



SECTION 1 – MSW 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.

MSW Program Assessment - Foundation

The foundation program objectives of the School's MSW program state that students will:

1. Possess critical thinking skills and address immediate client needs while promoting social justice, social change, and empowerment.
2. Have an understanding of the values and ethics of the profession and be able to apply this knowledge to work with oppressed populations.
3. Be able to communicate effectively across client populations, colleagues and communities, and make appropriate use of supervision and consultation in order to function effectively within social service systems.
4. Demonstrate culturally competent practice with diverse populations
5. Apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice in areas of direct practice, administration and planning, and/or social action and change.
6. Demonstrate an understanding and appreciation of historical and contemporary social issues, and bring vision, principles and leadership to the ongoing negotiation with urban service delivery systems.
7. Be able to evaluate research studies and apply this knowledge to practice, as well as evaluate their own practice interventions.

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

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

1. 1st Year MSW Survey
2. Annual Student Focus Groups
3. Field Education Evaluations
4. Field Instructor Survey
5. School Alumni Survey

Figure 2 below visually depicts which of the outcomes measurements assess the various program objectives. An in-depth description of each outcome measurement follows Figure 2. See Appendix B for full MSW assessment plan.

Program Objectives	1st Year MSW Survey	Annual Student Focus Groups	2nd Year Exit Survey	Field Education Evaluation	Field Instructors Survey	School Alumni Survey
Students will possess critical thinking skills and address immediate client needs while promoting social justice, social change, and empowerment.			x		x	
Students will have an understanding of the values and ethics of the profession and be able to apply this knowledge to work with oppressed populations.	x	x	x	x	x	
Students will be able to communicate effectively across client populations, colleagues and communities, and make appropriate use of supervision and consultation in order to function effectively within social service systems.			x	x	x	
Students will demonstrate culturally competent practice with diverse populations.	x	x	x			X
Students will apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work			x	x	x	X

practice and perspective in areas of direct practice, administration and planning, and/or social action and change,						
Students will demonstrate an understanding and appreciation of historical and contemporary social issues, and bring vision, principles and leadership to the ongoing negotiation with urban service delivery systems,	x			x	x	X
Students will be able to evaluate research studies and apply this knowledge to practice, as well as evaluate their own practice interventions			x		x	x

MSW Program Assessment and Continuous Improvement

Objective 1: Possess critical thinking skills and address immediate client needs while promoting social justice, social change, and empowerment

The assessment tools used to measure Objective 1 was the Field Instructors' Survey and the second year exit survey. The items in the exit survey that addresses this objective are the following: 1) As a result of the MSW program, I can say that I am better prepared to be a versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area? 2) Rate your preparedness to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities; 3) How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? And 4) To what extent do you think the MSW program prepare you for your career after the MSW program? The mean scores for these items ranged from 3.1 to 4, which show that graduating students assessed their critical thinking skills and ability to promote social justice, social change, and empowerment from moderate to well. The qualitative responses further indicate that students felt that their courses and field placement experience were instrumental in equipping them with these competencies.

Objective 2: Have an understanding of the values and ethics of the profession and be able to apply this knowledge to work with oppressed populations.

This objective was assessed using the First Year MSW Feedback Form, the Second Year Exit Survey, the Annual Student Focus Groups, the Student Field Practicum Evaluations, and the Field Instructors' Survey. In the First Year MSW Feedback From, the first few questions focused

on an application of social work values and ethics in working with oppressed populations. Based on a five-point Likert scale (with 1=not at all to 5=very well), the respondents had mean scores ranging from 3.8 to 4.7. This indicates a general understanding and ability to apply social work values and ethics in working with oppressed population.

The Second Year MSW Exit Survey asked a number of questions that would address this particular objective: 1) As a result of the MSW program, I can say that I am better prepared to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area; 2) Rate your preparedness to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities; 3) How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? 4) How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? The mean scores for these questions ranged from 3.1 to 4 which indicate that students rated their preparedness in working with oppressed populations from moderate to well.

The First Year focus group results showed a general agreement that the SSW's curriculum addressed its mission very well. This implies that students are able to apply social work values and mission to working with oppressed populations. Nonetheless, the program had its areas of improvement, foremost of which the student participants cited as the strengthening of clinical content.

The Alumni Survey asked a number of questions that addressed this objective of having students have an understanding of social work mission and values and be able to apply these to working with oppressed populations. These questions include 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 MSW program prepare you to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area? 3) To what extent did the MSW program prepare you to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities? 4) How well did the MSW program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired students to become advocates for economic and social justice? 5) How well did the program help you formulate culturally sensitive and appropriate plans of action that recognize personal, community, societal, and other environmental elements relevant to change processes? 6) How well did program help you develop working relationships with diverse clients, organizations, institutions, and communities, under a range of conditions (voluntary referral, involuntary contact, outreach, transfer)? 7) How well did the program help you undertake a variety of worker roles (advocate, change agent, coordinator, counselor, mediator, negotiator, support group leader, planner, administrator, and more), and practice with multicultural competence? 8) How well did the program help you facilitate the development of client empowerment with the means to achieve desired goals? 9) Overall, to what extent did the MSW program prepare you for your career after the MSW program?

The mean scores for these items ranged from 4.04 to 4.65 which indicate the general satisfaction with how the program equipped students with the understanding and competency

to apply social work values and mission to their practice with dispossessed populations. These findings are also indicative of the ability of those who graduated from the program to put the profession's values and mission into practice with different populations in their current practice.

Objective 3: Be able to communicate effectively across client populations, colleagues and communities, and make appropriate use of supervision and consultation in order to function effectively within social service systems.

Objective three was measured using the student field practicum evaluation, the field instructors' survey, and the second year exit survey.

For the Second Year Exit Survey, the following items best addressed this objective: 1) As a result of the MSW program, I can say that I am better prepared to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area; 2) Rate your preparedness to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities; 3) How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? 4) Overall, to what extent do you think the MSW program prepared you for your career after the MSW program? These questions somehow delve on competencies on building relationships, including communication skills, with diverse client populations. On a Likert-type scale (with 1=strongly disagree/not prepared at all/not very well/not at all and 5=strongly agree/very well prepared/very well/to a very high extent), the mean scores for these items ranged from 3.1 to 4. This shows that the graduating students' assessment of the program contributed to their competency in the area of communicating well with diverse client populations ranged from moderate to well. The mean scores were lower for items that refer to how the program aided students in gaining such competencies. They were higher for questions that asked about the students' preparedness for practice. As the qualitative responses indicate, the students stated that they already had some of these competencies even before joining the program; hence, the higher rating for their own preparedness. In terms of how the program added to these competencies, the students' mean scores reflected a more neutral or moderate rating.

Objective 4: Demonstrate culturally competent practice with diverse populations and will apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice in areas of direct practice, administration and planning, and/or social action and change.

The assessment tools used to measure Objective 4 were the second year exit survey, the student field practicum evaluation, the field instructors' survey, and the alumni survey.

For the Second Year Exit Survey, the following items best addressed this objective: 1) As a result of the MSW program, I can say that I am better prepared to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area; 2) As a result of the MSW program, I am now able to take on a global perspective of social work practice and can appreciate the interconnection of local and international issues; 3) Rate your preparedness to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities; 4) How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical

consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? 5) Overall, to what extent do you think the MSW program prepared you for your career after the MSW program? On a 5-point Likert scale (with 1=strongly disagree/not prepared at all/not very well/to a very low extent and 5=strongly agree/very well prepared/very well/to a very great extent), the mean scores ranged from 3.1 to 4. For the graduating students, their rating of their cultural competence in different areas of practice ranged from moderate to good. The scores were lower for the item that asked about how the program instilled critical consciousness, which is integral to culturally competent practice. The higher mean scores were for the item that asked about preparedness to work with diverse populations that are oppressed, disenfranchised, or marginalized. As with the earlier objective, some students felt that they already had this competence before joining the program. The results indicate that there was a moderate assessment of how the program honed such competencies through the curriculum.

From the alumni survey, For the Second Year Exit Survey, the following questions more closely addressed this objective: 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 MSW program prepare you to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area? 3) To what extent did the MSW program prepare you to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities? 4) How well did the MSW program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired students to become advocates for economic and social justice? 5) How well did program help you develop working relationships with diverse clients, organizations, institutions, and communities, under a range of conditions (voluntary referral, involuntary contact, outreach, transfer)? 6) How well did the program help you formulate culturally sensitive and appropriate plans of action that recognize personal, community, societal, and other environmental elements relevant to change processes? 7) Overall, to what extent did the MSW program prepare you for your career after the MSW program? On a Likert-scale ranging from 1-5 (with 1=not at all or to a very low extent and 5=very well or to a very high extent), the mean scores ranged from 4.04 to 4.65. This is indicative of alumni's general satisfaction with how the program has equipped them with competencies to communicate effectively with clients of diverse populations.

Both the Second Year Exit Survey and the Alumni Survey asked about students' competencies in terms of having a more global perspective and an appreciation of the interconnection between global and local issues. The mean scores for this item for both surveys were around 3, indicating a moderate rating of how the program has enhanced a global perspective among the graduates. Since this is a relatively new trajectory of the MSW program, the curriculum has yet to reflect a strong effort and commitment to internationalization.

Objective 5: Demonstrate an understanding and appreciation of historical and contemporary social issues, and bring vision, principles and leadership to the ongoing negotiation with urban service delivery systems.

This objective was measured using the field practicum student evaluation, the field instructors' survey, the first year feedback survey, the second year exit survey, and the alumni survey.

For the First Year Feedback Survey, the items that best reflected this objective were those that asked student respondents to rate their competencies on the following areas: 1) an understanding of historical and contemporary issues; 2) application of values and ethics in practice; 3) ability to communicate effectively with clients; 4) ability to communicate effectively with colleagues; 5) ability to evaluate practice interventions; and 6) ability to facilitate development of client empowerment. On a five-point Likert scale (with 1=not at all and 5=very well), the mean scores ranged from 3.8 to 4.7. This reflects a fairly well level of competency among the first year students of understanding historical and contemporary issues and an ability to bring leadership, vision, and principles to their practice. The qualitative responses which listed particular skills they learned after the first year are also indicative of this objective. Examples of these were having a historical perspective of practice, clinical and community skills, ethnic and cultural competence, the strengths perspective, the systems theory, and community and eco mapping.

For the Second Year Exit Survey, the questions that best addressed this objective were: 1) As a result of the MSW program, I can say that I am better prepared to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area; 2) Rate your preparedness to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities; 3) How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice? and 4) Overall, to what extent do you think the MSW program prepared you for your career after the MSW program? On a five-point Likert scale (with 1=strongly disagree/not prepared at all/not very well/not at all and 5=strongly agree/very well/to a large extent), the mean scores for these items ranged from 3.1 to 4. This demonstrates that graduating students had a moderate to high rating of how the program equipped them with an appreciation of having a historical perspective of practice and an ability to bring leadership, vision, and principles to their practice.

For the Alumni Survey, the questions that best addressed this objective were: 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 MSW program prepare you to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area? 3) To what extent did the MSW program prepare you to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities? 4) How well did the MSW program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired students to become advocates for economic and social justice? 5) How well did program help you develop working relationships with diverse clients, organizations, institutions, and communities, under a range of conditions (voluntary referral, involuntary contact, outreach, transfer)? 6) How well did the program help you formulate culturally sensitive and appropriate plans of action that recognize personal, community, societal, and other environmental elements relevant to change processes? 7) How well did the program help you undertake a variety of worker roles (advocate, change agent, coordinator, counselor, mediator, negotiator, support group leader, planner, administrator, and

more), and practice with multicultural competence? 8) How well did the program help you facilitate the development of client empowerment with the means to achieve desired goals? And 9) Overall, to what extent did the MSW program prepare you for your career after the MSW program? On a five-point Likert scale, the mean scores for these questions ranged from 4.04 to 4.65. This reflects a generally high rating of the alumni of how the program aided in instilling an appreciation for having a historical perspective of practice and an ability to bring leadership, vision, and principle to their practice.

Objective 6: Will be able to evaluate research studies and apply this knowledge to practice, as well as evaluate their own practice interventions.

Objective six was measured using the second year exit survey and the field instructors' survey.

For the Second Year Exit Survey, the items that best measures this objective were: 1) How would you rate your quantitative and qualitative research skills (includes research design, data-collection, data analysis, & critiquing of research articles)? 2) How would you rate your understanding of the importance of social work research on practice? And 3) Overall, to what extent do you think the MSW program prepared you for your career after the MSW program? On a five-point scale (with 1=poor/to a low extent and 5=excellent/to a high extent), the mean scores for these items ranged from 2.73 to 3.91. These results indicate a moderate to fair rating of graduating students of their ability to evaluate research studies and their application to practice. Research courses have always been one of the more challenging courses in the MSW program. In most cases, students come into the program having trepidations about research. While the research sequence of the program, which includes an introductory and advanced course, are designed to assuage such fears, the challenges identified make the process of instilling an appreciation for research in social work practice a longer one than most that students go through in the program.

Detailed Results of Student Assessments of the MSW Program

First Year MSW Survey

The Assessment Committee decided that it was necessary not only to gather information from students upon graduation and post-graduation, but also while they were students in the program. In the Spring 2009 term an annual First Year MSW survey (see Appendix I) was given to all full-time students completing the first year of their MSW program. Only 15 responses were received. The feedback form was utilized to gather outcome data related to Program Objectives #2-6 above. (See Figure #2)

The results of the first year MSW Survey are as follows:

Based on the courses that you have taken thus far, please answer the following questions listed below. There are no right or wrong answers. This a 5 point Likert scale from: (1- not at all) (2-not very well) (3-somewhat) (4-fairly well) (5-very well) (8-no answer)								
Answer Options	Not at all	Not very well	Somewhat	Fairly well	Very well	No answer	Response Count	
Do you understand the historical and contemporary issues and how these affect the clients you serve?	0	1	3	3	8	1	15	
At your workplace or at school are you able to apply the values and ethics of the social work profession?	0	1	3	2	8	1	15	
Are you able to communicate effectively with clients at your agency?	0	1	2	2	9	1	15	
Are you able to communicate effectively with colleagues at your agency?	0	1	1	3	9	1	15	
Are you able to undertake a variety of worker roles (advocate, change agent, coordinator, counselor, mediator, negotiator, support group leader, planner, administrator, and more)?	1	1	2	3	7	1	15	
Are you able to apply culturally competent practice skills to assist your clients?	1	0	4	4	6	1	15	
Are you able to critically evaluate existing research studies?	1	1	1	7	4	1	15	
Are you able to evaluate your own practice interventions?	1	1	4	6	2	1	15	
Are you able to facilitate the development of client empowerment with the means to achieve desired goals?	1	0	3	5	4	2	15	
Additional comments							5	
							<i>answered question</i>	15
							<i>skipped question</i>	0

The mean scores for each item are as follows:

Question	Mean Scores
This a 5 point Likert scale from: (1- not at all) (2-not very well) (3-somewhat) (4-fairly well) (5-very well) (8-no answer)	
Understanding of historical & contemporary issues & how these affect clients serviced	4.7
Able to apply values & ethics in practice	4.5
Able to communicate effectively with clients	4.6
Able to communicate effectively with colleagues	4.7
Able to take on various worker roles	4.3
Able to apply culturally competent practice skills	4.5
Able to evaluate existing research studies	4.1
Able to evaluate own practice interventions	3.8
Able to facilitate development of client empowerment	4.4

On average the first year MSW respondents indicated a response of fairly well for the items asking about basic social work competencies and their application to practice. The responses to the open-ended questions qualified some of these data. It seems that some respondents misunderstood the question. The question clearly referred to the courses taken in the foundation year; however, some respondents were not clear about their reference. They read the questions to refer to their abilities in general. Thus, some of the comments critiqued the way the questions were phrased.

Additional responses:

The respondents stated that many of the skills listed in the questions were skills that they already had before coming to the program. Most of the respondents seemed to have missed the fact that the questions referred to courses they have taken in the program as opposed to their own skill set prior to coming into the program.

One respondent added that the field education placement proved to be problematic as the values of the leadership were not consistent with the organization's values.

List the skills that you have learned in your classes thus far. Respondents were asked to list the skills learned from their first year classes thus far. The responses are listed below:

- *Assessment strategies, research strategies, social work values, ethics, historical international framework that has shaped US*
- *How to tread water so I don't slip under the work load, assignments, and time commitment.*
- *Writing paper skills- APA format*
- *I've learned not to express unpopular opinions. I've learned to ask open-ended questions and not be so quick to problem-solve.*
- *Research skills*
- *Social skills with peers*

- *clinical skills*
- *critical thinking*
- *access to community resource*
- *some community organizing knowledge*
- *Understand historical perspectives of SW and its comparison to current practice*
- *strengths perspectives and other theories*
- *deeper understanding of ethnic & cultural perspectives and biases*
- *Interventions, discharge planning,*
- *Genograms in a practice methods class*
- *Systems theory, how to navigate the system*
- *Case mapping/eco mapping*
- *Analysis of community strengths*
- *Information about legal issues and management skills*
- *Most skills I learned in my field work, such as direct practice, case management, and counseling. Also, in my social work practice methods I learned group work and therapy skills. I learned some research skills in the research class. Other classes have given me more theoretical knowledge rather than skills.*

Suggest ways in which social work education could be more meaningful for you?

Most of the comments centered on the need to provide very practical information and skills for students. There is a need to be more practical in terms of skills directly related to social work practice. For example, one student suggested providing more information on programs that students will encounter in their work such as Medicaid, IHSS, to name a few. This not to say that theories are not important. Perhaps theories can be laid out more clearly in a way that they can be applied to acquiring more practical skills.

A few comments were made regarding the Urban Generalist Practice focus in the first year. There is a sense that it is too general. One respondent stated that majority need more immediate exposure to theories and direct practice in particular tracks. Related to this, some students recommended putting more emphasis on improving clinical skills and building knowledge about psychotherapy/counseling.

There were also suggestions on having a variety of ways to assess learning. While there may be official ways in which the social work program is evaluated by accrediting bodies and that the SSW needs to be in compliance with accrediting standards, the SSW can explore culturally competent ways of learning and assessing learning.

There were also particular suggestions concerning the curriculum: 1) having a more international curriculum; 2) having courses on listening. One student held that listening is a “skill that needs to be taught over and over as it is one of our most important asset as social workers, to be able to listen, really hear what the individual or societal problem is”; 3) learning about how to use the empowerment model in bureaucratic settings and how to affect change in traditional organizations; and lastly 4) intervention skills that distinguish social work from other disciplines.

There were also more specific comments on particular courses: 1) the HBSE course needs to be more structured to respond to students needing a foundation on behavior science or psychology; 2) the SW 770/771 class needs to have a more in-depth analysis of privilege, oppression and institutionalized racism.

Other comments focused on field education. One perspective is that the first year field placement ought to be focused on the students' chosen emphasis. While the Urban Generalist Practice provides an integrated experience, there may be students wanting exposure to the emphasis early on.

What are some of ways that faculty can enhance your skills?

Most of the comments shared by students focused on pedagogical approaches, including assignments, particular content areas, curricula, and relationships within the faculty.

In terms of pedagogical approaches, the following suggestions were raised:

- Combine assignments with field placements. Have assignments that are useful for the internships.
- Have assignments that are relevant economically and politically
- Call students out on their ISMs
- Be prepared to teach.
- Have more role-plays
- Tailor required accreditation teaching more towards real life situations or current events.

For content areas, the following suggestions came up:

- Discuss macro practices and include macro practices in addition to clinical practice
- Create a track for students who want to go into research, publication, or a doctoral program.
- Create a more cohesive curriculum

In terms of faculty dynamics, the students suggested:

- Faculty should get over their differences. The students regard all faculty members well and thus, become affected by the acrimony. The students appeal is for faculty to focus on students rather than their professional differences.

2nd Year MSW Exit Survey

The School of Social Work is interested in the students' experience during their educational program. For instance, information about their process while in program is important feedback for the school. This may include information about the application process, signing up for courses, School administration, the Field Education program and process, and the graduation process.

An Exit Survey was conducted in the Spring 2009 in the MSW program assessed the students' satisfaction with the program. The survey instruments included qualitative questions assessing students' satisfaction with signing up for classes, teaching abilities of faculty, administration, advising, the field program, culminating projects (for MSW students only) and the process of graduation. The following is a sample of responses from students illustrating their overall feedback about their experience in the program, outside of curriculum:

What influenced your decision to attend SFSU SSW for your MSW? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
School reputation	40.0%	6
Program concentration/emphasis	53.3%	8
Faculty	0.0%	0
Recommendation from a friend or colleague	13.3%	2
You were an SFSU alumnus/alumna	20.0%	3
You were an SFSU field instructor	0.0%	0
Geographically close	66.7%	10
Financial package	6.7%	1
Other (please specify)	13.3%	2
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Additional comments:

Some respondents indicated being drawn to the stated school mission and vision. One respondent shared that it was respect for a former SFSU social work professor that influenced her/his decision to attend the program the former professor taught in.

What was your emphasis?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Individuals, Families, & Groups (IFG)	53.3%	8
Administration & Planning (A&P)	20.0%	3
Social Action & Change (SAC)	26.7%	4
<i>answered question</i>		15
<i>skipped question</i>		0

As a result of the MSW program, I can say that I am better prepared to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area.			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Strongly agree	15.4%	2	
Agree	61.5%	8	3.8
Neither agree nor disagree	15.4%	2	
Disagree	7.7%	1	
Strongly disagree	0.0%	0	

Additional comments	1	
<i>answered question</i>	13	
<i>skipped question</i>	2	

Additional comments:

One student commented that she/he already knows how to relate with people of other cultures as a result of working in the field.

As a result of the MSW program, I am now able to take on a global perspective of social work practice and can appreciate the interconnection of local and international issues.			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Strongly agree	0.0%	0	
Agree	46.2%	6	
Neither agree nor disagree	15.4%	2	3.3
Disagree	30.8%	4	
Strongly disagree	7.7%	1	
Additional comments		2	
<i>answered question</i>		13	
<i>skipped question</i>		2	

Additional comments:

The comments were generally one of frustration at the absence of an international curriculum and discussions on social work issues. The students would have wanted to see courses or emphasis on international issues and on international social work. One commented that she/he would have like to receive employment search assistant for doing CPS abroad.

Rate your preparedness to address the needs of the oppressed, disenfranchised, and otherwise marginalized peoples and communities.			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Excellent	38.5%	5	
More than adequate	23.1%	3	4
Adequate	38.5%	5	
Less than adequate	0.0%	0	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		2	
<i>answered question</i>		13	
<i>skipped question</i>		2	

Additional comments:

The main comment was that preparedness to work with oppressed, disenfranchise, and marginalized communities did not come out of the MSW program but a competency that some students already had. One student commented on how discussions about other oppressed groups are ignored. This student had this to say:

“So many groups are left out and so many are just addressed cursorily or as a ‘side-bar’. Many professors and adjuncts do not seem to have addressed their own biases and are unprepared for deep and thoughtful dialogue on these issues. Many totally avoid queer issues and adolescent issues wholesale.”

How well did the program provide learning experiences that instilled critical consciousness and inspired you to become advocates for economic and social justice?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	7.7%	1	
Fairly well	23.1%	3	
Somewhat	53.8%	7	3.1
Not very well	7.7%	1	
Not at all	7.7%	1	
Additional comments		2	
		<i>answered question</i>	13
		<i>skipped question</i>	2

Additional comments:

While there were comments earlier stating that the program was reluctant to address other forms of social difference, there was also a comment about the program being racially divisive. This reflects the differences in perspectives among the student body about the extent to which issues of oppression are discussed openly in classes. Some would like to have more open and honest discussion about this while others feel that it could be acrimonious. This is indicative of the challenge that most social work programs face in teaching diversity and social justice.

Other comments focused on how critical consciousness was fostered more through interaction among students at the MSWC or through their internships rather than the courses, with the exception of SW 855.

How would you rate your knowledge and application of social policy analysis frameworks?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Excellent	9.1%	1	
More than adequate	36.4%	4	
Adequate	45.5%	5	3.45
Less than adequate	9.1%	1	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		0	
		<i>answered question</i>	11
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

How would you rate your policy advocacy skills?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Scores
Excellent	18.2%	2	
More than adequate	18.2%	2	
Adequate	54.5%	6	3.45
Less than adequate	9.1%	1	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		1	
		<i>answered question</i>	11
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comment:

Only one student commented that IFG students need to have more exposure to policy work.

How would you rate your quantitative and qualitative research skills (includes research design, data-collection, data analysis, & critiquing of research articles)?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Scores
Excellent	18.2%	2	
More than adequate	36.4%	4	
Adequate	18.2%	2	2.73
Less than adequate	27.3%	3	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		2	
		<i>answered question</i>	11
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comments:

Students commented about how the research courses were effective in honing quantitative and qualitative research skills. They learned significantly from their professors who were concerned about their understanding of the material.

Others commented on the inconsistency and lack of standardization of the research classes. Some professors do an excellent job covering the necessary research material while others do not. How much students learned depended on who they had as a professor.

How would you rate your understanding of the importance of social work research on practice?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Scores
Excellent	27.3%	3	
More than adequate	45.5%	5	3.91
Adequate	18.2%	2	

Less than adequate	9.1%	1	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		1	
<i>answered question</i>		11	
<i>skipped question</i>		4	

Additional comment:

Only one student stated that it was fine to have an understanding of research but felt that it had little resonance with the need to do advocacy with clients.

To what extent did your course work prepare you for your culminating experience?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a large extent	27.3%	3	
To some extent	27.3%	3	
Neither large nor small extent	18.2%	2	3.45
To a small extent	18.2%	2	
Not at all	9.1%	1	
Additional comments		2	
<i>answered question</i>		11	
<i>skipped question</i>		4	

Additional comments:

Generally, students were satisfied with the support given by readers, although there were a few exceptions where students felt that their readers were not invested in reading drafts or holding meetings.

In terms of areas of improvement, students suggested doing preparations early on. The literature review should be undertaken and built upon papers in several classes. There should be discussions of the data analysis and discussion sections of the papers. Readers should provide their students with a structure of how the papers should be organized. Some felt that the culminating experience involved a lot more work than what is required for a three-credit course.

What learning needs would you have wanted the culminating experience to address?

- Knowledge of methodology
- The importance of time and knowing what one would like to do with her/his thesis or research project even before starting the project.
- In terms of areas of improvement, the students offered the following comments:
 - It would have been beneficial to allow students to work toward their culminating experience in the research class.
 - Research teachers should allow students to pursue their own ideas for culminating experiences.

- Have the same professors for SW 720 and SW 721.
- Have the readers help students with better planning for the culminating experience including discussing ideas about where to take the culminating project.
- One student conducted a symposium and thus did not feel that some learning needs were not met.

In the process of working on your culminating experience, how supported were you by your first and second readers?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Excellent support	45.5%	5
More than adequate support	27.3%	3
Adequate support	9.1%	1
Less than adequate support	9.1%	1
Poor support	0.0%	0
Additional comments	9.1%	1
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		4

Additional comment:

As with the first reader, the support depended who the second readers were as well.

What did you learn most from your culminating experience?

- The importance of being clear about study objectives.
- Those students should have started the process the moment they were accepted into the program.
- How intense the classes are and not having enough time to absorb subjects chosen.
- How to recruit participants and communicate points.
- That students can do what they set out to do.
- Deeper understanding of the content of the culminating experience.
- How to organize a conference event, review abstracts, and research organizations or persons doing amazing work in the field of forensic social work.
- Writing a literature review, analyze data, and discuss findings
- How to conduct and present qualitative research
- About resources and what makes them effective and how to outreach them in such a way that youth are likely to access them.

To what extent has your culminating experience been an integrative work that incorporated theories and methods learned throughout the program?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	
To a large extent	18.2%	2	
To some extent	45.5%	5	
Neither large nor small extent	18.2%	2	3.54

To a small extent	9.1%	1	
Not at all	9.1%	1	
Additional comments		1	
		<i>answered question</i>	11
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comments:

There was no theory taught and very few actual methods discussed in the program.

Overall, to what extent do you think the MSW program prepared you for your career after the MSW program?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a large extent	18.2%	2	
To some extent	63.6%	7	3.9
Neither large extent nor small extent	9.1%	1	
To a small extent	9.1%	1	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		4	
		<i>answered question</i>	11
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comments:

Over-all, the students held that the program prepared them for careers in social work to a large extent. One student qualified this by saying that because she/he knew very little about social work before joining the program, then it would seem like the preparation was to a significant extent. According to one comment, most of the learning from the program was culled from the field placement more than the courses taught. One student cited a particular case concerning Title IV E and a decision by CalSWEC which affected her job search. Because of that situation, it may seem that the program has done little to help prepare students for a career in social work.

What were the central areas of the program that you think need improvement? Please specify.

Emphasis

- Mental health
- The emphases need organizing
- Students that were in one emphasis should have been given the chance to take courses in other emphasis.
- The IFG emphasis needs more methods and theory
- Offer more good clinical courses
- Social justice and oppression ought to be incorporated into the classes.

Curriculum

- Have more courses on human services administration.
- More culturally competent and sensitive practice infused in all classes.
- Mental health
- The curriculum needs to be designed to be student-driven.
- Have more theory
- Professors should have a teaching pedagogy as many simply read from their notes or powerpoints. Professors need to draw students into the discussion, even in graduate school.
- Assignments need to be meaningful.

Admission

- Increase enrollment.
- Raise the standards for admission
- The social justice admission policy is unique and reflective of the SSW's effort to recruit students from diverse backgrounds. One problem is that students from non-traditional backgrounds who are admitted to the school but may have low academic skills are not supported by the school and are left to fend for themselves. This then contradicts the social justice mission. When the SSW admits students from non-traditional backgrounds or have been away from school for some time, it should provide the necessary support from them to succeed.
- Need to clarify the admission criteria
- Reduce the paperwork and logistical requirements to graduate.

Others:

- Clarify the culminating experience process early on.
- Lessen the group work and have more class work. Students already work with groups in their own fields.
- Faculty and staff should go through on-going anti-oppression teaching methods.
- The teaching has to be standardized so that students get the same quality of instruction regardless of who their professors are. Faculty should lessen acrimony as this spreads to the students.
- Be more flexible in meeting individual student's needs.

Would you recommend SFSU SSW to others interested in pursuing an MSW program?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Definitely yes	27.3%	3
Probably yes	27.3%	3
Not sure	9.1%	1
Probably no	18.2%	2
Definitely no	18.2%	2
Additional comments		4
<i>answered question</i>		11
<i>skipped question</i>		4

Additional comments:

The program is generally a good one and that faculty members are up to par. Students' experiences were positive, overall. One student reiterated the suggestion to reduce the group work in classes and have more class work.

Some of the other comments reiterated the areas of improvement that the school should look into. One is the SSW does not follow its stated mission and vision at the administrative and curriculum level. There is much room for improvement and yet very little effort to address them. The quality of instruction is inconsistent with some faculty members being exceptional while others are not. There needs to be built-in student support. There is little room for suggestion and too much room for retribution. One student held that "serious work needs to be done within the faculty in order to create kind, respectful communication so that programmatic changes which support students (and thus clients) can be instituted.

Student Focus Groups

First Year Program Assessment

Overview

The M.S.W. curriculum is structured to educate practitioners who promote a just and secure society through working to address the material needs and developmental interests of disenfranchised, oppressed and vulnerable communities. It represents an integrative continuum of values, knowledge, and skills which moves from a generalist core to three distinctive but philosophically related advanced practice concentrations. The core consists of a generalist foundation particularized to the contextual challenges of achieving social justice outcomes in urban environments. The advanced concentrations reflect specialized competency related to social justice informed direct practice, administration and planning, and community organizing and social development.

In its curricular formulation, classroom focus, and field placement emphasis, the first year program prepares students to 'see', 'understand', and 'address' how socially structured environments (schools, hospitals, courts, nursing homes, etc.) influence both immediate life experience and ongoing personal development. Critical examination of the complex of organizational policies, procedures, and interest perspectives dynamically constituting the urban service delivery system serves as an integrative theme in classroom, field seminar and field work experience. Along similar lines, major emphasis is placed upon ethnicity and culture in the consideration of the use of self knowledge and skill building process. A distinctive pool of Urban Generalist First Year placements provide students with learning experiences where theory and practice are grounded in advocacy, empowerment, and negotiation activities as well as agency specific practice. Lastly, the First Year Field Seminar operates as a developmental resource exchange which meets weekly to "fit together" the personal as well as the pedagogic and practical pieces of the First Year Urban Generalist experience.

Assessment – First Year Perspective Building Survey

The First Year Field Seminar (S.W. 741) provides a natural setting for gathering information regarding the academic and professional development experience of First Year students. Its support group format, with the progression over the first few weeks of the initial semester to student based leadership and facilitation, produces a natural 'focus' group on the First Year Program is working for them. Over the 15 weeks of the semester, students have the opportunity to develop a shared frame of reference and common language for exchanging opinions and perspectives. By the end of the first semester, students in the seminar have an informed vision of how the classroom, the field placement, and their personal process are fitting together.

Over the past three years (2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009) an open-ended survey was developed to crystallize the perspective of students at the end of their first semester. During 2006-2007 the survey was composed by students in one seminar as part of the ongoing profiling of their professional development narrative for the entire First Year experience. The resulting survey consisted of the following four open-ended questions:

1. How does the First Year Curriculum fit with the School's Mission?
2. How did the courses relate to what you needed in making the First Semester work for you?
3. What are your thoughts about the Field Component including the Field Seminar, the Liaison arrangement, and the placement process?
4. What are the things you would like the faculty to consider in thinking about how to approach next year's first semester for entering M.S.W. students?

It was the strong belief of the students that widely framed questions would elicit the greatest amount of substance and detail. Results from that 2006-2007 survey were collected in class, read by two students who alternated reading aloud the responses, and remained in the possession of the students. The students decided to limit discussion of the survey to their own seminar. They asked that results not be formalized. In May of 2007 near the end of their First Year, the general results were revisited and a recommendation made that the survey be expanded to all First Year seminars and that it be formalized.

For 2007-2008 and 2008-2009 the four questions were adopted to compose a First Year Perspective Building survey distributed to all First Year students. The survey was not uniformly integrated into the S.W. Seminar process because some seminar faculty expressed reservations about using seminar time for it. The responses were in the 25-30% range. The responses were scanned and distributed to faculty and students for consideration. As a next step in this process, a focus group conducted entirely by First Year students from all the First Year seminars was held in March of 2009. Results from that closed to faculty group were summarized by students and presented to faculty and students at the April, 2009 School meeting.

2007-2008 Perspective Building Results

There was general consensus among the 16 respondents (out of 58 first year students)

that the first year curriculum fit the School's mission. While affirming this focus in the syllabi, he or she expressed concern that the connection was not being taken seriously enough by the professors. With regard to the second focal area (what student needed in courses to make First Semester work), opinions were decidedly split. One group found the courses relevant and helpful. A student in this group commented "perfect," and another stated appreciation for the progressively measured reading and assignments with allowed for a supportive transition back to being in school. The dissatisfied group found some courses a waste of time, or, lacking in the clinical content which could have helped with field placement. S.W. 770 was course identified as requiring further attention.

In response to question 3(Field Component and Field Seminar), a number of respondents drew attention to the field seminar as a valued support to connecting courses with the placement. Along these lines, one student stated: "Field seminar is great!! I think it is a great way to learn from each other and ourselves, and our placement experiences. It's a supportive environment!". On the other hand, another person strongly downgraded the field seminar, characterizing it as "a waste of time. I believe the Liaison should come to field placements for check-ins". Since the seminar instructor and the liaison are the same person, it would seem that the student's experience of the seminar is tied to the instructor and the instructor's approach.

Student input regarding the fourth question, refining 'next year', generating suggestions for increasing the clinical content of first semester courses, closer articulation between first year placements and the courses, and generally keeping students better informed of School policies and procedures. One student made a plea for more carefully moderated reading assignments.

2008-2009 Perspective Building Results

Once again, respondents almost uniformly affirmed the connection between the Curriculum and the School's mission. The 15 respondents (out of 57 First Year students) consistently observed that curriculum "fits well" with the School's mission. Some question was raised about the depth of application of course material to specific challenges pertaining to advocacy and empowerment in some formal agency settings. Concern about the absence of clinical content in the first semester was raised again. A number of students were appreciative of the clear linkage between practice methods and the field placement.

Question 3 brought forth consistent recognition of the importance of the field seminar and the field practicum. People highly valued the learning opportunity the placement provided. At the same time, respondents either strongly liked or disliked their field seminar. Interestingly, even when a student characterized his or her seminar "not at all what I expected or needed", the comment was preceded by the statement "I think having a seminar is very important". A few respondents were not happy with the placement process. These students were displeased with being "steered toward placements I was very clear I wasn't interested in".

Responses to the fourth question brought forth a number of specific suggestions. One student requested classes in the Monday morning time slot in which faculty usually have

meetings. This same student commented: "Make assignments more relative to our futures as MSWs (not PhDs)". A number of students called for greater clarity in School program documents, and for expanded discourse between students and faculty to improve overall operation of the Program. A student requested greater sensitivity to requiring textbooks which were not used throughout the semester.

2008-2009 First Year Student Focus Group

On March 18, 2009 all First Year students were invited to participate in a focus group addressing the 'First Year MSW Experience'. It met for 90 minutes and was facilitated solely by First Year students with no faculty present. As characterized by the student reporters, it was 'well attended'. They reported back to the faculty at the May 4, 2009 School meeting. A written summary was distributed which was divided into sections of 'Strengths' and 'Areas to consider...'.

The strengths were largely consistent with the preceding surveys. Individual instructors, field placement experience, student collaborative learning, and administrative responsiveness received positive recognition. The discussion of areas to consider appears to have been more extensive. The call for more consistency from one section of a class to another was notable and compelling. Similarly, thoughtfulness in structuring and timing of assignments was an important area for further consideration. First Year Research drew considerable attention from students. Among the strongest comments offered were 1) "Students are thirsty for inspiration", and 2)"Students from other programs are doing things their Schools can be proud of".

The results of the student-led first year MSW focus group are presented as follows:

Conclusion and Recommendation

There is work to be done in the First Year Program. There are many strengths, but also a number of areas for faculty-student combined effort. Regular meeting of a First Year Program Work group should be constituted to review the curriculum, the pool of First Year field placements, and the congruence of First Year Field seminars with the support group format identified by students as an important resource. The Work Group should also address the nature and timing of course assignments. Major attention should be given to a discussion of research methods in the totality of the First Year experience.

1. Alumni Survey

As aforementioned in the BASW section, the 2009 Alumni 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.

The instrument (see Appendix H) measures outcomes from Program Objectives # 1, 3, 4, and 6 in the MSW foundation program. The survey was sent out to 497 MSW alumni who had email addresses. Of these, 82 responses were returned from the survey. The earliest graduating year indicated in the survey as 1972 and the latest was 2008. The range in ages was 27 to 72. In terms of gender, 72.5% were female, 26.3% were male, and 1.3% was a gender non-conformist. In terms of sexual preference, 79.3% were heterosexuals, 17.1% were gays or lesbians, 2.4% were queer, and 1.2% were bi-sexual. The breakdown in terms of racial identification was as follows: 63% Caucasian/White/Euro-Americans ; 19.8% African-Americans/Caribbean-Americans/Blacks; 11.1% Latinos; 9.9% Asians/Pacific Islanders; 3.7% Native Americans/Native Alaskans; 3.7% multiracial. About 85% of respondents reside in California while the rest were from different states across the country. In terms of religious preferences, 36.1% were Protestants; 33.3% were Buddhists; 25% were Catholics; 19.4% were Jewish; and 45% specified other religions.

The results showed that on average the MSW alumni respondents indicated that their program at SF State helped prepare them in their social work careers to some extent. The MSW program helped prepare alumni to some extent to work in a variety of social work settings in the Bay Area as well as gain a global perspective of practice that appreciates the link between local and international issues, according the average response of alumni respondents. The average response from alumni respondents indicated that the program prepared them to a great extent in terms of working with disenfranchised and marginalized populations.

The more detailed results of the MSW Alumni Survey are presented herein:

What influenced your decision to attend SFSU SSW for your MSW? (Select all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
School reputation	51.2%	42
Program concentration/emphasis	51.2%	42
Faculty	14.6%	12
Recommendation from a friend or colleague	20.7%	17
You were an SFSU alumnus/alumna	25.6%	21
You were an SFSU field instructor	0.0%	0
Geographically close	62.2%	51
Financial package	18.3%	15
Other (please specify)	22.0%	18
<i>answered question</i>		82
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Additional response:

Some respondents added other factors affecting their decision to come to the SSW. The program itself was the major draw for some respondents. One respondent indicated that the program was more realistic and less theory-based than other programs in the Bay Area. The program’s focus on social justice and its reputation for progressive politics and emphasis on multiculturalism

Other features of the program were the main factors influencing students' decisions to come to SF State. Among these are: a supportive faculty, especially towards minority students, the affordability of the program, the availability of financial aid, and the fact that the GRE is not a requirement for admission.

Others also cited the flexibility of the program. Examples of these were the satellite program in Sonoma, the part-time program, and flexible class schedules.

There were also reasons not having to do with the MSW program itself. For instance, some respondents admitted that the desirability to live in San Francisco was the main reason for going for an MSW at SF State.

What was your emphasis (In previous years, this was called concentration)?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Individuals, Families, & Groups (IFG)	57.3%	47
Administration & Planning (A&P)	23.2%	19
Social Action & Change (SAC) - Formerly known as Social Development	25.6%	21
<i>answered question</i>		82
<i>skipped question</i>		0

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
To a large extent	46.9%	38	
To some extent	39.5%	32	4.19
Neither large nor small extent	1.2%	1	
To a small extent	11.1%	9	
Not at all	1.2%	1	
<i>answered question</i>		81	
<i>skipped question</i>		1	

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	27.5%	22	
More than adequate support	18.8%	15	3.84
Adequate support	40.0%	32	
Less than adequate support	12.5%	10	
Poor support	1.3%	1	
<i>answered question</i>		80	
<i>skipped question</i>		2	

To what extent did the MSW program prepare you to be versatile, creative, and effective in serving the peoples of the San Francisco Bay Area?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a large extent	54.3%	44	
To some extent	37.0%	30	4.4
Neither a large extent nor small extent	6.2%	5	
To a small extent	2.5%	2	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		16	
<i>answered question</i>		81	
<i>skipped question</i>		1	

Additional comments:

Among the strengths and appealing features of the program, students cited the focus multicultural populations addressing clients and other stakeholders, the field education program, excellent and brilliant teachers, and interesting and smart student body. The program provided a solid foundation for social work practice. One respondent shared the following insight:

“I worked in crisis mental health for the City and County of SF; then with clients with HIV, mental illness, and substance abuse, then private practice. The MSW program gave me the basics I needed. I then did self-education to make up what I lacked. But I got a solid foundation at SFSU”.

The cultural and political climate of San Francisco in the last years of the 1980s, particularly with the HIV/AIDS crisis and the earthquake, was also a conducive time to be at SF State.

The program also had its problems and shortcomings. The respondents cited the wanting rigor in academics. One respondent held, “With the exception of a couple of professors who clearly had high expectations of the students, the academic experience of SFSU was extremely lacking”. In addition, the social justice orientation was only learned from a few professors and fellow students but was not generally shared nor practices. Another respondent had the following insight to say:

“I did expect it to be more significant than it was. I learned more from a couple of professors and my colleagues at the school than the overall program itself. I had the utmost pleasure of meeting some incredible individuals who in their life experience had already instigated social change. However, I had heard from several of my colleagues that they had a similar experience with the staff. There were a couple of professors who were very demanding yet supportive but most were simply accommodating.”

Another area of improvement that was cited was the lack of feedback and advice concerning field education. In the Social Development or Social Action concentration, there was also a lack of exploration of marketable skills that are needed now.

To what extent did the MSW 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 large extent	31.3%	25	
To some extent	35.0%	28	3.72
Neither large nor small extent	13.8%	11	
To a small extent	15.0%	12	
Not at all	5.0%	4	
<i>answered question</i>		80	
<i>skipped question</i>		2	

To what extent did the MSW 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
To a large extent	67.9%	55	4.65
To some extent	30.9%	25	
Neither large nor small extent	0.0%	0	
To a small extent	1.2%	1	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		8	
<i>answered question</i>		81	
<i>skipped question</i>		1	

Additional comments:

Learning about social justice and the need to address the needs of oppressed and, marginalized communities came about as a result of the ethnic and cultural diversity of the Bay Area and the social justice-based curriculum of the school for some respondents. Others maintained that they developed a social justice and global perspective through their undergraduate programs outside of social work, such as Women’s Studies. Still others held that the MSW program equipped them with the skills to do well in other fields. One respondent shared the following insight:

“I believe my training as an MSW has given me the skill to be more successful in the medical field, especially in the area of community health.”

Some respondents felt that faculty was mixed in terms of being instrumental in preparing students to work with marginalized and oppressed populations or in fostering a global perspective of practice. One respondent put it this way: There were some professors and colleagues that lead substantive discussions and facilitated insightful ideas in class. But for the most part, the professors who had been teaching in the program for a number of years did not demonstrate interest in new ideas nor did they seem to be current in their thinking of what was happening in the community at that time.”

How well did the MSW 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	39.5%	32	
More than adequate	37.0%	30	4.15
Adequate	22.2%	18	
Less than adequate	1.2%	1	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		9	
		<i>answered question</i>	81
		<i>skipped question</i>	1

Additional comments:

Generally, the respondents were appreciative of the reflection and honest dialogue with fellow students making what they learned even more tangible. Some stated that they credit this from their fellow students for inspiring them focus on social justice and economic justice. A good number claimed being an advocate for economic and social justice even before they joined the program. The program only reinforced these ideals. Field education was cited as a venue for providing the most learning experience. Others suggested having at least two courses that focused on social justice and economic justice. Some respondents thought that the emphasis on economic and social justice was quite strong that the program seemed almost biased against clinical practice.

How well did program help you develop working relationships with diverse clients, organizations, institutions, and communities, under a range of conditions (voluntary referral, involuntary contact, outreach, transfer)?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	38.5%	30	
More than adequate	32.1%	25	4.06
Adequate	26.9%	21	
Less than adequate	2.6%	2	
Poor	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		8	
		<i>answered question</i>	78
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comments:

The diversity of the student body was thought of as one of the main factors in helping develop working relationships with diverse communities. Students thus felt well prepared to work with diverse people, families, and communities. Other respondents felt they already had this competency coming into the program. The program merely reinforced the cultural competencies which some students already had.

How well did the program help you formulate culturally sensitive and appropriate plans of action that recognize personal, community, societal, and other environmental elements			
---	--	--	--

relevant to change processes?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	38.5%	30	
More than adequate	33.3%	26	4.04
Adequate	23.1%	18	
Less than adequate	3.8%	3	
Poor	1.3%	1	
Additional comments		3	
		<i>answered question</i>	78
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comments:

Most of the respondents reiterated that they already had some of these competencies before coming in to the program. One respondent acknowledged that she/he had more knowledge and experience than many of the faculty working with people with disabilities so much so that she/he was oftentimes the “voice” of persons with disabilities. In terms of areas of improvement, one respondent suggested focusing on identity development in courses that explored social differences. There were expectations from respondents to have learned more in these courses.

How well did the program help you undertake a variety of worker roles (advocate, change agent, coordinator, counselor, mediator, negotiator, support group leader, planner, administrator, and more), and practice with multicultural competence?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	46.2%	36	
Fairly well	29.5%	23	4.2
Somewhat	23.1%	18	
Not very well	1.3%	1	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		3	
		<i>answered question</i>	78
		<i>skipped question</i>	4

Additional comments:

Some respondents stated that the program offered a wide variety of experiences. One added that although this was the case, it was imperative on students to seek other experiences to enhance their ability to undertake a variety of worker roles. Learning independently of the program was one way of gaining this particular competence. Another respondent stated that cultural competent practice was not as defined yet in the 1970s, thus, it did not seem to like it was the focus.

How well did the program help you facilitate the development of client empowerment with the means to achieve desired goals?			
---	--	--	--

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Very well	34.6%	27	
Fairly well	41.0%	32	4.06
Somewhat	20.5%	16	
Not very well	3.8%	3	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		3	
<i>answered question</i>		78	
<i>skipped question</i>		4	

Additional comments:

Respondents stated that group classes, internships, and discussions in and out of class provided additional learning experiences. They added further that while they learned significantly from good reading materials for class, they got a lot out of hearing about personal stories of classmates. One respondent made a comment about the word “empowerment” connoted a Western and individualistic approach.

To what extent did your course work prepare you for your culminating experience?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a great extent	26.9%	21	
To some extent	47.4%	37	3.92
Neither large nor small extent	16.7%	13	
To a small extent	9.0%	7	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		8	
<i>answered question</i>		78	
<i>skipped question</i>		4	

Additional comments:

By and large, respondents stated that they were able to work on their culminating experiences successfully with sufficient support from advisors. Others worked independently and were able to seek support from people other than their advisors. The research classes aided very much in helping students complete their culminating experience. In terms of areas of improvement, respondents expressed the need for more guidance in conducting real scholarly work.

In the process of working on your culminating experience, how supported were you by your first and second readers?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
Excellent support	20.5%	16	
More than adequate support	23.1%	18	

Adequate support	24.4%	19	2.88
Less than adequate support	9.0%	7	
Poor support	2.6%	2	
Additional comments	20.5%	16	
<i>answered question</i>		78	
<i>skipped question</i>		4	

Additional comments:

Some respondents indicated that they were generally supported by their first and second readers for the culminating experiences. A significant number of respondents who were from earlier cohorts do not recall having a culminating experience project and thus were unsure about what was being asked.

Overall, to what extent did the MSW program prepare you for your career after the MSW program?			
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count	Mean Score
To a large extent	52.6%	41	
To some extent	38.5%	30	4.40
Neither large nor small extent	5.1%	4	
To a small extent	3.8%	3	
Not at all	0.0%	0	
Additional comments		7	
<i>answered question</i>		78	
<i>skipped question</i>		4	

By and large, the respondents expressed that the MSW program prepared them adequately in their careers, whether in practice or in academia. Some of the basic tenets of practice which they learned in both the undergraduate and graduate program stayed with one of the respondents and now come in handy in her/his work. Relationships formed during the program were also instrumental in finding and securing employment. One respondent, who is now a social work academic in Florida had this to say:

“I am currently a senior faculty member at a social work program in Florida and teach practice and policy courses in both our BSW and MSW programs. I feel that my practice experiences add greatly to my ability to effectively teach social work practice and policy and that my SFSU experience enabled me to have positive practice experiences.”

In terms of areas of improvement, some respondents offered the following suggestions:

- 1) The program could have been encouraging of students to prepare for the licensure regardless of their program emphasis. Alumni are recognizing how the licensure lends credibility and power.
- 2) Others expressed wanting to have had more exposure and content in child welfare as a number of graduates work in the child welfare system.

What central areas of the program do you think need improvement? Please specify.

Emphasis

- Have a medical emphasis and psychiatric social work. Perhaps a combined program with Health.
- SAC emphasis should also include the DSM.
- All the emphasis should be equally strong to prepare students for all areas of social work. Perhaps students can be offered opportunities to pursue combined emphases as the delineation between emphases seems artificial and unnecessary.
- The Administration and Planning emphasis should delve more on human resources and supervision skills, organizational techniques, and fund raising and less on computer programs.
- The program can be designed to help graduates through licensing by offering LCSW courses.
- The SAC emphasis could be developed more as the content was rather thin.
- Develop the Pupil Personnel Student Credential.

Curriculum

- Improve the cultural competence classes and have better teachers handle them. Also include other areas of diversity (i.e. disability).
- Have more flexibility in class schedules.
- Make the classes more rigorous. The courses did not meet learning objectives. Professors were lacking in passion and effectiveness.
- Make sure that the PPSC credentials will be recognized.
- Include the DSM in the curriculum.
- Use other pedagogical forms, for example bring in speakers from the field who can talk about the practicalities of implementing theory and practice.
- Offer a course on death and dying.
- Have more macro courses.
- Require all students to take classes in other emphasis.
- Make the curriculum more flexible to allow students to cross-register in other departments.
- Offer study abroad programs.
- Connect the program more to the community.
- The program needs to value clinical licensure as an agent of social change.
- Have more specialized curriculum.
- Make the curriculum more current.

Admission

- The diversity of the student body reflects an effective admission process. There is no need to change it. The school should continue to admit a diverse group of students. The clients are from different cultural backgrounds, thus the providers should reflect that as well.
- The process needs to start sooner so that professors do not have to balance between their class load and reading applications.
- Make the process shorter.
- Recruit applicants from populations with the greatest need.

Others

- Broaden the options for field placements.
- Include preparations for licensure exam.
- Professors should not give blanket A's.
- Provide students with a check list of tasks and dates they need to take note of throughout the year.
- Hold community outreach.
- Have a part-time program.
- Have better leadership of the school.
- Have courses on spirituality.
- Have advisers request meetings with advisees at least once so advisory relationships can be developed between students and advisers.

Would you recommend SFSU SSW to others interested in pursuing an MSW program?		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Definitely yes	61.5%	48
Probably yes	20.5%	16
Not sure	11.5%	9
Probably no	3.8%	3
Definitely no	2.6%	2
Additional comments		11
<i>answered question</i>		78
<i>skipped question</i>		4

Additional comments:

It would be best for the SSW to restore the part-time program as a way of attracting more applicants. More financial incentives should be given to applicants to pursue an MSW.

Following graduation from the MSW program, have you held a position in any of the following areas? (Check all that apply.)		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Clinical practice	70.3%	52
Administration	48.6%	36
Policy	12.2%	9
Advocacy	43.2%	32
Community Organizing	27.0%	20
Academia	17.6%	13
Research	10.8%	8
Government	28.4%	21
International	2.7%	2
Further studies – another master's degree	5.4%	4
Further studies – doct	5.4%	4
Other (please specify)		15
<i>answered question</i>		74

If you are currently working, what is your working status?

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Full time	63.5%	47
Part time	21.6%	16
Self-employed/Freelance	9.5%	7
Not working	12.2%	9
Additional comments		24
<i>answered question</i>		74
<i>skipped question</i>		8

How many months did it take before you found a job?

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Less than 3 months	72.6%	53
4-6 months	19.2%	14
7-9 months	2.7%	2
10-12 months	2.7%	2
More than a year	2.7%	2
Additional comments		21
<i>answered question</i>		73
<i>skipped question</i>		9

What were the factors that kept you from finding employment?

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Illness	3.3%	1
Relocation	23.3%	7
Family	13.3%	4
Additional schooling	10.0%	3
Few employment opportunities	63.3%	19
Other (please specify)		28
<i>answered question</i>		30
<i>skipped question</i>		52

How long have you been employed at your current or latest job?

Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Less than a year	14.3%	10
2-5 years	30.0%	21
6-10 years	20.0%	14
10-15 years	15.7%	11
More than 15 years	20.0%	14

Additional comments	11
<i>answered question</i>	70
<i>skipped question</i>	12

Please list all your memberships in professional organizations.		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
NASW	92.3%	36
CSWE	7.7%	3
CALSWEC	7.7%	3
ACOSA	5.1%	2
Other (please specify)		25
<i>answered question</i>		39
<i>skipped question</i>		43

MSW Program Assessment – Individuals, Families and Groups (IFG) Concentration

The program objectives of the Individuals, Families and Groups (IFG) concentration in the School of Social Work are:

1. Students will understand the historical development, values, and ethical responsibilities of conducting social work with individuals, families and groups.
2. Students will understand and be able to implement the legal parameters and bases for advocacy activities pertaining to direct social work practice.
3. Students will expand and refine communication skills with clients in the areas of listening, expressing thoughts and perceptions, and promoting client introspection.
4. Students will utilize developmental, strengths-based, and client-centered theories and approaches when working with clients' situations, needs, and problems.
5. Students will be able to utilize direct use of self in initiating, developing, and ending intra-personally-focused individual, groups and family-based interventions.
6. Students will identify and address personal issues and dynamics encumbering the student's professional use of self in direct practice relationships.
7. Students will develop a clear and ethically-responsible value base for practice.
8. Students will adopt principles for the individualization of practice guidelines in response to ethnic, cultural, socio-economic, age, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of the client's intrapersonal experience.
9. Students will link research and direct practice by documenting outcomes and/or evaluating a developmental perspective on practice.
10. Students will integrate knowledge and experience into a responsible, relevant and effective framework that stresses developmental advocacy which includes community organizing, social action and social policy arenas of practice.

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

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

1. IFG Evaluation Survey 2007-2009
2. Field Education Evaluations
3. LCSW passage rate
4. Field Instructor Survey
5. School Alumni Survey

Figure 3 below depicts which of the outcomes measurements assess the various program objectives. An in-depth description of each outcome measurement follows Figure 3.

Figure 3. IFG Concentration Assessment Plan

Program Objectives	IFG Evaluation Survey	Field Education Evaluations	LCSW Passage Rate	Field Instructors Survey	School Alumni Survey
Students will understand the historical development, values, and ethical responsibilities of conducting social work with individuals, families and groups.	x	x	x	x	
Students will understand and be able to implement the legal parameters and bases for advocacy activities pertaining to direct social work practice.		x	x	x	
Students will expand and refine communication skills with clients in the areas of listening, expressing thoughts and perceptions, and promoting client introspection.	x	x		x	
Students will utilize developmental, strengths-based, and client-centered theories and approaches when working with clients' situations, needs, and problems.	x	x	x	x	
Students will be able to utilize direct use of self in initiating, developing, and ending intra-personally-focused individual, groups and family-based interventions.		x	x	x	
Students will identify and address personal issues and dynamics encumbering the student's		x	x	x	

professional use of self in direct practice relationships.					
Students will develop a clear and ethically-responsible value base for practice.	x		x	x	
Students will adopt principles for the individualization of practice guidelines in response to ethnic, cultural, socio-economic, age, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of the client's intrapersonal experience.		x	x	x	
Students will link research and direct practice by documenting outcomes and/or evaluating a developmental perspective on practice.				x	X
Students will integrate knowledge and experience into a responsible, relevant and effective framework that stresses developmental advocacy which includes community organizing, social action and social policy arenas of practice.		x		x	x

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

1. IFG Evaluation Survey 2007-2009

**EVALUATION OF THE
INDIVIDUALS, FAMILIES, AND GROUPS (IFG) EMPHASIS
2007-2009
Submitted by Dina Redman (10/19/09)**

Background

In the spring of 2007, San Francisco State University School of Social Work faculty members Dina Redman and Miriam Levine-Alcala, with additional comments from Sonja Lenz-Rashid, developed a survey to be administered to full-time first-year and second-year students, as well as Planned Part-Time (PPT) students in the Individuals, Families, and Groups (IFG) Emphasis. The IFG Emphasis is one of three in the School of Social Work and is focused on direct practice. It includes students who are receiving stipends for Child Welfare through Title IV-E, mental health through the Mental Health Services Act, as well as students who are preparing for careers in school social work with a Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC).

The aim of the survey was to assess the degree to which students perceived themselves as prepared with the requisite knowledge and skills for professional practice. Also ascertained was whether this skill and knowledge was gained through their coursework, internships, and/or employment. In addition, the students' career goals five to 10 years from graduation were explored.

A follow-up questionnaire was developed by Dina Redman in 2009. This survey assessed for both perceived learning and the students' perspectives about topics that should receive greater coverage in the social work curriculum. Results from the two surveys were compared and trends identified. Areas of satisfaction and dissatisfaction were elicited and recommendations for improving the IFG component of the Social Work program have been delineated. It is anticipated that the findings could illuminate the students' needs and interests so as to improve the design and organization of the social work curriculum with a particular emphasis on components related to IFG.

Study Population and Participants

In 2007, there were approximately 90 IFG students enrolled in the School of Social Work. In 2009, there were an estimated 63 and these individuals constituted the study population. In 2007, the School of Social Work still had a substantial number of PPT students enrolled but by 2009, the numbers had been reduced to two or three as the program had been suspended as of 2004. Seventy-eight students completed the survey in 2007 and 22 completed it in 2009. Demographic data was not collected on the respondents.

Study Design and Measures

A longitudinal survey design was utilized in this curricular evaluation. The questionnaire included both closed and open-ended items. The closed-ended items in the 2007 survey addressed: (1) the primary professional role/s that the students would like to fill 5 to 10 years post-graduation (yes/no); (2) the classes that the students had taken or were currently taking (yes/no); (3) interest in becoming a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (yes/no/not sure yet); (4) how well students felt as if they had been prepared in 19 different areas related to social work knowledge and skills (e.g., developing rapport and relationship building, biopsychosocial assessment, risk assessment, etc.) (Likert scale from 1 - 5 with 1: Not at all prepared, 5: Very well prepared); (5) basic knowledge about three aggregated theoretical groupings (e.g., psychosocial, ecological, systems, and psychodynamic) (Likert scale from 1 - 5 with 1: None, 5: A great deal); (6) sources of knowledge of the aforementioned theoretical areas (SFSU School of Social Work coursework, internship/s, employment, other settings or experiences); (7) knowledge of eight different practice areas involving specific issues and populations (e.g., aging adults, disability, LGBT issues, substance abuse, etc.) (Likert scale from 1 - 5 with 1: None, 5: A great deal); (8) sources of knowledge of the aforementioned practice areas (SFSU School of Social Work coursework, internship/s, employment, other settings or experiences); (9) year in the SFSU Social Work program (1st-year full-time, 2nd-year full-time or 2nd – 5th year Planned Part-Time).

Open-ended items in the 2007 survey included the following: (1) Which of the above-mentioned or other classes have best met your needs in moving towards the direction/s that you named in Questions 1 and 2 (related to career goals and licensing)? (2) Which have not

been as helpful? (3) Based on your experiences in your internship/s and/or employment as a social worker, what in your coursework would you like to have (or have had) more knowledge, exposure, and information about? (4) Any other comments?

The 2007 questionnaire also included questions related to student interest in SW 831: Advanced Social Casework versus SW 833: Advanced Social Group Work as required versus elective options. These decisions were made based on curricular priorities, enrollment, and resources available and so are not included in this evaluation report.

The 2009 survey included the same items related to career goals post-graduation, classes that students have taken or are currently taking, and interest in becoming a Licensed Clinical Social Worker. However, the question related to preparation to utilize 19 different areas requiring social work knowledge and skills was reconfigured to address the degree to which students thought that School of Social Work classes should have greater coverage in those areas (e.g., developing rapport and relationship building, biopsychosocial assessment, risk assessment, etc.) (Likert scale from 1 - 5 with 1: Strongly disagree, 5: Strongly agree). The 2009 survey provided a greater breakdown of theoretical constructs, identifying individual theories rather than aggregating them by type. The question as to the sources of theoretical knowledge was the same as in the 2007 survey. Based on the qualitative comments made by students in the 2007 survey, statements were advanced in a quantitative format to assess how widespread these perspectives might be (e.g., In general, there should be greater rigor in the ways that classes are taught. In general, there should be greater rigor in the ways that classes are graded. There should be greater structure in the ways that courses are taught, etc.) (Likert scale from 1 - 5 with 1: Strongly disagree, 5: Strongly agree).

Open-ended items in the 2009 survey included the following: (1) Please include any other comments about methods and theories covered in our social work classes; (2) If you have any other comments about issues and populations covered in your social work classes, please include them below; (3) Please identify any other issues or concerns that were not previously covered in this questionnaire; (4) What do you recommend to address any of the issues or concerns raised in this questionnaire? (5) Any other comments?

Data Collection and Analysis

On May 2, 2007, hard-copy questionnaires were distributed in all the field seminars except one for IFG students to fill out in class. Students from the PPSC seminar submitted their questionnaires by e-mail. The surveys filled out in class were left in Dina Redman's faculty mailbox after the seminar and the others were e-mailed to her. She entered the data into SPSS and completed analyses of the means and frequencies, differentiating between first-year and ongoing students. Content analyses were completed in relation to the qualitative responses to each open-ended question and across questions.

The online Survey Monkey questionnaire was sent out through e-mail on April 15, 2009. The Survey Monkey site automatically completed the analyses of frequencies and means. Having students fill out the questionnaire during the field seminar provided a much greater

response rate than did posting it on Survey Monkey (87% vs. 35%). The quantitative and qualitative results are reported in the following sections of this document.

Quantitative Results

Quantitative results are reported for each item in the questionnaire, starting with the tables of findings. Following the tables are the most significant factors that emerged.

Table 1: Interest in Types of Primary Professional Employment over the 5 – 10 Years Post-Graduation

Profession	1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	2nd-year, PPT 2007 (n = 44)	2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 12)
Administrator	11 (32.4%)	3 (30.0%)	11 (25.0%)	1 (8.3%)
Advocate	14 (41.2%)	3 (30.0%)	12 (27.3%)	1 (8.3%)
Case manager	18 (52.9%)	3 (30.0%)	21 (47.7%)	5 (41.7%)
Community organizer	4 (11.8%)	1 (10.0%)	5 (11.4%)	1 (8.3%)
Clinical social worker/counselor	22 (64.7%)	10 (100%)	36 (81.8%)	7 (58.3%)
Educator	12 (35.3%)	2 (20.0%)	10 (22.7%)	1 (8.3%)
Mediator	7 (20.6%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (20.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Policy-maker	4 (11.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Researcher	3 (8.8%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.8%)	0 (0.0%)
School social worker	15 (44.1%)	2 (20.0%)	6 (13.6%)	2 (16.7%)
Other	2 (5.9%)	3 (30.0%)	2 (4.5%)	2 (16.7%)

As is illustrated in Table One, the professions that IFG students across cohorts showed the greatest interest in were that of clinical social worker/counselor (58.3% - 100%) and case manager (30.0%-52.9%). There was also moderate interest in becoming an educator (8.3%-35.3%). Among first-year students in 2007, there was substantial interest in pursuing a career as a school social worker (44.1%) but this was not repeated to the same degree among the second-year students in 2007 or the first and second-years in 2009.

Table 2: Interest in Becoming a Licensed Clinical Social Worker

Interested	1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	2nd-year, PPT 2007 (n = 44)	2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 12)
Yes	26 (76.5%)	8 (80.0%)	39 (88.9%)	8 (67.7%)
No	2 (5.9%)	1 (10.0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0.0%)
Not sure yet	6 (17.6%)	1 (10.0%)	5 (11.4%)	4 (33.3%)

Table Two shows that the great majority of IFG students across years and cohorts expressed interest in obtaining a License in Clinical Social Work (LCSW) post-graduation (67.7% - 88.9%).

Table 3: Degree to Which Students Feel Prepared with Skills and Knowledge
(1 = Not at all prepared; 5 = Very well prepared)

	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year, PPT 2007 (n = 44)
Developing rapport & relationship building	4.30 (3.00-5.00)	4.21 (2.00-5.00)
Bio-psychosocial assessment	3.69 (1.00-5.00)	3.84 (2.00-5.00)
Risk assessment	3.38 (2.00-5.00)	3.89 (1.00-5.00)
Identifying strengths & assets	4.03(2.00-5.00)	4.50 (3.00-5.00)
Ethical standards, dilemmas, & legal mandates	3.60 (1.00-5.00)	3.78 (2.00-5.00)
Values & principles of social work	4.28 (2.00-5.00)	4.25 (2.00-5.00)
Goal formulation & contracting	3.52 (1.00-5.00)	3.60 (1.00-5.00)
Intervention planning & implementation	3.46 (2.00-5.00)	3.60 (1.00-5.00)
Closure/termination	3.97 (2.00-5.00)	3.65 (1.00-5.00)
Evaluation	3.32 (2.00-5.00)	3.34 (1.00-5.00)
Crisis intervention	3.30 (2.00-5.00)	3.56 (1.00-5.00)
Working with clients at different stages of the life cycle	3.16 (1.00-5.00)	3.37 (1.00-5.00)
Psychosocial rehabilitation & recovery	2.70 (1.00-5.00)	3.50 (1.00-5.00)
Utilizing the DSM-IV-TR	3.52 (1.00-5.00)	3.90 (1.00-5.00)
Culturally competent/appropriate methods & practices	4.03 (3.00-5.00)	3.90 (2.00-5.00)
Group work	3.00 (1.00-5.00)	3.41 (1.00-5.00)
Resource development/coordination	3.03 (1.00-5.00)	3.05 (1.00-5.00)
Advocacy	3.69 (2.00-5.00)	4.01 (2.00-5.00)
Self-care	3.33 (1.00-5.00)	3.61 (1.00-5.00)

Students in 2007, in both the first and second years, perceived themselves as being most prepared (> 4.00) in developing rapport and relationship building, identifying strengths and assets, and in the values and principles of social work. Those in the first year expressed that they were well-prepared in culturally competent/appropriate methods and practices while those in the second year perceived themselves well-prepared in advocacy. Students in the first year saw themselves as least prepared (< 3.50) in risk assessment, intervention planning and implementation, evaluation, crisis intervention, working with clients at different stages of the life cycle, group work, resource development/coordination, and self-care. In their second year, the mean for preparation was somewhat higher in most of the listed categories, with the exceptions of evaluation, working with clients at different stages of the life cycle, group work, and resource development/coordination, all of which remained lower than 3.50.

Table 4: Degree to Which Classes Should Have Greater Coverage of Areas Related to Skills and Knowledge

(1: Strongly disagree – 5: Strongly agree)

	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 11)
Life cycle stages & human development	3.78 (1.00-5.00)	3.50 (2.00-5.00)
Developing rapport & relationship building	4.33(4.00-5.00)	3.64 (2.00-5.00)
Biopsychosocial assessment	4.33(4.00-5.00)	3.64 (2.00-5.00)
Risk assessment	4.40(4.00-5.00)	3.90 (1.00-5.00)
Identifying strengths & assets	4.00 (2.00-5.00)	3.00 (1.00-5.00)
Legal mandates & ethical standards	3.56 (1.00-5.00)	3.20 (2.00-5.00)
Values & principles of social work	3.20 (1.00-5.00)	2.90 (4.00-5.00)
Theoretical models & their application	4.22 (3.00-5.00)	3.60 (2.00-5.00)
Counseling & therapy	4.67 (4.00-5.00)	4.50 (4.00-5.00)
Goal formulation & contracting	3.89 (3.00-5.00)	3.50 (2.00-5.00)
Intervention planning & implementation	4.11 (3.00-5.00)	4.10 (2.00-5.00)
Closure/termination	3.56 (3.00-5.00)	3.40 (2.00-5.00)
Evaluation	3.89 (3.00-5.00)	3.40 (2.00-5.00)
Crisis intervention	4.44 (4.00-5.00)	4.00 (2.00-5.00)
Harm reduction theories & techniques	4.44 (3.00-5.00)	4.40 (4.00-5.00)
Psychosocial rehabilitation & recovery	4.56 (4.00-5.00)	4.00 (3.00-5.00)
Utilizing the DSM-IV-TR	4.56 (3.00-5.00)	3.80 (2.00-5.00)
Culturally competent/appropriate methods & practices	4.56 (3.00-5.00)	3.56 (2.00-5.00)
Group work	4.33 (3.00-5.00)	3.50 (2.00-5.00)
Resource development/coordination	4.22 (4.00-5.00)	3.00 (2.00-5.00)
Advocacy	4.11 (3.00-5.00)	2.90 (2.00-5.00)
Self-care	4.20 (3.00-5.00)	3.60 (2.00-5.00)

The question of content areas was addressed differently in the 2009 survey, representing the next stage in exploring a similar set of topics. Given that perceiving oneself as less prepared might not mean that students would recommend greater inclusion of the relevant topics in the social work curriculum, the question was posed as to the degree to which students thought that School of Social Work classes should have greater coverage of the same 19 times that were addressed in the 2007 survey related to skills and knowledge. Table 4 illustrates that the topics seen as highest priority for greater coverage across both the first and second year cohorts (>4.00) were counseling and therapy, intervention planning and implementation, crisis intervention, harm reduction theories and techniques, as well as psychosocial rehabilitation and recovery. Those in the first year also listed developing rapport and relationship building, bio-psychosocial assessment, risk assessment, identifying strengths and assets, theoretical models and their application, utilizing the DSM-IV-TR, culturally competent/appropriate

methods and practices, group work, resource development/coordination, advocacy, and self-care. Some of these content areas, such as theoretical models and their application, utilizing the DSM-IV-TR, and group work are often covered during the second year, but the others would be considered appropriate curricular material to cover during the first year. The lowest areas of priority among those in their second year were values and principles of social work and advocacy.

Table 5: Basic Knowledge about Theory
(1: None – 5: A great deal)

Theoretical Areas	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year, PPT 2007 (n = 44)
Psychosocial, ecological, systems, & psychodynamic	3.65 (2.00-5.00)	3.66 (2.00-5.00)
Behavioral, cognitive-behavioral (CBT), dialectic behavioral (DBT), & solutions-focused	3.12 (2.00-5.00)	3.24 (1.00-5.00)
Narrative, attachment, humanistic/client-centered, feminist, & recovery-oriented	3.06 (1.00-5.00)	3.35 (1.00-5.00)

In the 2007 survey, theoretical frameworks were aggregated according to both type and the point at which they tend to be covered in the succession of social work classes. The perceived knowledge during 2007 was highest referent to the psychosocial, ecological, systems, and psychodynamic cluster across both years. Means fell under 3.50 regardless of year in the remaining areas of behavioral, cognitive-behavioral (CBT), dialectic behavioral (DBT), solutions-focused, narrative, attachment, humanistic/client-centered, feminist, and recovery-oriented theory.

Table 6: Sources of Knowledge about Social Work Theory

Source of Knowledge	1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	2nd-year, PPT 2007 (n = 44)	2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 11)
School of Social Work	31 (47.0%)	6 (30.0%)	33 (42.9%)	8 (32.0%)
Internship/s	17 (25.8%)	6 (30.0%)	26 (33.8%)	10 (40.0%)
Employment	16 (24.2%)	6 (30.0%)	15 (19.5%)	5 (20.0%)
Other	2 (3.0%)	2 (10.0%)	3 (3.9%)	2 (8.0%)
Total # responses	66 (100%)	20 (100%)	77 (100%)	25 (100.0%)

Students across cohorts fairly consistently stated that their knowledge of theory came primarily from their coursework in the School of Social Work, and secondarily from either their

internships or employment in the field. Other areas identified by respondents in 2007 from which they gained knowledge of theory included personal readings (n = 4), volunteer jobs, previous work, workshops, and Title IV-E trainings (n = 2).

Table 7: Basic Knowledge about Social Work Practice
(1: Strongly disagree – 5: Strongly agree)

Social Work Practice Areas	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 44)
Aging adults	2.50 (1.00-5.00)	2.37 (1.00-5.00)
Children & adolescents	3.74 (2.00-5.00)	3.41 (1.00-5.00)
Couples & families	2.91 (1.00-5.00)	3.17 (1.00-5.00)
Disability	2.18 (1.00-5.00)	2.35 (1.00-4.00)
International social work	1.35 (1.00-5.00)	1.86 (1.00-5.00)
LGBT issues	2.65 (1.00-5.00)	2.90 (1.00-5.00)
Mental health	3.82 (2.00-5.00)	3.65 (1.00-5.00)
Substance abuse	2.97 (1.00-5.00)	3.20 (1.00-5.00)

Students in 2007 tended across the board to say that they had lesser knowledge of specific practice areas than those of general methods, particularly related to aging adults, couples and families, disability, international social work, LGBT issues, and substance abuse. One might expect a rise in all areas between the first and second year, however the means actually dropped related to children and adolescents, and mental health.

Table 8: Degree to Which Classes Should Have Greater Coverage of Specific Practice Areas:
(1: Strongly disagree – 5: Strongly agree)

Social Work Practice Areas	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 11)
Aging adults	4.00 (3.00-5.00)	3.82 (1.00-5.00)
Children & adolescents	3.60 (2.00-5.00)	3.82 (1.00-5.00)
Child Welfare	3.50 (2.00-4.00)	3.36 (1.00-5.00)
Couples & families	4.20 (3.00-5.00)	3.64 (2.00-5.00)
Disability	4.60 (4.00-5.00)	3.91 (2.00-5.00)
International social work	3.20 (2.00-5.00)	3.40 (3.00-5.00)
Medical social work	3.70 (3.00-5.00)	3.91 (2.00-5.00)
LGBT issues	4.30 (3.00-5.00)	4.00 (2.00-5.00)
Mental health	4.20 (2.00-5.00)	4.09 (3.00-5.00)
Physical health issues	3.70 (2.00-5.00)	3.40 (2.00-5.00)
Substance abuse	4.60 (3.00-5.00)	4.27 (3.00-5.00)
Co-occurring (dual) diagnoses	4.80 (4.00-5.00)	4.10 (2.00-5.00)
Community violence	4.30 (3.00-5.00)	3.82 (2.00-5.00)

Again, in an effort to compare what students felt prepared in with what they would like to see greater coverage of, some similar areas were mentioned in the 2009 survey with students across cohorts indicating that there should be greater coverage of LGBT issues, mental health, and substance abuse. The additional category of co-occurring (dual) diagnoses was added based on qualitative responses to the 2007 survey. Those in the first year expressed a desire for greater curricular content related to aging adults, couples and families, and disability. The category of “community violence” was also added as it emerged as a qualitative suggestion in the 2007 survey and this was endorsed as an area in which greater coverage would be beneficial by first-year students in 2009 (See Table 8).

Table 9: Sources of Knowledge about Social Work Practice

Source of Knowledge	1st-year 2007 (n = 34)	2nd-year, PPT 2007 (n = 44)
School of Social Work	22 (68.8%)	22 (30.1%)
Internship/s	25 (78.1%)	34 (46.6%)
Employment	26 (81.3%)	15 (20.5%)
Other	3 (9.4%)	2 (2.7%)
Total # responses	32 (100%)	73 (100%)

Respondents in 2007 revealed that their knowledge about practice, including specific populations and issue areas, was more likely to come from their internships and employment than their coursework. Other areas of knowledge of practice came from personal readings, volunteer and paid jobs, and workshops (see Table 9).

Table 10: Knowledge of Theory
(1: none – 5: A great deal)

Social Work Theoretical Areas	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year 2009 (n = 11)
Psychosocial	3.30 (2.00-4.00)	3.50 (2.00-5.00)
Ecological	2.67 (1.00-4.00)	3.30 (2.00-5.00)
Systems	3.30 (2.00-5.00)	3.67 (2.00-5.00)
Psychodynamic	3.00 (2.00-4.00)	3.30 (2.00-4.00)
Behavioral and Cognitive Behavioral	3.11 (2.00-4.00)	3.00 (1.00-4.00)
Dialectical Behavioral	2.60 (1.00-5.00)	2.60 (1.00-4.00)
Solutions-focused	2.67 (2.00-4.00)	2.50 (1.00-4.00)
Narrative	2.22 (1.00-4.00)	2.50 (2.00-4.00)
Attachment	3.33 (2.00-5.00)	2.70 (1.00-5.00)
Humanistic/client centered	3.22 (2.00-4.00)	2.90 (2.00-4.00)
Feminist	2.67 (1.00-5.00)	2.20 (1.00-4.00)

Recovery oriented	2.10 (1.00-3.00)	2.20 (1.00-4.00)
-------------------	------------------	------------------

The 2009 survey provided a greater breakdown of theoretical constructs, identifying individual theories rather than aggregating them by type. In response to these items, both first and second-year students produced a mean of 3.50 or less in all categories, except for systems theory among the second-year students. In other words, students did not endorse having substantial knowledge of the following frameworks: psychosocial, ecological, psychodynamic, dialectical behavioral, narrative, recovery-oriented, and among just first-years, systems. The means for behavioral and cognitive behavioral, solutions-focused, attachment, humanistic/client centered, and feminist fell below 3.50. It is of note that perceived level of knowledge was actually lower referent to these theories among the second-year respondents than the first-years.

Qualitative Results: 2007

The qualitative responses to the open-ended questions in the 2007 survey were distilled into four different themes. These include course content, standardization and teaching methodology, preparation for clinical practice, and curricular structure.

Course Content

In relation to the classes taken and those that the students found most or least helpful, there was some variation and as students repeatedly reiterated, the degree to which they found the class beneficial was based on the quality of instruction rather than the content explicitly delineated in the syllabus. When first-year students were posed the question, “Based on your experiences in your internship/s and/or employment as a social worker, what in your coursework would you like to have (or have had) more knowledge, exposure, and information about,” one student suggested that it would be beneficial to include:

Therapy skills from different theoretical orientation such as art, movement, expressive therapy, aside from conventional theories. (2) Trainings in Biomedical area in terms of mental health assessment (aside from DSMR psychosocial we need to equip w/knowledge on biomedical, aspect of mental health.

Other comments about content included, “This school lacks in teaching the needed tools for social workers. We never talked about mental health, substance abuse, DBT, CBT, and other psychotherapy models needed to get licensed,” and “It would be nice to have a class that is taylored to student specific area OF INTEREST For example, I would like to learn more about practices around adoptions.” Other suggestions, in the students’ own words, were categorized during analysis into “Methods” and “Specific population and topic areas” as follows:

First-year Students

Methods:

Clinical social work
Practice methods
DSM

What treatment goes with what presenting symptoms
Theory and its application in Social Work
More about theoretical models, approaches and techniques
Goal formulation
Group work
Transference/Counter transference
Self-care
Legal mandates, ethical dilemmas

Specific population and topic areas:

LGBT issues
Disabilities
Substance abuse
Families
Law and casework
Harm reduction
Child welfare

Second-Year full-time and PPT Students

Methods:

Clinical interventions
Clinical social work
Basic counseling
Therapy
Psychotherapy models needed to get licensed
Theory
Life cycle stages
DSM
Diagnostic skills
CBT
DBT
Crisis intervention
Risk assessment

Specific population and topic areas:

Aging
Families
Children
Child welfare
LGBT issues
Dual diagnosis
PTSD
HIV/AIDS - Harm reduction
Mental health
Medical social work

Community violence

Standardization and Teaching Methodology

In response to the request for any other comments, students in 2007 addressed a variety of thematic areas. One was standardization. As one student said, “Please standardize the coursework, so that each section of a class learns similar things. Currently there’s an enormous disparity.” Another echoed this thought in pointing out:

The differences in class structure and knowledge gained are dependent on the instructors in this program. This is very discouraging. The course content should be consistently monitored in order to ensure students that have worked to get into a competitive program are guaranteed not just an adequate education but a quality education.

A related theme to standardization reflected perspectives on teaching methodologies. As one respondent asserted:

I think on its face, the coursework is fine. My criticism is with the way it is taught, which is often unstructured and careless. With a few exceptions, I am disappointed with the quality of instruction in this program.

Another student stated, “I think that there needs to be a better understanding of the student’s abilities and let us have more choice in the way we learn.” Other comments addressed disparities in instruction, including, “All of the courses mentioned in the survey are valuable. The biggest differences between the courses are the instructors. Some require you to learn and others do not,” and “Much of the lack of information/subject area material had to do with uneven professor performance – where some worked hard + expected a lot and others just didn’t – making their classes almost useless.” An additional statement made was:

Unfortunately, the quality of professors makes such a difference and, in my opinion, the worst professors I had are tenured or tenure track. I really think there should be more oversight and standardization as to what is taught. I also have to say that the low expectations in most of the classes I took – and automatic A’s – was surprising for graduate school level work. When people ask me about the program I don’t recommend it. It is not rigorous and only 50% of the courses I took were worth it. I think there are some great professors and lectured who actually prepare for classes and make an effort to teach – but too many seem complacent with doing as little as possible and it rubs off on the student body. I know this is outside the scope of this survey, but this survey brought up these thoughts and feelings for me.

Preparation for Clinical Practice

Another theme addressed in the survey was the students’ sense of preparation to engage in clinical practice. As one respondent pointed out:

This social work program needs to provide more intensive clinical trainings for students who want to do clinical work in their profession. I feel the current courses work and the program are not putting enough of emphases in preparing students to do clinical work working w/the population with mental health disabilities from different age groups. The SW 843: Child Welfare Practice course should be offer as elective to students who want to do clinical work with children and families.

Another student said, "I don't see the MSW equipped me to became a therapist/clinical social worker," and yet another, "We graduate and are put into placements/jobs w/ expectations of knowledge of this info. We need to have a foundation of knowledge." Concrete practice was emphasized in these students' comments, such as the suggestion that there be "Casework practices; focusing on skills and not theories."

Curricular Structure

Some suggestions related to the ways in which the curriculum is structured. One student observed:

DSM class should be 2 semesters long! (health + disordered behavior) I think Spanish for the helping professional should be offered. There should be an option of the internship full time in the summer. Ethics + cultural principles should be one semester.

Other comments related to curricular structure included, "Did not feel like second diversity class was necessary." Another student reiterated this opinion in saying, "Clinical program needs a major overhaul esp, 770 + 771." Another respondent suggested, "It would be nice if the IFG seminars could have a placement focus (i.e., medical, psychiatric, case mgmt, etc.) to enhance our learning." Another stated, "I wish classes were better structured and not as boring."

Some suggestions had to do with greater flexibility in the program requirements. One student stated, "A flexible advance or elective courses should be established to be able to respond to our needs as future professionals." Another asserted:

I've been in the field for well over a dozen years and would like to explore more macro issues instead of having my entire program mandated – it makes the learning process frustrating and keeps me from exploring things I know I need to learn for my career development right now vs. what the MSW program thinks I should know and I already know so I find myself bored.

Other recommendations articulated by these respondents had to do with the balance between micro and macro content including, "There was much focus on social change which is important but it seems to be at the expense of a good clinical foundation."

Some comments addressed whether coursework reflected what is most current in the field. One student stated, "The curriculum needs to be updated and taken seriously at this

school. I expected my experience to be enhanced as a social worker at this school.” Others addressed academic expectations; for example a respondent asserted:

I didn't like that some teachers required 15 page papers. I think that in the classes that I took, there should have been a basic minimum of 10 pages for papers. Requiring 15 page papers is over the top especially if they are not involving research or directly related to the culminating project.

Qualitative Results: 2009

Qualitative themes related to the open-ended questions posed in the 2009 survey were categorized into four themes, including the relationship between course content and teaching methodology, application of theory to practice, curriculum and course structure, and faculty mentorship.

The Relationship between Course Content and Teaching Methodology

In response to the item “Please include any other comments about methods and theories covered in your social work classes,” several of the students addressed the relationship between course content and teaching methodology. For example, one student stated, “Currently, I am supposed to be learning about the various theories, but I frankly don't have a good handle on most of them. The professor's teaching style doesn't work with my learning style.”

As to ways in which to address the issues or concerns raised in the questionnaire, students had a range of suggestions. Some had to do with the match between the faculty members' interests and skills with the courses they are assigned to teach. For example, one student stated, “Listen to the students when they say that a professor should not be teaching a specific class.” Another paired instructor suitability with standardization:

I think greater standardization would help so that each class would cover material necessary for that course regardless of the instructors. Also make sure instructors have expertise in the subject areas they are teaching to maximize learning for the students. to make sure and give equal time to all age ranges and types of populations served in the classes.

One student summarized a range of suggestions articulated by others, including:

Pairing teachers appropriately, updating the curriculum, preparing students for licensure, get rid of social work practice methods or make it more clinical in focus. Professors should be evaluated to make sure they are implementing feedback from student evaluations. Teachers that receive poor evaluations without a plan to improve should not be asked back to teach. Greater emphasis on student's development. I think focus groups would be helpful to get at things this survey does not cover.

Application of Theory to Practice

Another theme that was repeatedly addressed was the application of theory to practice. As one respondent stated, "Everything was covered superficially. More in-dept explanation, role-plays, or case examples utilizing methods and theories would be helpful." Others asserted, "Would like to know more clinical and theory based methods to working with various types of clients" "From my experience, SFSU does not provide much experience with framework, it gives a basic knowledge and the student them self has to continue building on different frameworks." "We need MORE and then to apply our internship work to them!!! Or do papers in which we apply our work to the theories. We have almost no work helping us make the theories concrete!" Expressing similar views, one student said, "I may understand what a lot of the theories mean but I don't have a clue as to how to implement them." Another commented, "I would like a little more basic straightforward presentation of the models & relate them to specific cases for help in understanding."

When students were asked to identify any other issues or concerns that were not previously covered in the questionnaire, one student said, "It would be extremely helpful if there was a class for IFG students on different types of therapy and how to actually do therapy with clients. We are placed in our internships and told to do therapy with clients, but we are not shown how to do it!!"

Curriculum and Course Structure

Some remarks had to do with the curriculum and course structure in general; for example, one student stated, "have research professors understand that some students are not that passionate about research." Another student pointed out:

I think that seminar classes should be restructured so that they are more supportive about issues pertaining to either field internship to questions about class. Another issue that I would like to bring to the table is that 1st readers for research should be determined by whoever your seminar instructor is because if we have any questions we see our seminar instructor every week therefore they are more available to the student.

Other more general curricular suggestions included, "Have research classes taught in laymen's terms" and "All seminar instructors should be on the same page." As to further comments, respondents suggested, "I would like better balance of professors' contribution to class versus the high demand of the student."

Faculty Mentorship

The final theme emerging from the students' comments related to the faculty's' roles as mentor. As this respondent pointed out, "I think there should be increased mentorship by faculty. Advisors should serve more than just a signatory role. I feel that a greater developmental approach to student's professional growth would be really helpful."

Table 11: Degree to Which Students Agree or Disagree with the Listed Statements

(1: Strongly disagree – 5: Strongly agree)

Social Work Practice Areas	MEAN & RANGE 1st-year 2009 (n = 10)	MEAN & RANGE 2nd-year, PPT 2009 (n = 11)
In general, there should be greater rigor in the ways that classes are taught.	3.80 (2.00-5.00)	3.64 (2.00-5.00)
In general, there should be greater rigor in the ways that classes are graded.	2.60 (2.00-3.00)	3.17 (1.00-5.00)
There should be greater structure in the ways that courses are taught.	4.22 (3.00-5.00)	3.91 (2.00-5.00)
Classes should be less broad in their content and instead have a greater focus on specific issues and populations.	3.78 (2.00-5.00)	4.09 (1.00-5.00)
There should be a greater standardization of classes (in that the content is similar regardless of instructor and section).	3.70 (2.00-5.00)	4.00 (2.00-5.00)
For IFG students, there should be less emphasis on macro methods and more on clinical skills-development.	4.00 (2.00-5.00)	4.00 (2.00-5.00)
For IFG students, there should be a greater integration of micro and macro approaches.	4.11 (4.00-5.00)	3.73 (2.00-5.00)
There should be less repetition in course material from one class to another.	3.50 (2.00-5.00)	4.09 (2.00-5.00)
The social work curriculum should be updated.	4.22 (3.00-5.00)	4.27 (2.00-5.00)
There should be greater flexibility in the classes that students can take to fulfill the requirements for graduation.	4.00 (3.00-5.00)	4.64 (3.00-5.00)

Based on the qualitative comments made by students in the 2007 survey, statements were advanced in a quantitative format to assess how widespread these perspectives might be. Listed here are the statement with a mean between 3.50 and 5.00 across the first and second-year cohorts in 2009:

- In general, there should be greater rigor in the ways that classes are taught.
- There should be greater structure in the ways that courses are taught.
- Classes should be less broad in their content and instead have a greater focus on specific issues and populations.
- There should be a greater standardization of classes (in that the content is similar regardless of instructor and section).

- For IFG students, there should be less emphasis on macro methods and more on clinical skills-development.
- For IFG students, there should be a greater integration of micro and macro approaches.
- There should be less repetition in course material from one class to another.
- The social work curriculum should be updated.
- There should be greater flexibility in the classes that students can take to fulfill the requirements for graduation.

The only statement that was not endorsed to the 3.50 mark was:

- In general, there should be greater rigor in the ways that classes are graded.

In relation to the degree to which students in 2009 endorsed the qualitative statements generated from the 2007 questionnaire, one student stated:

I answered neither agree/nor disagree to questions pertaining to class structure and grading because I don't think that is the underlying problem. Some "less structured" teachers teach with great vigor and prioritize the development of students while others are very structured but aren't catering to the needs of the students, aren't up to date in their knowledge or teaching methods and aren't covering relevant material. As far as grading- I don't really believe in the audit system, however I do believe that teachers should be using methods to ensure that students are learning core concepts. I feel pairing teachers with the appropriate classes is really important- sometimes we get professors with little competency in the subject area they are being asked to teach and it is not conducive to strengthening our competencies in those areas. I think some standardization is necessary, particularly for 771 where I don't feel core competencies are even addressed in all of the classes. But most importantly, I want to be able to take a class and have confidence that whatever section I chose, I will learn something and have a competent professor. I don't feel that currently- particularly with the DSM class. I think we have very knowledgeable professors- just some are not appropriate for the subject matter or their teaching skills are not as strong.

Limitations

This evaluation had several limitations. One was the difference between wave-one and wave-two of data collection, with the first wave utilizing the field seminars for hard copy distribution of the questionnaires (except for students from the PPSC seminar who submitted their questionnaires by e-mail). Having students fill out the questionnaire during the field seminar provided a much greater response rate than through posting on Survey Monkey (87% vs. 35%). The lower response rate increased the probability of bias due to self-selection. There were also technological difficulties in the administration of the second questionnaire through Survey Monkey which were resolved during the first 24 hours, but still might have had an impact on the response rate. Another limitation is that these questionnaires measured subjective perceptions rather than objective measures of learning and preparation and there is no collateral information to back up the students' observations about their own knowledge and skills in relation to the items covered.

Recommendations

One perspective that was repeatedly mentioned among both first-year and ongoing students was that the dissatisfaction with courses was not so much due to their proposed content, but to the ways in which classes were taught and who was teaching them. The significance of making the appropriate match between instructors and course material was highlighted throughout this evaluation. Students identified specific instructors in their comments and while those names have been removed from the final report, the overall content of the comments has been fully represented. It is recommended that when consistent problems emerge as reflected in either direct student feedback or their course evaluations that action be taken so that the same complaints do not go on being voiced year after year. These interventions might include increased support and mentoring for new faculty members, as well as adjustments in teaching assignments so that the most optimal fit between instructor and course objectives might be realized.

Overall across cohorts, there was a need expressed for more clinical content such as counseling and therapy, intervention planning and implementation, crisis intervention, as well as harm reduction theories and techniques. By the time that they were close to graduation, students in 2007 also revealed that they felt insufficiently prepared in working with clients across different stages of the life cycle, group work, and resource development and coordination, although in the 2009 survey, these did not emerge as priorities for greater coverage. Students across cohorts reported a greater degree of preparation in the values and principles of social work and did not identify that as a priority for increased coverage. In addition, it would be of benefit to update the curriculum with such topics as psychosocial rehabilitation and recovery so that students feel better prepared for the types of internships in which they are placed along with the evolving demands of the social work marketplace. The vast majority of students expressed interest in obtaining the License in Clinical Social Work (LCSW) so it is suggested that there should be greater preparation in the areas relevant to the licensing process.

Students are particularly reliant on the School to learn about social work theory and the findings across cohorts suggest that students do not feel strongly grounded in the principal social work frameworks; thus, attention should be paid to strengthening this aspect of the curriculum. In addition, it was repeatedly expressed that there is a greater need to apply those frameworks to practice, as well as to specific issues and populations. The areas in which the students most strongly expressed both that they were insufficiently prepared and that there should be greater coverage included issues related to mental health, co-occurring disorders, substance abuse, aging, couples and families, disability, community violence, and identification as LGBTQQ. The students in 2007 revealed that they had learned more about social work practice with specific issues and populations through their internships and employment than they had through their coursework.

Findings from these surveys underline that courses should be designed and taught to ensure that the core competencies are effectively covered. Some degree of standardization, or a consistent expectation of what students will learn across sections and instructors would be of

benefit. Overall, when both quantitatively and qualitatively measured, students made a plea for greater rigor and structure in the ways that courses are taught. They recommended that classes be less broad in their content and instead have a greater focus on specific issues and populations. It was suggested that for IFG students, there should be less emphasis on macro methods and more on clinical skills-development, while at the same time providing greater integration of micro and macro approaches. There should be less repetition in course material from one class to another, for example, extending the coursework covered in SW 810: Health, Illness, and Disordered Behavior to two semesters and reducing the Ethnic and Cultural Concepts and Principles (SW770-771) sequence to one. If resources and curricular objectives allow, some students also requested greater flexibility in the classes that students can take to fulfill the requirements for graduation. It is also recommended that faculty serve as mentors for student and further involve themselves in their students' professional development and growth.

2. Licensed Clinical Social Worker Exam

The Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) Exam is another outcome measurement used by the School to assess for IFG students' social work practice skills, as most SFSU MSW graduates who take the exam were in the IFG concentration (the direct service concentration). The State of California LCSW exam is a standardized instrument that, until early 2004, included a written multiple choice exam and an oral case vignette exam conducted in front of two trained LCSW examiners. Unlike most states that license clinical social workers, the written exam is not part of the national exam administered by the (American Association of State Directors?). In fact, statistics show that California's written exam has a lower pass rate than that of the national exam. It is important to note that during the time California utilized the national exam the pass rate for California test-takers was higher than the national average (95% pass rate). In a desire to make the written exam more "rigorous" California developed its own written exam through the California Board of Behavioral Sciences. Each candidate has to respond to a list of set questions pertaining to a case vignette they were given. As of June 2004 the full California LCSW examination included two separate written exams. The LCSW oral and written exams test participants on legal and ethical behavior of social workers, social work practice skills (assessment, treatment planning, referrals, etc.), cultural competency, use of supervision and consultation, and theoretical frameworks for social work practice. Results from the exams are presented annually to faculty by the School's Director in the December school meeting. The IFG curriculum committee utilizes this information to update and/or modify course syllabi and course curriculum each year. The LCSW exam is a standardized measurement that examines outcomes for MSW Program Objectives #2 and 4-8.

In the most recent LCSW oral examination statistics (June 2009) distributed by the Board of Behavioral Sciences, San Francisco State University MSW graduates ranked ninth in pass rate of all the Social Work programs throughout the State of California (44%). San Francisco State University MSW graduates ranked third (75%) in the pass rate among first time takers. Summarizing the top five pass rates in the state, Table 5 below illustrates the results:

Table 5. LCSW Oral Exam Pass Rate by accredited programs

**BOARD OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES
LCSW WRITTEN EXAMINATION STATISTICS**

1/1/09 - 6/30/09

ACCREDITED UNIVERSITIES	PASS	FAIL	% PASSED	1ST TIME TAKERS		% PASSED 1ST TIME
				PASS	FAIL	
CSU, Bakersfield	5	6	45%	4	5	44%
CSU, Chico	5	4	55%	4	2	67%
CSU, Fresno	11	27	29%	7	4	64%
CSU, Hayward	1	0	100%	1	0	100%
CSU, Long Beach	35	54	39%	27	19	59%
CSU, Los Angeles	8	23	26%	7	9	44%
CSU, Sacramento	24	48	33%	17	19	47%
CSU, San Bernardino	20	14	59%	18	8	69%
CSU, Stanislaus	4	13	23%	3	3	50%
San Diego State University	22	13	63%	20	8	71%
San Francisco State University	14	18	44%	12	4	75%
San Jose State University	23	33	41%	21	13	62%
UC, Berkeley	16	13	55%	16	7	70%
UC, Los Angeles	23	11	68%	23	1	96%
Loma Linda University	1	14	7%	1	7	12%
University of Southern California	55	56	49%	48	23	68%
OUT-OF-STATE UNIVERSITIES	88	82	52%	80	36	69%
OUT-OF-COUNTRY UNIVERSITIES	2	7	22%	2	3	40%

793 PARTICIPATED
357 PASSED (45%)
436 FAILED (55%)

Although the sample size is quite small, the results from the most recent written LCSW exam are most significant to all constituencies at the School of Social Work at SFSU (faculty, students, field instructors, community members, etc). These most recent LCSW written exam results were taken back to the MSW Individuals, Families and Groups curriculum concentration committee and the School meeting. The IFG concentration committee members, and all faculty that teach IFG courses (i.e. Social Casework, Advanced Casework, Health, Illness and Disordered Behavior), are currently examining all IFG course syllabi and lesson plans to see how the curriculum needs to be modified to better prepare students in direct service practice who are interested in licensure.

MSW Program Assessment – Social action and change (SAC) Emphasis

The program objectives of the Social action and change (SAC) emphasis of the School of Social Work are:

1. Students understand and promote professional social work values and ethics in the community change and development process.
2. Students have knowledge of the history of struggles for social, political, and economic justice.
3. Students acquire the theories, knowledge and skills that enable them to be effective change agents.
4. Students demonstrate an understanding of power relationships and leadership dynamics and how these work to help and/or hinder social change.
5. Students are able to apply variety of change models to community problem settings.
6. Students can analyze, observe and describe the goals, functions, structure, and behavior of community change dynamics.
7. Students can develop and apply a diverse range of problem-solving and decision-making approaches that include social planning, policy analysis collaboration, and comprehensive community initiatives to disparate problem situations.
8. Students can think critically, develop their own concept of critical consciousness and analyze processes using Paulo Freire's models of adult education.
9. Students demonstrate an understanding of SAC as a viable social work method.
10. Students have the theoretical base necessary to engage in community problem-solving, including assessment, intervention and implementation.
11. Students develop skills in the evaluation of intervention and can test the efficacy of their interventions.

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

The methods of measurement used to assess the achievement of Social action and change Concentration program objectives are:

1. Annual Students Focus Groups
2. Field Education Evaluations
3. Field Instructor Survey
4. School Alumni Survey

Figure 4 below depicts which of the outcomes measurements assess the various program objectives. An in-depth description of each outcome measurement follows Figure 4.

SAC Objectives	Annual Student Focus Group	Field Education Evaluations	Field Instructors Survey	School Alumni Survey
Students understand and promote professional social work values and ethics in the community change and development process.		x	x	
Students have knowledge of the history of struggles for social, political, and economic justice.	x		x	
Students acquire the theories, knowledge and skills that enable them to be effective change agents.	x	x	x	
Students demonstrate an understanding of power relationships and leadership dynamics and how these work to help and/or hinder social change.	x	x	x	
Students are able to apply variety of change models to community problem settings.	x	x	x	X
Students can analyze, observe and describe the goals, functions, structure, and behavior of community change dynamics.	x	x	x	
Students can develop and apply a diverse range of problem-solving and decision-making approaches that include social planning, policy analysis collaboration, and comprehensive community initiatives to disparate problem situations.	x	x	x	X
Students can think critically, develop their own concept of critical consciousness and analyze processes using Paulo Freire's models of adult education.	x	x	x	
Students demonstrate an understanding of SAC as a viable social work method.			x	
Students have the theoretical base necessary to engage in community problem-solving, including assessment, intervention and implementation.	x	x	x	X

Students develop skills in the evaluation of intervention and can test the efficacy of their interventions.	x	x	x	x

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

1. Student Focus Groups

As mentioned above, the school conducts annual focus groups with 2nd year MSW students. An anonymous Student Focus Groups was conducted with SAC MSW students on February 18, 2009. The qualitative instrument used for the focus group is in Appendix E.

After graduation, what would you like your primary employment to be over the next 5 – 10 years?

- Medical Social Work*
- Mental Health field*
- The budget crisis, maybe Medical Social Work*
- Working with a Community Based Organization*
- School Social Worker*

What course of all courses you have completed best met your needs in moving towards the direction/s that you named in Question 1? What was helpful about it?

I think for myself, the SW 836. I will be working with a CBO I will be better prepared because of this course since I will work with underprivileged communities.

SW 835. I liked Theories, Methods and Strategies course. I learned a lot and the Professor had knowledge about the course so that is always better.

I agree with everyone because each of these classes there was teaching, I learned a lot.

I liked all my courses except for one and can't really pinpoint one particular course.

Which course of all courses you have completed has not been as helpful? What was least helpful about this course? What could have made the course better?

The DSM Mental Health course, I couldn't understand why they had us take the class because it didn't have nothing to do with our concentration.

I agree also but more so that it should be explained what the course had to do with our concentration.

How does it apply to SAC? If I'm doing Community Organization how does it apply?

SW 801 Change, Strategies and Professional Values was not helpful at all.

Discuss how well you have been prepared to engage in the following:

Not prepared

- Conducting a social investigation
- Coalition Development
- Indigenous communities
- Refugees/immigrants/IDP's?
- Human Services Administration

There was not enough and if I work with this population I would be clueless.

Somewhat Prepared

- Power and interest analysis in the community?
I feel I can engage in power and interest analysis but I'm not sure which class we learned it.
- Spirituality and social work
- Participatory approaches
- Action-reflection
- Capacity-building
- Community Organizing
There could be more though since we are SAC students. I don't think we got all that we need in this area.
There were many things going on in the city that we could have been working on to support the community, if we were involved it was because of our own doing not because a class has us organizing.
I feel like with other things it was self-motivation not anything else.
- Campaigning
- Policy Analysis and Development
This too could have been a stronger learning area I'm not sure but I believe I prepared.

I agree the program needs an overhaul because it is taking awhile to get through this. We are thinking too much and should know this stuff or we just didn't learn it.

- LGBT issues
Some professors barely scratched the surface on the topic while others always included the topic.
- Mental Health

Very prepared

- Leadership training and formation
- Building relationships and social capital
- Community-driven development
- Organizational formation and development
- Analyzing poverty and oppression
- Consciousness-raising
- Social Planning
- Strategies and Tactics
- Mobilizing resources
- Diversity and Multiculturalism
- Social Work Group
- Resource Development/coordination
- Advocacy
We gained a lot of experience advocating for ourselves with all the changes that have occurred since we been here.
I agree that we have been well prepared by some professors to advocate but there could have been more since we are SAC students.
I feel I'm well prepared for advocating from school and my internship.
- Incorporating a human rights perspective
The university is all about human rights so I can apply this is my work.
A lot of my human rights come from work I do in the community although the school touches on it,
- Program Planning & Development
- Program Coordination

How much basic knowledge do you feel you have about the following theoretical areas?

- Freire's problem-posing approach and consciousness-raising
- Community-driven and participatory approaches and capacity building
- Social Movement and Action Models
- Empowerment Theories
- Social and Economic Justice Theories
- Dialogism
- Humanitarian Reform
- Strengths Perspective

How much basic knowledge do you think you have learned about social work practice in the following?

- Aging adults
- Children and adolescents
- Couples and Families
- Disability
- International Social Work
- Families and Communities
- Advocacy
- Group Work
- Multicultural Practice
- Community Organizing

This is supposed to be a big piece of our learning experience and it's not. We should be placed in internships that include this.

- Mezzo Practice
- Macro Practice

Based on your experiences in your internship/s and/or employment as a social worker, what in your coursework would you like to have/or have had more knowledge, exposure, and information about?

*LGBTQ courses,
International Social Work
Disability courses.*

I think we should get more surrounding Community Organizing.

All students said "No" when asked If SW 850 Human Services Administration I, SW 864 Human Services Administration II, or SW 880 Computers and Human Services Administration were available as electives would you take either course?

Other comments:

International Social Work

Yes, there are a few professors who have backgrounds in International Social Work but they have no opportunity to teach their individual areas of specialty. I think that is a disservice to not only them but also a loss opportunity for us students because others don't have that expertise in that area.

Dual Concentrations

I think that something should be done about students who have a concentration in SAC or the other concentrations and are also obtaining a PPSC also. Classes need to be scheduled where it's not

such an inconvenience to get all the requirements complete for the concentration and the PPSC.

LGBTQ

There should be more instruction surrounding LGBTQ and other minority populations. The university always says it's diverse but these populations get little support by the school of social work. It should just be more than just surface discussions and some professors either choose not to or just don't discuss it.

Curriculum Development

The MSW program itself should be overhauled from the top on down. It is not fair to students who are paying their tuition to get the mediocre learning experience that we are getting. Some professors are not happy teaching the course they are paid to teach. They don't hide their emotions about being thrown into certain classes due to issues in the department.

School of Social Work Response

The SAC emphasis faculty, which currently includes two tenure-track faculty and one part-time faculty, has scheduled a meeting in the Fall 2009 semester to review the findings from the assessments and evaluations conducted the past school year. As a team, the SAC faculty will discuss the results and student feedback on how the emphasis, as it is structured, best meets their learning needs. The next step will be a meeting with SAC students in the Spring 2010 semester to plan on actions on the recommendations raised in the evaluations, particularly proposals to be presented to the MSW Committee on changes made on the emphasis.

MSW Program Assessment – Administration and Planning (A&P) Concentration

The program objectives of the Administration and Planning (A&P) concentration of the School of Social Work are:

1. Students understand and promote professional social work values and ethics in the development of administration of human services.
2. Students create programs and structures that are grounded in the principles of social justice and equality.
3. Students acquire theories, knowledge and skills that enable them to direct agencies and administer programs that bring about positive change in their communities.
4. Students demonstrate an understanding and are cognizant of the impact that various bureaucratic structures have on the poor, disenfranchised and oppressed.
5. Students apply management theories and knowledge pertinent to human services administration to the actual operational roles and functions performed in social service agencies and organizations.
6. Students demonstrate the ability to critically analyze, observe, and describe the goals, functions, structure, and behavior of agencies and organizations.

7. Students develop and apply a diverse range of problem-solving and decision-making skills that are applicable in organizations, institutions, and communities.
8. Students demonstrate an understanding of administration as social work method.
9. Students have the knowledge and skill base to enter or re-enter social work practice as managers or administrators.
10. Students can evaluate administrative practice and the effectiveness of social service programs.

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

The methods of measurement used to assess the achievement of Administration and Planning Concentration program objectives are:

1. Annual Students Focus Groups
2. Field Evaluations
3. Field Instructor Survey
4. Alumni Survey

Figure 5 below depicts which of the outcomes measurements assess the various program objectives. An in-depth description of each outcome measurement follows Figure 5.

Figure 5. Administration and Planning Concentration Assessment Plan

A & P Objectives	Annual Student Focus Groups	Field Evaluations	Field Instructors Survey	Alumni Survey
Students understand and promote professional social work values and ethics in the development of administration of human services.		x	x	
Students create programs and structures that are grounded in the principles of social justice and equality.		x	x	X
Students acquire theories, knowledge and skills that enable them to direct agencies and administer programs that bring about positive change in their communities.	x	x	x	
Students demonstrate an understanding and are cognizant of the impact that various bureaucratic structures have on the poor, disenfranchised and oppressed.	x	x	x	

Students apply management theories and knowledge pertinent to human services administration to the actual operational roles and functions performed in social service agencies and organizations.		x	x	
Students demonstrate the ability to critically analyze, observe, and describe the goals, functions, structure, and behavior of agencies and organizations.		x	x	
Students develop and apply a diverse range of problem-solving and decision-making skills that are applicable in organizations, institutions, and communities.		x	x	
Students demonstrate an understanding of administration as social work method.		x	X	
Students have the knowledge and skill base to enter or re-enter social work practice as managers or administrators.		x	x	
Students can evaluate administrative practice and the effectiveness of social service programs.		x	x	x

Student Outcome Data and Measurements

1. Annual Student Focus Groups

Dr. Susan Sung conducted a focus group that included five Administration and Planning students in May, 2008. This was in combined field seminar for “indirect service” A & P as well as SAC second year MSW students. The following observations were drawn:

1. Students were overall very open and animated in talking about their two year experience in the master of social work (MSW) program at SFSU. There was a sense of solidarity among the students. They were supportive of each other and wanted to provide responses that could be helpful to the program.
2. The Field Seminar: Students stated that the field seminar had been a focal point for students to gather and exchange ideas and learn from each other. It was ‘the place’ where they felt belonged and cared for. The Field Instructor was well liked and had

provided useful learning experience regarding the macro/mezzo perspectives to social work. Visits to the field agencies were extremely helpful as part of the seminar curriculum. They expressed strong sentiment that, pedagogically, AP/SAC field seminar should be separate from the IFG concentration.

3. A and P Curriculum: The A and P students were more critical about their program when compared with the SAC counterpart. They did not feel that they learned from their instructors. For example, when taking the 'computer related budget course', the instructor talked about how to use the basic software (such as Microsoft office) which was to them "a waste of time." Often the curriculum content did not meet the goals and objectives of the graduate courses. Almost all of the courses were taught by temporary faculty who did not specialize in the A and P concentration. They felt that the School needed to strengthen the A and P curriculum and deployed faculty who would be committed to the curriculum (such as tenure-track faculty specialized in A and P). Complaints were not directed to the structure of the A and P Curriculum, rather, to the instructors and the content of the courses. They still felt that A and P was a viable and important concentration for MSW students who wanted to specialize in this area.
4. Future direction of the MSW curriculum: Students were asked to address a number of issues related to the future direction of the MSW program. They did not feel that the MSW program should steer toward a "generalist" approach. They feared that this would become a "de factor" clinical social work program. They definitely did not wish to be in the "clinical/director service" concentration. The current "three concentrations" could be better served by two concentrations: macro and micro social work. The macro curriculum should clearly include/delineate courses for social advocacy and administration/planning. All students should be given the opportunity to take courses within the dichotomized curriculum while specializing in one of the two areas.
5. End comments: The focus group was well received. The participants were happy that there was an effort to seek their evaluation/feedback about the MSW program. They did not regret that they chose the MSW program at SFSU. The urban environment of San Francisco was a big draw to the program.

School of Social Work Response

School of Social Work administrators and faculty were appreciative of the thoughtful comments by students. Each of the recommendations for change is being addressed. John Lemmon, who heads the Administration & Planning emphasis, has sought ongoing information from current A & P students. Spring 2009 he will work with A & P students to conduct a follow up focus group. In addition to offering SW 811, he has also begun teaching SW 850 to increase his contact with A & P students.

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 1. MSW SETE Data Fall 2006 and Spring 2007

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall MSW instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2006</u>	<u>Overall MSW instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2007</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.52 (0.88)	1.49 (0.85)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.69 (0.96)	1.71 (0.98)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.64 (0.96)	1.68 (0.99)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.67 (1.01)	1.73 (1.00)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.51 (0.93)	1.45 (0.82)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.70 (1.00)	1.67 (0.98)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.67 (0.91)	1.69 (0.91)
8. The course content was:	1.61 (0.85)	1.68 (0.87)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.60 (0.92)	1.63 (0.87)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.41 (0.74)	1.40 (0.72)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.52 (0.86)	1.47 (0.72)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.65 (0.91)	1.63 (0.92)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.52 (0.84)	1.63 (0.89)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.62 (0.94)	1.65 (0.92)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.68 (0.92)	1.72 (0.95)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.64 (0.95)	1.62 (0.89)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.53 (0.86)	1.51 (0.78)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.50 (0.86)	1.50 (0.80)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.71 (1.06)	1.62 (0.97)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.68 (0.94)	1.67 (0.94)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.64 (0.94)	1.48 (0.78)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.57 (0.87)	1.53 (0.80)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.68 (0.99)	1.60 (0.90)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.51 (0.82)	1.54 (0.82)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.62 (0.92)	1.54 (0.81)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.55 (0.93)	1.47 (0.83)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.60	1.59

Table 2. 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 instructor's teaching was effective.	1.74 (1.03)	1.67 (0.98)
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 3. MSW SETE Data Fall 2007 and Spring 2008

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall MSW instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2007</u>	<u>Overall MSW instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2008</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.44 (0.77)	1.47 (0.88)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.68 (0.97)	1.70 (1.02)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.66 (0.94)	1.69 (1.05)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.72 (0.99)	1.58 (0.96)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.44 (0.80)	1.55 (1.06)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.65 (0.95)	1.69 (1.07)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.70 (0.93)	1.69 (1.07)
8. The course content was:	1.68 (0.83)	1.66 (0.95)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.56 (0.82)	1.59 (0.98)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.41 (0.73)	1.43 (0.87)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.48 (0.70)	1.47 (0.91)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.65 (0.92)	1.62 (1.00)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.60 (0.95)	1.53 (0.94)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.60 (0.92)	1.66 (1.13)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.72 (0.96)	1.75 (1.09)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.65 (0.93)	1.64 (0.98)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.51 (0.76)	1.53 (0.98)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.51 (0.79)	1.56 (1.04)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.59 (0.92)	1.58 (0.94)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.65 (0.94)	1.65 (1.05)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.54 (0.84)	1.51 (0.87)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.55 (0.84)	1.56 (1.00)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.58 (0.85)	1.63 (0.97)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.52 (0.79)	1.49 (0.82)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.59 (0.90)	1.52 (0.88)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.42 (0.77)	1.46 (0.97)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.58	1.59

Table 4. 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 performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.74 (0.98)	1.71 (1.00)
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 5. MSW SETE Data Fall 2008 and Spring 2009

<u>Variable of Teaching Effectiveness</u>	<u>Overall MSW instructor Mean (SD) Fall 2009</u>	<u>Overall MSW instructor Mean (SD) Spring 2009</u>
1. Instructor defined course objectives, learning activities, requirements & grading.	1.47 (0.80)	1.56 (0.93)
2. Course was organized in a way that helped my learning.	1.79 (1.03)	1.65 (0.93)
3. Instructor created experiences that stimulated my learning.	1.71 (0.96)	1.59 (0.92)
4. Instructor provided helpful & timely feedback on my performance & progress throughout the semester.	1.77 (1.04)	1.61 (0.98)
5. Instructor was open to a variety of points of view.	1.48 (0.89)	1.43 (0.83)
6. When I consider the contribution to my learning, this instructor's teaching was effective.	1.74 (1.01)	1.62 (1.00)
7. This course as a whole was:	1.78 (0.97)	1.67 (0.91)
8. The course content was:	1.77 (0.92)	1.65 (0.83)
9. Instructor's contribution to the course was:	1.62 (0.89)	1.55 (0.88)
10. Has command of the subject matter of the course.	1.49 (0.85)	1.43 (0.86)
11. When asked, is a good source of advice to student who wants to find out additional information.	1.51 (0.86)	1.44 (0.85)
12. Motivates me to continue learning more about the specific subject.	1.68 (0.94)	1.55 (0.90)
13. Well organized and prepared.	1.61 (0.91)	1.62 (0.90)
14. Maintains a classroom atmosphere conducive to learning.	1.63 (0.92)	1.52 (0.84)
15. Makes appropriate range of classroom methods & techniques.	1.78 (1.05)	1.71 (1.00)
16. Makes the objectives of the course substantially clear.	1.66 (0.94)	1.67 (1.02)
17. Gives student chance to think & learn independently, critically & creatively.	1.56 (0.88)	1.47 (0.81)
18. Encourages student expression of viewpoints & opinions different from his/her own.	1.52 (0.90)	1.43 (0.81)
19. Provides clear & relevant definition of what is expected of students.	1.67 (0.98)	1.70 (1.06)
20. Uses class time effectively.	1.77 (1.07)	1.63 (0.90)
21. Grades work, papers, exams fairly	1.66 (0.89)	1.56 (0.90)
22. Makes course work meaningful; demonstrates significance of subject.	1.64 (0.95)	1.53 (0.88)
23. Devises assignments which are clear & reasonable in relation to course credits & coordinated w/ course objectives.	1.69 (0.99)	1.60 (0.95)
24. Is available to students during office hours & other times upon request.	1.46 (0.77)	1.42 (0.73)
25. Is prompt in providing relevant feedback on papers, exams, & general student progress.	1.66 (0.93)	1.46 (0.83)
26. Is sensitive to student needs & maintains a level of flexibility that is in keeping with student needs.	1.47 (0.89)	1.43 (0.85)
OVERALL MEAN RESPONSE	1.64	1.56

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

Title IV-E Child Welfare Stipend Program Assessment

In 1989, County Child Welfare Directors and Deans and Directors of 10 California social work graduate schools in conjunction with the California Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers formed the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC). The goals of CalSWEC were to increase professionalization of public social services by providing financial assistance to MSW students enrolled in MSW programs to enter the field of public child welfare and to facilitate efforts to retain professionals in public child welfare agencies. In 1993, the California Department of Social Services entered into a contract with CalSWEC to provide federal Title IV-E money for stipends for full-time MSW students and staff to implement the program. San Francisco State University (SFSU) is currently one of 19 accredited social work schools contracting with CalSWEC to provide a Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project. The Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project provides stipends of \$18,500 per year for two years for up to 40 students. Students must participate in the full-time MSW program and prepare for careers in public child welfare. SFSU currently has 30 students enrolled in the project.

The Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project funds the following positions: full-time Project Coordinator, full-time Project Assistant and 3 instructional FTEs. The Title IV-E Child Welfare Project is administered by the Project Coordinator under the supervision of the school director, who serves as the projects Principal Investigator. The Project Coordinator implements the general policies and procedure of the IV-E program; develops policies and procedures integrating the IV-E program within the school; oversees fiscal and programmatic accountability of the program; works with the Field Director, field liaisons and agency representatives to ensure appropriate field placements for IV-E students and represents SFSU at statewide meetings for Project Coordinators, the CalSWEC Child Welfare Subcommittee Meeting and the Bay Area Collaborative.

The Project Coordinator is responsible for student recruitment, screening, and selection and tracking. The Project Coordinator ensures that school recruitment policies are in alignment with CalSWEC priorities. In an effort to recruit current county public social services staff, the Project Coordinator attends recruitment fairs at local county public social services to provide information about both SFSU School of Social Work and the Title IV-E Child Welfare Project. In addition the Project Coordinator participates in School of Social Work sponsored orientations to discuss the project with potential MSW candidates and to encourage them to apply for the stipend if accepted to the MSW program. Upon acceptance to the MSW program, a letter is sent to the student, introducing them to the project and encouraging them to apply. All applications for admission to the Title IV-E Child Welfare Project are reviewed by the Project Coordinator to ensure that they meet project eligibility requirements. Eligibility requirements include: acceptance to the full-time MSW program, agreement to complete Title IV-E course work while enrolled in the program, proof of legal residency, a valid driver's license, valid insurance, access to a car and the ability to pass a criminal background clearance. Eligible students are interviewed by an awards committee. This committee is equally comprised of county child welfare agency staff and school representatives. The students are ranked by the committee and stipends are awarded based on overall rankings. The school contracts with students to participate in the Title IV-E project on an annual basis. Each fall semester, students

are required to sign and submit a Title IV-E Social Work Student Contract. This contract outlines the terms and conditions of participation in the program.

Once students have been accepted into the Title IV-E project, all information is recorded in the CalSWEC Student Information System (CSIS). Student information is collected from the time of acceptance into the Title IV-E program through the required employment period post graduation. The Title IV-E Project Assistant, under the supervision of the Project Coordinator, is responsible for regularly updating CSIS information. The Project Coordinator monitors that students in the Title IV-E project remain in good standing. This is done by working with students and their faculty advisors to ensure that they are adhering to program guidelines. Upon graduation, the Project Coordinator monitors compliance with job search and employment obligations. Every 6 months students are required to submit employment verification forms or documentation of job searches. This information is reviewed by the Project Coordinator to verify compliance. This information is communicated to CalSWEC via the CSIS system. If students are found to be in violation of the Title IV-E agreement, they are referred to the University Loans and Collections Department for repayment of the stipend. The Loans and Collections Department provides monthly reports to the Title IV-E project regarding the repayments of the stipends. In addition, the Title IV-E Project staff meets regularly with Collections staff to ensure adherence established policies and procedures. Information regarding stipend repayments is inputted into CSIS on a quarterly basis.

The Project Coordinator is a member of the SFSU MSW Committee. This committee is responsible for overseeing all aspects of MSW curriculum in the School of Social Work and meets on a monthly basis. As a member of the MSW Committee, the Project Coordinator discusses curricular issues with faculty and lectures and is able to monitor how Title IV-E competencies are being infused in the general social work curriculum. To ensure all competencies are being addressed, the Title IV-E Project Coordinator supplements school course work with Title IV-E trainings. These trainings are mandatory for Title IV-E students and address a wide range of child welfare specific topics. The efficacy of these trainings is monitored in several ways. The Project Coordinator convened a subcommittee of the MSW Committee to specifically review the current Title IV-E trainings and receive recommendations on training content. These recommendations are being used to update and revise the Title IV-E trainings being scheduled for students. In addition, Title IV-E students complete self-evaluations that address the infusion of curriculum competencies in field placements and school curriculum. The students are asked to assess their level of mastery of each competency and identify specific courses, Title IV-E trainings or field placement where the knowledge was obtained. These self-evaluations are used to identify areas that need to be strengthened to ensure mastery of CalSWEC curriculum competencies.

Many CalSWEC competencies are met while students are participating in field internships. Title IV-E students participate in 2 different internship placements. Field placements in the 1st year are generally conducted in a non-profit agency serving Title IV-E clients. 1st year students meet with the Field Director to discuss internship possibilities for their 1st year placements. Based on information provided to the Field Director, students are referred to appropriate Title IV-E eligible internships. The student's contact the agency's Field Instructor and undergoes an interview to determine if the agency is a good match and will meet the student's educational

needs. Once an appropriate agency is found a placement agreement is signed by all parties. The students are expected to incorporate foundation CalSWEC competencies into their 1st year learning agreement. The 2nd year placement field placement occurs in a county public child welfare agency. The Project Coordinator is responsible for coordination of the 2nd year field placement. The goal of the 2nd year placement is to provide students with broad exposure to child welfare services and provide an opportunity for students to experience direct case management services to children and families involved with the child welfare system. Students are expected to incorporate advanced CalSWEC competencies into their 2nd year learning agreements.

The Project Coordinator works with the Office of Research Special Projects (ORSP) on the administration of the Title IV-E grant money. The Project Coordinator collaborates with both an ORSP Pre-Grant and Post-Grant Administrator. The Project Coordinator and the Pre-Grant Administrator develop the project budget, as well as compile and submit all necessary paperwork to CalSWEC for the upcoming fiscal year in order to continue participation in the project. The Post-Grant Administrator works with the Project Coordinator to ensure execution of the Master Title IV-E contract with CalSWEC and compliance with the awarded funds. The Title IV-E Project currently provides SFSU 3 FTEs for instructional costs for Title IV-E students. The number of FTEs is determined by student enrollment in the project. Each semester Reimbursed Release Time Agreements and Time and Effort Reports are completed to account for these costs and reimburse the school. In addition, the Project Coordinator and Project Assistant monitor project expenses, complete and submit all necessary paperwork to ORSP on an on-going basis. Quarterly meetings are held with ORSP and Fiscal Affairs to discuss all project related issues, promote effective communication and ensure compliance with CalSWEC and SFSU policies and procedures.

CalSWEC requires that the Project Coordinator, or delegate, attend state wide meetings three times per year. Policy issues that impact the state wide program are discussed during these sessions. It is also an opportunity to receive input and feedback from other Project Coordinator's and CalSWEC staff regarding project issues or concerns. The Project Coordinator represents SFSU as a voting member at CalSWEC Child Welfare Committee meetings. This committee is responsible for leading and overseeing curriculum, stipend, and other issues of social work education pertaining to public child welfare. In addition, the Project Coordinator is a member of the Bay Area Collaborative. This is a collaborative between the Bay Area graduate school's of social work and Bay Area county child welfare agencies. Collaborative meetings are held every 2 months and are used as a forum to ensure cooperation between the schools and county child welfare agencies. The collaborative sponsors a yearly Field Placement Informational Meeting to provide students with information regarding 2nd year county field placement options and the 2nd year placement process. The collaborative provides vital information for Title IV-E student, which is communicated by their Project Coordinator that allows them to negotiate the program more effectively.

TAB Report

The Training Advisory Board (TAB) was established in 1997 by Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) and is coordinated by the Bay Area Academy. To insure a strong

connection with BASSC, the Vice-Chair of BASSC serves as the Chair of TAB. The charge of TAB is to advise the Academy staff on planning and implementing the annual regional training plan. This board is comprised of two representatives from each county (the child welfare services administrator and staff development director), and invited CalSWEC representatives. BASSC Directors are responsible for designating two TAB members, one of who serves as Chair of the TAB. The Training Advisory Board meets on a quarterly basis.

The regional training plan reflects training priorities of the public child welfare agencies served by the Bay Area Academy. These training priorities are reflective of best practice standards and new and evolving regulations within the field of public child welfare. Understanding the nature and scope of these priorities is imperative for the success of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project. Title IV-E recipients are required to complete their 2nd year field internship within a public child welfare agency and to seek employment in public child welfare agencies upon graduation. Training they receive while placed in these internships will be reflective of regional training plan and child welfare practice in the Bay Area. To ensure that students are prepared for this endeavor, the university must understand these content areas and be prepared to support and assist students with their mastery. The content areas identified in the regional training plan is often incorporated into child welfare specific practice classes with the goal of ensuring that students are incorporating knowledge into practice.

The field of child welfare is ever changing and evolving. It is imperative for child welfare professionals to receive on-going training and support. TAB promotes continued professional development by setting priorities for child welfare training in the Bay Area and ensuring these training priorities are implemented. Therefore, TAB serves as a leader for the continued professionalization of the field of public child welfare which is also the mission of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project.

Title IV-E Current Student Survey

A survey was sent to all 1st and 2nd year Title IV-E students via survey monkey. There are currently 16 2nd year students and 14 1st year students enrolled in the Title IV-E program. Of the 30 surveys that were sent, 13 2nd year students and 11 1st year students responded. The survey contained 5 quantitative questions were students were asked to rank levels of the following: satisfaction with the Title IV-E program; effectiveness of workshops; integration of competencies in curriculum; responsiveness of staff; and communication. The students were asked to use the rating scale of not at all, somewhat, basically, mostly and completely. The students were also asked 6 qualitative questions regarding the program.

The Title IV-E students are basically satisfied with the Title IV-E program, however, there are challenges that were noted that need to be addressed. Most of these challenges appear to stem from staffing transitions within the Title IV-E program, especially that of the Project Coordinator. The Project Coordinator was not in place at the beginning of the semester and this created a void for many students. Overall, students indicated the primary areas of concern were communication and field seminar. Many students reported that requirements and expectation of the program were not clearly communicated. They expressed a need for more detailed explanations in areas such as stipend distribution, field placement process and general

Title IV-E requirements. Many students stated that the focus of field seminar needed to shift and that increased structure was needed. Students expressed a desire to have more child welfare specific content within field seminar to bolster and support their learning.

Students appear to be most satisfied with the Title IV-E trainings. Students expressed a desire to continue to receive child welfare specific trainings and felt the trainings are effective in addressing CalSWEC competencies.

Recommendations:

Increase communication between Title IV-E staff and students by:

Reviewing and revising Title IV-E manual;

Conducting an orientation for Title IV-E students regarding program requirements;

Developing a calendar of important dates for Title IV-E students;

Conducting mid-semester individual check-in meetings with students;

Increasing email communication with Title IV-E students;

Hosting Title IV-E meetings mid-semester to discuss program issues and upcoming events.

Review and revise syllabi for field seminars to ensure inclusion of child welfare specific content.

Incorporate discussions of 2nd year field placement process in 1st year field seminar.

Incorporate discussion of job search process in 2nd year field seminar.

Increase trainings and meetings that allow cohorts to intermingle.

Survey students once per year.

Title IV-E Alumni Survey

A survey was sent to all Title IV-E alumni via survey monkey. There were 206 surveys that were sent to alumni of which 35 were sent to email addresses which were no longer valid. Of the 171 surveys which were delivered there were 37 responses to the survey. The survey included 9 quantitative questions where alumni were asked to rank their responses. The ranks were as follows: not at all, very little, some (medium amount), quite a bit, and a lot (significant amount). There were 8 questions in which a qualitative response was requested. The graduation years of the respondents were from 1999 to 2008.

The respondents appeared to be satisfied with both the overall social work program and the Title IV-E program at SFSU. In discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the MSW program, several students indicated specific faculty that had significant positive impacts on their learning. Overall, respondents rated the MSW curriculum favorably, however a few felt that courses needed to be more rigorous and that they were not academically challenged. Respondents also felt that they would have benefited from more clinically oriented classes. Respondents indicated that field placements were critical to their social work education. Most of the respondents had favorable experiences in field placement however a few remarked on the need for increased communication between the school and field instructors and the need for increased support of students when they were experiencing difficulty. Several students also remarked that although they mastered CalSWEC curriculum competencies, they did not fully understand their value until they were employed in a child welfare agency. In discussing the

quality and impact of the Title IV-E program, respondents were almost unanimously positive. In particular respondents noted that workshops and child welfare specific classes were strengths.

Recommendations:

- Provide training/workshops on clinical issues relevant to child welfare practice.
- Increase student knowledge and awareness of how CalSWEC curriculum competencies relate to best practice.
- Continue to provide child welfare specific trainings and course material.
- Continue to provide high quality internships that prepare students for child welfare practice.
- Continue to solicit alumni feedback regarding the MSW and Title IV-E programs.

Mental Health Educational Stipend Project Review
San Francisco State University
School of Social Work

March, 2009

Sheila Hembury, LCSW, CPRP

In 2004, Californians passed Proposition 63, a 1% tax on people with incomes over one million dollars to create a new fund to support recovery-based mental health treatment services to allow people with serious and persistent mental illness to survive and thrive in the community through appropriate, available services. This bill, now called the Mental Health Services Act, contains many parts—all directed to transforming the mental health system to be consistent with the President’s New Freedom Commission on Mental Health’s recommendations.

The first major effort of the act focuses on developing a culturally, linguistically and competent workforce to better serve the diverse communities of California.

Prior to passage of this act, the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) had been working together to develop competencies needed for a masters’ level social worker in the public mental health system. Because of this readiness, CalSWEC was able to contract with the California Department of Mental Health (DMH) to obtain stipends for second year MSW students interested in public mental health. San Francisco State University asked for and was granted ten (10) stipends per year. The students were granted \$18,500 for their second year of graduate school, and are expected to “payback” the grant with one year of work in public mental health.

We are currently educating the fourth cohort of this program, and the next two years (2009-10 and 2010-11) will complete the cycle of funds from CalSWEC’s partnership with the DMH.

Year	Students Completed	Fulfilled /ing “payback”	In process of work/payback	Currently in public m.h.
2005-06	10	8	2	8
2006-07	10	6	4	4
2007-08	9	6	3	6

The current year's cohort of 10 are currently completing their public mental health internships and will be looking for a qualifying position that will payback their grant.

Overview of the stipend students from 2005-2009:

A total of 39 students have completed (or are completing) the educational program.

Ethnicities:

- Asian/Pacific Islander: 10
- African-American: 3
- Latino/Hispanic: 6
- Multiethnic: 2

Languages spoken:

- Spanish: 10
- Cantonese/Mandarin: 7
- Tagalog: 1
- European languages: 2
- American Sign Language: 1

In addition, three (3) students meet a large underserved need in the SF Bay Area—for transgender-sensitive social workers. (All three are transgendered themselves.)

A survey was sent to all 39 of the program recipients for their feedback. Thirty-four (34) responded, a response rate of 87.1%.

Survey results highlights:

1. 25 students (76% of respondents) are currently working in public mental health.
2. Almost 70% were Individuals, Family and Groups emphasis students. The rest were equally divided between Administration & Planning, Social Action and Change and PPSC credential students.
3. At graduation, 90.9% felt that they were competent (minimally, competent and very competent); at the time of the survey, 81.8% rated themselves as competent, very competent or **skilled**.
4. In order of importance, the students felt the following best prepared them for public mental health work:
 - a. Second-year internship, 56.8%
 - b. SSW coursework, 59.4 (see helpful classes listed, below)
 - c. MHSA program training, 37.5%
5. "Most helpful" classes:
 - a. SW 810: Health Illness and Disordered Behavior (11, 32.3%)
 - b. SW 730: Casework (9, 26.4%)

- c. SW 740/741: Field & Seminar (6, 17.6%)
- d. SW 830: Advanced Casework (5, 14.7%)

The students rated their own current evaluation of their value-base, skills and practice in public mental health. In order of importance, they were:

1. Is an advocate for clients' rights
2. Strives to involve consumers and families in all aspects of work
3. Provides services in the least restrictive/most appropriate setting
4. Promotes recovery, wellness, hope and resiliency for adults and children
5. Promotes the use of self-help peer support and education
6. Provides culturally and linguistically competent services
7. Assists recovering clients to have a constructive, satisfying lifestyle
8. Promotes high priority, accessible services for people with serious MH needs
9. Addresses the special needs of person with co-occurring disorders or other multiple vulnerabilities.

When asked for advice about the top three topics the Mental Health Project training should provide for students, the responses follow:

	Most important	Very important	Also essential	Response Count
Recovery and wellness	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)	7
Self-care, avoiding burnout	57.1% (4)	42.9% (3)	0.0% (0)	7
Psychosocial rehabilitation v. medical model	33.3% (2)	50.0% (3)	16.7% (1)	6
Consumer/family voice, perspectives	33.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	66.7% (2)	3
Lived experience vs. diagnostic	0.0% (0)	66.7% (2)	33.3% (1)	3

labels				
Mental health policy, systems information	100.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1
Assessment skills	30.0% (3)	40.0% (4)	30.0% (3)	10
DSM-IV	33.3% (2)	50.0% (3)	16.7% (1)	6
Strengths-focused skills	37.5% (3)	25.0% (2)	37.5% (3)	8
Evaluating risk and danger	50.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (2)	4
Culturally-focused rehab skills	25.0% (1)	25.0% (1)	50.0% (2)	4
MHSA and systems transformation issues	25.0% (1)	75.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	4
Transference and counter transference	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (2)	2
Best practices/evidence-based practice	55.6% (5)	44.4% (4)	0.0% (0)	9
Substance abuse & motivational interviewing	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (2)	2

Documentation skills	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	66.7% (2)	3
Ethical and boundary issues	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	33.3% (1)	3
Skills for working side-by-side with consumers	0.0% (0)	40.0% (2)	60.0% (3)	5

Students were also asked what classroom learning the SSW should provide for students interested in public mental health, the students rated:

Most important	Very important	Also essential	Response Count	
Recovery and wellness	33.3% (2)	66.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	6
Self-care, avoiding burnout	25.0% (2)	50.0% (4)	25.0% (2)	8
Psychosocial rehabilitation v. medical model	50.0% (3)	16.7% (1)	33.3% (2)	6
Advanced social work practice skills	66.7% (4)	33.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	6
Groupwork skills	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	1
Assessment/treatment-planning skills	46.2% (6)	30.8% (4)	23.1% (3)	13
DSM-IV and culture-	27.3% (3)	18.2% (2)	54.5% (6)	11

bound syndromes				1
Strengths-focused skills	50.0% (4)	37.5% (3)	12.5% (1)	8
Evaluating risk and danger	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (1)	1
Cultural and linguistic competence	60.0% (3)	20.0% (1)	20.0% (1)	5
Intervention skills	25.0% (3)	41.7% (5)	33.3% (4)	1 2
Transference and counter transference	25.0% (1)	50.0% (2)	25.0% (1)	4
Best practices/evidence-based practice	66.7% (4)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	6
Substance abuse	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (2)	2
Motivational interviewing	40.0% (2)	40.0% (2)	20.0% (1)	5
Documentation skills	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	2
Ethical and boundary issues	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	2

In summary, all students who enrolled in the program completed at least the educational parts of the program (one student has not completed all requirements for the MSW, and is working on completing his culminating project.) All expressed that they learned a good deal from their educational, field experience and MHSA training program. A final quotation from the respondents:

“My most important teachers have been my own clients through all my years of experience. Each client represents a different world and culture. It is important for social workers to be skilled in cultural awareness and competency in order to work with clients from the place where they are at least at that particular time in their lives. Compassion, understanding, patience and acceptance are important tools for social workers to have when working with the mentally-ill population.”

Mental Health Educational Stipend Project Review

2008-09 COHORT (Expanded)

San Francisco State University

School of Social Work

May, 2009

Sheila Hembury, LCSW, CPRP

As the program year ends for the students in this year’s mental health educational stipend project, a survey was undertaken to evaluate the training provided through the program. All ten students are in the process of completing their field placements in public mental health. The agencies are a mix of publicly provided mental health services in three counties, and behavioral health contract agencies such as Instituto Familiar de la Raza, Citywide Case Management, Boys and Girls Club Behavioral Health, the Y-Team and Foster Youth Services. Students are serving families, children, adolescents/transitional youth, adults and older adults. In a roundtable meeting in January 2009, students talked about what they learned last semester. Some of the major themes follow (in students’ own words at times.)

Taking care of self: They learned or were reminded about “space to respect self, nourish hopes and dreams and space to continue learning and being nurtured.” More self acceptance, balance, knowledge of the potential for burnout and awareness of vicarious trauma issues emerged. “In my focus on others, I found ways not to leave me out.”

Cultural Competence: Many students talked about constantly learning about engagement, bringing one’s whole self to the work, and “getting to know and understand life situations of people seen as offenders of others.”

Practice skills: “I got out of my comfort zone.” They reported being more aware of skills, coping mechanisms, group, individual intervention and assessment skills, self-management and emotional regulation, and the therapeutic understanding that “there is no quick fix.”

All felt some fear about finding a great public mental health job in these times of funding problems. To their credit, all are thinking about the big issues: understanding people who are different, factoring in the role of trauma, poverty, discrimination, stigma and disability, and moving away from the medical model of treatment toward an expanded model of recovery.

The training this year included the following:

- Motivational Interviewing 1/21/09 (provided by Title IV-E)
- Psychosocial Rehabilitation 1/24/09
- Consumer and Recovery Issues 2/2/09
- Hearing Voices that are Distressing 2/28/09
- California Association of Social Rehab Agencies Conference 4/7 & 4/8/09

The survey, in April, asked students to rate their experiences from most recent to the earlier trainings. The survey was sent to ten (10) current students, and additionally to one (1) student from the 2009-10 cohort who chose to go to the conference on her own. There were eight responses, but only 70% of the current year's students responded. The CASRA conference was cafeteria-style and offered full and half day institutes on the first day, a plenary and three slots to choose 90 minute workshops.

CASRA Conference

One student felt that the conference was “a waste of time” primarily because of a lack of focus on children and youth’s mental health needs. The majority—87.5%--felt the conference was a “great investment” or a “good value.”

Many of the questions asked students to rate on a five-point scale from not at all (1) to significantly (5.) The top expectations met by the CASRA conference were:

1. Reinforcing your value base (4.63)
2. Increasing your mental health competencies (4.5)
3. Preparing you for public mental health (4.5)
4. Raising important questions (4.5)
5. Challenging your practice (4.5)

Some of the comments made by students about the experience follow.

- Understanding human experience outside the DSM
- Recognizing the inherent capacity for reparation and resilience
- Laughter promotes healing
- Recognizing that within the states of recovery, we as workers often automatically live within the action stage while our clients can be in any of the stages of recovery. Knowing this will enable me to appreciate the potential discrepancy more and evaluate it better. I like that it emphasized empowerment, and recognized that we may all be “consumers” at some point in our lives
- It was inspiring to be around folks that truly believe in recovery, hope and healing
- It reminded me to include spirituality practice
- Building relationships is so important
- Learning how to hear clients’ stories and frame them in terms that give more potential to clients
- I gained greater self-awareness and understanding of trauma
- I was extremely disappointed that there was not one session with children and youth—parallel to SFSU’s program. It seems crazy to me to address mental health issues with adults without considering early intervention or prevention.
- It was a wonderful, inspiring experience where I learned more than I could have imagined.

Hearing Voices that are Distressing

This curriculum was developed by Patricia Deegan, Ph.D from her long experience as a mental health client and “voice hearer.” It included listening to a tape simulating the voice-hearers’ experience while doing a variety of tasks. It was a half-day experience which integrally involved some consumer leaders, and providers in the community.

All of the students rated this experience as significant (5 on scale.) In addition, they felt that the experience will impact their future learning (4.63), stayed with them in the intervening time (4.38) and that they learned things about themselves that will inform their work (4.25.)

Some of the comments made by students about the experience follow.

- Great training! I felt it focused on providing me with a different perspective.
- I loved the exercise! I appreciate having the opportunity to hear the stories of the folks that assisted with the exercise.
- Really enjoyed this; more compassion for challenges around hearing voices.
- Excellent training—perhaps the most significant one and one that will stay with me.

Psychosocial Rehabilitation and Recovery (Two sessions facilitated by Sheila Hembury, MHSP Coordinator)

Again using a scale of 1-5, in which 5 means “significant” the students rated the overall training:

- I improved my competencies (4.63)
- I learned new knowledge or skills (4.63)
- Will improve my future practice (4.5)
- Overall rating of the training (4.38)
- I learned something about myself (4.25)

When asked to identify the “nuggets of gold” that they learned, all of the comments noted either the integral role of the consumer’s voice and experience in the design of their recovery, or the importance of deepening self-awareness. One student summed it up when she quoted Pat Deegan, Ph.D., who called for:

“Not mainstreaming everything and everybody,
but creating a wide-stream where all are accepted as we...”

Mental Health Competencies

Self-reflection ratings on a set of principles that frame the CalSWEC competencies MHSP students are to obtain during this program showed that students are graduating with a sense of themselves as either skilled or highly skilled/expert in eight (8) of nine (9) areas.

They leave with a number of priority skills they will continue to refine:

- Culturally competent practice (2)

- Theoretical and treatment approaches (DBT, CBT, somatic-based trauma work, Motivational Interviewing, Harm Reduction, etc.) (7)
- Assessment, including trauma assessment, case formulation, treatment planning (5)
- More knowledge about substance abuse, dual diagnosis, integrated services, stages of recovery (5)
- Anything youth oriented
- Strengthen clinical and diagnostic skills
- Learning to turn agencies into recovery providers

Students were asked what they think would make the project better for students in the future. Their responses follow:

- I believe that in the overall, this experience has been beneficial. I appreciate that Professor Hembury always tried to be very accommodating in her chosen dates for the training, despite encountering some resistance.
- If the School of Social Work administration could prepare students further ahead of time.
- Offering a class during the regular semester to cover the content of the trainings-- I know that Sheila tried to do this during the winter session, but it was too late for most of us to fulfill our unit requirements. Clear information regarding taxes would have been very helpful. Overall, I am very happy with the project, Sheila's role and what I am taking with me as I graduate. I only wish there were some jobs out there.
- Timing was fair and flexible, did not interfere with my classes, work and internship. I would recommend inviting experts in mental health in the seminar and core classes to help students better understand the mental health system and politics in San Francisco. Content of the MHSP should always be very comprehensive and multi-activity oriented.
- Perhaps have seminars be a 2 credit class? Work on having counties give preference to stipended students for available jobs.
- Overall it was a great experience and I learned much more to help me understand the field of mental health. I learned more about treatment, trauma and self-care. Also I realize that there is more of a connection to individuals going through difficulties that are affecting their mental health, than separation. I also appreciated seeing the connection between consumers and providers. When you provided food it was great, and the tea and salad reminds me of the time I participated, but most importantly you. I think there is no need for improvement since you did a gr4eat job in trying to keep us informed and flexible in scheduling the training.
- I would really like to suggest trainings that address working with children, students, youth. There was nothing that addressed this age group. It is outrageous to me to think about working in the mental health field without having significant trainings ion this area—especially when there are many folks who work with this population.

- I believe it would be great for MHSP students to share a seminar, and then be able to exchange emphasis-specific experience with the other stipend students rather than being spread over a variety of seminars. This leads to my general critique of the handling of the emphases. As I consider my specialization within social work mental health, I would rather have my SAC emphasis inform my mental health specialization. At the moment, it tends to feel as if I have to defend my specialization against the emphasis which is sometimes within the program interpreted as a pure focus on macro-level involvement. However, I'd rather see it as a good foundation for advocacy within my interest in mental health work which spans micro, mezzo and macro work.

The final comments from the survey follow:

- Thank you for your heartfelt trainings and for sharing your passion for social work. I think we all appreciated the yummy lunches and your enthusiasm and many years of experience in the field of mental health. I am sorry about missing the last hour or so of CASRA—I admit it was poor planning on my part. Keep well.
- The experience provided by Ms. Hembury was a wonderful and valuable experience that complemented my academic course work.
- Thanks Sheila for all your hard work! It is clear that you really care about shaping us into good mental health workers and I am very grateful for that! I admire you for your optimism and positivity, especially when you had to deal with some serious attitudes within our stipend group. I don't know how you do it, but I'm happy that you do! It's been a pleasure working with you, too!
- I really enjoyed the MHSP training and all the valuable tools and resources you have given us. Your level of integrity, dedication, inspiration, friendly attitude, sense of humor and role model has definitely made my MSW journey an immense and rich experience. Sheila, I really appreciate your great work, thanks so much for everything and GOD bless you.
- Thanks for all your support. You are a great caring person and your actions say enough. I really appreciate your support in our job search as well.
- Thanks for all of your hard work and dedication to the program!!
- This is a great survey! It enabled me to rethink my experiences during the conference and to shape my anticipation of the events of the stipend program. The only question I have regarding the survey method is whether the questions that ask participants to rate their own skills could maybe reformulated into questions that ask about how the trainings and the conference have helped develop one's skills. It can be really hard to honestly evaluate one's own skills. It either feels too modest or too self-assured, at least for me. (MHSP student for 2009-10 who attended CASRA conference in preparation for her program next year.)

Pupil Personnel Service Credentials (PPSC)

School Social Work

Program Design, Rationale and Coordination

The program is coordinated effectively in accordance with a cohesive design that has a cogent rationale. Foundation and theoretical courses precede and are designed to be taken prior to more specialized and advanced courses.

Background

In the early 1970's, the School of Social Work developed its initial curricula required for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC). It has maintained an accredited PPSC program and produced school social workers for approximately 30 years. Over the years the PPSC program design has evolved from one that had an affiliation with the Counseling Department to one that is now self-contained within the School of Social Work and is programmatically based in the School's Social Work Practice with Individuals, Families and Groups (IFG) Concentration. In addition to the concentration requirements, PPSC candidates are required to complete specialized course work in social work practice in school settings. The evolution of the curricular structure to its present design is the result of a variety of forces including socio-economic conditions in the social environment, faculty input, consultation with school social workers in the field, public school administrators, and involvement with community based collaborations in a variety of geographic locations that are attempting to develop "wrap around" services addressing multiple issues and problems.

Organizational Structure of the PPSC Credential Program

The Director of the school hires/appoints the PPSC Coordinator.

The PPSC Coordinator administers and coordinates all aspects of the Pre and Post Master's Degree (CEL) PPSC Program, including the following duties:

- Disseminate information and/or advertise to recruit PPSC students.
- Conduct information meetings and sessions for prospective students.
- Create and continuously update application information and application form.
- Respond to queries and requests for information.
- Receive, review, analyze, assess, and evaluate applications.
- Admit qualified students into the program.

- Evaluate student portfolios and determine what they must do to meet all PPSC requirements.
- Admit eligible students, and communicate with them about their ongoing status in the program.
- Work with and advise all students in the cohort group. Assist each student with work and efforts that must be completed for the PPSC from point of inception into the program through program completion.
- Keep accurate and complete records in the School of Social Work Office, including documents pertaining to applicants, for at least 6 years.
- Provide reports to School of Social Work director and faculty that include the number of admitted students, pertinent background information, number of applicants, and important issues that arose with regard to the program and students.
- Keep the School Director informed of all aspects, components, and issues of the PPSC Program, especially when they impinge on the Program, School, and University.
- Arrange to have student evaluations of teaching effectiveness forms disseminated to all PPSC classes, for CEL and on campus classes.
- Create assessment/evaluation forms and distribute them to all students before they graduate or complete the program. This assessment focuses on all aspects of the PPSC program, including the curriculum, program, administration, and practices.
- Turn in assessments and evaluations to the Director, and provide discussion of results.
- Meets with school district personnel to discuss, develop, and secure school site placements for pre-MSW students
- Participate in the NCATE evaluation process with the School of Education including providing assessment data, reports, and documents for the re-accreditation process.
- Maintain accreditation of the PPSC program from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Submit created forms and documents to the School Director for review and approval prior to dissemination.
- Create course schedules and arrange for instruction of all courses required for the PPSC.

Compensation: The Pre and Post MSW PPSC Coordinator will receive a .3 position for administration of the campus-based and CEL – funded PPSC Programs. For the .3 compensation, the campus-based program may have 20-25 students, and the CEL Post-Master’s Program may

have 20 students. If the number of post-master's CEL students exceeds 20, then an additional honorarium will be provided as follows: \$2,000 for an additional 20 students. If there are more or less than 20 additional students, then the proportionate amount will apply (\$100 honorarium per student over the base 20 students).

Major oversight and enforcement of PPSC requirements in the graduate MSW program.

Graduate students in social work who are interested in obtaining the PPSC must be initially admitted to the MSW program in its Social Work Practice with Individuals Families and Groups (IFG) Concentration. Once accepted to the program, these students meet with the School's PPSC Coordinator to discuss their educational and career goals. The PPSC Coordinator works with the students to develop an individualized plan of study that incorporates programmatic and credential requirements. In addition, the PPSC Coordinator works in cooperation with the School's Director of Field Education to develop second year field education placements for PPSC students, consistent with the requirements of the MSW program and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Once students are placed in their field education agencies, the PPSC Coordinator serves as their faculty PPSC liaison, whose role is to assure the educational quality of the students' experience in their field education placement.

Students admitted to the Administration and Planning and Social, Action, and Change concentrations are eligible for the PPSC and must create a unique plan with the coordinator to meet eligibility for the credential.

Coordination of the Program Within the School and the University

The PPSC coordinator meets regular with the Director of the school to discuss program concerns. The coordinator also participates in the MSW committee and IFG committee meetings to the extent possible.

In addition to the procedures described above, the School of Social Work has the following School committees which address issues that both directly and indirectly bear upon the program's adherence to PPSC requirements. All committees meet monthly, report regularly to the School of Social Work faculty at scheduled meetings, and make proposals for new programs or programmatic revisions when faculty action is needed. Each committee also writes an annual report summarizing its activities for the previous year.

School of Social Work Committees. Major Functions and Composition:

- *Director's Advisory Committee*

Assists the Director in determining issues to be brought before the faculty at its meetings and with business not falling within the responsibility of existing School of Social Work committees. Assists the Director in those decision making situations where it is not possible for the entire faculty to take action –e.g. an emergency or crisis. Serves as the School's Strategic Planning Committee.

Composition: Five faculty, selected annually by the Director. Membership rotates each year.

- *Hiring, Retention, Tenure and Promotions Committee*

Functions as prescribed by the University's Faculty Manual and procedures approved by School of Social Work faculty.

Composition: Five tenured faculty, who are elected by tenure track faculty in the School of Social Work to 3-year staggered terms.

- *Admissions Committee*

Recommends admissions policies and procedures to faculty; establishes and implements procedures for the evaluation of applicants; designs and implements a School of Social Work plan for the recruitment and selection of students.

Composition: Five faculty, appointed by the Director annually, and two students elected by the MSW student caucus.

- *Curriculum Committee*

Reviews MSW course and field education curricula and makes recommendations to the faculty for curricular changes and additions, including the development of new courses. Reviews field work policies and procedures and recommends revisions to the faculty as needed.

Composition: Six faculty - the Director of Field Education, the Coordinator of the Undergraduate Program, the Chairs of the three MSW Concentrations, and the Coordinator of the first-year MSW Curriculum – all appointed by the Director on an annual basis, and two students, elected by the MSW student caucus.

In addition to these School of Social Work committees, the MSW program is represented on the College Council of the College of Health and Human Services and, through the School of Social Work Director on the Planning Committee of the College.

The School of Social Work has an active Field Education Community Advisory Board, coordinated by the Director of Field Education. This committee meets four times each year to assess the field education curriculum, and makes recommendations to the faculty regarding changes in the field education curriculum and field education placement policies and procedures. One member of this committee is a school social worker whom the School of Social Work utilizes as field instructor for students in its PPSC Program. Through the Field Education program, the School also provides Orientation Seminars for field instructors (which includes content on the PPSC and school social work) and agency executives, content seminars for issues relevant to field education which link the curriculum directly to field education, the annual Field Fair for over 100 agencies in the Bay Area including several school districts, and faculty field liaisons who visit the agencies on behalf of the School to assist the student and agency in designing and monitoring internships to meet the requirements of the credential and the School.

To summarize, the School of Social Work maintains ongoing contacts with professional associations and the broader practice community within the social service field, in general, and the field of school-based social services in particular.

Overall Design of the Program

The central goal of the School of Social Work's MSW program is the education of graduates capable of advanced social work practice in and of communities that are economically

disadvantaged and oppressed where the problems of powerlessness and disenfranchisement are endemic. This goal arose out of the conviction that racism, sexism, ageism, social inequality and injustice affect large numbers of urban families, whose major needs are for social and economic empowerment to improve their life chances and the life chances of their children. The institutional arrangements that perpetuate these egregious social conditions must, in the School's view, either be reformed drastically or radically changed within the parameters of a truly democratic society.

The educational design of the MSW program is both consistent with this mission and meets the objective of preparing students for advanced social work practice.

All students complete an Urban Generalist core, consisting of 24 units, and an advanced curriculum, consisting of 36 units. The total of 60 units includes 10 units in the field practicum and 4 units in the concurrent field education seminars. The first year Urban Generalist core presents students with an integrative framework of knowledge, skills and values directly related to the challenges involved in addressing the needs of urban, disenfranchised populations.

Required first year courses include:

- SW 700-History and Philosophy of Social Welfare
- SW 710-Human Behavior and the Social Environment
- SW 720-Research Methods in Social Work
- SW 730-Social Work Practice Methods
- SW 740-Field Education (two semesters, two days/week)
- SW 741-Field Seminar (two semesters)
- SW 770-Ethnic and Cultural Concepts and Principles I
- SW 771-Ethnic and Cultural Concepts and Principles II

The School of Social Work has adopted social systems theory, developmental theory, social psychology and modern political-economy as the conceptual frameworks for urban practice. In the Urban Generalist core, completed within the first year of the full-time program, students are introduced to the basic principles and processes of these theories and are educated to apply these principles and processes to different practice situations and with different client populations.

In addition, the foundation curriculum is based on the assumption that the urban environment is an arena in which interest groups compete for resources and power; and that the complex nature of the U.S. urban experience creates problem areas and individuals. Instead of producing social workers who accept problems as traditionally defined, the MSW program strives to develop practitioners who view these problems as points of departure for working toward the enhancement of the quality of urban life.

Beginning with two courses in the second semester of the first year, MSW students pursue specialized practice roles. All students in the PPSC Program complete the requirements of the Social Work Practice with Individuals, Families and Groups Concentration. This concentration focuses on the delivery of services to individuals, couples, families and groups in a manner that reflects the School's mission and philosophy. The personal needs and goals of clients are understood to be intricately related to the effects of the environment in determining their life

chances and structuring their daily experiences. Social Work Practice with Individuals, Families and Groups students are taught to facilitate the satisfaction of those needs and goals in a manner that brings immediately constructive results, while promoting personal development. Within this framework, human development serves as the medium as well as the context for purposeful change.

Required courses for students in the Social Work Practice with Individuals, Families and Groups Concentration includes:

- SW 701-Social Policy Analysis
 - SW 721-Evaluative Research Methods
- or
- SW 820-Advanced Research Methodology in Social Work
 - SW 740-Field Work (two semesters, three days/week)
 - SW 741-Field Seminar (two semesters)
 - SW 810-Health, Illness, and Disordered Behavior
 - SW 830-Social Casework
 - SW 831-Advanced Casework
 - SW 832-Social Group Work or • SW 833, Advanced Group Work
 - SW 895-Research or Professional Practice Project in Social Work
- or
- SW 898-Master's Thesis
- An additional elective from any concentration:

Social Work Practice with Individuals, Families and Groups students also generally complete the following elective courses:

- SW 800-Program Planning and Program Development
- SW 831, Advanced Casework

In addition, all students in the PPSC Program must complete the following four courses:

- SW 855-Social Work Practice in School Settings
- SW 741-Seminar in Field Instruction (Fall) Dedicated content based seminar.
- SW 741-Seminar in Field Instruction (Spring) Dedicated content based seminar.
- SW 760-Social Work and Law

Students in the PPSC Program, with a specialization in school social work, complete two field instruction seminars that are content based.

Post-MSW PPSC Program

On January 29, 2007, San Francisco State's School of Social Work faculty voted to approve a beginning cohort of Post-Masters candidates for the PPS credential. The school is accredited to provide this credential training for our matriculating students and the coursework expectations are the same for Post-Masters candidates.

In the fall of 2007, 18 candidates entered the first post-MSW PPSC cohort and participated in classes offered through the College of Extended Learning. In the summer of 2008, 21 candidates participated in the second cohort. Typically, at a minimum, candidates take SW 760 Social Work And The Law class (3 units), SW 741 the PPSC field content seminar (1 unit), and SW 855 Social Work Practice In Public School Settings, the core school social work practice course (3 units) for a total of 7 units.

The admissions criteria for post-MSW PPSC candidates is as follows:

Admissions Process:

Applicants should meet the following criteria:

- A. Have graduated from a CSWE accredited MSW program. Official copies of the MSW transcript and transcripts for all other graduate level work must be provided.
 - B. Have completed the necessary field experience required for the PPSC while in the MSW program or after having received the MSW. If the internship is not complete, the applicant should be in the process of completing field experience through employment or volunteer work in a public school setting. (Field placements are the applicant's responsibility to obtain.) The internship must meet the following requirements of the PPSC:
 1. The school site/ internship experience must be under the supervision of a person holding a PPS credential. That person must be willing to sign off on written documentation of the hours completed, to verify the type of settings, and to provide a copy of their valid PPSC.
 2. The field supervisor must be able to verify that the applicant has completed, or is in the process of completing, at least 450 clock hours of school-based practice under his/her supervision, of which a minimum 100 hours are with at least ten (10) pupils of an ethnic background different from that of the candidate. The school assignment must take place with at least two age groups (preschool, elementary, middle, high school) with a minimum of 100 clock hours at the secondary site, not to exclude district services and programs or alternative school settings. Field supervisors also should document experiences in individual and group practice with male and female school aged children of diverse ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds, and working with parents, school staff, and community resources. These tasks should be documented by utilizing the Verification of Standards form.
 - C. Provide a one page cover letter that describes why he or she is pursuing the PPSC credential.
- All candidates will need to complete the courses currently required of PPSC students at San Francisco State University's School of Social Work program. The PPSC coordinator will determine course equivalencies from the applicant's transcript. Transcripts will be reviewed upon receipt of the application, and the applicant will receive information about required coursework at the time of admission. Applicants who did not earn their

MSW from SFSU may need to take an additional course or courses depending on their transcript. Coursework in ethnic and cultural awareness is necessary (Equivalent to SW 770/771).

- Candidates will register and pay fees for required classes through Open University/the College of Extended Learning. (Students must obtain a university identification number.)
- After receiving notice of admission, candidates must pay the application/administration expense of \$950 in the form of a check addressed to SFSU School of Social Work PPSC Program.
- Candidates must successfully complete any necessary field experience and pass all of the required classes within *three* years (from time of admission to the PPSC).
- Candidates are responsible for securing their own internships. If the school requires that you obtain an internship credential before beginning your work with them, please see the PPS Internship Procedures available at http://www.sfsu.edu/~cstpc/pp_svs_intern.htm
- Candidates will need to check to make sure they are covered under the school district liability insurance for its personnel or volunteers. Insurance is also available through NASW. The SF State Post-Masters PPSC Program is not providing liaison assistance, oversight, or responsibility for your field work.
- Candidates must pass the CBEST test in order to obtain the PPSC. Even with successful completion of coursework and internship, the Credentialing Office at SFSU cannot process the applicant's paperwork until the applicant can provide an original copy of the CBEST card.

Pre-MSW Exit Evaluation:

8 graduating candidates responded to the survey.

Overall, our pre-MSW students are pleased with the PPSC program and all indicated that they feel prepared to serve as school social workers.

Their comments validated both the core class and the seminar. "Our instructor is a wealth of invaluable information. The organization of the class and the structure of the syllabus was excellent. Everything we learned was extremely timely and parallel with exactly what is going on in CA and around the country. An excellent class full of good resources."

Regarding the 741 seminar, they were interested in additional guest speakers to address topics like "Working with undocumented youth" and "how to better work with Asian families around MH and stigma in their culture."

One comment that is more of a trend with our PPSC MSW Alumni and less so with our Post-MSW candidates reveals the following feedback about the SW 760 law class:

“As much as I enjoyed some of the cases shared in SW 760—a requirement for PPSC—I wish it was better structured and aligned with the PPSC program goals—focusing on current cases or laws as it affects marginalized and disconnected youth populations and it’s (sic) impact on support services for these populations.”

Further work should be done to collaborate with the instructor of SW 760.

You may want to review their comments about how they rate other required courses in the IFG track in terms of how much attention those courses pay to children.

PPSC Alumni Survey results:

16 alumni responded to the survey.

The majority of the respondents rated the PPSC program excellent or good. (14 of 16)

They rated their satisfaction with the SW 760 as good (1) average (5) below average (5) and poor (5). Again this speaks to the need to align the courses so specific content about schools is included in the law class.

Post-MSW Survey results

24 post-MSW, credential-only graduates responded to the survey.

Obtaining the credential has represented a salary boost for 54% of the respondents and better benefits for 37.5%. 83.3% indicated the credential provided a different job opportunity.

Overall impression of the post-MSW PPSC program 58.3% rated it excellent, 29.2% rated good and 12.5% rated it average.

This group echoed frustration about the content of SW 760 not aligning with school-related legal issues.

“I think one of the biggest benefits is also the network I built through joining the SSW [school social work] list serve. I think more time dedicated to networking amongst school social workers or job readiness may be beneficial.”

One way to incorporate this feedback is to include job preparation materials for the post-MSW cohorts as we do for our pre-MSW students.

Appendix A
MSW Program Assessment
Annual Plan

	January	April	May	September	October	November	December
Data Collection and Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentration self-study during Faculty Development Days (every year the concentration changes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concentration Focus Groups • 1st Year MSW survey/focus group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness • Field evaluations • Agency evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alumni survey sent out • LCSW pass rates (both Standard and Clinical written examinations) 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Evaluations of Teacher Effectiveness
Feedback to faculty, staff, and students for modifications				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about SETE at school meeting and MSW Program Meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about focus groups at school meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback about field evaluations and agency evaluations at school meeting • All feedback to MSWC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCSW pass rate feedback for IFG concentration to evaluate

- MSW Foundation Self-Study every 2 years (beginning 2004-2005)
- Concentration Self-Study every 3rd year
 - Social action and change, 2004-2005
 - Administration and Planning, 2005-2006
 - Individuals, Families and Groups, 2006-2007

Appendix B
COURSE CONTENT SURVEY
Social Action and Change (SAC)

1. After graduation, what would you like your primary professional employment to be over the next 5 – 10 years?
2. Which course of all the courses you have completed best met your needs in moving towards the direction/s that you named in Question 1? What was helpful about it?
3. Which course of all the courses you have completed have not been as helpful? What was least helpful about this course? What could have made this course better?
4. Discuss How well you have been prepared to engage in the following:

Conducting a social investigation
Power and interest analysis in the community
Leadership training and formation
Building relationships and social capital

Community-driven development
Participatory approaches
Organizational formation and development
Analyzing poverty and oppression
Consciousness-raising
Action-reflection
Social Planning
Strategies and tactics
Capacity-building
Mobilizing resources
Diversity and Multiculturalism
Social Group Work
Resource development/coordination
Advocacy
Incorporating a human rights perspective
Coalition Development
Human Services Administration
Program Planning & Development
Community Organizing
Campaigning

Program Coordination

Policy Analysis and Development

5. How much basic knowledge do you feel that you have about the following theoretical areas

- A. Freiré's problem-posing approach and consciousness-raising:
- B. Community-driven and participatory approaches and capacity-building:
- C. Social Movement and Action Models
- D. Empowerment Theories
- E. Social and Economic Justice Theories
- F. Dialogism
- G. Humanitarian Reform
- H. Strengths Perspectives

5. How much basic knowledge, skills, and orientation do you think you have learned about social work practice in the following areas:

- Aging adults
- Children and adolescents
- Couples and families
- Disability
- International social work
- LGBT issues
- Mental health
- Indigenous communities
- Refugees/immigrants/IDPs
- Spirituality and social work
- Families and Communities
- Advocacy
- Group Work
- Multicultural practice

Community Organizing

Mezzo Practice

Macro Practice

Spirituality and Social Work

7. Based on your experiences in your internship/s and/or employment as a social worker, what in your coursework would you like to have (or have had) more knowledge, exposure, and information about?

8. If SW 850 Human Services Administration I, SW 864 Human Services Administration II, or SW 880 Computers and Human Services Administration were available as electives would you take either course?

9. Any other comments?

Appendix C
 San Francisco State University
 School of Social Work
 MSW Foundation Field Instructor Survey
 Fall 2004

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

1. Students will possess critical thinking skills and address immediate client needs while promoting social justice, social change, and empowerment

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

2. Students will have an understanding of the values and ethics of the profession and be able to apply this knowledge to work with oppressed populations

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

3. Students will be able to communicate effectively across client populations, colleagues and communities, and make appropriate use of supervision and consultation in order to function effectively within social service systems

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

4. Students will demonstrate culturally competent practice with diverse populations

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

5. Students will apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice in areas of direct practice, administration and planning, and/or social action and change

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

6. Students will demonstrate an understanding and appreciation of historical and contemporary social issues, and bring vision, principles and leadership to the ongoing negotiation with urban service delivery systems

Appendix D
IFG Student Evaluation of Agency

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FIELD AGENCY

Evaluation Form #815

For
Use Second Year MSW Students - Social Work with Individuals, Families, and Groups
By:

Your Name: _____

Agency: _____

Name of Field
Instructor: _____

How would you rate this field agency?

Excellent ____ Marginal ____ Good ____ Poor ____ Not Sure ____

In which of the following areas were you involved and with how many cases?

Intake ____ Groups ____ Crisis Intervention ____ Couples Therapy ____

Individual Therapy ____ Family Therapy ____ Case Management ____

Community Outreach ____ Specialized Training for Students ____

Agency-In-Service Training ____ Staff Meetings ____

Other: _____

What was the average number of cases you carried during the year? ____

Beginning on a new page, please answer the following questions as completely as possible. This paper permits a critical analysis and review of practice. It will be used to help plan the continuing program in field instruction. You are encouraged to provide any additional information you choose to include.

1. What methods of supervision were used? How was it structured? How effective was it?
2. How would you rate your level of awareness of community resources related to your placement?
3. How effectively and efficiently was your time used by yourself, your supervisor, and the agency?
4. What were your most valuable learning experiences? Your least valuable?
5. Would you choose this placement again if you could start over again?
6. What changes would you recommend for this placement?
7. How well did you work with other staff? Please explain.

Appendix E
 San Francisco State University
 School of Social Work
 MSW, IFG Field Instructor Survey
 Fall 2004

The following is a survey provides the School of Social Work with feedback about the MSW program. Please circle the response that most directly reflects the MSW/ Individuals, Families, and Groups (IFG) students you have supervised over the past three years or less.

1. Students will understand the historical development, values, and ethical responsibilities of conducting social work with individuals, families and groups

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

2. Students will understand and be able to implement the legal parameters and bases for advocacy activities pertaining to direct social work practice

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

3. Students will expand and refine communication skills with clients in the areas of listening, expressing thoughts and perceptions, and promoting client introspection

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

4. Students will utilize developmental, strengths-based, and client-centered theories and approaches when working with clients' situations, needs, and problems

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

5. Students will be able to utilize direct use of self in initiating, developing, and ending intrapersonally-focused individual, groups and family-based interventions

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

6. Students will identify and address personal issues and dynamics encumbering the student's professional use of self in direct practice relationships

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

7. Students will develop a clear and ethically-responsible value base for practice

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

8. Students will adopt principles for the individualization of practice guidelines in response to ethnic, cultural, socio-economic, age, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of the client's intrapersonal experience

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

9. Students will link research and direct practice by documenting outcomes and/or evaluating a developmental perspective on practice

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

10. Students will integrate knowledge and experience into a responsible, relevant and effective framework that stresses developmental advocacy which includes community organizing, social action and social policy arenas of practice

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

Any other Comments:

Appendix F
 San Francisco State University
 School of Social Work
 MSW, Social action and change Field Instructor Survey
 Fall 2004

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

1. Students understand and promote professional social work values and ethics in the community change and development process

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

2. Students have knowledge of the history of struggles for social, political, and economic justice

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

3. Students acquire the theories, knowledge and skills that enable them to be effective change agents

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

4. Students demonstrate an understanding of power relationships and leadership dynamics and how these work to help and/or hinder social change

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

5. Students are able to apply variety of change models to community problem settings

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

Students can analyze, observe and describe the goals, functions, structure, and behavior of community change dynamics

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

6. Students can develop and apply a diverse range of problem-solving and decision-making approaches that include social planning, policy analysis collaboration, and comprehensive community initiatives to disparate problem situations

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

7. Students can think critically, develop their own concept of critical consciousness and analyze processes using Paulo Freire’s models of adult education

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

8. Students demonstrate an understanding of SD as a viable social work method

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

9. Students have the theoretical base necessary to engage in community problem-solving, including assessment, intervention and implementation

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

10. Students develop skills in the evaluation of intervention and can test the efficacy of their interventions

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

Any other Comments:

Field Instructor Evaluation of A&P Students

MSW FIELD EDUCATION
FINAL FIELD EVALUATION
Evaluation Form #816b

For use by: Second Year MSW Students - Administration and Planning

NAME OF STUDENT: _____

NAME OF AGENCY: _____

Period of field instruction covered: _____, 20 ____ TO _____, 20 ____

=====

I. ASSIGNMENT			
II. PERFORMANCE			
*II = Improvement Indicated; ME =Meets Expectations; AE =Above Expectations	*II	ME	AE
A. Interpersonal Relationships and Skills			
1. Ability to relate to and work with administrative personnel; individuals who hold key positions, i.e., committee members, chairmen, administrators or other agencies, public officials, etc.			
2. Ability to establish effective working relationships with individuals and groups of different economic, social, racial and cultural backgrounds.			
3. Ability to relate to colleagues and to work with them as members of a team.			
4. Skill in carrying on personal conversation and interview; skill in giving or eliciting information, in interpretation of problems, role, agency function, goals, etc.			

5. Disciplined use of self; self-awareness and conscious application of role; sensitivity and insight to reactions of others to professional interventions.			
B. Group Relationship Skills			
1. Ability to organize and staff effective problem solving groups, e.e., committees, boards, study groups, action groups, councils.			
2. Skill in committee technology - staffing, functions, i.e., planning agendas, sending notices, minutes, room arrangement.			
3. Understanding and influencing group and inter-group process, decision making and leadership development. Skill in-working with group members and leaders between meetings; in understanding and influencing interaction roles, participation patterns, individual motivation and involvement, group development, leadership behavior; supportive skills in helping individuals and groups clarify issues and carry out effective decision making.			
C. Understanding the Community as a Social System			
Knowledge of the community context in which the agency operates; knowledge of structure and processes; knowledge of individuals, groups and other forces; voluntary and governmental bodies; knowledge of pertinent demographic data, community values, resources, etc.			
D. Understanding Agency or Organization			
Knowledge of structure - policy making, administration, services; relationships with outer agencies, etc.			
E. Knowledge and Skill in Applying Problem Solving Model			
1. Ability to identify and understand the problem or problems under consideration - skill in fact finding, problem analysis.			
2. Ability to identify and describe the actors involved.			
3. Ability to accurately assess the likely position of the actors involved in the problem.			
4. Ability to develop goal priorities for problem solution and change.			
5. Ability to develop alternative strategies and select preferred strategy.			

6. Ability to carry through plan.			
7. Ability to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy and tactics.			
F. Administrative skills			
1. Ability to systematize and organize duties, set priorities.			
2. Ability to prepare clearly written records, reports, letters, memos, etc.			
3. Ability to establish and maintain realistic time tables and resource utilization in relation to the project.			
G. Participation in Supervision			
1. Involvement of self in the learning process.			
2. Evidence of prior thought and planning for conferences.			
3. Recording.			
4. Use of supervision.			
5. Ability to function independently.			
III. PROFESSIONAL IDENTIFICATION III. PROFESSIONAL IDENTIFICATION			
A. Identification with social work as a profession, goals, values, ethics.			
B. Commitment to social change.			
C. Ability to work with social workers and professionals of other disciplines for shared objectives.			
IV. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS			
V. AREAS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION			

**Agency Field
Instructor Signature**

Date

**Faculty Field Liaison
Signature**

Date

Student Signature

Date

Recommend Credit _____ Note: The faculty field Liaison assigns the official grade.

(Check One) The recommended grade is a guide line.

No Credit _____

Field Instructor Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix H
 San Francisco State University
 School of Social Work
 MSW, Administration and Planning Field Instructor Survey
 Fall 2004

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

1. Students understand and promote professional social work values and ethics in the development of administration of human services

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

2. Students create programs and structures that are grounded in the principles of social justice and equality

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

3. Students acquire theories, knowledge and skills that enable them to direct agencies and administer programs that bring about positive change in their communities

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

4. Students demonstrate an understanding and are cognizant of the impact that various bureaucratic structures have on the poor, disenfranchised and oppressed

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

5. Students apply management theories and knowledge pertinent to human services administration to the actual operational roles and functions performed in social service agencies and organizations

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

6. Students demonstrate the ability to critically analyze, observe, and describe the goals, functions, structure, and behavior of agencies and organizations

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

7. Students develop and apply a diverse range of problem-solving and decision-making skills that are applicable in organizations, institutions, and communities

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

8. Students demonstrate an understanding of administration as social work method

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

9. Students have the knowledge and skill base to enter or re-enter social work practice as managers or administrators

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

10. Students can evaluate administrative practice and the effectiveness of social service programs

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

Any other Comments:
