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Accreditation Standard B2.0.2: The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

The program discusses the logic model and provided course descriptions. However, the program did not provide a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

The site visitor is asked to have the provide a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

SF State Response:

The BASW curriculum is based on the liberal arts foundation and social justice focus of SF State’s general education (GE). Students are required to take GE courses in a variety of areas through the lower division courses (English language communications and critical thinking; scientific inquiry and quantitative reasoning; art and humanities; social sciences; and lifelong learning) upper division courses (physical and life sciences; arts and the humanities; and social sciences) and through SF Studies (American & Ethnic Racial Minorities; global perspectives; social justice; & environmental sustainability). Having fulfilled some of these GE requirements, BASW students come into the major with a solid grounding in the liberal arts and an orientation in issues of equity and justice. This is consistent with the School's mission statement, which says, in part, that “The School provides educational foundations that promote just and secure communities, societies, and global networks, as well as fosters leadership, scholarship, and activism, to achieve equity and social justice."

As an impacted program, the BASW program only takes in students with an upper division standing. Its curriculum is thus focused exclusively on upper division courses.

The BASW program at SF State is characterized as having “…a strong emphasis on students' obtaining a clear understanding of individual and social inequality, in acquiring skills to analyze manifestations of inequality and oppression wherever they occur, and in acquiring the ability to work with clients and constituents to overcome the problems which inequality creates in their lives.” To address these goals, courses were selected for the Junior year of the BASW curriculum that focused on orienting students to the social work profession and aiding them in honing an understanding of individual and social inequality and oppression.
As can be gleaned from the logic model, the courses listed on the left-most column are the required courses for Juniors in their first semester in the major (Fall semester Junior year). In these courses, students begin to engage in content about how systems maintain advantage and disadvantage based on race, gender, class, ethnicity, age, ability, and other social identity categories. For instance, SW 300 U.S. Social Welfare I: Past, Present, & Future provides students with a historical overview of the social work profession in the U.S. SW 352 Gender, Sexism, and Social Welfare; SW 410 Human Development & Social Services (foundation); as well as SW 300, are courses that delve heavily on issues of inequality and oppression. In addition, students are introduced to content about social work practice in various settings through SW 302 Introduction to Social Services Organizations. The course seeks to familiarize students with the different areas of social work practice through visits to social service organizations.

As students move through the BASW curriculum, the goals of familiarizing students about social work profession and practice and deepening their understanding of oppression and inequality are further bolstered by offering courses in the Spring semester of the Junior year that introduce students to practice, amplify their analysis of oppression and inequality, and apply such analyses to social programs or policies. A list of these courses can be seen on the second to the left column in the logic model. SW 470 Social Differences in Social Work Practice build on SW 352 and SW 410 by guiding students in extending their critical thinking and analyses of social
problems using an intersectionality lens towards a conceptualization of anti-oppressive social work practice. SW 301 U.S. Social Welfare II: Problems, Programs, Policies further builds on students’ competencies in using an anti-oppressive framework in analyzing social policies and programs. As the assigned Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) class, SW 301 also seeks to develop students’ critical thinking and writing skills which are integral to social work practice (Grise-Owens & Crum, 2012). SW 400 Social Work Practice I and SW 402 Interviewing Skills are introductory practice courses that build on SW 302 and seek to hone students’ competency in individual practice.

In the Senior year of the program, the curriculum introduces students to additional areas of practice and an integrative course that allows students to incorporate their course work with field education. The second to the right column on the logic model lists the courses that address these goals. Students begin field education through SW 503 Field Experience in the Social Services I and its accompanying course SW 502 Seminar on Field Experience I. Students build on SW 400 and 402 and take additional practice courses which orient students to practice with groups (SW 401 Social Work Practice II) and community practice (SW 456 Urban Community Organization & Citizen Action). Students also have the option of taking a course that focuses on social work practice with children, youth, and families (SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, & their Families) or with older adults (GRN 500 Gerontology: Multidisciplinary Perspectives).

The right most column of the logic model shows the courses offered in the Spring semester of the Senior year. This stage of the BASW curriculum focuses on having students integrate what they have learned in all their courses with their field experience. Students take the second part of their field education, SW 505 Field Experience in the Social Services II, and its accompanying course, SW 504 Seminar on Field Experience II. Student also take SW 450 Introduction to Research in Social Work where students learn to see the relevance of research to practice (E.P. Competency 4 Practice-informed research; Research-informed practice) through participatory action research. The signature assignment for this class, a mini-research proposal (includes a problem statement, literature review, and a variable definition section), serves as a capstone of sorts for the BASW students. Students develop a mini-research proposal based on their field placement wherein they formulate a research question about a social problem, a program, or a policy that they are involved in through their field placement. By formulating an agency-based problem statement, students begin to integrate practice with research and research with practice. In writing a literature review, students apply their critical thinking and anti-oppressive frameworks covered in their courses throughout the program in synthesizing and critically analyzing the literature informing their research question. By conceptually and operationally defining variables of their research proposal, students begin to articulate their own positionality around contested concepts covered in their field practice and their courses.

References

Accreditation Standard 2.2.1: The program explains how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of the classroom and settings.

The program discussed the field education program. However, the program did not explain how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of the classroom and settings.

The site visitor is asked to have the program explain how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contributions of the classroom and settings.

SF State Response:

The SFSU SSW is committed to serving historically oppressed and disadvantaged populations utilizing strengths and systems-based modalities. It is often stated that field represents the heart of social work education. Indeed, internships provide students the opportunity for social work theories to come alive. It is here that students apply the theoretical learning gained in the classroom to real world situations with clients, organizations, and communities.

Course content is drawn upon and applied to the developmental process of skill and knowledge building. The selection and matching of students to placements is grounded in the history and philosophy of social work, from the mission and goals of the profession and its standards and ethics to its theoretical and pragmatic strategies and techniques. The breadth of social work’s evolving theoretical frameworks is considered in every aspect of field education, along with the application with a wide range of issues and populations. For example, student coursework provides a multifaceted set of perspectives in considering both the utility and potential limitations of the welfare state in addressing the needs of complex communities. Consideration is consistently given to client services within the context of cultural specificity and the sociopolitical environment.

Internships take place in a variety of organizations including medical, wellness, care management, day treatment, and behavioral health settings; educational institutions such as K-12 schools; community organizing, criminal justice, advocacy, governmental, policy-making agencies, as well as senior day programs and hospice care. Interns therefore have the opportunity to work with individuals, families, groups, and communities throughout the lifespan.

The development of appropriate placement sites has been shaped by social work’s trajectory in the United States and internationally. There has been increasing attention to issues related to immigration within a global context, and this has been reflected both in the school’s coursework, such as SW 352 where immigration is covered in a module on gender and globalization, as well as in the school’s selection of placement sites that include 30th Street Senior Center, Newcomer High School and La Clinica de la Raza, which serve largely immigrant populations, including new arrivals of unaccompanied minors and older adults. The school’s students come from a wide variety of national and ethnic backgrounds and a fair number speak multiple languages. This has been of great benefit to the field agencies seeking interns. Our placement process is student-driven and university-supported. Students receive support in choosing individually tailored internships within a broad array of settings. The school currently has internship agreements with over 250 public and private non-profit social and human service agencies.
Connections between field education and micro-level practice

When agency leaders seek to apply to be an approved internship site, and again during the field instructor screening and orientation process, the school proactively discusses the fact that classroom assignments in direct practice, weekly field seminar as well as in policy or other mezzo/macro related courses are built around the field experience. Students are regularly invited and encouraged to use de-identified client information in their case presentations to act as a launching point for researching their interest in a particular form of social work practice, and to then serve as the inspiration for a policy analysis, to name a few.

Field is also the context in which research skills and analyses are consistently applied. During their final year in the program, many BASW students utilize their field placements as the sites in which to complete their research-related capstone projects. In this context, they apply the knowledge gained in the classroom to their efforts in the field, and vice versa. When students are interviewing for their senior year placement, they are encouraged by the field director to explore the ability to make connections between their research interests and the population served by potential field agencies. Students are further encouraged to ask direct questions during their placement interviews about the feasibility of linking research interests directly to their understanding of needs on site. Once selected, students further integrate goals into the learning agreement that pertain to their research.

Examples of capstone projects where BASW Seniors addressed concepts directly related to their focused on their field placements include: telephone intervention programs addressing problem gambling; policy evaluation of SB 855 addressing commercial sexually exploited children (CSEC); increasing supports for adult day health programs; increasing availability of school-based intervention programs for underrepresented youth; improving services for Chinese immigrant older adults, juvenile diversion programs, short and long-term shelters for homeless populations, county mental health services; evaluating the Department of Veteran Affairs Directive for LGBTQ-friendliness; evaluating the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) volunteer program; evaluating programs for birth mothers at adoption agencies; and evaluating Meals-on-Wheels.

In addition to the capstone projects, the Seniors in AY 2016-2017 conducted a mixed methodology needs assessment to inform campus programs to promote food and housing security for SF State students. To build on that initial study, the BASW Seniors in AY 2017-2018 are conducting a follow-up study on basic needs of SF State students. Part of that study is the creation of a bio-psycho-social assessment instrument, which the Health Promotion and Wellness (HPW) office on the SF State campus has agreed, together with the School Field Director, to use and pilot in a possible field placement for a BASW student in AY 2018-19. In this way, the students’ interests, schoolwork and internship opportunities come full circle. While the needs assessment, bio-psycho-social assessment tool and the role of student intern will involve students from three different cohorts, this project is a powerful example of a lasting commitment not only within the School of Social Work, but from the larger university, to recognize and respond to the very real needs of current SFSU students’ basic need for food, housing and critical social services.
Support to Field Instructors to Enhance Student Learning

During the field orientation, field instructors are encouraged to add a particular item to their weekly supervision checklist that includes what the student is currently reading/studying and how and whether the student views the field practice context to affirm, confirm and/or contradict what they are hearing in class. Students are encouraged to engage in critical thinking, and to make links between theory and practice both in the classroom, and in the field setting. Faculty are further encouraged to contact field instructors when students are working on projects that borrow heavily from their field placement experience, in an effort to let field instructors know that their work, and student work in the field is valued in the classroom, and to encourage instructors to further relate student: client experiences to theoretical discussions that may be happening on campus. By sharing assignments and stated expectations of students in the classroom, field instructors are better able to reinforce the viability of both theory and practice.

Supporting the integration of field into the classroom

The field experience is explicitly supported and integrated into the social work curriculum during the weekly field seminar (SW 502 and SW 504), where students have the opportunity to reflect on their ongoing day-to-day experiences at their internships, while integrating them with the learning gained in the classroom.

In order to build a foundation for their field placement, at the beginning of the first semester of the field seminar, students are required to write, and present to the class an Agency Assessment paper that requires an understanding of the agency’s history, philosophy, mission/goals, organizational structure and funding sources. Student findings in this paper and presentation are discussed in field seminar, where students are prompted to make connections between the information presented, and course content addressed in the history and manifestation of social welfare policies, past and present in SW 300 and SW 302, as well as their learning about social service organizations in SW 301. Students are further asked to prepare a bio-psycho-social assessment focused on their own lives. Here, students draw upon knowledge of human behavior addressed in SW 410 and assessment-writing skills covered in SW 401 and apply those skills to their own self-assessment. Discussions about this assignment include student perspectives on how they felt about exposing parts of themselves, and their lives/histories in response to various prompts. Reflective small and large-group discussions include bridging this self-reflection to spaces of empathy for clients who may feel over-exposed by system demands for personal information, and how students might integrate this awareness to their engagement and service delivery in their internships.

Throughout the semester, students in their field seminar courses are required to submit narrative summaries that include the agency modality, the student’s evaluation of their social work skills development and application, agency meetings and their role in those meetings, and topics they would like to further explore during the field seminar. Also, during the first semester, faculty discuss specific topics relevant to the field, such as understanding individual roles (student, field faculty/liaison, field instructor), understanding their Learning Contract, the role of supervision, cross-cultural issues, NASW Code of Ethics, EPAS, HIPAA regulations, risk assessment (both personal and for clients), boundaries, termination, self-care and other topics brought up by students. In addition, as the year progresses and students gain increased levels of responsibility and direct service with clients, they are required to submit a process recording focused on a
particular intervention or moment in time. This assignment is given with the understanding that it may hold a different focus when applied in mezzo or macro-level or mezzo practice settings.

During the second semester in field seminar, students are also required to provide Agency Assessments to continue to monitor their learning in the field. Here, special attention is paid to the additional skills that students want to learn. They may include case studies, understanding and learning about transference and countertransference when working with clients; understanding of personal trauma and how that may affect working with clients, de-escalation/anger management, difficult supervision scenarios, ethical dilemmas, policy practice, and preparing for the job market. Field seminar sessions also include the use of practice vignettes, based upon actual cases from current and/or former student field experiences to help illustrate and explore concepts such as child and/or elder abuse reporting, crisis intervention and applying a developmental lens to understanding child behavior. In these examples, students are called upon to articulate skills and theories of engagement, as well as policies and laws that are covered in the classroom to practice examples that simulate work in the field. From here, discussions ensue about connections to actual and current practice examples and/or ethical dilemmas that students may face in their internship settings.

In the last semester of field seminar, students are required to develop a project for their organizations. The project idea requires the field instructor’s approval to ensure that the project is within the scope of services and achievable for the agency. The project is primarily geared to giving the agency a possible modification/improvement in their services that does not require major staffing/budgetary changes. This project further provides the opportunity for students to work in teams, an arrangement that mirrors what they would likely find themselves exposed to in their future employment.

Finally, the seminar instructor serves as the field liaison between the students enrolled in the field seminar class and their field placement. In this role, the field liaison is available to field instructors from agency sites to help bridge gaps in content understanding through both addressing necessary content in the actual seminar, and in reaching out to the Field Director and other faculty colleagues to make note of trends, questions, and/or observations about ways that the university might strengthen the continuity of learning between the needs and demands of the field, and the content that is being offered (or needs to be introduced) in the classroom. Indeed, the field seminar represents the fulcrum at which theory and practice are joined, each informing the other.

**Accreditation Standard 2.2.5:** The program describes how its field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and a minimum of 900 hours for master's programs.

The program describes that it provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for the baccalaureate program. However, the program references that it would benefit from a standardized practice of recording hours. The site visitor is asked to have the program describe how its field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and a minimum of 900 hours for master's programs.
SF State Response:

As noted in our self-study documents, the school would benefit from a standardized practice of recording hours. The current, and newly-assigned Field Director has made note of the fact that recording practices have differed from one field seminar/field placement section to the next, and that recent practice has involved a mixture of field instructor/agency-specific time sheets, coupled with some (but not all) field liaisons recommending that students maintain their own record.

Given the small number of baccalaureate students assigned to each field liaison, and the frequency of phone, email and in-person contact between school field liaisons, students and agency field instructors, the school has found that students’ ability to achieve not only the established minimum of 400 hours, but the school requirement of 480 hours, to be attained. That said, further documentation would serve to support how the school knows this to be true.

Thus, the Field Director has initiated a new practice being piloted in Spring 2018, with plans for full adoption in AY 2018-2019, whereby, as part of their grade for Field Experience in the Social Services I and II (SW 502 and SW 504), each student is expected to maintain a monthly timesheet for their time in internship, which records time in, time out, and time utilized for breaks/lunch. Students are responsible for bringing these forms to their field instructor every month for signature. The signature line on the form states that, upon signature, both parties further stipulate that they have participated in one hour of weekly supervision.

Students are expected to provide the prior month’s signed form to their field liaison at the start of the following month. As a part of the pilot program, all current field instructors received an email notification of its implementation and were instructed that the school is requiring this in addition to (and not instead of) any other agency-generated time sheets. The field liaison, in turn, will bring these forms to each semester visit to review together with the student and field instructor to ensure that student recordings are accurate before issuing a final grade.

In subsequent years, including fall 2018, this form will be incorporated into the Field Instructor Orientation, and will be an appendix to the Field Manual.

See Appendix A: Field Education Time Sheet.

Accreditation Standard B2.2.9: The program describes how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program social work competencies. Field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-social work degree practice experience in social work. For cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree or does not have the required experience, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.
The program described the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors. However, the program did not specify if field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, the program did not explain how it assumes the responsibility for reinforcing the social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.

The site visitor is asked to have the program specify if field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, the site visitor is asked to have the program explain how it assumes the responsibility for reinforcing the social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.

**SF State Response:**

When prospective field instructors apply to the SFSU School of Social Work, the information form and resume required include a listing of where the individual obtained their social work degree. Upon receipt, the Field Director, who receives the application, makes note of 1) the highest level of degree earned, 2) the college/university from which the degree was obtained, 3) whether this degree was obtained from a CSWE-accredited program based upon the CSWE Directory of Accredited Programs [https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Directory-of-Accredited-Programs.aspx] and 4) the applicant has worked for the agency/organization for at least two years.

In limited situations, students seek placements in organizations/agencies and there is neither an available field instructor on staff, nor someone serving as an agency volunteer or member of the board of directors with a minimum of a BASW/BSW degree from a CSWE-accredited program who is willing to take on this responsibility. In these rare instances, the school assumes the responsibility for reinforcing the social work perspective by:

1. First assessing that the placement in question is appropriate for a social work student and where there is a viable opportunity for social work practice in the agency/organization

2. Assessing the level of maturity of the student, including whether the student can reliably seek out additional support if needed from an off-site supervisor, and whether they can hold the “general” perspective offered by the agency in addition to a distinctly social work perspective at the same time

3. If the student does not appear able to proactively seek out off-site supervision, the school will request the agency/organization contract with a BASW or MSW-level supervisor who received their social work degree from a CSWE accredited university to act as the student’s field instructor

4. If item #3 is required, the school will assist the organization/agency to formalize an arrangement where there is clear communication with the school and the organization/agency and the student, in terms of who is doing what, issues of confidentiality, etc.
5. If there is no other option, the Field Director will work with the field liaison to offer specific times to meet, that represents an increased level of contact between field liaison and the student/field instructor to discuss the student’s field education experiences.

6. The student and field liaison also meet during weekly field seminar classes, which serve as an additional opportunity to offer continued reinforcement of this standard.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.2:** The program describes the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.

The program listed three admissions decisions. However, the program did not describe the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.

**SF State Response:**

The application process is different for transferring students and for students who are already at San Francisco State University.

Prior to applying for the social work program, transferring students must complete an online application to the University via CalState Apply. Students must meet the general university admission requirements for upper-division applicants. Students must have completed the Lower Division General Education curriculum (or equivalent) and have junior standing (60 units or more) upon acceptance to San Francisco State. The site directs applicants to the School of Social Work site in order to complete the supplemental information.

For students already at the University, they can go directly to the School of Social Work site and complete an application. Applicants must be a current SF State student and must have completed the Lower Division General Education curriculum (or equivalent) and have junior standing (60 units or more) at San Francisco State University.

Whether transferring or continuing students, applicants must have an all-college total GPA of 2.0 (California residents) or 2.4 (non-residents) or higher at the time of application, and must have completed the five required prerequisite courses with either a "C-" grade or higher prior to admission into the BASW Program.

SF State Division of Undergraduate Studies screens all applications to ensure they have completed the Lower Division General Education curriculum (both Segments I and II, or equivalent) and have junior standing (60 units or more). Once this screening process is completed, the Undergraduate division notifies the School of Social Work of their eligibility.
All applicants are required to complete and sign an application. *Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.* The application requires the applicant to submit proof that all five prerequisites (Human Biology, Macroeconomics, Psychology, Sociology, and 2nd year English composition) have been completed and/or a statement that they will be completed by the time the student begins the program. In addition, the applicants are asked to complete the required information on application that includes:

- A written personal statement that documents interest in or experience with social work and human services; addresses community service, civic engagement, and voluntarism; indicates values and commitment to the profession; and reveals educational goals consistent with the School’s mission.
- A history of employment and/or volunteer experience in human services.
- Copies of transcripts (unofficial is accepted) from all college or university work completed.
- A resume
- Letter of reference

The School’s office assistants screen all completed applications, and eliminate incomplete applications (e.g., five pre-requisites). All completed applications are maintained in a computer data available to all reviewers. The BASW Program Coordinator is responsible for assigning the application materials to the admission reviewers (“readers”) after they are trained in the review of the application with a standardized evaluation form developed by the School of Social Work. Review of the BASW application is conducted by all tenured/tenure track faculty, but may include some full-time or part-time faculty as necessary. Each application is reviewed independently by 2 two faculty members.

The SSW’s BASW application calls for answering a series of questions that are designed to garner information about the applicant’s values, commitments, and vision about social work. The applicant can receive up to 19 points for their application as follows: They can receive up to 11 points for their personal statement that takes into consideration three areas; the reason social work has been selected as a career choice, values and goals, any personal experience with marginalization and/or with other marginalized populations, as well as why they chose SFSU BASW program. They receive up to 7 points for the length of volunteer experience and/or employment in human services settings. Lastly, the Bay area county applicants receive an extra point. The total number of points for each applicant determines his/her/their ranking on a list of eligible applicants for admission. Folders with discrepant average scores of more than 5 points are sent to a third faculty reader for further review. The three scores are then averaged for arriving at the final score. The scores are then tabulated by the Admissions Administrative Assistant

The list of applicants is organized from highest to lowest to identify the top 25 candidates for the program. Following this ranking, any applicant with less than a 2.0 (or 2.4 for non-residents) GPA is dropped from those being considered and a denial letter is sent. The top 25 candidates are sent a letter of acceptance and another 5 are placed on a waiting list and notified of such. Both admitted applicants and those on a waiting list are asked to respond within a specific period of
time to ensure that if an applicant decides not to continue being considered, an applicant from the
waiting list is moved up to acceptance and someone else can be moved up to the waiting list.

**Admission Notification Letter:** The Division of Undergraduate Studies notifies applicants of
their admission status after their application is accepted by the University and reviewed by the
School of Social Work. Timing of notifications varies. After review of all application materials,
the BASW Program Coordinator and the Director of School of Social Work notify the SF State
Undergraduate Admissions Office of their admission recommendations. Applicants are then
notified of their admission status by three steps: (1) the congratulatory acceptance email sent by
the SF State Division of Undergraduate Studies that is immediately followed by (2) the official
SF State Undergraduate Admission Notification Letter mailed by the SF State Division of
Undergraduate Studies, and (3) the Letter of Admission from the BASW Program mailed and
emailed by the BASW Program.

**Waitlisted for Admission:** Every year the School of Social Work receives
far more applicants than the number of available student spaces. A small percentage of
applicants are selected for the waitlist until 25 class size is filled. If space becomes available
before June 1, applicants are removed from the waitlist and offered admission through email and
letter. As class size has been reached, denials to the waitlist are issued through the mail in June.

**Denial Letter:** Applicants who are not on waitlist and who are denied by either the University or
the School of Social Work receive Notification of Denial from the Division of Undergraduate
Studies (not from the School of Social Work) through the mail (and/or email).

The BASW Program Coordinator and the Director of School of Social Work meet as necessary
during the admissions cycle to discuss and make the final decisions for acceptance from the
waitlist based on the rank ordered. Admitted applicants from the waitlist are contacted in the
manner described above for admitted applicants. When withdrawals occur after May, the
Director of the School of Social Work is responsible for making the final decisions for
acceptance from the waitlist based on the rank ordered until places are filled.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.7:** The program submits its policies and procedures for
evaluating students’ academic and professional performance, including grievance policies and
procedures. The program describes how it informs students of its criteria for evaluating their
academic and professional performance and its policies and procedures for grievance.

**SF State Response:**

**SSW Grievance Procedures and Policies**

**General SSW Grievance Procedure**
If a School of Social Work BASW has a grievance about their professor or class that is non-
dermination in nature the steps are as follows:
1. The student should first meet with their instructor about the situation (if they feel
   comfortable doing so).
2. The student should then meet with their SSW Faculty Advisor to discuss the situation.
3. If no satisfactory solution is arrived at with their SSW Faculty Advisor, then the student meets with the BASW Program Coordinator.
4. If the student is still not satisfied after meeting with the BASW Coordinator, then the student meets with the SSW Program Director.
5. Throughout these various steps a plan of action can be developed to meet the needs of student with the grievance.

Grade Appeal Grievance Policy and Procedure
The College of Health and Social Sciences (CHHS) has a Grade Appeal policy for students who have a grievance about their final grade. If a student has a grievance about their grade the steps are as follows:

1. The student should first meet with their instructor about their grade.
2. If no satisfactory solution is arrived at with their instructor, the student should then meet with their SSW Faculty Advisor to discuss the grade.
3. If no satisfactory solution is arrived at with their SSW Faculty Advisor, then the following steps are taken in accordance with the CHSS Grade Appeal Policy:

CHSS Grade Appeal Procedures Checklist

Please follow these steps to complete the grade appeal process.

Informal Procedure (department level) - Normally, grade appeals should be resolved informally between the student and faculty involved.

☐ Step 1: The student who believes he/she has been assigned an improper grade will meet with the instructor of record and together review the grading procedures used to determine the grade assigned.

☐ Step 2: If the student and instructor are unable to resolve their differences, the department chair/director or designee will attempt to serve as mediator working with the individuals to resolve the dispute.

☐ Step 3: If the instructor of record refuses to take part in the informal process described above, or if following this process the student is still dissatisfied, the student may initiate the formal grade appeal process.

Formal Procedure - The following steps need to be taken if the appeal is not resolved within the informal procedure above.

☐ Step 4: Formal grade appeals must be initiated by the student by the end of the eighth week of the semester following the award of the grade.

☐ Step 5: If the instructor of record is not available within one semester, the department chair/director or designee will act in lieu of the instructor of record for the purpose of this grade appeal.
Step 6: If the instructor and student cannot resolve their differences of opinion, the student must present a written brief outlining the problem and the area of disagreement to the department chair/director.

Step 7: After notification by the department chair/director that a grade appeal brief has been filed, the instructor must respond to the department chair/director in writing within ten working days.

Step 8: The department chair/director or designee will attempt to serve as mediator working with the individuals to resolve the dispute.

Step 9: If this mediation proves unsuccessful, the department chair/director shall notify the college associate dean. Written briefs from both student and instructor shall be forwarded to the college associate dean.

Steps 4-9 must be completed to continue at the college (associate dean) level.

Step 10: The college associate dean or designee will review the findings to date and will attempt to act as a mediator in resolving the dispute. If mediation at the college level does not lead to resolution, then a Grade Appeal Committee shall be formed by the college associate dean within ten working days.

Note: Students should not be given written information about the formal grade appeal process until all attempts at mediation of the problem at the departmental level have been made and failed. Refer to the “Student Affairs Policies and Procedures Guidelines” for information and instructions specific to CHSS regarding grade appeals and grievances.

Discrimination-related Grievance Policy

All discrimination-related grievances are handled by the San Francisco State University Title IX Office. See SF State University policy below:

If you feel that you have been the victim of sexual harassment, discrimination or assault the University has a process by which you can report the issue. You may also report to the University if you feel you have been retaliated against for a previously filed complaint or if you participated in an investigation of such a complaint.

The University has designated a Title IX Coordinator (VP Luoluo Hong) who is responsible for ensuring the University’s compliance with Title IX including oversight of investigations into complaints. SF State has also designated several Deputy Title IX Coordinators.

The Title IX Senior Deputy Coordinator for Employees & Third Parties serves as the primary intake officer for faculty, staff, and third parties; and, the Title IX Senior Deputy Coordinator for Students serves as the primary intake officer for students.

You can report your concerns to any of the following people:
SF State Title IX Coordinator:

Luoluo Hong  
Vice President for Student Affairs & Enrollment Management  
Title IX Coordinator & DHR Administrator  
Hours: Mon-Fri, 9am-6pm  
Phone: (415) 338-7313  
Email: vpsaem@sfsu.edu

SF State Title IX Senior Deputy Coordinators:

Katon Dalton  
Interim Senior Deputy Title IX Coordinator/DHR Administrator for Students  
Equity Programs & Compliance Manager  
Hours: Mon-Fri, 9am-6pm  
Phone: (415) 338-2032  
Email: kdalton@sfsu.edu

Christina Sabee  
Senior Deputy Title IX Coordinator/DHR Administrator for Employees and Third Parties  
Dean of Equity Initiatives  
Hours: Mon-Fri, 9am-6pm  
Phone: (415) 338-2032  
Email: csabee@sfsu.edu

Once a concern has been raised, SF State will follow its established procedures which are based on CSU Executive Orders 1096 and 1097 to address complaints of discrimination, harassment or retaliation. Reports can be made via the incident reporting form. Alternatively, you may visit Suite 403 in the Student Services Building to speak to someone directly.

Except in the case of a privilege recognized under California law (examples of which include Evidence Code §§1014 (psychotherapist-patient); 1035.8 (sexual assault counselor-victim); and 1037.5 (domestic violence counselor-victim)), any member of the University community who knows of or has reason to know of sexual discrimination allegations shall promptly inform SF State’s Title IX Coordinator.

Regardless of whether an alleged victim of sexual discrimination ultimately files a complaint, if the campus knows or has reason to know about possible sexual discrimination, harassment or violence, it must review the matter to determine if an investigation is warranted. SF State must then take appropriate steps to eliminate any sex discrimination/harassment, prevent its recurrence, and remedy its effects.
**Accreditation Standard 3.2.2:** Faculty who teach practice courses have a master's degree in social work from an accredited program and at least 2 years of post master's social work degree practice experience.

**SF State Response:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 302</td>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 350</td>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Lott</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 400</td>
<td>Not Offered</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 401</td>
<td>Scudder</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 402</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Giometti</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Takahashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 456</td>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 470</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Takahashi</td>
<td>Not offered</td>
<td>Takahashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 502</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid &amp; Lee</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid &amp; Lee</td>
<td>Melara &amp; Lee</td>
<td>Melara &amp; Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 504</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid &amp; Lee</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid &amp; Lee</td>
<td>Melara &amp; Lee</td>
<td>Melara &amp; Lee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Akiko Giometti does not have two years post MSW practice experience. As stated previously, Dr. Jones (Director) was hired in fall 2016 and the AY 2016-2017 teaching schedule was already established and set. Upon learning that Ms. Giometti did not have two-years post master’s practice experience, Dr. Jones made the necessary changes in the 2017-2018 teaching schedule to ensure we are in currently in full compliance with this standard and will be in the future.

**Accreditation Standard B3.2.4:** The baccalaureate social work program identifies no fewer than two full-time faculty assigned to the baccalaureate program, with full-time appointment in social work, and whose principal assignment is to the baccalaureate program. The majority of the total full-time baccalaureate social work program faculty has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred.

**SF State Response:**

**AY 2016-2017**

As shown in the chart below labeled Table 1, three full-time faculty had principal assignment to the BASW program (Drs. Lee, Lenz-Rashid, and Sonia Melara, full-time lecturer).

**AY 2017-2018**

Also, as shown in Table 1, during the 2017-2018 academic year two full-time faculty had principal assignment to the BASW program (Dr. Lee and Sonia Melara, full-time lecturer).
AY 2018-2019

For AY 2018-2019 and onward, the director must ensure total compliance with AS B 3.2.4 and M 3.2.4. Given the small faculty, it is imperative that the director ensures compliance when coordinating and assigning teaching schedules.

For the AY 2018-2019, Sonia Melara and Dr. Hermoso (BASW Program Coordinator) will be the two full-time faculty whose workload is 51% or more principally assigned to the BASW program. The rest of the faculty will be principally assigned to the MSW program.

Table 1: BASW Full Time Faculty & Assignment to BASW Program

*BASW Courses are all those indicated by the numbers 300, 400, and 500s. The course numbers starting at 700 and up are MSW courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Shapiro</td>
<td>730, 740, 741, 840</td>
<td>740, 741, 830</td>
<td>730, 740, 741, 840</td>
<td>740, 741, 760, 830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0% assign to BASW</td>
<td>0% assign to BASW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Takahashi</td>
<td>701, 710, 410</td>
<td>720, 895, 470</td>
<td>701, 710, 410</td>
<td>720, 402, 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33% assign to BASW</td>
<td></td>
<td>50% assign to BASW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(calculation: 2 undergrad courses [410, 470] divided by all courses taught 6 = 33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeonshim Lee</td>
<td>820, 502, 503</td>
<td>400, 502, 503</td>
<td>820, 502, 503</td>
<td>895, 504, 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83% assign to BASW</td>
<td>87% assign to BASW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Lenz-Rashid</td>
<td>502, 503, grant buyout</td>
<td>895, 504, 505</td>
<td>832, 401, grant buyout</td>
<td>810, 843, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80% assign to BASW</td>
<td>40% assign to BASW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Hermoso</td>
<td>721, 352, assigned time for BASW coordinator</td>
<td>895, 450, assigned time for BASW coordinator</td>
<td>721, 352, assigned time for BASW coordinator</td>
<td>780, 895, 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% assign to BASW</td>
<td>50% assign to BASW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Melara</td>
<td>855, 302, 350, 456</td>
<td>780, 301, 350</td>
<td>855, 302, 456, 502, 503</td>
<td>301, 350, 504, 505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accreditation Standard 3.3.4: The program identifies the social work program director. Institutions with accredited baccalaureate and master’s programs appoint a separate director for each.

The program identified the social work program directors for both program levels. However, it is unclear who is the program director for the baccalaureate program due to the discussions about multiple academic years.

The site visitor is asked to have the program identify the social work program director. Institutions with accredited baccalaureate and master’s programs appoint a separate director for each.

**SF State Response:**

In the spirit of full disclosure and transparency, the self-study documented perhaps too much information that was unclear about the BASW program coordinator and therefore confused the reader.

Because our self-study data year was AY 2016-2017, we wanted to report what was in play during the data year. Sonia Melara (our full-time lecturer) was in the position of BASW program coordinator during 2016-2017.

Dr. Jones (director) asked Dr. Hermoso to step into the role of BASW program coordinator, beginning August, 2017 while Sonia Melara would return to teaching in the BASW program full-time.

Again, Dr. Jocelyn Hermoso was appointed as the BASW Program Coordinator effective August, 2017 and continues to serve in that role.

Accreditation Standard B3.3.4(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program, a minimum of 25% assigned time is required at the baccalaureate level. The program discusses that time is sufficient.

**SF State Response:**

The *teaching load* for all full-time tenured and tenure track faculty is 3 courses per semester. In order to comply with AS B3.3.4(c), that requires that the BASW program coordinator be granted
a minimum of two course releases per academic year, which would translate into a 33% assign
time and meets the minimum of 25%.

During the AY 2017-2018 year, given the sudden retirements of two faculty members, Dr.
Hermoso (BASW Program Coordinator) only received a one course release. The dean did not
grant Dr. Hermoso a second release in the spring 2018 semester. Therefore, Dr. Hermoso taught
2 courses in the fall 2017 semester and 3 courses in the spring 2018 semester. This translates into
17% assigned time, under the required minimum of 25% [Calculation used: 1 course release
divided by 6 total course/teaching workload = 17%].

The dean has expressed his commitment to and has granted the authority to the director of the
SSW to provide the BASW program coordinator two course releases during the AY, which will
provide more than ample time for the coordination of the undergraduate program.

For the AY 2018-2019 Dr. Hermoso will take one course release in the fall 2018 semester and
the second release in the spring 2019 semester, which translates into 33% assigned time
[Calculation: 2 course release divided by 6, total teaching workload = 33%].

Accreditation Standard B3.3.5(c): The program describes the procedures for calculating the
field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field
education. To carry out the administrative functions of the field education program, at least
25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this
time is sufficient.

The program discussed the release time for the field director. However, the procedures for
calculating the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative
leadership for field education were not provided. In addition, the program did not discuss if
that time is sufficient.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe the procedures for calculating the field
director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field
education. In addition, the site visitor is asked to have the program clarify if the release time is
sufficient.

SF State Response:

As stated numerous times throughout the self-study, there have been significant changes in the
structure, operations, and personnel of the SSW over the past two years. The timeline and
changes as they relate to the field director are outlined below.

AY 2016-2017

During our self-study data year (2016-2017), Dr. Dina Redman was the field director. Dr.
Redman had 100% assign time in her role as field director. Dr. Redman unexpectedly retired in
August, 2017 and the SSW director, Dr. Jones, appointed Christine Scudder to the role of field
director.
AY 2017-2018

During the AY 2017-2018, Christine Scudder assumed the role as new field director and attached to the position is the commitment to teach one section of field seminar. Again, due to the unexpected retirement of Dr. Redman, Ms. Scudder was asked to teach a second additional section of field seminar, which translated into an approximate 50% assign time in her role as field director.

AY 2018-2019

For the AY 2018-2019, Christine Scudder will not be teaching and therefore will be 100% released/assigned time in her role as field director and full release is sufficient time granted to the position.

Accreditation Standard 3.3.6: The program describes its administrative structure for field education and explains how its resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.

The program discussed the administrative structure and personnel in field education. However, the program did not describe how the resources are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe how the resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.

SF State Response:

In addition to the full-time appointment of Christine Scudder, LCSW, as our field director, we have a half-time staff member, Mira Pasikov, who provides administrative support for the field program at 8-10 hours per week. The new Field Director is working together with Mira to codify the job duties that are required to support the field program. These duties include making changes to the school website to redirect inquiries from the community about developing new field sites be re-directed from the personal email of the Field Director, to a general field education email address managed by the administrative assistant, who is trained to address and assist with general inquiries. The field staff administrative assistant is also being trained to input newly approved field agency data into the S4 field site database, which is made available to students in reviewing available field placements.

SFSU has committed to the use of the S4 database for social work field placement sites, as this system also effectively manages the field placement needs of other California State University programs, both at SFSU and on other campuses across the state. Use of this system includes access to site administrators who are available to the SFSU field education program to address problems with the site, as well as possible improvements to enhance efficiency of the interface between agencies, students and school personnel. The Field Director has a university-issued computer, telephone, fax machine and email access that are sufficient to address regular,
proactive, and as-needed communication with field agencies. The university further reimburses the Field Director and all assigned school field liaisons for mileage between the university and field agencies/organizations when responding to twice annual, and as-needed in person meetings between students, field instructors and school field liaisons.

In addition, the full-time Administrative Office Coordinator, Victoria Lee, provides support as needed to field education. As both the school Director and Field Director proceed forward in their new jobs, the school has committed to ensuring that the field education program continues to receive the resources and support that it requires, needs, and deserves. At present, given the small size of the program and the availability of current resources, the school director and field director both feel the resources currently allocated to field education are more than sufficient to administer the field education to meet our mission and goals.

**Accreditation Standard 3.4.1:** The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits a completed budget form and explains how its financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals.

The program described the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. However, the program did not explain how its financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals.

The site visitor is asked to have the program explain how its financial resources are sufficient and stable to achieve its mission and goals.

**SF State Response:**

The school of social work receives a yearly budget at the beginning of the academic year from the College of Health and Social Sciences. As indicated in our self-study, the school of social work receives our budget allocation for the year with no distinction about BASW and MSW monies. Rather, it is the role of the director to manage the SSW budget to ensure both programs are funded as needed and the director has the authority and autonomy to manage all funds allocated to the SSW. The SF State’s general fund fully supports all full-time tenure track faculty and for all full-time administrative personnel. The remainder of our budget comes from academic resources to ensure that we can run the adequate courses. As a result of our numerous grants and the indirect costs that are generated, the school of social work has sufficient and stable resources to achieve our mission and goals. The director works closely and continuously with the dean and the college fiscal office to ensure sufficient resources are allocated. As shown below, the budget line items have sufficient funds for the operations of both the BASW and MSW programs, especially given the small size of our student enrollment and programs. Additionally, there are adequate and sufficient funds to offer all of the courses necessary every semester, support faculty travel and research, support the technological needs of lecturers who meet the union criteria, offer students training and opportunities outside of the classroom, and provide support for our agency field instructors via trainings, orientations, and appreciation luncheons. These examples are a few ways that offer evidence to support our adequate resource allocation.
### Program Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Expenses</th>
<th>Previous Year 2016</th>
<th>Current Year 2017</th>
<th>Next Year 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollar Amount % Hard Money</td>
<td>Dollar Amount % Hard Money</td>
<td>Dollar Amount % Hard Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Administrators</td>
<td>$717,349 100%</td>
<td>$614,520 100%</td>
<td>$614,520 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>$73,446 100%</td>
<td>$74,310 100%</td>
<td>$75,000 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary or Adjunct Faculty &amp; Field Staff</td>
<td>$215,003 100%</td>
<td>$248,179 100%</td>
<td>$248,179 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$426,914 100%</td>
<td>$394,729 100%</td>
<td>$394,729 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>$22,875 100%</td>
<td>$20,000 100%</td>
<td>$22,000 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$12,009 100%</td>
<td>$11,500 100%</td>
<td>$12,000 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>$1,400 0%</td>
<td>$1,800 0%</td>
<td>$2,250 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Resources</td>
<td>$27 100%</td>
<td>$6,500 100%</td>
<td>$6,500 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>$8,092 0%</td>
<td>$4,550 0%</td>
<td>$9,000 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,483,540</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,356,288</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,198,002</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technological Resources: Includes costs for IT equipment as well as reprographics.

Other: Work Study Allocations

**Accreditation Standard 4.0.4:** The program describes the process used to evaluate outcomes and their implications for program renewal across program options. It discusses specific changes it has made in the program based on these assessment outcomes with clear links to the data.

The program described the process used to evaluate outcomes and their implications for program renewal across program options. However, the program notes that the program will make programmatic or curriculum changes in the future and noted that there was not time to utilize their results.

The site visitor is asked to have the program discuss specific changes it has made in the program based on these assessment outcomes with clear links to the data.

**SF State Response:**

The SF State SSW submitted its’ self-studies on December 1, 2017 and had our site visit on March 5 and 6, 2018. Given the quick turnaround time and the small faculty, we have been challenged to make large scale changes to the BASW program based on outcome assessment that draws clear links to the data.
We have, however, made a commitment in the ways we can to engage in this work and we have made strides.

Short-term Changes Implemented as a Result of Assessment Data Results

Charges to the Curriculum Committee
In February, 2018, we charged the Curriculum Committee to begin working on the feedback loop process of examining data gleaned from our assessment and how to best make charges to the curriculum from the data. Again, the Curriculum Committee has been charged to examine the assessment data outcomes and revisit courses where students underperformed (or failed to meet benchmark). Our summary data show that our BASWs did not meet benchmark for the following competencies:

- Competency 4: Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice; and
- Competency 5: Engage in policy practice.

As a result of our assessment and failure to meet benchmark for competency 4, we have begun our process to make curricular improvements, based on assessment data, by revising an assignment for SW 450 (Introduction to Research in Social Work), which is the course that we have identified that covers competency 4: Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice. In the revision of a required assignment for SW 450 we have more explicitly linked the competency and behaviors to the assignment. The curriculum committee will continue the assessment data feedback loop and continue to work on improving the curriculum, again, based on assessment data including making changes to courses that cover competency 5.

Please see Appendix B below for the complete assignment instructions, grading, and presentation rubrics.

Long-term Changes Implemented as a Result of Assessment Data Results

Curricular Re-Design
Continuation of Teagle Work
In 2016, the SSW was awarded a Teagle Curriculum Redesign Initiative grant, funded by the Teagle Foundation. The grant aided the faculty in engaging in a curriculum redesign process by coordinating assessment activities, planning and organizing a faculty retreat, meeting with a university faculty learning community, and meeting with curriculum consultants. Draft curricular roadmaps were developed as a result of our redesign efforts. The main immediate step of the curriculum committee is to finalize a new curricular road map for the BASW program that continues to address the EPAS 2015 core competencies and which include signature assignments as course-embedded assessments.

Improve Assessment/Data Collection Processes
As the SSW grows, we will develop an assessment team to improve and build a more robust rigorous data collection plan. For the time being, we are using the Field Evaluation (at mid-year and end-of-year) to assess all competencies and behaviors. We believe the field evaluation is
critical to understand students’ learning. The SWEAP Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory is an imperfect evaluative measure yet given our program size, it suits our current needs. Eventually, we would like to develop new course embedded measures (i.e. signature assignments in courses) that determine students learning in all competencies.

Information Literacy Assessment Project
During the 2017/18 Winter term, the BASW program participated in the Information Literacy Assessment Project headed by Jane Dewitt, PhD, Interim Associate Dean for Academic Planning in the Division of Undergraduate Education & Academic Planning (DUEAP). The project sought to assess the information literacy skills of SF State undergraduate students. Information literacy is one of the five core competencies identified as necessary for a baccalaureate education that prepares students for work, citizenship and life-long learning (adapted from the 2013 WSCUC Handbook of Accreditation) as well as a component of the educational outcomes for the baccalaureate degree at SF State.

The project entailed assessing assignments that required students to identify and properly use information to support the assignments. Two BASW courses (SW 352 and 450) were identified as courses that incorporated a library instruction course in previous semester and were thus included in the project. An information literacy rubric developed by teams of faculty and made available through the Associate of American Colleges and Universities was used to assess students’ ability to properly “identify, locate, evaluate, and responsibly use and share information for the problem at hand” (Information Literacy Value Rubric, AAC&U, n.d) through the signature assignments of both classes.

The BASW program’s experience with this project will enable us to continue using the information literacy value rubric as yet another assessment tool for ascertaining learning of our BASW students.
# Time Sheet for Social Work Field Placement

**Student Name:** __________________________  **Month:** __________  **Year:** _______  **Total Monthly Hours:** _______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Week One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Week Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Week Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Week Four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Week Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td># Hours</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>Breaks</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>To - From</td>
<td>____________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Monthly Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total hours completed in field

---

**SIGNATURES**

**Student:** __________________________  **Date:** __________  **Field Instructor:** __________________________  **Date:** __________

*By signing this form, I attest to meeting the minimum one-hour weekly supervision requirements between student & Field Instructor.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone Milestones</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Benchmark Count 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Selection</strong></td>
<td>Identifies a creative, focused, and manageable topic that addresses how social workers can improve service and service delivery systems through quantitative and qualitative research.</td>
<td>Identifies a focused and manageable topic that addresses how social workers can improve service and service delivery systems through quantitative and qualitative research.</td>
<td>Identifies a topic that while manageable/doable, is too narrowly focused and limits an understanding about how social workers can improve service and service delivery systems through quantitative and qualitative research.</td>
<td>Identifies a topic that is far too general or wide-ranging (or conversely to narrow and specific) to be manageable and doable. Nor does the proposal address how social workers can improve service and service delivery systems through quantitative and qualitative research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access the Needed Information</strong></td>
<td>Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and cites most appropriate and relevant information sources.</td>
<td>Accesses information using a variety of search strategies that includes some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search.</td>
<td>Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources.</td>
<td>Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance, quality, and connection to subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translation of Research to Practice, Policy, and Service Delivery</strong></td>
<td>Organizes and synthesizes evidence or ideas that reveal improvements in practice, policy, and service delivery.</td>
<td>Organizes evidence that reveal improvements in practice, policy, and service delivery.</td>
<td>Organizes evidence, but the organization is not offering insight for improvements in practice, policy, and service delivery.</td>
<td>Lists ideas for practice, policy, and/or service delivery but it is not organized or supported by evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis/synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with some interpretation/evaluation but not enough to develop a coherent analysis/synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources without any interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis/synthesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 7

Antioppressive Policy Analysis

--- POPULAR BUMPER STICKER SLOGAN

If the people lead, the leaders will follow.

Of all the helping professions, social work uniquely maintains a dual focus: to help people who are disadvantaged and to challenge the roots of their oppression in the socioeconomic environment. Social work is not just about bandaging people’s wounds, as is so often claimed. As Popple and Leightoninger (2010) proudly proclaim in the title of their book, social work is “the policy-based profession.”

The core values of challenging inequities and promoting democratic ideals have been formalized in the social worker’s code of ethics (National Association of Social Workers [NASW], 2008). To this end, students of social work study policy analysis and policy practice. How to change the system by working within the system is a typical theme of instruction. Social workers are enjoined to be proactive, not reactive.

That policy and practice are inextricably linked is a major assumption of this book. Social policy we can define as the intent or goals to accomplish certain ends relevant to allocating goods and services to the people. As Karger and Stross (2013) indicate, social welfare policy is a subset of social policy that “regulates the provision of benefits to people to meet basic life needs, such as employment, income, food, housing, health care,
Van Wormer Policy Analysis Framework / Model

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER
As a guide to the presentation of a policy proposal, whether for students in a policy analysis class or for research practitioners engaged in policy advocacy, we have organized the material presented in this chapter in outline form. The first author (van Wormer) used the following outline in teaching a course on social work policy. Groups that consisted of four to six students divided up the sections, collectively producing a 10- to 15-page paper, and later produced a brief fact sheet to present to state legislators. Among the topics chosen were advocacy for an assisted suicide bill, prison sentencing reform, legalized marijuana, the case against school consolidation, expanded funding for drug courts, and establishment of mental health courts. See Box 7.2, "Outline for Antioppressive Policy Development," for the framework that was used for the policy analysis discussed in this chapter.

Outline for Antioppressive Policy Development

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL CONDITION OR PROBLEM
A. What is the social condition that is oppressive?
B. What are the facts (from official and unofficial reports) concerning the social condition?
   1. What does documentation through review of the literature show?
   2. What do we know from agency records, surveys, and interviews with key experts?
   3. What are forecasts for future problems and expenses related to the problem?
   4. To what extent is the social condition perceived as a social problem?

II. HISTORICAL ANALYSIS
A. What were the relevant social conditions like in the past?
B. How did the social condition (e.g., child beating) come to be defined as a problem?
   1. How was the problem later defined in terms of changing social values?
   2. How was the problem dealt with?
C. Which influential groups were involved in supporting and opposing proposed remedies? Are the groups the same today?
D. What are the precedents for the ideas and values being used to correct the situation?
E. To what extent were the approaches to the problem effective or ineffective?
F. How did the manifest goals differ from the unstated or latent goals of potential solutions?
G. Comment on the lessons of history relevant to the present issue.

III. POLICY FORMULATION OVERVIEW
A. What are the goals (manifest and latent) of your proposed policy?
B. Listen to the voices of the people: What can we learn from people's (clients') narratives about the need to strengthen resources?
C. What are the pros and cons of various ways of dealing with the problem?
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BOX 7.2 (continued)
1. How does each of these competing policies meet the criteria of self-determination, empowerment, adequacy, feasibility, and efficiency?
2. How is your proposal superior to other remedies?
D. To what extent can public opinion be mobilized in support of your proposed policy?
E. In general, what do the research findings tell us about the problem?
F. What are anticipated barriers to policy change?

IV. THE GLOBAL CONTEXT
A. What can we learn about alternative policies or approaches to meet the same need?
B. Discuss differences in funding sources and levels of support.
C. How is your proposed policy integrated within the cultural values of one or more other countries?
D. Could we advocate a similar policy for the United States given U.S. traditional values?
E. Relate the policy under consideration to the relevant section of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

V. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS
A. How much will the proposed initiative cost?
   1. How does this expense compare with present or other proposed offerings?
   2. How will the proposed program be funded?
B. What will be the projected cost savings (the benefits) to the state, county, or agency?
C. Which groups benefit financially from the social problem (e.g., landlords from housing shortages)?
D. Discuss the initiative in terms of its bearing on economic oppression.

VI. POLITICAL ANALYSIS
A. Who are the major players involved in the policy innovation or policy to be changed (politicians, professionals, populations at risk)?
B. Who are the major stakeholders who have vested interests in making or resisting the proposed change?
   1. Assess the extent of opponents’ political backing, clout, and media access.
   2. Assess the extent of the supporters’ political backing, access, clout, and media access.
C. What is the political context within which the policy initiative has been conceived? Is political, racial, or gender oppression an issue of public concern?
D. What are the major political arguments used by opponents against the proposal? Draw on research data to refute or acknowledge the truth of these arguments.
E. What are the NASW Code of Ethics standards (2008) and NASW policy statements (see Social Work Speaks [NASW, 2009]) relevant to the policy?
F. Describe lobbying efforts, if any, and any relevant legislative bills introduced.
G. Which profession (e.g., lawyers, psychologists, managed care bureaucrats) controls the territory? How does this influence affect the policy’s acceptability?
H. Gauge the likelihood of having the policy implemented and anticipate possible unintended (positive and negative) consequences of the initiative’s enactment.

E. If relevant, measure the economic benefits in terms of the effect on the physical environment. Is the policy consistent with environmental sustainability?
F. If the initiative entails an economic benefit, is the benefit measurable?
POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Reformers who see their policies implemented or programs instituted will not want to let their guard down. Opponents of the changes enacted may passively resist the changes in ways that undermine the intent of the measures introduced. In the case of protections given to physically handicapped people in the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, for example, many employers were slow to comply, such as with building accessibility requirements (Janson, 2012). When affirmative action programs first recruited women to work in male-dominated fields, fellow workers and employers often made life very uncomfortable for them; as a result, many of the token hires left.

One of the most powerful tools of policy analysis is the ability to foresee whether the proposed (or already implemented policy) has unintended consequences (Jimenez, 2010). Many policies that were well-conceived failed to work out because unintended consequences were not anticipated. A well-known historical example is when the Quaker ideals of prison reform were adopted and prisoners were placed in solitary cells to help them repent, and many of them became psychotic. And in World War II, orphaned infants placed in a germ-free environment and therefore never touched had severe developmental problems, and one third died (Spitz, 1945). From more modern times, Jimenez cites the well-recognized failure of America’s war on drugs to eradicate the drug supply.

Follow-up research and evaluation are vital to redress unanticipated problems and to furnish data for objective decision making to either discontinue the program or policy or to correct any flaws in the design. When the results are shared with other professionals, successful programs and policies might be adopted elsewhere. Model programs offer all kinds of grant-writing opportunities to assess treatment effectiveness or service use or to develop similar pilot programs for empirically based program evaluation studies.

Karen Kim-Ashman (2010, p. 19+) has introduced the Five-E framework for the evaluation of an existent policy. The Five-E model asks the following questions:

- How effective is the policy? (Does it accomplish its basic goals?)
- How efficient is the policy (in terms of money and time)?

A different kind of evidence must be gathered when the policy change is a matter of judicial process. Figueira-McDonough (1993) compares judicial policymaking with other forms of policy development. This process is often initiated by the aggrieved party, and the case must be made in terms of legal doctrine and legally recognized rights. Because this is a lengthy process, its success requires building a coalition that can lobby for a sustained period of time, as Figueira-MacDonough indicates. It is often very difficult to obtain legal representation in cases of this sort, involving oppression or discrimination. Chapter 9 explains the role of the courts in protecting the rights of citizens against excesses by the state.

To conclude this chapter, see Box 7.3, which presents a useful consciousness-raising exercise that shows the links between discrimination and the role of policy initiatives in confronting this form of oppression.

BOX 7.3

Small Group Exercise: Oppression Through Discrimination

1. Describe to other group members an experience in which you personally encountered discrimination because of your status (e.g., age, sex, ethnicity, occupation, appearance, sexual orientation, beliefs, marital status). Describe your involvement in discriminating against a person of another status.

2. After each group member has described the experience, discuss the following questions (as a group) and make a composite list of responses for each question.

a. What feelings and thoughts did the experience evoke in you?

b. What do you think were the feelings and thoughts of the other people involved in the experience?