>	2

Additional comments:

For some alumni respondents who graduated some years back, thinking globally was not given as much emphasis as there were enough problems going on locally for students to be concerned with international concerns. The classes were useful though in helping students understand current situations.

On hindsight, one alumni respondent stated that it would have been better if professors at the SSW focused on ensuring that students get the practical skills and a little less on students' idealism. Furthermore, it would have been helpful to offer to students at least one introductory theory course. Some alumni were told that they would not cover theory until they got into graduate school. This proved to be detrimental when students got into graduate school and were perplexed as a result of not being conversant in theory.

How well did the BASW program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired students to become advocates for economic and social justice?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	37.6%	32	
More than adequate	36.5%	31	4.09
Adequate	23.5%	20	
Less than adequate	2.4%	2	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		4	
		<i>answered question</i>	85
		<i>skipped question</i>	2

How well did the BASW program educate you to be a social worker who renders direct services to people in need and assist communities in their struggle for self-determination and empowerment ?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	46.4%	39	
More than adequate	32.1%	27	4.20
Adequate	16.7%	14	
Less than adequate	4.8%	4	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		6	

<i>answered question</i>	84
<i>skipped question</i>	3

Additional comments:

Most of the respondents stated that their understanding of the social work profession includes working with communities struggling for self-determination and empowerment. It is this feature of social work that drew some of them to the profession.

One alumni respondent commented considerably on the lack of diversity in faculty perspective. A liberal perspective has always been more prevalent in the school; however, in one respondent's experience, there are conservative or moderate social workers who match liberal social workers in thoughtfulness and concern. This respondent appealed to have faculty who can bring in perspectives other than the liberal perspective to help students be more accepting of these varying perspectives within their agencies and to see these perspectives as genuine options when problems come up.

Some respondents commented on how the question assumes that all graduates have gone into social work. Since not all alumni are in the social work profession, the alumni survey questions need to be modified to include alumni who do not have a career in social work.

Overall, to what extent did the BASW program prepare you for your career after the BASW program?			
<i>Answer Options</i>	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a large extent	51.2%	43	
To some extent	36.9%	31	4.33
Neither large nor small extent	7.1%	6	
To a small extent	3.6%	3	
Not at all	1.2%	1	
Additional comments		8	
<i>answered question</i>		84	
<i>skipped question</i>		3	

Additional comments

The BASW program provided a solid foundation to its graduates so much so that they had more of an advantage than other students in the MSW programs. Others felt that they got more out of their undergraduate program than they did in their graduate program elsewhere. For some who did not pursue social work careers, their social work training proved to be helpful in their chosen profession. For instance, the skill of being client-centered was useful for one respondent who creates education programs for various schools.

One respondent share how the faculty challenged her/him to work outside of her/his comfort zone. While this respondent was resistant to it, this respondent claimed that this was a very rewarding experience.

Would you recommend SFSU SSW to others interested in pursuing a BASW program?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Definitely yes	59.5%	50
Probably yes	33.3%	28
Not sure	4.8%	4
Probably no	2.4%	2
Definitely no	0.0%	0
Additional comments		7
<i>answered question</i>		84
<i>skipped question</i>		3

Additional comments:

The responses were quite mixed. Some respondents stated that they would definitely recommend SF State’s BASW program over other schools in the Bay Area, while others are uncertain and would like to know how the other programs are set-up as things have changed over the years.

On respondent summed up her/his thoughts about the BASW program:

“My time at SF state in the BSW program was very valuable and rewarding. It led to great employment opportunities and was an enriching experience. What was especially helpful was the internship that not only turned into full time employment but allowed me to work with a wonderful and diverse client population. Attending the program was one of the best decisions I have ever made and I would highly recommend it to anyone considering a career in social work.”

Following graduation from the BASW program, have you held a position in any of the following areas? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Clinical practice	45.5%	30
Administration	27.3%	18
Policy	10.6%	7
Advocacy	37.9%	25
Community Organizing	22.7%	15
Academia	18.2%	12
Research	6.1%	4
Government	39.4%	26
International	1.5%	1
Further studies – another master’s degree	45.5%	30
Further studies – doct	6.1%	4

Other (please specify)	16
<i>answered question</i>	66
<i>skipped question</i>	21

If you are currently working, what is your working status?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Full time	68.1%	49
Part time	4.2%	3
Self-employed/Freelance	6.9%	5
Not working	20.8%	15
Additional comments		18
<i>answered question</i>		72
<i>skipped question</i>		15

How many months did it take before you found a job?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Less than 3 months	63.8%	44
4-6 months	18.8%	13
7-9 months	1.4%	1
10-12 months	4.3%	3
More than a year	11.6%	8
Additional comments		19
<i>answered question</i>		69
<i>skipped question</i>		18

What were the factors that kept you from finding employment?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Illness	5.3%	2
Relocation	26.3%	10
Family	7.9%	3
Additional schooling	31.6%	12
Few employment opportunities	50.0%	19
Other (please specify)		19
<i>answered question</i>		38
<i>skipped question</i>		49

How long have you been employed at your current or latest job?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Less than a year	13.6%	9

2-5 years	40.9%	27
6-10 years	13.6%	9
10-15 years	15.2%	10
More than 15 years	16.7%	11
Additional comments		14
<i>answered question</i>		66
<i>skipped question</i>		21

Please list all your memberships in professional organizations.		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
NASW	90.3%	28
CSWE	3.2%	1
CALSWEC	12.9%	4
ACOSA	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		27
<i>answered question</i>		31

Would you be interested in participating in the SFSU Alumni Association?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	27.1%	19
Not sure	50.0%	35
No	22.9%	16
Additional comments		16
<i>answered question</i>		70
<i>skipped question</i>		17

Other Program Assessment Information

Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

Another form of evaluating student satisfaction with the Social Work program at SFSU is students' evaluations of teaching and instruction. Each semester, and in every course, social work BASW and MSW students fill out anonymous forms called Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (SETE) to evaluate the teaching in the School. The evaluations are conducted during the last two weeks of classes each semester and each class is evaluated separately. The Likert-scaled questionnaire is self-administered by students while the faculty member is not in the classroom and all responses are anonymous. The material is collected by students and delivered to the school office, who forwards these data to the SFSU campus University Testing Office (UTO). The UTO develops a quantitative summary of each faculty member's performance which is shared with the faculty member following grade submission, and is also placed in his/her personnel file. Both programs also utilize an open-ended evaluation form, in which the students assess the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in the particular

course. This evaluation is administered at the same time as the SETE evaluation (see Appendix R for form). Narrative comments by students are held in the School office until the final grades are submitted.

As a comprehensive institution, with a teaching mission, San Francisco State University mandates that all SETE are included in every level of appointment (Instructor to Professor) and at every level in the evaluation process (Department/School, College, Dean, University, Faculty Affairs, Provost, President). Therefore, all faculty must include copies of their SETE summaries in their Working Personnel Action File when applying for retention, tenure and promotion (RTP). Given that the faculty take student evaluations so seriously, in the Fall 2003 the School voted to include the narrative evaluations as part of the RTP process as well (in the past narrative evaluations were not included in RTP, but were for individual faculty review only). Additionally, the Director of the School of Social Work takes into consideration SETE data and narrative evaluations when assigning particular faculty to classes.

SETE and narrative evaluations contribute greatly to curriculum development and improvement of instruction. The data provide valuable feedback so faculty members can modify their lesson planning, text choices, guest speaker choices, and assignments. Additionally, through SETE and narrative evaluations, all faculty receive feedback on their teaching styles including ability to lead discussions, handling of sensitive topics, use of multi-media, and classroom modalities. Students fill out SETE data on a 5-point Likert scale for questions 1 through 4 (1=very good, 2=good, 3=average, 4=poor, 5=very poor) and for questions 5 through 21 (1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=neutral/undecided, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree). See Tables 12, 13 and 14 for the most recent SETE data, Fall 2002, Spring 2003.

SETE data are distributed to the School at the end of each semester so each program can utilize student evaluation data when reviewing the curriculum. For example, if the majority of students are offering negative feedback about a particular course, the committee overseeing that course may need to examine and modify the syllabus.

Table 12. BASW SETE Data Fall 2006 and Spring 2007

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall BASW instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2006</u>	<u>Overall BASW instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2007</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.42 (0.71)	1.45 (0.71)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.90 (1.04)	1.70 (0.84)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.88 (1.01)	1.73 (0.89)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	2.05 (1.17)	1.89 (0.99)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.59 (0.90)	1.53 (0.86)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.88 (1.08)	1.67 (0.85)

7. This course as a whole was:	1.92 (0.93)	1.71 (0.78)
8. The course content was:	1.80 (0.86)	1.67 (0.74)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.81 (0.99)	1.67 (0.82)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.55 (0.83)	1.47 (0.68)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.65 (0.90)	1.56 (0.76)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.83 (1.00)	1.68 (0.82)
13. Well organized and prepared.	2.06 (1.18)	1.74 (0.90)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.85 (0.98)	1.72 (0.88)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.93 (0.98)	1.66 (0.80)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.75 (0.89)	1.58 (0.71)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.71 (0.83)	1.54 (0.68)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.61 (0.85)	1.59 (0.81)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.86 (0.91)	1.52 (0.70)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.84 (0.98)	1.62 (0.81)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.79 (0.91)	1.44 (0.62)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.72 (0.89)	1.52 (0.71)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.75 (0.84)	1.53 (0.69)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.75 (0.89)	1.65 (0.84)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.75 (0.96)	1.54 (0.72)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.68 (0.94)	1.49 (0.72)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.78	1.61

Table 14. School SETE Data Fall 2006 and Spring 2007

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall School instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2006</u>	<u>Overall School instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2007</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.50 (0.84)	1.49 (0.85)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.74 (0.98)	1.71 (0.98)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.70 (0.97)	1.68 (0.99)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.76 (1.07)	1.73 (1.00)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.53 (0.92)	1.45 (0.82)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this	1.74 (1.03)	1.67 (0.98)

instructor's teaching was effective.		
7. This course as a whole was:	1.73 (0.92)	1.69 (0.91)
8. The course content was:	1.66 (0.85)	1.68 (0.87)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.65 (0.94)	1.63 (0.88)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.44 (0.77)	1.40 (0.72)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.55 (0.87)	1.47 (0.77)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.70 (0.95)	1.63 (0.92)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.65 (0.96)	1.63 (0.89)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.68 (0.95)	1.65 (0.92)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.74 (0.94)	1.72 (0.95)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.67 (0.93)	1.62 (0.89)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.57 (0.86)	1.51 (0.78)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.53 (0.87)	1.50 (0.80)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.74 (1.04)	1.62 (0.97)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.72 (0.95)	1.67 (0.94)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.67 (0.95)	1.48 (0.78)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.61 (0.87)	1.53 (0.80)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.70 (0.95)	1.60 (0.90)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.57 (0.84)	1.54 (0.82)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.65 (0.95)	1.54 (0.81)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.59 (0.92)	1.47 (0.83)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.65	1.59

Table 15. BASW SETE Data Fall 2007 and Spring 2008

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall BASW instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2007</u>	<u>Overall BASW instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2008</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.48 (0.72)	1.44 (0.83)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.72 (0.85)	1.85 (1.05)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.75 (0.92)	1.86 (1.05)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.79 (0.96)	1.96 (1.03)

5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.47 (0.76)	1.56 (0.96)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.72 (0.93)	1.87 (1.04)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.81 (0.85)	1.91 (0.90)
8. The course content was:	1.74 (0.84)	1.82 (0.90)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.69 (0.82)	1.75 (0.93)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.51 (0.76)	1.54 (0.80)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.56 (0.75)	1.63 (0.85)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.80 (0.86)	1.89 (1.03)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.72 (0.93)	1.82 (1.09)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.65 (0.82)	1.85 (1.04)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.80 (0.97)	1.84 (1.00)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.67 (0.89)	1.66 (0.90)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.59 (0.80)	1.75 (0.99)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.54 (0.82)	1.64 (0.95)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.73 (0.91)	1.68 (0.94)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.71 (0.87)	1.86 (1.03)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.59 (0.78)	1.64 (0.87)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.60 (0.78)	1.67 (0.83)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.70 (0.91)	1.72 (0.95)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.55 (0.79)	1.70 (0.96)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.59 (0.87)	1.77 (0.94)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.59 (0.88)	1.60 (0.87)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.66	1.74

Table 17. School SETE Data Fall 2007 and Spring 2008

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall School instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2007</u>	<u>Overall School instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2008</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.45 (0.76)	1.46 (0.86)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.69 (0.94)	1.75 (1.04)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.68 (0.95)	1.75 (1.05)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my	1.74 (0.98)	1.71 (1.00)

performance & progress throughout the semester.		
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.45 (0.79)	1.55 (1.03)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.67 (0.95)	1.75 (1.07)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.73 (0.95)	1.77 (0.96)
8. The course content was:	1.70 (0.83)	1.71 (0.95)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.60 (0.82)	1.65 (0.96)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.44 (0.74)	1.46 (0.86)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.50 (0.73)	1.53 (0.88)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.70 (0.90)	1.71 (1.02)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.64 (0.94)	1.63 (1.00)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.62 (0.88)	1.73 (1.10)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.74 (0.99)	1.78 (1.06)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.65 (0.93)	1.64 (0.97)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.53 (0.78)	1.61 (0.98)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.52 (0.80)	1.59 (1.01)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.63 (0.92)	1.61 (0.95)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.67 (0.91)	1.72 (1.05)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.56 (0.80)	1.56 (0.86)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.56 (0.83)	1.60 (0.95)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.62 (0.87)	1.66 (0.97)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.53 (0.79)	1.56 (0.88)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.59 (0.89)	1.61 (0.90)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.47 (0.81)	1.51 (0.90)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.60	1.64

Table 18. BASW SETE Data Fall 2008 and Spring 2009

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall BASW instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2008</u>	<u>Overall BASW instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2009</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.27 (0.58)	1.50 (0.81)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.51 (0.75)	1.83 (0.99)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.45 (0.74)	1.89 (1.04)

4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.72 (0.91)	2.02 (1.08)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.28 (0.58)	1.60 (0.87)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.51 (0.79)	1.87 (1.04)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.55 (0.76)	1.85 (0.93)
8. The course content was:	1.50 (0.78)	1.80 (0.88)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.30 (0.59)	1.83 (0.96)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.30 (0.59)	1.62 (0.90)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.36 (0.63)	1.65 (0.84)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.54 (0.77)	1.91 (1.01)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.56 (0.83)	1.79 (1.08)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.45 (0.79)	1.81 (0.98)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.51 (0.83)	1.85 (1.07)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.49 (0.73)	1.72 (0.92)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.43 (0.75)	1.73 (0.90)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.34 (0.68)	1.65 (0.87)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.39 (0.64)	1.69 (0.89)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.52 (0.81)	1.78 (0.97)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.48 (0.74)	1.79 (0.92)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.44 (0.67)	1.75 (0.94)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.50 (0.73)	1.80 (0.94)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.54 (0.75)	1.75 (0.92)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.64 (0.87)	1.94 (1.00)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.43 (0.70)	1.67 (0.92)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.47	1.77

Table 20. School SETE Data Fall 2008 and Spring 2009

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall School instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2008</u>	<u>Overall School instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2009</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.42 (0.75)	1.53 (0.88)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.71 (0.98)	1.74 (0.96)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.64 (0.92)	1.73 (1.00)

4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.76 (1.00)	1.82 (1.03)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.43 (0.82)	1.51 (0.86)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.68 (0.96)	1.74 (1.03)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.72 (0.93)	1.76 (0.92)
8. The course content was:	1.71 (0.90)	1.72 (0.87)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.59 (0.86)	1.68 (0.95)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.44 (0.80)	1.53 (0.87)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.47 (0.81)	1.54 (0.86)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.64 (0.91)	1.73 (0.97)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.60 (0.89)	1.71 (0.99)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.58 (0.90)	1.67 (0.91)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.71 (1.01)	1.78 (1.04)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.62 (0.89)	1.70 (0.96)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.53 (0.84)	1.60 (0.86)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.47 (0.86)	1.53 (0.86)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.59 (0.92)	1.69 (0.99)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.71 (1.00)	1.70 (0.94)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.61 (0.87)	1.67 (0.92)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.59 (0.89)	1.64 (0.91)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.64 (0.93)	1.70 (0.95)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.48 (0.77)	1.58 (0.85)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.66 (0.91)	1.69 (0.95)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.46 (0.84)	1.55 (0.88)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.59	1.66

Appendix A
BASW Program Assessment
Annual Plan

	January	April	May	September	October	November	December
Data Collection and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BASW self-study during Faculty Development Days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BEAP exit survey given to seniors • BASW focus group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness • Field education evaluations • Agency evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BEAP Entrance Survey given to new juniors • BEAP SWVI given to new juniors • Alumni Survey sent out 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field instructor survey to be sent out to all BASW field instructors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness
Feedback to faculty, staff, and students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about all BEAP measurements at school meeting and BASW prog committee mtg 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about the field instructor survey to BASW program committee mtg 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about SETE at school meeting and BASW Program committee meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about focus groups at school meeting, BASW Program Committee meeting, and SWAVE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about field evaluations and BASW agency evaluations at school meeting, BASW Program Committee meeting, and SWAVE 	

- BASW Self-Study every 2 years (set schedule beginning in 2004-2005)

Appendix B
BASW Field Instructor Evaluation of Student

UNDERGRADUATE FIELD EDUCATION
STUDENT EVALUATION-FIRST SEMESTER
Form #701

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

NAME OF AGENCY: _____

DATES COVERED BY EVALUATION _____, 20 ____ TO _____, 20 ____

=====

5=Outstanding, 4=Very Good, 3=Good, 2=Average, 1=Below Average, N/A=Not Applicable	5	4	3	2	1	N/A
A. PERSONAL						
1. Aware of own feelings/values/biases						
2. Is a willing and conscientious worker						
3. Manifests initiative, willingness to take on additional responsibilities, work independently						
4. Is organized in work						
5. Is able to accept and use supervision/is open to suggestions						
6. Works cooperatively with others						
7. Uses discretion in judgments and action						
B. RELATIONSHIP						
1. Ability to establish appropriate rapport						
2. Ability to empathize with clients						

3. Has a writing knowledge of non-verbal communication						
4. Ability to be supportive of clients						
5. Ability to listen and interpret						
6. Ability to structure interviews						
7. Ability to appropriately use the "authority" role						
C. KNOWLEDGE						
1. Understands bio-socio-psycho knowledge base affecting client behavior						
2. Understands significance of human growth and behavior						
3. Understands the relevance for practice of various theories of personality						
4. Understands environmental impact on client behavior						
5. Understands the nature of the community within which the agency functions and serves						
6. Understands agency function						
D. PROBLEM SOLVING						
1. Aware of clients' social and physical functioning						
2. Able to make use of social work skills in assessment and intervention						
3. Demonstrates interviewing skills						
4. Integrates knowledge and skills in the helping processes						
5. Able to work in crisis situations						

6. Ability to adapt to variety of working environments, i.e. home visits, community meetings, collateral visits, office settings						
E. LEARNING						
1. Learning is/was progressive						
2. Able to think and plan logically and creatively						
3. Able to record the dynamics of his/her work with clients						
4. Able to present facts to support assessment						
5. Has learned that there are a variety of theorists, and techniques in intervention						
F. COMMENTS: (We encourage you to comment briefly on your overall impression of the student. We recognize that check lists cannot entirely capture the essence of the student's performance. The overall statement is valuable for future use since these evaluations are used for employment, and graduate school references, etc.)						

Evaluation completed (date): _____

Signature of Agency Field Instructor

Date

***Signature of Student**

Date

Signature of Faculty-Field Liaison

Date

* Signature of student indicates that student has read and discussed this evaluation. Additional comments for students, if needed, may be attached and signed by all signatories.

Appendix C
BASW Field Instructor Evaluation of Students

FINAL EVALUATION FOR FIELD EDUCATION

Evaluation Form #702

For use by: Undergraduates

The second and final semesters written evaluation should be related to the goals and objectives stated in the contract that was developed between the field instructor and student. The statement should articulate the student's learning goals, personal growth, skills, and competencies acquired that were needed to perform satisfactorily in your agency. Describe the student's use of self, and utilization of the various resources that may have been available to supplement agency services. Professional objectivity in the writing of student evaluations helps the continuing and graduating student become aware of strengths and weaknesses and also facilitates the School of Social Work in its efforts to place students in settings appropriate for their professional growth.

I. Identifying Information

- a. Student name
- b. Name of Agency
- c. Name of agency-field instructor

II. Learning Goals and Competencies Related to Student Contract

This section should assess the student's year-long progress related to the goals and objectives articulated in the student's contract. We ask that you consider the following areas when evaluating the student's progress, and add any additional areas relevant to the student's learning experiences in your agency.

- Assessment**
Discuss the soundness and comprehensiveness of the student's perceptions and observations; the student's sensitivity to psychological, social, economic, physical, biological, and cultural factors which may be in operation with self and/or the client; the student's efforts to conceptualize field experiences to different theoretical orientations.
- A.**
- Assessment Skills**
Discuss the student's ability for considering available data; making observations; ordering; organizing; and speculating from available records; recognizing and building on strengths that may be found in the client's situation or community; recognizing and appraising realistically those factors that work against constructive change, including the student's limitations and those of the
- B.**

agency; relevant planning based on the student's assessment of the situation with participation of supervisors.

- C. **Accountability and Self-Discipline**
Does the Student accept the responsibility for what s/he does?

- D. **Communication Skills**
Ability to listen and to communicate verbally, and in writing.

Interpersonal Skills

Ability to work with others, colleagues, client, groups, team members, supervisor, and administration. Participation with others, individually or in groups, in the process of change. Includes the use of self as a change agent.

- E. Willingness to take risks; seeking or avoidance of new opportunities and challenges; ability to act independently and autonomously and to accept responsibility of his or her own learning and growth.

III. Personal Factors

Describe the student's personal factors, including such areas as self-awareness, self-discipline, motivation for personal growth, openness to learning, ability to tolerate frustration, intellectual and conceptual capacity related to field tasks, creativity, and any additional factors relevant to the student's personal development should be noted.

IV. Overall Strengths and Areas for Future Growth:

Evaluation completed (date): _____

Signature of Agency Field Instructor

Date

***Signature of Student**

Date

Signature of Faculty-Field Liaison

Date

Appendix D

Junior BASW Survey (OPTIONAL/ANONYMOUS)
San Francisco State University

Date of Completion: _____

Thinking back over your total experiences (please fill in your answers):

A. BASW Curriculum, Content, & Schedule

1. How well are diversity and non-discrimination covered in the curriculum, especially in areas related to ethnicity/culture, international affairs, gender, sexual orientation, class, age, and ability?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
satisfied Satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

2. How well are values, ethics, and mission of social work covered in the curriculum?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
satisfied Satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

3. Indicate the degree to which the BASW curriculum applies the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with systems of all sizes.

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

4. What are the specific SW practice skills and results stemming from the program?

A. Descriptions:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

5. Indicate the degree to which the BASW curriculum uses theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to understand individual development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations, and communities.

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

6. How well are history, philosophy, social policies, and influences covered in the curriculum?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

7. How well are introduction of social service organizations, nature of social service agencies, and service delivery covered in the curriculum?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

8. Indicate the degree to which field education and field placements are informed and arranged.

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

9. How well are class schedules and course sequences organized and coordinated?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
 satisfied Satisfied
 1-----2-----3-----4-----5

B. Effectiveness and Availability of Faculty and Staff

10. State your experiences with the SSW faculty and staff (e.g., instructors, liaisons, field supervisors, faculty advisor, Director of the School, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director).

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
satisfied Satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

C. Overall BASW Program

11. Address your overall experiences with the BASW program.

C. Strengths:

D. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all Very much
satisfied Satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5

12. What recommendations for change have been identified? What needs to be done to strengthen the BASW curriculum and program?

A. Recommendations/Comments for changes:

Appendix E

Senior BASW Survey (*OPTIONAL/ANONYMOUS*)
San Francisco State University

Date of Completion: _____

Thinking back over your total experiences (please fill in your answers):

1. Describe your experiences with the application and admission process (application information, notification, questions answered, responses, etc.)

A. Description:

B. Rate your experiences:

Not at all					Very much
satisfied					Satisfied
1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5	

2. Assess the orientation processes (orientation meetings for incoming and prospective students, meet and greet, field orientation, related handouts, etc.)

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses

C. Rate your experiences:

Not at all					Very much
satisfied					Satisfied
1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5	

3. Address your experiences with the curriculum and class content.

E. Strengths:

F. Weaknesses:

G. How were they helpful to your learning specific SW values, Code of Ethics, SW skills, social policy/programs, social change/actions, cultural competency, mission of SW?

H. How did the assignments assist you in your field placement?

I. Rate your experiences:

Not at all					Very much
------------	--	--	--	--	-----------

satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Satisfied

4. Indicate the degree to which the School of SW follows its Mission in class offerings, course assignments, etc?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all
satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Very much
Satisfied

5. Specify how accessible your faculty/instructors/field liaison/advisor have been to your professional development questions and concerns?

B. Strengths:

C. Weaknesses:

D. Rate your experiences: Not at all
satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Very much
Satisfied

6. Identify how accessible the Director of the School, BASW Coordinator, and Field Director have been to your academic questions/ concerns?

A. Strengths:

B. Weaknesses:

C. Rate your experiences: Not at all
satisfied
1-----2-----3-----4-----5
Very much
Satisfied

7. State your experiences with the SSW staff (instructors, liaisons, field supervisors, administrators, and field director).

A. Description:

B. Rate your experiences:

Not at all
satisfied

Very much
Satisfied

1-----2-----3-----4-----5

8. Provide comments/suggestions for changes for the BASW program and curriculum.

Appendix F
BASW Student Evaluations of Agencies

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FIELD AGENCY

Evaluation Form #703

For use by: Undergraduates

It has been the policy of the School of Social work to require that students undertake a detailed evaluation of the field agency. This has been proven to be an important part of the student's learning experience and has been helpful in maintaining complementarity between the School's curriculum and the field experiences offered. This final evaluation of your field placement agency is intended to allow a critical analysis and a review of your field practice experience. **The following coversheet format and outline of topics are a guide to some specifics that should be addressed. Feel free to provide additional information of your own choice.**

1. What methods of supervision were used? How was it structured? How effective was it? What changes would you recommend?
2. How difficult were your field assignments? Were they too difficult to accomplish satisfactorily? Not hard enough? Just O.K.? Explain your response.
3. How would you rate your level of awareness of community resources in relation to your placement? Explain your response.
4. Your knowledge of legislation, regulations, policies, and rules pertinent to your field education should have increased. How would you evaluate your strengths and weaknesses in these areas?
5. How effective and efficient was your use of time in the program?
6. How well did you work with your co-workers? Please explain.
7. What were some of your most valuable learning experiences? List and comment on them briefly.
8. What things didn't get done that you wanted to do?
9. List all of the agencies and workers with whom you have had face-to-face contact during the semester. List all of the agencies and workers with whom you have had only telephone contact during your placement.
10. Would you choose this placement again if you could start all over? Why or why not?
11. What recommendations would you make to new students who would want to use your placement?

12. List any previous courses that were helpful to your field education, whether they were in social work or not. Please list the course number, department, and the name of your instructor.

Appendix G
 San Francisco State University
 School of Social Work
 BASW Field Instructor Survey
 Fall 2004

The following is a survey provides the School of Social Work with feedback about the BASW program. Please circle the response that most directly reflects the BASW students you have supervised over the past three years or less.

1. Students are able to practice with an informed empowerment perspective, and an understanding and appreciation of the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and the strategies of change that advance social and economic justice

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

2. Students are able to practice guided by knowledge of diversity and cultural awareness/competence

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

3. Students have an understanding of, and commitment to, the values and ethics of the social work profession

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

4. Students have an understanding and sufficient factual knowledge in the foundation areas (social policy, social work practice, human behavior and the social environment, research and evaluation, and field education) necessary to engage in entry level generalist social work practice

Agree	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Disagree
-------	----------	---------	----------	----------

	Agree		Disagree	
--	-------	--	----------	--

5. Students have the requisite analytic/critical thinking, problem-solving, and practice skills to serve various types and sizes of client systems and work directly with or on behalf of clients at multiple system levels

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

6. Students have the requisite foundation knowledge and skill in research to evaluate their own professional social work practice and, under supervision, engage in program evaluation and social work research

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

7. Students have the requisite communication skills and knowledge of professional use of self as change agent and enabler in order to work with a variety of client populations, colleagues, and members of the community

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

8. Students will have a commitment to social justice (demonstrated beginning knowledge and sensitivity of diversity, oppression, and 'isms')

Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neutral	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree
-------	----------------	---------	-------------------	----------

Any other Comments:
