CHAPTER 1: BASW MISSION AND GOALS

Educational Policy 1.0: Program Mission and Goals
The mission and goals of each social work program address the profession’s purpose, are grounded in core professional values, and are informed by program context.

1.0.1. The program submits its mission statement and explains how it is consistent with the profession’s purpose and values.

Mission Statement
The mission of the San Francisco State University School of Social Work is to educate diverse learners to achieve progressive development and promote social change throughout the Bay Area and beyond. The School cultivates ethical leadership for social justice and promotes professional advocacy, versatility, activism, and cultural humility.

The mission of the SF State SSW is reflective of the School’s deep commitment to social change efforts to achieve equity, diversity, inclusiveness, access, and all forms of justice (social, cultural, political, economic, environmental, legal, educational, health, restorative, and more). The School promotes ongoing advocacy and activism in an effort to have impact throughout societal systems at all levels.

The mission statement conveys the School’s commitment to ongoing education and progressive change. Our mission creates the foundation for providing a broad-based and diversity sensitive education, emphasizing versatility though informed knowledge and skill building applicable to diverse settings and multicultural/multiethnic populations. The School’s mission reflects our intention to promote lifelong education and ongoing human development, in an effort to foster cultural humility. One never “arrives” at the end-state of knowledge and skills needed to effectively and sensitively work with human diversity factors.

In keeping with our mission, the core of the School’s purpose is the commitment to foster and develop human well-being at all levels, including individuals, families, groups, organizations, institutions, communities, states, and countries. The School provides cognitive frames from which skills and practices are developed and created to have
significant impact. Person-in-environment frameworks, theories, factors, and contexts and other variables are utilized in all areas of social work practice. Stemming from our mission, all aspects of the curriculum and program revolve around appreciation and respect for human diversity, civil rights, human rights, global environments and perspectives, and change dimensions.

To achieve our mission, the School emphasizes development and achievement at all levels of cognition, including knowledge, understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and creation (Bloom’s Taxonomy, cognitive domain). Research and evidence from scientific inquiries are utilized to inform educational principles and practice standards. Efforts are directed at having impact on improving individual lives, promoting just societies, and enriching the quality of our world at micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

Link to Profession’s Purpose and Values

The purpose and values reflected in the mission of the SF State SSW are consistent with the profession of social work as described in the National Association of Social Workers’ *NASW Code of Ethics*, which says, in part:

The primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty. A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession’s focus on individual well-being in the social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living.

Social workers promote social justice and social change with and on behalf of clients. “Clients” is used inclusively to refer to individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. Social workers are sensitive to cultural and ethnic diversity, and strive to end discrimination, poverty, and other forms of social justice.
The mission of the social work profession is rooted in a set of core values. These core values, embraced by social workers throughout the profession’s history, are the foundation of social work’s unique purpose and perspective: service, social justice, dignity and worth of the person, importance of human relationships, integrity, and competence.

The mission of the SF State SSW is fully aligned with the profession of social work’s purpose. We are committed to furthering this purpose though all aspects of our program - our curriculum, our school community, and our involvement in the greater Bay Area community and beyond. This commitment is reflected in our mission statement, and held at the core of the design of all aspects of our school.

1.0.2. The program explains how its mission is consistent with the institutional mission and the program’s context across all program options.

Mission Consistency with Institutional Mission
The mission of the San Francisco State University School of Social Work is to educate diverse learners to achieve progressive development and promote social change throughout the Bay Area and beyond. The School cultivates ethical leadership for social justice and promotes professional advocacy, versatility, activism, and cultural humility.

The SSW is situated within the College of Health & Social Sciences (CHSS), which is one of six academic colleges at SF State. This urban institution, located in Northern California, is one of twenty-three universities within the California State University (CSU) system, which educated 478,638 students in 2016. The CSU system is the largest four-year public university system in the United States, and it is the “most ethnically, economically, and academically diverse student body in the nation” (CSU Chancellor’s Website. https://www2.calstate.edu/csu-system/about-the-csu/facts-about-the-csu/enrollment/Pages/default.aspx).
Mission statements at all institutional levels reveal that our school mission is consistent with the institutional missions of the broader CSW, SF State, and CHSS. Mission statements from each institutional level are included below.

**California State University**

*Mission Statement*

The California State University promotes student success through opportunity and a high-quality education that prepares students to become leaders in the changing workforce, making the CSU a vital economic engine for California.

SF State is one of the 23 campuses that comprise the California State University (CSU) System. Since the signing of the Donahoe Higher Education Act in 1960, the CSU has been the nation’s leading university system. Taken together, the CSU educates 479,000 students each year and has one of the most diverse student bodies in the United States. Consistent with the CSU system, the SSW’s mission emphasizes cultivating leadership, and providing opportunities to a diverse set of learners.

**San Francisco State University**

*Mission Statement*

From the heart of a diverse community, San Francisco State University honors roots, stimulates intellectual and personal development, promotes equity, and inspires the courage to lead, create, and innovate.

SF State is a major public urban university, situated in one of the world’s great cities. Building on a century-long history of commitment to quality teaching and broad access to undergraduate and graduate education, the University offers comprehensive, rigorous, and integrated academic programs that require students to engage in open-minded inquiry and reflection. SF State encourages its students, faculty, and staff to engage fully with the community and develop and share knowledge.
SF State was founded in 1899 as a women’s college, and in 1901 graduated its first cohort of thirty-six women. Today, there are 29,000 students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Fifty-seven percent of the students are women, while forty-three percent are men. Students overwhelming come from the state of California (90%), while 5.5% come from another country. Incoming freshman who are the first in their family to attend college make up 37% of the student population.

Inspired by the diversity of its community that includes many first-generation and low-income college students, and the courage of an academic community that strives to break down traditional boundaries, SF State equips its students to meet the challenges of the 21st century. With the unwavering commitment to social justice that is central to the work of the university, SF State educates its students to become productive, ethical, active citizens with a global perspective.

Our SSW’s mission is consistent with SF State’s mission in its commitment to intellectual and personal development, cultivating leadership, equity, and fostering a school that supports and utilizes the diversity of its students to create a dynamic learning environment.

**College of Health & Social Sciences**

**Mission Statement**

*The College of Health & Social Sciences prepares students to help solve the most pressing and enduring issues confronting the well-being of individuals, families, communities and society.*

*Students, faculty and staff participate in a learning process that fosters excellence in their professions and supports them in the pursuit of equity and social justice.*

*To advance this mission, the College is committed to innovative teaching, scholarship and service that inspire leadership for positive social change.*

The SSW is situated within the College of Health & Social Sciences (CHSS), which is multidisciplinary with the following departments: Child and Adolescent Development; Counseling; Family Interiors, Nutrition and Apparel; Health Education; Kinesiology; Physical Therapy; Recreation, Parks and Tourism; and Sociology and
Sexuality Studies. In addition, there are three schools within the College: School of Nursing; School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement, which includes Criminal Justice Studies; Environmental Studies; Gerontology; Public Administration; and Urban Studies and Planning; and the School of Social Work. The CHSS also houses the Clinical Laboratory Science Internship Training Program and four institutes: Center for Research and Education on Gender and Sexuality; Marian Wright Edelman Institute; Pacific Leadership Institute; and the Health Equity Institute.

CHSS describes itself in its website with the following statement, “The College comprises a wide range of departments, programs, and schools with a shared commitment to equity and social justice” (CHSS website, https://chss.sfsu.edu/about). The SSW’s mission is consistent with CHSS’s commitment to equity and social justice, and aligned with its mission to prepare students to help solve the most pressing and enduring issues confronting the well-being of individuals, families, communities, and society.

**Mission Consistency with Community Context**

The SSW’s specified mission reveals that it is steeped in social work professional values, and that it reflects the needs of the surrounding urban environment. The whole program reflects sensitivity for the needs of the urban environment in which it exists, the city and county of San Francisco.

San Francisco, California is an urban setting with a 2016 estimated population of 864,816. The metropolitan area surrounding San Francisco has approximately 4.6 million people, and the San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland “metropolitan hub” includes 8.7 million people. After New York City, San Francisco is the second most densely populated city, with 6,266 persons per square mile density. (World Population Review, San Francisco Population. Retrieved 18 September 2017, from http://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/san-francisco-population/).

The city and county of San Francisco is diverse with persons of many cultures, ethnicities, nationalities, backgrounds, and orientations. The 2015 census estimates indicate the following composition:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (non-Hispanic: 41%)</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Given the highly urban context in which the SF SSW is situated, the School promotes a curriculum relevant to social workers serving in urban areas. The School provides urban content while also delivering generalist foundation material. Thus, the School presents an urban generalist curriculum with emphases in practice with individuals, families, and groups. The School offers students the option to focus on child welfare (Title IV-E Program) and/or school services for children in schools (Pupil Personnel Services Credential). From this content, students are able to work with diverse populations, in multiple settings, with service delivery systems in a range of fields and at all service delivery levels.

**Mission Consistency with Higher Education Context**

The mission of the SSW was developed in accordance to practices outlined as integral to the context of its institutional setting in higher education.

All faculty at SF State, both full-time tenured and tenure track faculty members and lecturers, are members of the California Faculty Association (CFA), which engages in collective bargaining. There are 1,783 faculty at SF State, 786 of whom are full-time tenure track and 988 of whom are lecturers. Fifty-one percent are women, while forty-nine percent are male. The breakdown of tenured/tenure-track faculty by ethnicity is as follows:
Faculty affiliation with and membership in CFA leads to SF State faculty membership in four additional organizations, which provide policies, frameworks, principles, and standards for all aspects of faculty work. Consistent with CFA, the following adds to and strengthens faculty representation: American Association of University Professors (AAUP), National Education Association (NEA), California Teachers Association (CTA), and Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

AAUP and CFA share parallel policies, principles, purposes, and guidelines pertaining to faculty in higher education, particularly with respect to two major substantive areas: academic freedom and shared governance. These principles of individual and professional freedoms, shared governance, and participatory decision-making processes are consistent with social work values and expected social work practices. Both are intertwined concepts and values, as pointed out by AAUP:

. . . sound governance practice and exercise of academic freedom are closely connected, arguably inextricably linked. While no governance system can serve to guarantee that academic freedom will always prevail, and inadequate governance system – one in which the faculty is not accorded primacy in academic matters – compromises the conditions in which academic freedom is likely to thrive. Similarly, although academic freedom is not a sufficient condition, it is an essential one for effective governance. (American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2015). AAUP Policy Documents and Reports (11th Ed.). Washington, D.C.: p. 125. Hereinafter referenced as The Redbook).
Participatory decision-making processes and shared governance are important principles and values that underlie higher education, social work, and social service delivery systems. The SSW in establishing a new mission statement and accompanying goals instituted principles and standards for participatory decision-making processes and values of shared governance. The processes, dynamics, and procedures leading to final collaborative results provide an excellent case example of how these principles, standards, and values led to desired results, reflective of collective decisions and unanimous agreements.

During Spring Semester 2017, the SSW set its sights on creating a new mission statement and articulating consistent goals reflective of the social work profession’s purposes and values. A Mission and Goals Committee, comprised of two full professors (Rita Takahashi (Chair) and Jerry Shapiro), three graduate MSW students (two in their first year (Kelsey Parsons and Monica Bower) and one in second year of study (Rebecca Olsen)) and one baccalaureate BASW student (Eric McClendon), worked throughout the Spring Semester to accomplish their charge. Every step of the process was collaborative and participatory, and input was sought from associates throughout SF State and the surrounding communities.

The Committee solicited and received input from all social work students, faculty, and staff, as well as University representatives. Further, the Committee disseminated calls for input from social workers represented in the School’s Community Advisory Board, social work field education agencies, and additional social workers in community agencies. As a result, the Mission and Goals Committee received suggestions, ideas, and inputs from a wide range of persons, leading to the richness captured in the mission and goal statements.

Ultimately, after multi-pronged and ongoing communications with all parties mentioned above, the Committee presented its ultimate proposed mission and goals statement, and disseminated it widely, as before. The document was tweaked several times until all came to a final consensus as to what everyone wanted in the mission and goal statement. When the proposed mission and goals were presented to the full School for an action vote, it passed unanimously. The collaborative processes, participatory inputs, and collective results served to unify and connect diverse constituents and associates.
The Mission and Goals Committee then drafted the mission and goals sections of this self-study. As before, the collaborative and participatory processes (consistent with shared governance principles and standards) were implemented. The draft document was disseminated to all Committee members, faculty members, BASW and MSW social work students, and select agency/community persons (ones who participated in drafting the mission and goal statements) for comments, suggested changes, and other inputs. Ultimately, the faculty reviewed the mission and goals draft document during a School meeting. The document was further tweaked and additional suggested changes were incorporated, leading to the final mission statement that is reflective of collective decision-making processes involving faculty, staff, students, and the community.

Mission Consistency with Historical Context

The SSW’s current mission reflects the intentions of the school throughout its long history. Since the 1930s, then San Francisco State College had an undergraduate major in social welfare. However, during its early period of operation, it was situated within the Sociology Department. According to the SSW’s accreditation self-study (SS) documents submitted to the Council on Social Work Education in November 1967,

. . . in 1955 it [social work] became an independent department – within the Division of Social Sciences. With the later reorganization of the college into schools, the Social Welfare Department became one of the constituent members of the School of Behavioral and Social Sciences (p. 32).

In the early years of the undergraduate social welfare curriculum, all courses were taught by sociologists. It was not until 1948 that a professionally educated social worker was brought in and placed in charge of the social welfare course offerings (SSW, SS (1967), p. 32).

From 1948 until 1966, the Department concentrated on baccalaureate education, with enrollments reaching around 600 at the time it started a Master of Social Work degree program in 1966. Fifty years ago, then San Francisco State College submitted its self-study
materials for graduate social work program accreditation. In a cover letter dated 27 November 1967, College President John Summerskill said:

. . . I want to personally assure you of the College’s firm and enthusiastic support of the Department of Social Work Education in its efforts to establish and maintain a program of excellence in graduate professional education. The College is committed to the proposition that whatever physical, financial, or intellectual resources are required to maintain a program of excellence will be and, in fact, have been allocated. Moreover, I am greatly encouraged by the splendid support the program has received from the professional social work community.

Social workers in community agencies have played a key role in the establishment, development, and ongoing excellence in the School’s curriculum. According to the 1967 accreditation document,

In 1962, the President of the College appointed an Advisory Committee for Graduate Social Work Education consisting of leading agency executives and practitioners in the Bay Area. Assisted by the faculty of the Social Welfare Department, during 1963 this Committee conducted a study to determine the feasibility of establishing a graduate school of social work at the College, using guidelines provided by the Council on Social Work Education. The Committee’s report, submitted to the President in February 1964, concluded that there is a need for another graduate social work school in the Bay Area and that adequate resources for field instruction exist among Bay area social agencies (SSW, Self-Study (1967), pp. ii – iii).

San Francisco State College’s first Masters of Social Work (MSW) class was tentatively scheduled to begin in September 1967, but the program was funded a year earlier than projected. Therefore, the graduate program began in 1966 with 41 students who were selected from a pool of 180 applicants. Field placements were found for all 41 students, and all but 13 “secured” stipends (SSW SS (1967), p. iv).
The SSW has now been accredited for 50 years. Since the MSW Program’s beginning in 1966, the SSW has changed and innovated to meet evolving population needs, national and global/international contexts, and environmental changes. The School’s foundation focus on service to diverse populations; social, economic, and multiple other forms of justice; and social reform remain firm and solid. The School’s current curriculum has deep roots implanted during its progressive past and early beginnings, which blossomed during and after the 1968-1969 SF State Strike (for ethnic studies) and the country’s anti-war and pro-peace movements.

SF State’s SSW now admits both baccalaureate (BASW) and graduate (MSW) students during fall semesters, and runs two-year programs for both degrees. The School, surrounded by rich sources of technological innovations (e.g. the Silicon Valley and well-beyond), has many resources that support faculty and students, including technological innovations, hardware, and software. Faculty and students may utilize the services of the College of Health & Social Services and the University, as both provide extensive and strong technological supports. Further, the University provides ongoing technology training and support, and provides a wide range of equipment for everyone’s use (e.g. laptop computers, desktop computers in computer labs and library, cameras, camcorders, audio recorders, and much more).

Reflecting its long history and its current place in the epicenter of technological change, the SSW expresses its ongoing commitment to the values of social change and progressive development in its mission statement.

1.0.3 The program identifies its goals and demonstrates how they are derived from the program’s mission.

**Bachelor of Arts in Social Work Program Goals**

1. Education: Learn from and apply the rigorous SF State social work education that achieves the nine Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) curricular competencies at the undergraduate (BASW) foundation level. Utilize education and research to inform and effectively engage in practice at micro (individuals, families, and groups),
mezzo (organizations, institutions, and communities) and macro (societies and international arenas) levels.

2. Application: Use knowledge and skills to affect all practice areas (direct and indirect). Know and understand multiple forms of power, and their forms, uses, and implications. Be skilled at giving, engaging and sharing power and instilling shared, delegated, and/or “other person” responsibilities in decision-making and problem solving.

3. Diverse Learners: Expect, accept, and appreciate human differences in all areas, including diversity of ethnicities, cultures, values, backgrounds, learning styles, problem solving approaches, and more. Promote diversity to enrich environments, thought processes, experiences, and more.

4. Collaboration and Participation: Respect, value and honor one another’s personal and professional experiences, knowledge, skills, and values. Seek, receive, and utilize inputs from diverse persons, groups, and communities and make diversity-sensitive and appropriate decisions. Engage and utilize the voices of many through participatory means.

5. Ethical Foundations and Leadership: Engage in professional practices that are ethically sound and appropriate, consistent with the National Association of Social Workers’ (NASW) Code of Ethics. Create ideas and action plans from research and interdisciplinary knowledge; instill visions among team members; and enact innovative actions having substantial impact on individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and societies.

6. Progressive Development: Expand and enhance cognitive and affective abilities through continuous development of knowledge, values, skills, and practices. Utilize research to develop best practices to improve human conditions and generate research agendas through practice experiences.

7. Advocacy and Activism for Progressive Change: Know multiple forms and purposes of advocacy, and engage in change plans and efforts to achieve progressive change at micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Utilize evidence to set agendas, establish goals, create action plans, and move forward with efforts to enhance human conditions, including political, economic, legal, social, cultural, and physical environments.
8. Equity and Social Justice: Identify, understand, and evaluate multiple forms of justice (e.g. social, economic, environmental, political, and legal justice) and rights (human and civil). Promote and achieve fairness, equality, and human/civil rights.

9. Professional Versatility: Be equipped to work in a variety of settings, in a range of fields and forms of practice, and with diverse persons from multiple backgrounds, cultures, ethnicities, nationalities, ages, genders, experiences, abilities, orientations, classes, religions, and more. Be effective in systems processes through engagement, assessment, intervention, evaluation, and self-awareness.

10. Cultural Humility: Appreciate the fact that cultures and values evolve and change, and that one never “arrives” with respect to knowledge, skills, and practices related to diversity. Identify and analyze the intersectionality of forces that impinge on lives.

These ten goals connect cognitive and affective domains, as adapted and applied from Benjamin Bloom’s taxonomy, cognitive domain (1956) and David Krathwohl’s taxonomy, affective domain (1964) as defined below (Leslie Owen Wilson, retrieved 25 September 2017 from http://thesecondprinciple.com/instructional-design/threedomainsoflearning/).

- **Cognitive Domain**: Achieve highest levels of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and creation.
- **Affective Domain**: Engage and sustain well-developed abilities and skills to receive, respond to, value, organize, and internalize diverse phenomena.

Baccalaureate students are expected to achieve competencies in affective and cognitive areas of Bloom’s Taxonomy in all areas, including knowledge, comprehension, and application of all subject matters specified by the School curriculum. In addition, baccalaureate students are expected to achieve basic levels for upper cognitive areas of cognition, including analyses, synthesis, evaluation, and creation.

**BASW Goals and School of Social Work Mission Statement**

The ten goals of the BASW Program, detailed above, stem from and frame the SSW mission. These goals articulate the details behind the mission statement, including
substantive content and practice applications. Further, they convey the core professional values that drive the School’s mission and underlie the social work profession. All goals address the nine competencies specified in the Council on Social Work Education’s Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards (EPAS).

By holding the goals of education, application, diverse learners, collaboration and participation, ethical foundation and leadership, progressive development, advocacy and activism for progressive change, equity and social justice, professional versatility, and cultural humility at the core of the design of all aspects of our school curriculum and culture, we bring to life our mission:

*The mission of the San Francisco State University School of Social Work is to educate diverse learners to achieve progressive development and promote social change throughout the Bay Area and beyond. The School cultivates ethical leadership for social justice and promotes professional advocacy, versatility, activism, and cultural humility.*
CHAPTER 2: BASW EXPLICIT CURRICULUM

Educational Policy 2.0 – Generalist Practice

Generalist practice is grounded in the liberal arts and the person-in-environment framework. To promote human and social well-being, generalist practitioners use a range of prevention and intervention methods in their practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities based on scientific inquiry and best practices. The generalist practitioner identifies with the social work profession and applies ethical principles and critical thinking in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Generalist practitioners engage in diversity in their practice and advocate for human rights and social and economic justice. They recognize, support, and build on the strengths and the resiliency of all human beings. They engage in research-informed practice and are proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice.

Accreditation Standard 2.0 Generalist Practice

B 2.0.1: The program explains how its mission and goals are consistent with generalist practice as defined in EP 2.0.

The SF State SSW’s mission and goals as stated above are grounded in the accrediting standards set by the Council on Social Work Education’s (CSWE) Educational Policy and Accrediting Standards (EPAS). Our mission reflects the values of generalist social work practice, including an emphasis on ethical leadership and social change. Our goals are linked to one or more of these nine standards, as well as in guiding a knowledge domain expected for student learning achievement in every class, including fieldwork.

For instance, in the cognitive domain, students are expected to achieve foundation levels of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and creation. In the affective domain, students are expected to reveal basic abilities to receive and respond to diverse phenomena; and value and organize phenomena, as well as show beginning levels of internalization (Adapted and applied from Benjamin Bloom’s
taxonomy of cognitive and affective domains). The following are the BASW program goals:

Goal 1: Education: Learn from and apply the rigorous SF State social work education that achieves the nine Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) curricular competencies at the baccalaureate (BASW) foundation level. Utilize education and research to inform and effectively engage in practice at micro (individuals, families, and groups), mezzo (organizations, institutions, and communities) and macro (societies and international arenas) levels (EPAS 1-9).

Goal 2: Application: Use knowledge and skills to affect all practice areas (direct and indirect). Know and understand multiple forms of power, and their forms, uses, and implications. Be skilled at giving, engaging and sharing power and instilling shared, delegated, and/or “other person” responsibilities in decision making and problem solving (EPAS 1-9).

Goal 3: Diverse Learners: Expect, accept, and appreciate human differences in all areas, including diversity of ethnicities, cultures, values, backgrounds, learning styles, problem solving approaches, and more. Promote diversity to enrich environments, thought processes, experiences, and more (EPAS 1,2,3,6,7,9).

Goal 4: Collaboration and Participation: Respect, value and honor one another’s personal and professional experiences, knowledge, skills, and values. Seek, receive, and utilize inputs from diverse persons, groups, and communities and make diversity-sensitive and appropriate decisions. Engage and utilize the voices of many through participatory means (EPAS 1-9).

Goal 5: Ethical Foundations and Leadership: Engage in professional practices that are ethically sound and appropriate, consistent with the National Association of Social Workers’ (NASW) Code of Ethics. Create ideas and action plans from research and interdisciplinary knowledge; instill visions among team members; and enact innovative actions having substantial impact on individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and societies (EPAS 1-9).
Goal 6: Progressive Development: Expand and enhance cognitive and affective abilities through continuous development of knowledge, values, skills, and practices. Utilize research to develop best practices to improve human conditions and generate research agendas through practice experiences (EPAS 4).

Goal 7: Advocacy and Activism for Progressive Change: Know multiple forms and purposes of advocacy, and engage in change plans and efforts to achieve progressive change at micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Utilize evidence to set agendas, establish goals, create action plans, and move forward with efforts to enhance human conditions, including political, economic, legal, social, cultural, and physical environments (EPAS 1-9).

Goal 8: Equity and Social Justice: Identify, understand, and evaluate multiple forms of justice (e.g. social, economic, environmental, political, and legal justice) and rights (human and civil). Promote and achieve fairness, equality, and human/civil rights (EPAS 1,2,3).

Goal 9: Professional Versatility: Be equipped to work in a variety of settings, in a range of fields and forms of practice, and with diverse persons from multiple backgrounds, cultures, ethnicities, nationalities, ages, genders, experiences, abilities, orientations, classes, religions, and more. Be effective in systems processes through engagement, assessment, intervention, evaluation, and self-awareness (EPAS 1-9).

Goal 10: Cultural Humility: Appreciate the fact that cultures and values evolve and change, and that one never “arrives” with respect to knowledge, skills, and practices related to diversity. Identify and analyze the intersectionality of forces that impinge on lives (EPAS 2,3,6).

The 2015 EPAS define generalist practice as:

Generalist practice is grounded in the liberal arts and the person-in-environment framework. To promote human and social well-being, generalist practitioners use a range of prevention and intervention methods in their practice with diverse individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities based on scientific inquiry and
best practices. The generalist practitioner identifies with the social work profession and applies ethical principles and critical thinking in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Generalist practitioners engage diversity in their practice and advocate for human rights and social and economic justice. They recognize, support, and build on the strengths and resiliency of all human beings. They engage in research-informed practice and are proactive in responding to the impact of context on professional practice. The baccalaureate program in social work prepares students for generalist practice. The descriptions of the nine Social Work Competencies presented in the EPAS identify the knowledge, values, skills, cognitive and affective processes, and behaviors associated with competence at the generalist level of practice.

The SF State SSW is confident that its mission and goals identified above address the components of a generalist practice. Based on the urban geographic region in which the school operates, it necessitates generalist practice that is (a) culturally sensitive and respectful and effective with all sizes of systems (individuals, groups, families, organizations, institutions, communities, and domestic and global societies) and (b) nuanced in understanding the vast and rich diverse contexts of SF (e.g. cultural, racial, urban/rural, public/private, and community-based/institution-based).

For SF State’s SSW, generalist social work practice involves social workers that view problems in their full and complete context, have skills to intervene at multiple system levels and integrate a combination of methods as the particular situation requires. Specifically, generalist practice assists individuals, families, small groups, organizations, communities, and societies to function with the best possible relationship between people and their cultural environments. Generalist social work frames a way of thinking about both problems and solutions in context (historical, social, cultural, legal, political, economic, and environmental) and describes a way of working with clients at a variety of system levels, micro, mezzo and macro.
This work occurs through the incorporation of a wide variety of roles, including the enabler, facilitator, advocate, mediator, broker, teacher, trainer and planner. Through consultancy, clients and workers collaborate to develop plans for change by sharing their expertise with one another for the purpose of resolving personal, family, organizational and societal problems. Through resource management, social workers assist clients to activate their resources, and develop resources that are not available. Generalist practitioners also serve as educators, exchanging information with their clients that reflects the partnerships of co-learners and co-teachers. Generalist social work practitioners advocate for fair and responsive social policies that benefit all individuals and groups; conduct and evaluate research to further understand human behavior and the social environment, measure practice effectiveness and contribute to program development and policy analysis.

Social workers draw from many disciplines to comprehend human behavior in context. The ecosystems approach fits social work's simultaneous focus on people and their environments; the strengths perspective redefines methods for practice, affects how workers and clients relate and influences their distribution of responsibilities. With a generalist approach to change, social workers develop an organized approach that applies to their professional practice at all system levels.

Students in the Baccalaureate Program are educated for entry level professional positions in a variety of human services organizations in such fields of practice as child welfare, aging, health care, and criminal justice. Their program of study emphasizes a generalist approach to social work practice based upon a strong liberal arts foundation. In addition to entry level professional positions in social work, graduates are prepared for graduate level programs in social work, law, psychology, public health, public administration and education.

During the frosh and sophomore years, either at SF State or at the community college level, the typical undergraduate social work student completes the lower division general education requirements of the University. To ensure that only students who have acquired a liberal arts perspective before entering the Program are permitted access to the major, only students with junior standing are allowed to enroll in social work courses. To have junior standing, students must have completed most of the courses in the University’s Lower Division General Education, or their equivalent.
The social work major courses total 44 credits of upper division social work coursework. Each student must meet the requisite 120 credits to graduate (76 + 44 = 120 credits). Students are admitted into the Social Work program during their junior year (or more) after having completed a minimum of 60 units (and a maximum of 96). They complete the Social Work program during the last two years of their course of study at SF State.

The BASW Program has refined its curriculum in many ways since our last reaffirmation. Our curriculum structure reflects the integration of the 2015 EPAS. The courses offered in the program are well matched to ensure that all competencies, behaviors, and dimensions, along with all the components of generalist practice, are thoroughly covered. In the section below, we begin by describing our core curriculum requirements for an undergraduate degree in social work. All social work courses and their trajectory are outlined.

2.0.2: The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for generalist practice demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

*Logic Model of the BASW Curriculum*

Figure 2.0.1 below illustrates a logic model of the BASW. The model depicts how the curriculum (the strategy) achieves the BASW program goals (the outcomes) at the cognitive and affective domains. The undergraduate curriculum is designed to teach the basic social work knowledge, skills, values, and cognitive and affective processes necessary for entry level professional practice as a generalist social work practitioner and ensure students are prepared to enter the field and subsequent employment in micro, mezzo, and macro level practice.
The BASW degree has a solid foundation in the liberal arts, which enable students to understand the needs of people in their social environments from many disciplinary and cultural perspectives. The undergraduate social work curriculum builds upon this foundation through its required courses and field instruction.

There is also 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.

During the Junior year, students are required to take a series of courses that prepare them to enter the field in their final year. Students who have not completed all courses required during the Junior year are not permitted to move on to the field.

**BASW Road Map**

Based on the BASW Program logic model above, the BASW Road Map was created to guide students on their course work and field placement as they progress towards the specialized practice curriculum. The logic model also provides a rationale for the sequencing of courses in the road map.
Table 2.0.1 a. BASW Road Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester Junior Year</th>
<th>Spring Semester Junior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 300 U.S. Social Welfare I: Past, Present, &amp; Future</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 301 U.S. Social Welfare II: Problems, Programs, Policies (Writing Intensive Course, meets University Requirement)</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 302 Introduction to Social Services Organizations</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 400 Social Work Practice I</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 352 Gender, Sexism, &amp; Social Welfare</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 402 Interviewing Skills</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 410 Human Development &amp; the Social Services</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 470 Social Differences in Social Work Practice</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits = 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Credits = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester Senior Year</th>
<th>Spring Semester Senior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, &amp; their Families</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, &amp; their Families</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR <strong>GRN 500 Gerontology: Multidisciplinary Perspectives</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td>OR <strong>GRN 500 Gerontology: Multidisciplinary Perspectives</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 401 Social Work Practice II</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 450 Introduction to Research in Social Work</strong> (3 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 456 Urban Community Organizing &amp; Citizen Action</strong> (3 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 504 Seminar on Field Experience II</strong> (2 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 502 Seminar on Field Experience I</strong> (2 units)</td>
<td><strong>SW 505 Field Experience in the Social Services II</strong> (2 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 503 Field Experience in the Social Services I</strong> (2 units)</td>
<td><strong>Total Credits = 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits = 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon entering the major, juniors enroll in two sequential courses in the history and philosophy of social welfare and social policy (SW 300 and SW 301, U.S. Social Welfare I and II). Concurrently, students are taught a generalist model of social work practice in SW 400 and SW 401, Social Work Practice Methods I and II. In the fall semester, students also complete SW 410, Human Development and the Social Services; SW 302, Introduction to Social Service Organizations (which combines visits to social service agencies and seminar); and SW 352, Gender, Sexism and Social Welfare. In the spring semester, along with SW 301 and SW 401, students enroll in a class on Interviewing Skills in Social Work (SW 402) and another course on Social Differences and Social Work Practice (SW 470). Following is a description of the courses.
**Required courses for the fall semester of the BASW Junior Year:**

*SW 300 U.S. Social Welfare I Past, Present and Future:* This course addresses the history of social welfare policies and services in the United States. Historical developments are analyzed in terms of attitudes, values, beliefs, philosophies, assumptions, and ideologies. Implications for growth and development of the social work profession and social service delivery systems are discussed. Political, economic, social, legal, historical, and cultural contexts of social policy are analyzed in terms of past, present, and future implications. Applications to and implications for diversity are emphasized.

*SW 352 Gender, Sexism and Social Welfare:* This course is an examination of the dynamics of identity-based discrimination in our society and how those dynamics are embedded in social work practice. The course places these forms of oppression in the historical and current economic, political and social contexts of the United States. The course is designed to prepare students to analyze classism, racism, patriarchy, transphobia, heterosexism, ageism, ableism, and other forms of identity-based discrimination as they operate at the individual, community, and institutional levels, and to understand how they shape our lives. A major theme of the course is the social worker’s professional responsibility to help achieve an inclusive society.

*SW 302 Introduction to Social Service Organizations:* This course introduces the participant to social work practice through the operations of different social service organizations as they define a distinctive context for social work practice. Within a conceptual framework focused on critically examining the function, structure, and process of social service organizations in general, it provides a programmatic overview of the public, private, and governmental agencies comprising the Bay Area urban service delivery system in particular. It identifies and characterizes the resource & service systems from which client needs and developmental interests are addressed, and, the knowledge and skills necessary for working with these agencies as they operate to influence client’s well-being and quality of life experience. Progressing from a specification of the laws, policies and procedures which constitute the formal structure of social service agencies, the course primarily focuses on the people and conditions shaping the way that ‘getting help’ works
and how ‘you’ as a social worker can fit into making ‘getting help’ happen in a way which benefits ‘your’ clients. The course content and assignments IN SW 300, 302 and 352 cover EPAS 1, 2, 3 and 5 and provide a foundation for students to learn ethical and professional behavior, engage diversity in practice, engage human rights and social and economic justice, as well as begin to engage in policy practice.

SW 400 Social Work Practice I: Social Work Practice Methods I is the first in the sequence of professional foundation courses (SW400 and SW401) required for BASW students. This course is intended to help students begin to put generalist social work theory into the direct practice of planned change with social work clients. Practice I focuses on culturally competent micro-level knowledge and skills development for working with and on behalf of individuals, families, and groups. This content includes engaging clients in an appropriate working relationship, identifying issues, problems, needs, resources, and assets; collecting and assessing information; and planning for service delivery. Much of each lecture will be built around learning and practicing basic direct practice social work skills. A variety of teaching methods will be utilized, including: lecture, assigned readings, class dialogue, experiential exercises, case examples, video presentations and guest speakers.

SW 410 Human Development and the Social Services (3 units): This course covers the basic principles of human development and behavior from conception through old age, and the functions of social service agencies in dealing with different life crises. Except for EPAS 4, these two courses cover the other 8 EPAS. In addition to the skills and values developed in the two courses above, these classes provide a foundation to begin to engage with, assess, intervene and evaluate individuals, families, groups, and organizations.

Required courses for the Spring Semester of the BASW Junior Year:

SW 301 U.S. Social Welfare II: Problems, Policies, and Programs: This class builds on the student’s knowledge acquired in Social Work 300 above. The course focuses on viewing the welfare institution as a societal response to certain social needs. Certain social problems are selected for intensive study in relation to policies and programs that
determine available services. Attention is given to the adequacy of such policies and programs and the input of government, voluntary associations, and consumer groups.

While this course covers EPAS 1-6, an emphasis is placed on policy research and analysis of various social problems. SW301 is also designated as a Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) course for the university. Therefore, the course uses a variety of writing assignments to evaluate students.

**SW 401 Social Work Practice II:** This class builds on the knowledge acquired in Social Work 400 above, and continued examination of factors influencing professional social work practice with special attention to such tasks as forming, maintaining and coordinating action systems, differential ways of influencing action systems in various phases of the change process and terminating change efforts. Emphasis in this course is on the overall problem-solving process of social work practice interventions. The course is divided into four specific phases: assessment, contracting, implementation and termination of work with client populations, and include communication skills necessary for effective interaction. Except for EPAS 4 and 5, this course covers all other EPAS and begins to build direct client skills that may be applied in the field.

**SW 402 Interviewing Skills in Social Work:** This course provides students with hands-on basic skills models of interviewing in a variety of social work modalities and settings.

**SW 470 Social Differences and Social Work Practice:** This course is an examination of the dynamics of identity-based discrimination in our society and how those dynamics are embedded in social work practice. The course places these forms of oppression in the historical and current economic, political and social contexts of the United States. The course is designed to prepare students to analyze classism, racism, patriarchy, transphobia, heterosexism, ageism, ableism, and other forms of identity-based discrimination as they operate at the individual, community, and institutional levels, and to understand how they shape our lives. A major theme of the course is the social worker’s professional responsibility to help achieve an inclusive society. This course will introduce students to the concepts of principles relevant to working with peoples of color, LGBTQQI, people
with disabilities, and older adults. The focus will be on the examination of the myriad factors that must be considered in social work practice with oppressed and marginalized individuals, families, and communities. The differences and commonalities of values, norms, attitudes, and behaviors among and across these groups will also be examined.

**Required courses of the BASW Senior Year, both fall and spring semesters (designed to support students in the field):**

*SW 503 (fall) and 505 (spring):* Credits granted for field placement hours at a social services agency.

*SW 502 (fall) and 504 (spring):* Concurrent weekly seminar for the entire academic year. The two-semester field work placement and concurrent seminar offers an opportunity for students to integrate theory and practice through "hands-on" experience, seminar discussions, and written assignments. The seminars are designed as a discussion seminar to integrate student’s field experience (SW 503) to the curriculum in generalist social work practice. The seminar provides a forum in which social work interns can examine their fieldwork practicum experience and process. The emphasis is on the integration of social work knowledge, attitudes, values, ethics, skills and techniques from the curriculum to the field agency setting. Emphasis is placed on cultural responsiveness and the importance of recognizing issues of diversity within oppressed and disadvantaged populations. The seminar is a forum for discussing ethical and practice issues arriving from student’s practice settings, with an emphasis on developing student’s skill with the target population and an increased ability to evaluate their individual practice at all levels of practice. The seminar covers EPAS 1,2,7 & 8.

*SW 456 Urban Community Organizing and Citizen Action (Fall):* This course looks at the history and current developments in community organizations in urban settings primarily and, to some extent, in other locales. Topics include principles and strategies of developing citizen action organizations, the role of community organizing and citizen participation in urban social programs. Culturally appropriate, sensitive, and effective methods for organizing and implementing social action and change in our international environment are
emphasized. This course completes the curriculum's generalist practice framework. The course focuses on EPAS 1-5.

*SW 450 Introduction to Research Methods in Social Work (Spring):* This course provides students with an overview of research methodology, a perspective on the social work practitioner as a consumer of social work research, and methods employed in the evaluation of their practice. This course provides the student with an introductory understanding of social work research as scientific method and its application to generalist social work practice. It provides students with knowledge, skills, values, and cognitive and affective processes necessary to conduct professionally-related research studies and to critically assess research articles in the social work/social welfare literature. Quantitative and qualitative research methods are examined. It also explores the relevance of research in generating and perpetuating perceptions of race, gender, and sexual orientation. This course is only open to students who have completed the Junior year curriculum. As a Community Service Learning (CSL) designated class, students earn CSL credits upon completing the course.

*SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, and their Families (Fall or Spring):* This course is designed as an introductory course, which addresses policies, programs, and practices that impact on services to children, youth, and their families. A significant focus is given to public child welfare because it is a specialized field in social welfare services. Therefore, this course includes exploration into the family court system, the juvenile justice system and the child welfare system with emphasis on children’s protection services. The implication of these services is looked at within the context of delivery on the state, national, and international levels. The intentional inclusion of a global context examines how the rights of children, youth, and families are framed within international laws. Throughout the course, students engage in critical analysis about the range of services and how they are delivered within system practices, policies, and programs. Attention is given to local and global issues such as poverty; laws for the protection of children; child abuse and neglect; foster care, kinship care and adoptions, health issues, especially those that
impact children locally and globally, such as lack of health coverage and HIV/AIDS, as well as institutional and global racism, LGBTQQQI youth issues, and immigration laws.

In an effort to provide students an inter-generational perspective to practice, students now have the option to choose between taking SW 350 and GRN 500 Gerontology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective offered by the Gerontology Program. This course covers concepts and issues in gerontology; the processes, problems, and challenges of aging as it relates to other disciplines. The course integrates and emphasizes research findings in gerontology.

In sum, upon successful completion of the Baccalaureate Program, students have acquired the ability to have an understanding of the social and physical environment in which social work practice occurs, and of the complex sources of human thoughts and ideals. Students have acquired an awareness of the social, economic, political and cultural factors which shape our society today and which contribute to the development and interpretation of individual and social needs. Students have an understanding of social work values and ethics and their implementation in social welfare policies and social work practice. This is a central theme of the curriculum that is taught in every course through the use of the NASW Code of Ethics. The value base as an element of the social worker's practice is particularly emphasized in the field work placement and field seminar, as well as beginning skills in social work practice through both classroom and field instruction.

Study Abroad Programs

The SSW offers two study abroad programs to BASW students as part of its commitment to fostering a global perspective to social work practice and SF State’s strategic goal of promoting equity in international education. These programs are part of bilateral exchanges between SF State and partner institutions overseas, which offer students unique opportunities for long-term study abroad as part of their social work degree. In exchange, the SSW also serves as a host institution to exchange students from these partner universities.
Hochschule Fulda, Germany Bilateral Exchange Program (Fall, Senior Year). Students participate in the International Social Work Course, a cohorted program offered by Fulda Hochschule Department of Social Work. The program runs only in the Fall semester and is taught in English except for one course in German as a Foreign Language. Students take courses in Subject-specific Aspects of Social Inequality and Social Work; the Fundamentals of Intercultural Competence; the Policy, Politics, and Structure of Europe; Social Work Institutions: Visits for the Purpose of Familiarization with “Good Practice”; and German as a Foreign Language. Students also have a field placement and a field seminar internship and project work in an intercultural context. Field placement opportunities offered to students include working with agencies servicing refugees, asylees, and unaccompanied minors; working with youth; and “street work.” BASW students participate in the ISWC along with German students and other international students.

Below is the road map for students who participate in the student exchange program with Hochschule Fulda. Table 2.0.1.a shows the road map during the semester that they are abroad while Table 2.0.1.b shows the road map during the semester following their semester abroad:

Table 2.0.1 a. Study Abroad HS Fulda Road Map Fall Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Requirement</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Course Substitute</th>
<th>ECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7. A. Social Work in an International Context and Fundamentals of Intercultural Competence (450 hours)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 401 Social Work Practice II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Subject-Specific Aspects of Social Inequality and Social Work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fundamentals of Intercultural Competence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division General Education Requirement – SF Studies (Global Perspectives)*</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>• Policy, Politics, &amp; Structure of Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SW 502 Seminar on Field Experience I 2 3.7.B. (300 hours)
1) Social Work Institutions: Visits for the Purpose of “Familiarization” with Good Practice 2.5

SW 503 Field Experience in the Social Services I 3 2) Internship and project work in an Intercultural Context 7.5

Upper Division General Education Perspectives– SF Studies (Global Perspectives)* 2.5 3.7.C. German as a Foreign Language (150 hours) 5

Total 15 30*

(*15 units = 30 ECTS) Students will be able to transfer up to 15 units to SF State upon their return. Students will earn 30 ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) which are equivalent to 15 (U.S.) units.

Table 2.0.1 b. Study Abroad HS Fulda Road Map Spring Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Requirement</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Course Substitute</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose one:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, &amp; Their Families</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GRN 500 Gerontology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 450 Introduction to Research in Social Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 456/UPS 456 Urban Community Organizing and Citizen Action (Only offered in the Fall semester)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>***Choose one:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• USP 512 Urban Policies and Community Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HED 455 Community Organizing and Community Building for Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ETHS 410/SOC 410 Grassroots Organizing for Change in Communities of Color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City University of Hong Kong Bilateral Exchange Program (Fall and Spring). Students take a minimum of 12 units of social work courses offered by the City University of Hong Kong through open enrollment. Students have the option of studying abroad in either the Fall or Spring semester. The courses are taught in English. Proficiency in Cantonese and Mandarin is required for field instruction classes.

Below is a road map for students who participate in the student exchange program in City University of Hong Kong during the Fall semester of their senior year. Since CUHK have very similar course offerings to our program, the students follow the same road map for the Fall Semester Senior year as students staying in SF State. Thus, it was not necessary to create another road map for the students during the semester following that when they study abroad.

Table 2.0.1 c. Study Abroad City University of Hong Kong Road Map Fall Semester Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Requirement</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Course Substitute</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One of the following:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>One of the following:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, &amp; Their Families</td>
<td></td>
<td>• SS 4206 Working with Children &amp; Families</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GRN 500 Gerontology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td>• SS 4215 Working with Older Adults</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 401 Social Work Practice I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SS 2116 Working with Organizations &amp; Communities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuous improvement of the BASW curriculum

Teagle Curriculum Redesign Initiative

In an effort to continue to improve the program curriculum, the SSW began a reevaluation and redesign process of its BASW curriculum in 2016. This process was supported by the Teagle Curriculum Redesign Initiative, a university mini-grant program funded by the Teagle Foundation to provide different baccalaureate programs with opportunities to facilitate curriculum analysis and redesign as part of the university’s effort to ensure higher retention of its students in the undergraduate levels. The redesign process of the BASW program involved holding a day-long faculty retreat, participation in a university-wide faculty learning community, working with external consultants (Amy Driscoll, PhD, curriculum specialist; Amy Kilgore, PhD, faculty of Communication Studies), and forming mentoring pods between tenured and adjunct faculty to work jointly on course maps and assessment rubrics. The redesign process resulted in a new BASW Road Map and assessment rubrics, both of which were useful in developing this self-study. However, the BASW road map that was developed from this process will be not be implemented until after the reaffirmation process. The school’s intent is to ensure that our curriculum continues to be in line with the school goals and the changing demographics and needs of the populations we served, as well as ensure that they continue to demonstrate a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field. Our redesign efforts for the BASW program, which sought to address redundancies within the program, were cited
in *Inside higher ed* (Pazich, 2017) as an example of how barriers can be removed to achieve curricular coherence.

**SSW Student Survey: Feedback and Results**

As part of the BASW program’s efforts at continuous improvement, the SSW created opportunities for students to provide input and feedback on the curriculum. The committee was tasked to write the explicit curriculum chapter of this self-study included student representatives from the Junior and Senior BASW cohorts who contributed meaningfully in composing the instrument for a student survey about the curriculum, and creating the dataset on SPSS. The committee refined the instrument before administering it to both cohorts. The faculty members of the committee entered the responses into SPSS and later analyzed the results. The table below shows the mean responses of the students on the curriculum.

Table 2.2.2. b Results of the Student Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean (Scale 1-5; 1= strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know the mission and goals of the BASW Program</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives and learning outcomes of each class are sufficiently made clear to me</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the curriculum, there is equal distribution of courses, emphasis, and instruction time focusing on each level of practice – micro, mezzo, macro, and global</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sequencing of the courses from one semester to the next is clear and logical</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you answered disagree or strongly disagree, please cite specific examples of over emphasis on only one or two levels of practice:

- I would like this course will be taught differently because the course or content of the classes is difficult to understand sometimes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel like there are redundancies between the courses.</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>3.29</th>
<th>1.206</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you answered disagree or strongly disagree, please cite specific examples of the sequencing of courses that are unclear or illogical (verbatim BASW student responses below):

- I don't have an issue with redundancies in this context because social work concepts are all focused on social issues/welfare.
- I feel like in general some parts of the curriculum and assignments feel repetitive
- In this semester, we are doing the same project three times in three separate classes.
- Many courses mimic one another in terms of subject/content manner, making it redundant and hard to focus in multiple classes.
- Materials are not the same throughout (the) courses but content is consistent.
- Not bad because there are connections between the courses which make the subject better.
- Repeat different concepts to make sure students understand the course material
- Some of the history of SW
- Some required courses do not seem necessarily related to the major.
- SW 402 (Interviewing Skills) and SW 400 (Direct Practice) both have similar role-playing assignments.
- The interviewing class (SW 402) and the direct practice in social work (SW 400) seem similar because (in) both classes, we were doing similar assignments. We learn about interviewing in the direct practice class and it feels like the content can be done in one course.
- The practice classes had given the same assignments
- This is good through theories, frameworks
- We have class assignments that are similar.
- We have the same assignment in two of our classes!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My instructors engage students through a variety of methods</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>4.19</th>
<th>.739</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My instructors facilitate opportunities to understand and directly apply key components of different theoretical frameworks</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My instructors encourage critical thinking.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classes are engaging and provide space for stimulating discussions</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My instructors create opportunities for self-reflection to ensure that I am aware of how my biases may impact my thoughts and actions.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My classroom learning environments model affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My classroom learning environments model anti-oppressive practice (AOP).</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My voice is heard and respected in classes.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum is coherent and integrated between classroom and field.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum easily translates to usable application of theories and concepts in the field.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My field education has provided generalist practice opportunities to demonstrate all social work competencies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My classes have supported my competency as a social worker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How familiar are you with the Nine Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Social Work Competencies?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum has honed my professional identity as a social worker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum enhanced my ability to engage with diversity and difference.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum enhanced my commitment to human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum enhanced my appreciation for research and its application to social work practice.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum enhanced my ability to engage in policy practice.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum honed my ability to engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum honed my ability to assess individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum honed my ability to intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum honed my ability to evaluate interventions with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use this space to elaborate on your answers above and provide concrete examples.

- 50% of classes are not engaging and are very monotonous and repetitive, as well as difficult to comprehend due to them having low participation opportunities, as well as unclear answers to questions.
- I am a BASW student, I haven't had field experience yet!
- I answered neither agree nor disagree because I'm unclear as to what my "field education" is referring to.
- I wish we had more hands-on practice and scenarios in class rather than written papers. There was too much emphasis on written work (not enough case or court report writings). I would have liked to role play different fields in social work.
- Regarding field education, I think the current financial situation/cost of living in the Bay Area should be taken into account. It's already difficult to afford schools, and many students work, sometimes 2+ jobs. Requiring students to complete 16 hours (2 days) of internship on top of two full days of on-campus days, doesn't leave students with time to work and make a living. Many students are struggling with having to choose between work or the program (school). Perhaps cutting down on the hours of on-campus time would be a good way to allow students to still get their internship hours in. Half days would/could be an option.
- By making field work mandatory. In my field placement, I was able to work with an inter-disciplinary team and it being in a community with many intersectionalities, we've learned Chinese. Seminar helped us connect theory to practice.
- Didn't hone in on my ability but briefly touched on it.
- I'm very content with my education @ SFSU's BASW program.
As one can glean from the survey results, the students were generally satisfied with the BASW curriculum. The first set of questions asked about the goals of the BASW program, how the curriculum addresses the goals, the sequencing of courses, and redundancies (if any) in the curriculum. The average responses of the students were mostly in the 4.0 to 4.6 range on a five-point agreement scale. The responses were more homogenous among the students for the questions on knowledge of the goals of the BASW program, being heard and respected, field education, and how the curriculum supported improving a number of social work competencies. The only items that had lower mean scores were: 1) the question on redundancies in the curriculum (X = 3.29; s.d. = 1.206); and 2) how familiar were the students with the EPAS 2015 core competencies (X = 2.97; s.d. = 1.347). The responses to the questions were also more varied based on the standard deviations. These findings reflected the fact that students’ views were mixed about the redundancies in the curriculum, as well as how well they know the core competencies. The qualitative responses indicate that some students thought that the intentional redundancies were not necessarily problematic and were in fact, considered important in learning and understanding particular theories or practice principles. Others identified redundancies in terms of similar assignments between practice courses (i.e. SW 400 and 402). Another theme gathered from the qualitative responses was the students’ appreciation for the connection between class content (theories, approaches) and the field instruction experience. One student cited how the field seminar was very helpful in making this connection clear to the students.

These survey results are indeed very informative. The faculty intends to use these results to inform on-going curriculum redesign. The redesign process resulted in a multi-draft BASW Road Maps and assessment rubrics, which were useful in developing this self-study. The School’s intent is to ensure that our curriculum continues to be in line with the school goals and the changing demographics and needs of the populations we serve, as well as ensure that they continue to demonstrate a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.
2.0.3: The program provides a matrix that illustrates how its generalist practice content implements the nine required social work competencies and any additional competencies added by the program.

*See Next Page for the BASW Curriculum Matrix and the narrative follows the matrix.
# SFSU BASW Curriculum Matrix FALL 2016 (Generalist Practice Curriculum Matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course Content (readings, module, assignments, class activities, etc)</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Course unit(s) or weeks covered</th>
<th>Page number(s) in respective course syllabus [*all syllabi are in volume II]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>SW 302: Introduction to Social Service Organizations</td>
<td>Group review of NASW Code of Ethics and their applicability to service organizations. Grobman, Days in the Lives of Social Workers 1-58, chapter report and presentation reflecting on the Code of Ethics. Visits to community service organizations. Journal reflections on visits, readings and Code of Ethics. Visits to Community Service organizations providing services to diverse populations. Reflective journals on visits and populations served. Overview of Social Services organizations, operations and sustainability.</td>
<td>Knowledge, Skills Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective processes</td>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>SW 352: Gender, Sexism, &amp; Social Welfare</td>
<td>Kirk &amp; Okazawa-Rey, Chapters 1-12 Film: The F word Capabilities &amp; Vulnerabilities Analysis Framework Women’s Empowerment Framework</td>
<td>Knowledge, Skills Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective processes</td>
<td>1-16, 4-16</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the CVA &amp; WE on SB 23 Repealing the Maximum Family Grant Rule</td>
<td>1-10, 12, 13, 15, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading: March, Smyth, Mukhopadhyay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Exercise: Reshaping Body Images</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Reflection Paper on Identity &amp; Social Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion: Criminalization of Black Girls – A timeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime &amp; Criminalization Group Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Division of Labor Discussion. Workshop on searching Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Services Guest speaker: Joe Daniels (JPL Library)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster Presentation on applying the Capabilities &amp; Vulnerabilities (CVA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Women’s Empowerment (WE) frameworks on the DoD Manual on Sexual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault. Guest speaker: BASW Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women &amp; the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecofeminism; Green Social Work Group Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a Globalized World.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive workshop on Social Work &amp; Human Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, Peace, &amp; Security Group Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film: Pray the Devil Back to Hell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Change: Theory, Vision, &amp; Action. Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class exercise: Feminism In-class free writing prompts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1, 2, 3, | SW 410: Human Development & Social Services | Conversation with BASW and in-coming exchange student on social work practice & study abroad  
Gender Analysis Paper  
Final Oral Exam |  
| 1, 2, 3, | SW 410: Human Development & Social Services | Marsiglia & Kulis, Chapters 1-10  
Rogers, Mezzo and Macro, Chapters 14-17  
Rogers, Life Course, Chapters 1-4, 9-13  
Bloom’s Taxonomy  
TED Talk: Laura Schulz: “The surprisingly logical minds of babies.”  
TED Talk: Nadine Burke Harris: “How childhood trauma affects health across a lifetime.”  
Video: Ed Boyden: “A new way to study the brain’s invisible secrets.”  
Presidential Debate activity: critique intercultural communication approaches  
Video: Richard Greene: “The 7 secrets of the greatest speakers in history.”  
Mid-term Exam  
TED Talk: Eli Pariser: “Beware Online ‘Filter Bubbles.’”  
Community experience presentations  
TED Talk: “Stuart Brown: Play is more than just fun.”  
Final Exam | Knowledge, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes | 1-16 | 14-16 |
| 1 | SW 350: Services to Children, | Article review and report on child welfare issues providing a critical analysis of the issues.  
Downs, S.W., Moore, E., McFadden, E.J., Michaud, S.M. & Costi, chapters 1-11 | Knowledge, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes | 10-13 | 11-13 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1, 2, 3</th>
<th>SW 470 Social Differences in Social Work Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youths, and Their Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video: First Impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Recognizing Child Abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Human Trafficking; Crisis for the EU and the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Human Trafficking; Crisis for the EU and the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Affective processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1-16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>13-22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social differences and their significance for social work practice. What we mean by human diversity and social differences in intercultural, interethic, and international realms.

Social differences and contexts: political, social, economic, historical, national, legal, more. Current events and changed contexts under changed political leadership (executive, legislative, and judicial branches).

Concepts and constructions of race, class, culture, ethnicity.

Conscious and unconscious notions, constructions, assumptions regarding humans of diverse backgrounds. What do “blind spots” tell us? Subtleties of the isms.

Words, terms, phrases, and meanings of diversity concepts and principles.

Factors, theories, and concepts of power and control; privilege/under-served and under-represented; and advantage/disadvantage.
Theories, concepts, issues pertaining to multiple forms of disparities by age, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, nationality, size, ethnicity, cultures, religions, more. Theories of race, ethnicity, and class. Intersectionality and matrices of isms. Theories of inequalities, discrimination, and disparities.

**Readings:**

**Assignments**
1. Write a paper that addresses “blind spots” (Banaji and Greenwald, 2016) as they pertain to you, your family/friends/associates, organizations, communities, and societies. Apply content from the three assigned textbooks, especially the book titled, *Blind Spot.*
2. Engage as a group member in a team of three gathered together to analyze a case on during class time on 18 April 2017.
Groups will be created from a random drawing during class on 4 April 2017. Each group may create their own case study or they may “discover” one in the community. Students are strongly encouraged to identify a case from which they can address intercultural differences involving international contexts. At minimum, all selected cases must involve human differences and social justice agendas, as addressed in this course and the assigned readings.

Groups are to use and apply the seven-steps in the “equity literacy case analysis approach” outlined in the Gorski and Pothini (2014) book. A group paper, authored equitably by all team members, is due on 25 April 2017. Each group is to deliver a 15-minute presentation of their work and findings on 25 April 2017. All team members are to share and share alike in all aspects of the assignment, including preparing, planning, writing, and presenting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2, 3</th>
<th>SW 410 Social Work Practice II</th>
<th><strong>Values &amp; Ethical Dilemma Paper</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This 6-7 page paper demonstrate understanding of the importance of all three levels of practice and the way different levels of practice overlap and contribute to the overall practice of social work. The paper was based on student’s internship placement, a written case study, Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective Processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
classroom role-play, or a video role-play.

Students: Identified a macro/mezzo level problem that they believed might have been faced by a social worker who is engaged in primarily micro-level practice in a specified field (i.e. forensic, child welfare, geriatric, military).

Students identified the problem and addressed the interplay of micro, mezzo and macro factors. Particular attention was paid in discussion to the way this problem may have contributed to oppression, based upon actual and/or perceived age, class, color, culture, physical and mental ability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, gender identity and expression, marital status, national origin, military status, race, religion, and sexual orientation.

Students identified the value and ethical dilemmas that may have arisen for social workers from this problem.

Students identified how they saw their own personal or professional values about this situation as congruent or conflicting with the NASW Code of Ethics.

Students identified how they would see themselves practicing social work and promoting the values of the profession in responding to this problem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</th>
<th>1, 2</th>
<th>SW 301 U.S. Social Welfare II: Problems, Programs, Policies</th>
<th>Social Policy and the American Welfare System, A Framework for Policy Analysis, and The Making of American Policy—This session focused on the complexity of the American social welfare system institutionalized in governmental, for-profit, and not-for-profit organizations; the role of values, and the recurrence in recent decades of a conservative perspective. The class discussed the importance of policy analysis in analyzing social welfare policies. The understanding how policy frameworks can be useful and the emphasis on the use and benefits of objective research based on sound data in policy implementation. Lastly, the class explored how to incorporate the voices of the marginalized in policy as well as understanding the role played by various conservative and liberal think tanks in the policy making process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Discrimination in American Society</strong> This session focused on social, economic, and political discrimination and an analysis of inequity on the bases of race, class, gender, age, sexual orientation, immigration-status and how these correlate with poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Poverty in America</strong> - This session focused on the theories that attempt to explain the nature and causes of poverty. The class explored the higher rates of poverty among minorities, female single-headed households, and children. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
class analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the various definitions of poverty and attempts to show that employment-based strategies are the most effective in dealing with poverty.

**Tax Policy and Income Distribution** – This session focused on the significance of the tax policy in the US and its implication on the provision of welfare services. The class examined how the tax code in the US seems to be more regressive than progressive and how it has exacerbated poverty.

**Social Insurance Programs** – This class explored some of the major issues and problems surrounding social insurance programs; their contradictions and difficulties and how they have become a popular mainstay of the U.S. social welfare state.

**Public Assistance Programs** - This session focused on an analysis of welfare programs from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) to the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The class explored the myths and facts about the programs; as well as their challenges and failures.

**The American Health Care System** - This session focused on the U.S. health care system—specifically; as well as Obama Care and its impact if repealed. The class also explored how the number of uninsured people, especially those with chronic illnesses, impacts
the health care system. For comparison, the class also examined medical services in other countries.

**Mental Health and Substance Abuse Policy** – This session will focus on the provision of mental health and substance abuse services and how lack of services have contributed to people living on the streets or living in single-room-occupancy hotels. The class explored various policies that have attempted to improve problems associated with chronic mental illness, as well as with alcohol and drug abuse, incarceration, street violence and social deterioration.

**Criminal Justice** – This session focused on the roles of various governmental jurisdictions in criminal justice; recent data on crime and justice expenditures; important developments and issues that include juvenile justice, Zero Tolerance, the War on Drugs and other related policies.

**Housing and Food Policies and Politics.** – This session focused on the challenges of providing housing to the lower-income households with a deeper assessment of homelessness; the disadvantages and challenges of homeownership for the poor. The also explored how a sizeable segment of the population in the U.S. is food insecure and its relationship to U.S farm
policies; as well as related programs that supplement food and nutrition for lower income households, i.e., Food Stamps, WIC, Cal Fresh etc.

The American Welfare State in an International Perspective—This session took a comparative perspective of the US welfare system in the US to other European systems. It also focused on bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies that are involved in global social and economic issues.

Readings

Assignment
Government Body Journal. Students were required to select a governmental body of their choice. They must watch the meeting proceeding in person, television or on-line and provide three separate journals (covering three or more meetings) describing the charge of the particular body, policies being discussed and the students’ reflections on policy decisions, the student’s opinion and reflections on the process as it applied to readings and discussions in class. Additional points were given to students who wrote an additional journal outlining their participation in Lobby Days.
| 1, 2 | SW 352: Gender, Sexism, & Social Welfare | Kirk & Okazawa-Rey, Chapters 1-12  
Film: The F word  
Capabilities & Vulnerabilities Analysis Framework  
Women’s Empowerment Framework  
Applying the CVA & WE on SB 23 Repealing the Maximum Family Grant Rule  
Reading: March, Smyth, Mukhopadhyay  
Class Exercise: Reshaping Body Images  
Assignment: Reflection Paper on Identity & Social Location  
Discussion: Criminalization of Black Girls – A timeline  
Crime & Criminalization Group Presentation  
Midterm Exam  
Gender Division of Labor Discussion. Workshop on searching Government Information Services Guest speaker: Joe Daniels (JPL Library)  
Poster Presentation on applying the Capabilities & Vulnerabilities (CVA) and Women’s Empowerment (WE) frameworks on the DoD Manual on Sexual Assault. Guest speaker: BASW Senior  
Women & the Environment  
Ecofeminism; Green Social Work Group Presentation  
Living in a Globalized World. Group Presentation  
Interactive workshop on Social Work & Human Rights  
Women, Peace, & Security Group Presentation  
Film: Pray the Devil Back to Hell | Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes 1-10, 12, 13, 15, 16 | 10-13 |
| SW 410: Human Development & Social Services | Marsiglia & Kulis, Chapters 1-10  
Rogers, Mezzo and Macro, Chapters 14-17  
Rogers, Life Course, Chapters 1-4, 9-13  
Bloom’s Taxonomy  
TED Talk: Laura Schulz: “The surprisingly logical minds of babies.”  
TED Talk: Nadine Burke Harris: “How childhood trauma affects health across a lifetime.”  
Video: Ed Boyden: “A new way to study the brain’s invisible secrets.”  
Presidential Debate activity: critique intercultural communication approaches  
Video: Richard Greene: “The 7 secrets of the greatest speakers in history.”  
Mid-term Exam  
TED Talk: Eli Pariser: “Beware Online ‘Filter Bubbles.’”  
Community experience presentations  
TED Talk: “Stuart Brown: Play is more than just fun.”  
Final Exam | Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes | 2-16  
14-23 |
|   | SW 350: Services to Children, Youth, and Their Families | Article review and report on child welfare issues providing a critical analysis of the issues. Downs, S.W., Moore, E., McFadden, E.J., Michaud, S.M. & Costi, chapters 1-11  
http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/poor-kids/  
Video: First Impressions  
Video: Recognizing Child Abuse  
Video: Human Trafficking; Crisis for the EU and the World  
Group Discussion  
Video: Human Trafficking; Crisis for the EU and the World  
Group Discussion  
International human trafficking video  
Final Exam | Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes | 2-16 | 10-13 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>SW 456 Urban Community Organizing &amp; Citizen Action</td>
<td><strong>Guest speaker:</strong> Geoffery Grier, San Francisco Recovery Theater and Garden to Table.</td>
<td>Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective processes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice | 1, 2, 3 | SW 450 Introduction to Research in Social Work | Introduction to Social Research and the Scientific Method  
Discussion: Introduction to research, social justice research values/principles, CSU study on food and housing insecurity  
**Class activity:** Social justice research values/principles affirmation activity  
**Getting started with the research process** | Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes | 1-16 | 9-18 |
Needs assessment
Discussion: Social work research; anti-oppressive research; research paradigms; needs assessment using a rights-based approach

**Class Activity:** Writing research questions

**Ethical issues in social work research**
**Participatory Action Research**
Discussion: Racial injustice and unethical research practice in the Tuskege syphilis study. Ethics in social work research Participatory Action Research (PAR)

**Film-showing:** Nova, WGBH Productions (1993). The deadly deception.

**The literature review**
Workshop on conducting database searches for peer-reviewed articles. Guest speaker: Joe Daniels (JPL Library)

**Class Activity:** Drawing up a literature map and outline

**Measurement in research**
Discussion: variable definition, levels of measurement, measurement issues with diverse populations Photovoice as a PAR approach.

**Class activity:** Using Wang & Burris (1997) framework (SHOWeD) for Photovoice
### Sampling approaches in research studies
Discussion: Sample planning; sampling terminology; probability & non-probability sampling; generalizability of results; diversity issues in sampling

**Class activity**: Sample size exercise

### Quantitative research
Discussion: quantitative data collection approaches; survey research; developing datasets using SPSS; data entry; descriptive statistics

**Class activity**: Developing an SPSS dataset on the needs assessment to address food and housing insecurity on campus; entering data collected from needs assessment survey.

### Research colloquium: Decolonizing research through PAR
Forum and discussion on special topics on PAR. This colloquium will focus on research justice and decolonizing research

Guest speaker: Andrew Jolivette, PhD, Professor, American Indian Studies, SF State

### Qualitative research
Discussion: qualitative data collection approaches; analyzing Photovoice

**Class activity**: Analyzing Photovoice.
### Report writing

Discussion: report writing

**Class activity**: Putting together a report on survey results and Photovoice on needs assessment study on food and housing insecurity of SF State students

### Readings


### Assignments

1. Signature Assignment/Capstone Project – Mini-Research Proposal. As a final product for this course, students were expected to turn in a mini research proposal based on their current field placement. The mini research proposal included a problem statement, a literature review, variable definitions, and a hypothesis statement if applicable.
2. NIH or CITI certificate
3. The class research project focused on the issue of food and housing insecurity among SF State students. In 2016, the Chancellor's Office of the California State University
(CSU) commissioned a study to determine the levels of food and housing insecurity among students in the CSU system. This class research project built on that study by conducting a needs assessment of SF State students in terms of food and housing insecurity. Students worked in teams and recruited research participants from campus for their projects. They explained the research project to the research participants and sought their consent. Each group then undertook both the quantitative and qualitative components of this study:

a. The **quantitative component** involved creating a survey instrument, setting up an SPSS database based on this instrument, conducting the survey, entering the data on the SPSS database, and running descriptive statistics.

b. The **qualitative component** involved conducting a Photovoice project. Participants took photographs of scenes and/or things that symbolize what they define as their needs and rights in terms of achieving food and housing security. Each group will conduct a focus group and summarized their findings from the photovoice.
Social Values & Social Welfare  
America and Poverty  
Concepts for Social Welfare  
Social Welfare & Social Justice  
Social welfare & its clients  
Economic security  
Non-profit and private security  
The social work profession  
Dolgoff & Feldstein, Chapters 4-9, 11-13, 15  
Film: Down But Not Out: A Look at Situational Poverty  
Film: The Helping Hand  
Film: Breaking the Cycle of Poverty or What Poor Child is This?  
Film: Reducing Poverty, Economic USA, 21st Century Edition  
Film: The Women of Hull House: Harnessing Statistics for Progressive Reform  
Film: Legacies if Social Change: 100 Years of Professional Social Work in the United States  
Film: Girls in Trouble  
Assignment: Social Work Pioneers Paper  
Assignment: Group Presentation and Paper  
**Group Presentation & Paper.** Students formed 5 groups of 4-5 members each. Each group created a presentation and submitted a paper that: 1) briefly described a current social problem/issue of interest or concern (child poverty, income inequality, mass incarceration, child welfare, senior services, etc.) and identified  
Knowledge, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes  
5-13, 15-17  
p. 17 |
| 1,2,3 | SW 301  
Assignment to visit and document policy body proceedings. Reflective journals on experience. Analysis of policies and creation of new ones. Final Exam covering major social welfare policies.  
**Social Policy and the American Welfare System, A Framework for Policy Analysis, and The Making of American Policy**—This session focused on the complexity of the American social welfare system institutionalized in governmental, for-profit, and not-for-profit organizations; the role of values, and the recurrence in recent decades of a conservative perspective. The class discussed the importance of policy analysis in analyzing social welfare policies. The understanding how policy frameworks can be useful and the emphasis on Knowledge, Values, Cognitive & Affective processes | 1-16 | 9-12 |
the use and benefits of objective research based on sound data in policy implementation. Lastly, the class explored how to incorporate the voices of the marginalized in policy as well as understanding the role played by various conservative and liberal think tanks in the policy making process.

**Discrimination in American Society**
This session focused on social, economic, and political discrimination and an analysis of inequity on the bases of race, class, gender, age, sexual orientation, immigration-status and how these correlate with poverty.

**Poverty in America** - This session focused on the theories that attempt to explain the nature and causes of poverty. The class explored the higher rates of poverty among minorities, female single-headed households, and children. The class analyzed the strengths and weaknesses of the various definitions of poverty and attempts to show that employment-based strategies are the most effective in dealing with poverty.

**Tax Policy and Income Distribution** – This session focused on the significance of the tax policy in the US and its implication on the provision of welfare services. The class examined how the tax code in the US seems to be more regressive than progressive and how it has exacerbated poverty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Social Insurance Programs</strong> – This class explored some of the major issues and problems surrounding social insurance programs; their contradictions and difficulties and how they have become a popular mainstay of the U.S. social welfare state.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Assistance Programs</strong>- This session focused on an analysis of welfare programs from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) to the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The class explored the myths and facts about the programs; as well as their challenges and failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The American Health Care System</strong>- This session focused on the U.S. health care system—specifically; as well as Obama Care and its impact if repealed. The class also explored how the number of uninsured people, especially those with chronic illnesses, impacts the health care system. For comparison, the class also examined medical services in other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Health and Substance Abuse Policy</strong> – This session will focus on the provision of mental health and substance abuse services and how lack of services have contributed to people living on the streets or living in single-room-occupancy hotels. The class explored various policies that have attempted to improve problems associated with chronic mental illness, as well as with alcohol and drug abuse,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
incarceration, street violence and social deterioration.

**Criminal Justice** – This session focused on the roles of various governmental jurisdictions in criminal justice; recent data on crime and justice expenditures; important developments and issues that include juvenile justice, Zero Tolerance, the War on Drugs and other related policies.

**Housing and Food Policies and Politics.** – This session focused on the challenges of providing housing to the lower-income households with a deeper assessment of homelessness; the disadvantages and challenges of home-ownership for the poor. The also explored how a sizeable segment of the population in the U.S. is food insecure and its relationship to U.S farm policies; as well as related programs that supplement food and nutrition for lower income households, i.e., Food Stamps, WIC, Cal Fresh etc.

**The American Welfare State in an International Perspective** - This session took a comparative perspective of the US welfare system in the US to other European systems. It also focused on bi-lateral and multi-lateral agencies that are involved in global social and economic issues.
Readings

Assignment
**Government Body Journal.** Students were required to select a governmental body of their choice. They must watch the meeting proceeding in person, television or on-line and provide three separate journals (covering three or more meetings) describing the charge of the particular body, policies being discussed and the students’ reflections on policy decisions, the student’s opinion and reflections on the process as it applied to readings and discussions in class. Additional points were given to students who wrote an additional journal outlining their participation in Lobby Days.

**Paper Policy Proposal and Analysis**
Students were randomly assigned a chapter within the book and were required to develop a policy proposal for a policy in the subject area discussed in the chapter using the Policy Analysis outline “A Model for Policy Analysis” on page 29 in the book (Ch. 2). The student was required to outline a proposal that included the first three parts of the outline using the headings for each section throughout the paper. These proposals were randomly assigned to other students who provided the Policy Analysis section for the proposal as well as any other feedback. For both assignments, students were
required to use primary and secondary data, including scholarly internet sources, to ensure that the proposal was based on objective information not third party opinions or information. Lastly, students who developed the proposal and the analysis on the same subject area made a presentation to the class on both sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 6: Engage with</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Page no. in respective syllabus in volume II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>SW400 Social Work Practice I</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviewing skills paper & presentation on engagement/assessment: Students are to demonstrate in class an interview segment involving basic interviewing skills utilized by a generalist social work practitioner. The demonstration may be an in-class role play. Students should choose one of the following to be performed with single or multiple partners: a) an initial interview with a new client demonstrating engagement, assessment, and role induction skills; b) an intervention with a client(s) with the purpose of facilitating change; c) any other practice skill covered in the course, with instructor approval. Each presentation is expected to last 10 minutes. Schedule the presentation with the professor.

| Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes |

This assignment can cover multiple phases including engagement/assessment/intervention
individuals/families/groups.

**Class exercise: Role Play:** Dividing into groups of three. One person is to role-play a social worker, another the client, and the third an observer. The social worker is to practice the skills of engagement reviewed in this engagement, including positive listening skills, facilitative conditions (empathy, positive regard, and congruence), summarizing and paraphrasing, clarifying, and appropriate use of questions (open-ended, close-ended, and Socratic). To determine one’s level of competence, use the checklist provided. Case scenario is given is the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</th>
<th>Field placement – no syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW503 Field Experience in the Social Services I</td>
<td>BASW student interns conduct in-take session with individual clients beginning to apply to build rapport with diverse clients through individual session or group facilitation</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>Field placement – no syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 401 Social Work Practice II</td>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is part of a three-part, developmental assignment based upon students’ work with a client in their internship. Students are asked to note HIPAA guidelines and discuss this with their field instructor in advance. Students who are not working directly with clients receive an alternative means for completing this assignment based on a film. Part A involves a process recording. The student may select a session that is involved in the engagement or assessment stages and prepare a process recording based upon an outline.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
submitted in class.

**Part A: Process Recording:** This process recording requires the student to demonstrate knowledge, concepts and skills learned over two semesters in Social Work Practice Methods I, Interviewing Skills in Social Work and into the current course, Social Work Practice Methods II. An outline for the process recording will be distributed in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, &amp; their Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The controversial, “Failure to protect children” policy &amp; Child Protection Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SW 400 Social Work Practice I</th>
<th><strong>Working with Families</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>SW 402 Interviewing Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW503 Field Experiences in the Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>SW 302 Introduction to Social Service Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students reserve 9:30 – 11:55 for agency visits (lab) which were scheduled according to the agency's availability and capacity. Students were required to attend class and agency visits, ask questions during visits, and participate in class discussion, as well as do the readings, participate actively in class and hand in written assignments.

Agencies visited:
- On Lok 30th Street Senior Day Services - Services to Spanish speaking seniors
- Our Family Coalition – LGBT advocacy organization
- Stepping Stones – Senior and disable services
- La Casa de Las Madres – Domestic violence shelter
- Boys and Girls Club – After school organization for youth
- Rally Family Visitation Services – Providing supervised visitation services to families referred by the family and dependency courts
- NICOS – Coalition of agencies serving the San Francisco Chinatown community
- Administrative Offices of the Court – Policy making body for the Court system in California
- UCSF Citywide – Adult behavioral health services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>SW 456 Urban Community Organization &amp; Citizen Action</th>
<th><strong>How organizing works: Leadership &amp; meetings</strong></th>
<th>Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective Processes</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case Studies will be reviewed focusing on leadership and another important element in organizing which is the “meeting”. The meeting is where organizations build their strategic capacity. The class covered the role of meetings in organizing and ways of running meetings effectively.</td>
<td>Video: Making Government Work</td>
<td>Reading: Rubin, H.J. &amp; Rubin, I.S. (2008). <em>Community Organizing &amp; Development</em>. 4th Ed. Pearson. Chapter 12. Expanding capacity through empowering, participatory meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>SW 456 Urban Community Organization &amp; Citizen Action</th>
<th><strong>How organizing works: Organizations.</strong></th>
<th>Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective Processes</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This session focused on the organization, as the expression of people’s capacities and power.</td>
<td>Reading: Pyles, L. (2009). <em>Progressive Community Organizing: Reflective Practice in a Globalizing World</em>. Routledge, Chapter 6, Organizing people: Constituencies &amp; coalitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Course Content</td>
<td>Dimension(s)</td>
<td>Page no. in respective syllabus in volume II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 7: Assess with Individuals</td>
<td>SW400 Social Work Practice I</td>
<td>Student intern provide community outreach &amp; education on various issues &amp; services (e.g., teen pregnancy, gambling, alcohol use, etc)</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills paper &amp; presentation on engagement/assessment: Students are to demonstrate in class an interview segment involving basic interviewing skills utilized by a generalist social work practitioner. The demonstration may be an in-class role play. Students should choose one of the following to be performed with single or multiple partners: a) an initial interview with a new client demonstrating engagement, assessment, and role induction skills; b) an intervention with a client(s) with the purpose of facilitating change; c) any other practice skill covered in the course, with instructor approval. Each presentation is expected to last 10 minutes. Schedule the presentation with the professor.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assignment can cover multiple phases including engagement/assessment/intervention individuals/families/groups.
Students are given the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST), and life stress assessment measures to practice to assess alcohol problem and life stress of clients.

Students will complete a self-reflection of bio-psycho-social-spiritual-cultural and history assessment (of self).
The format for the social study will be provided by the professor.

**Class exercise:** Students are given several case scenarios for assessment using one of the theories covered in class and asked to (1) explain and assess these cases; (2) explain how the theory helps explain/assess the case; (3) explain how the theory help social workers intervene the case; and (4) explain the limitation of the theory to explain/assess the case.

**Some cases are related to individuals, some are families, and some are groups/organizations**

**Class exercise:** Designing genogram & ecomap

Class exercise: Class watch a child with behavioral problems as well as family issues and students are asked to assess the child based on bio-psycho-social-spiritual-cultural and history assessment.

Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes

Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW502</td>
<td>Seminar on Field Experience I</td>
<td>Historical-spiritual/cultural assessment framework and to identify intervention methods.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW503</td>
<td>Field Experience in the Social Services I</td>
<td><strong>Case scenario assessment:</strong> Students practice risk assessment (e.g., child maltreatment, elder abuse, partner violence, etc)</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW504</td>
<td>Seminar on Field Experience II</td>
<td>Example: BASW student interns conduct bio-psycho-social assessments to problem gamblers/drug addicts through interviews and assess “where the client is” by building rapport and using active listening when working with clients one-on-one. BASW students conduct bio-psycho-social-spiritual/cultural assessments with individual clients (as relevant) and present their case assessment in the field seminar class.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment: Each student will be expected to complete a process recording of an interaction with a client(s) with whom you have had several contacts (for about 20 minutes in one session). This process recording will involve reconstructing a narrative including verbatim (exactly) what you said to the client and how the client responded to you in the interview process. You will be expected to share your thoughts and feelings toward the client both during and after the meeting.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families</strong></td>
<td><strong>SW 350 Services to Children, Youth, &amp; their Families</strong></td>
<td><strong>This process-recording assignment can be done with individuals/families/groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students are taught about the Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale and practice assessing suicidality risks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The controversial, &quot;Failure to protect children&quot; policy &amp; Child Protection Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW 401 Social Work Practice II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assessment &amp; Identifying Strengths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>SW 400 Social Work Practice I</td>
<td>Working with Groups: Macro Practice</td>
<td>SW 401 Social Work Practice II</td>
<td>Focus: Assessment and Framing Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Mining for strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affective processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity:</td>
<td>Practice and videotape role-play client interviews with emphasis on solution focused interventions and nonverbal behavior- scenarios and grading rubrics given.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations</td>
<td>SW 456 Urban Community Organization &amp; Citizen Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding power</td>
<td>In this session, students develop an understanding of power, its dimensions, and manifestations in organizations, communities and social work practice, as well as its centrality organizing. Students review steps to developing Power analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading:</td>
<td>Rubin, H.J. &amp; Rubin, I.S. (2008). <em>Community Organizing &amp; Development</em>. 4th Ed. Pearson. Chapter 4, Empowering individuals; Chapter 5, Building community to create capacity for social change; Chapter 6, Empowering through building progressive organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment: Power Analysis</td>
<td>Students conduct an analysis of the faces of power that they observe in an organizational setting. The paper include the diagram showing where power lies in the organization being analyzed and a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge, Skills, Values, Cognitive &amp; Affective Processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
narrative detailing their analysis. This power analysis can also be based on a case study presented in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SW502 Seminar on Field Experience I</th>
<th><strong>Assignment:</strong> Students are asked to conduct field agency assessment including the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Your field work agency related to its philosophy, mission, organizational structure (and/or programs/services), and theoretical orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Funding and its source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Client population served and characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Your role as a student intern and social work skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Description of areas of social work development and growth (for clinical or macro practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Others (e.g., job opportunities or career path related to the internship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>no more than 10 pages.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td><strong>Overview of Non-profit organizations, populations served.</strong> Understanding the micro, mezzo and macro service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 302 Introduction to Social Service Organizations</td>
<td><strong>Reading:</strong> Days in the Lives of Social Workers - Linda May Grobman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong> Group Research Paper &amp; Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students were divided into. Each group developed a paper chosen from one of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge, Skills, Value, Cognitive &amp; Affective Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 and 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the services/populations in assignment #1. The group chose a minimum of 3 organizations to research. The paper provided a description of the population(s) being served, the legal status of the organization, its structure, history, and anything else relevant to the organization and services being researched. The students provide their own analysis of whether they believe these are effective organizations and whether they would recommend them for an internship or work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 456 Urban Community Organization &amp; Citizen Action</td>
<td><strong>How organizing works: Community Profiles</strong>&lt;br&gt;The session focused on case studies and applying the elements of community organizing. This session delved on the techniques for undertaking a community profile.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Reading:&lt;br&gt;Rubin, H.J. &amp; Rubin, I.S. (2008). <em>Community Organizing &amp; Development</em>. 4th Ed. Pearson. Chapter 9, Learning about personal, community, and social needs through action research.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Assignment: Community Profile Students organized themselves into groups and conducted a profile of a community of their choosing. Students used asset-based and rights-based approaches in identifying issues and social problems in the community. The profile included research on such problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and demographic/ecological information on the community being discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Page no. in respective syllabus in volume II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 8: Intervene with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>SW400 Social Work Practice I</td>
<td>Interviewing skills paper &amp; presentation on engagement/assessment: Students are to demonstrate in class an interview segment involving basic interviewing skills utilized by a generalist social work practitioner. The demonstration may be an in-class role play. Students should choose one of the following to be performed with single or multiple partners: a) an initial interview with a new client demonstrating engagement, assessment, and role induction skills; b) an intervention with a client(s) with the purpose of facilitating change; c) any other practice skill covered in the course, with instructor approval. Each presentation is expected to last 10 minutes. Schedule the presentation with the professor.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assignment can cover multiple phases including engagement/assessment/intervention individuals/families/groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Class exercise</th>
<th>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 504 Social Work Field Seminar</td>
<td>Class exercise: Class watch a child with behavioral problems as well as family issues and students are asked to assess the child based on bio-psycho-social-historical-spiritual/cultural assessment framework and to identify intervention methods.</td>
<td>Crisis Intervention • Discuss current cases; • Challenges during crisis intervention • Developing self-awareness, after the crisis • Self-care post-crisis</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 400 Social Work Practice I</td>
<td>Class exercise: Class watch a child with behavioral problems as well as family issues and students are asked to assess the child based on bio-psycho-social-historical-spiritual/cultural assessment framework and to identify intervention methods.</td>
<td>Families</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW504 Social Work Field Seminar</td>
<td>Trauma Informed Care • What does it mean to be “trauma informed” with clients, families, groups, and organizations? • Vicarious Trauma and Self-Care</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAMSHA (2014). TIC in Behavioral Health Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>SW 401 Social Work Practice II</th>
<th><strong>Focus: Intervention and Creating Alliances</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        |                               | **Reading:**
|        |                               | An Experiential Approach to Group Work, Chapters 3-4
|        |                               | **Activity:**
|        |                               | Watch video solution focused interviewing with involuntary clients
|        |                               | **Discussion:**
|        |                               | Working alliances with voluntary and involuntary clients
|        |                               | Dealing with roadblocks
|        |                               | Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes | 14

83
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>SW 456 Urban Community Organization &amp; Citizen Action</th>
<th><strong>How organizing works: Leadership and Meetings.</strong> Case Studies will be reviewed focusing on leadership and another important element in organizing which is the “meeting”. The meeting is where organizations build their strategic capacity. We will cover the role of meetings in organizing and ways of running meetings effectively. Video: Making Government Work</th>
<th>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How organizing works: Campaigns.</strong> This session will focus on another important element of organizing – that of campaigns. Campaigns are actions pursued by organizations that manifest their strategic capacity. The steps and mechanics of conducting campaigns will be examined further. Video: Changing the World: Makers: Women Who Make America</td>
<td><strong>How organizing works: Organizations.</strong> This session will focus on the organization, as the expression of people’s capacities and power. Speaker: Geoffrey Grier, San Francisco Recovery Theater and Garden to Table.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communities</th>
<th>SW 456 Urban Community Organization &amp; Citizen Action</th>
<th>Community Organizing Plan</th>
<th>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Based on the community profile, student groups developed a community organizing plans outlining goals and objectives to organize around the issues or needs identified in the community profile. The plan provides a clear step-by-step strategy to achieve the goal. Each group wrote a paper on its CO plan and presented it in class.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Competency Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course Content</th>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Page no. in respective syllabus in volume II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 9: Evaluate with Individuals</td>
<td>SW 503 Field Experience in the Social Services I</td>
<td>BASW student interns use process recording as a tool for self-evaluation and reflection on outcomes BASW student interns participate in data analysis of clients’ presenting problems and outcomes in medical social work department in hospital setting</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>Field placement – no syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW 505 Field Experience in the Social Services II</td>
<td>Student interns use client's data to develop interventions. Student interns use agency data to evaluate the positive and negative impacts of agency programs on clients.</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>Field placement – no syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 503 Field Experience in the Social Services I / SW 505 Field Experience in the Social Services II</td>
<td>Student interns use field supervision (individual/group) to evaluate their practices and interventions/interactions with clients</td>
<td>Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive &amp; affective processes</td>
<td>Field placement – no syllabus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Families | SW 400 Social Work Practice I | **The Helping Process—Termination Phase**  
**Evaluation Process**  
Readings:  
| Groups | SW 401 Social Work Practice II | **Focus: Evaluation and Recognizing Success; Professional Writing**  
Activity: Practice writing SMART goals | Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes | 15 |
### Reading

**Focus:** Evaluation and Recognizing Success; Professional Writing, cont.

**Activities:**
- Assess other students’ goals and objectives based on rubric strengths and areas to improve?
- Identifying stages of change based on client statements
- Creating service goals based on client stage of change.

#### Readings

Dulmus & Sowers (2012). Fields of Practice, Chapter 8: Forensic Settings

### Organizations
| SW505 Field Experience in the Social Services II |
| Student interns collect and analyze data from the health education projects and gambling and evaluate effectiveness of community education. |
| Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes |
| Field placement – no syllabus |

### Communities
| SW 450 Introduction to Research in Social Work |
| Class research project: Needs assessment of food & housing security of SF State students |
| Knowledge, values, skills, cognitive & affective processes |
| 10-11 |
The class research project – a needs assessment of food and housing security of SF State students – includes both quantitative and qualitative components. The class research project focused on the issue of food and housing insecurity among SF State students. In 2016, the Chancellor's Office of the California State University (CSU) commissioned a study to determine the levels of food and housing insecurity among students in the CSU system. This class research project built on that study by conducting a needs assessment of SF State students in terms of food and housing insecurity. This class research project was conducted in five groups of five students. Each group recruited research participants from campus for their projects. They explained the research project to the research participants and sought their consent. Each group then undertook both the quantitative and qualitative components of this study:

1. The **quantitative component** involved creating a survey instrument, setting up an SPSS database based on this instrument, conducting the survey, entering the data on the SPSS database, and running descriptive statistics.

2. The **qualitative component** involved conducting a Photovoice project. Each group recruited a smaller number of research participants from those who completed the survey.
Group members asked research participants to take photographs of scenes and/or things that symbolize what they define as their needs and rights in terms of achieving food and housing security. Each group conducted a focus group with their research participants where in the latter showed and explained their photographs. Each group summarized their findings from the photovoice.

Note: SW 503 (fall semester) and SW 505 (spring semester) are credits given for field practicum and no syllabus exists yet professional expectations are outlined in the learning contracts that are aligned with EPAS 2015 competencies, behaviors, and dimensions.
Narrative to Accompany the BASW Curriculum Matrix

In order to complete this standard, the faculty began by collectively examining the SSW’s syllabi. We developed a week-by-week schedule of classes for each syllabus that outlines the readings, learning activities, assignments and other assessment instruments, the competencies, and the dimensions covered each week. Once all the syllabi were completed, the explicit curriculum committee conducted a pre-mapping of the BASW curriculum to determine which courses more strongly covered each of the competencies. The committee deemed it necessary to pre-map the BASW curriculum before composing the matrices.

Upon initially reviewing the syllabi, the committee noted that most showed their courses addressed each of the nine core competencies. While it is true that courses are able to demonstrate how all the core competencies are covered, it is perhaps more salient that certain courses clearly and extensively addressed a given competency, while others may do so in a secondary, or even more cursory way. Pre-mapping the curriculum, together with extensive discussion among the faculty enabled us to identify which courses more selectively covered a given competency and aided our composing the curriculum matrix for both foundation and specialized practice. As a result of the pre-mapping, the matrix for the BASW curriculum more accurately illustrates the areas in the curriculum that closely address each competency. Upon reflecting on this process of mapping out the competencies within the BASW curriculum, we also recognize that the course management system or iLearn (SF State’s CMS platform) may provide much more detail than the paper syllabi. It would appear that the current self-study takes place at a key moment in our academic history. Not unlike medical and other clinic practice settings, as a school, we often find ourselves using two systems simultaneously: a paper system (in this case, the syllabus) and an electronic one (iLearn). During this period, we recognize there are some redundancies between the two, and in some cases, neither system independently reflects the whole of the course in a manner that is 100% accurate. As of this writing our university applications are going online for the first time. It seems inevitable that our syllabi, too, will someday soon be required to exist in a fully-digital format.

For the time being, the iLearn site has become the main tool for student engagement in many of our courses. In an increasingly digital world, large numbers of
students and faculty, alike rely upon the iLearn site as the primary source for updated course information, including links to required readings, material for further learning, access to videos that may be reviewed in class, etc. As such, iLearn often serves as the “living record” for the course, reflecting changes and enhancements to the curriculum in response to the ever-changing realities of our social and practice environments throughout the semester. As the self-study continued, faculty agreed that by contrast, the syllabus is more often understood as a launching point for the course where baseline standards are articulated; a static source of basic course information. Indeed, some instructors explicitly state that if there is ever a discrepancy between the syllabus and the course iLearn page, students should rely upon iLearn as the most up-to-date. During the course of our self-study, a dilemma occurred with the realization that faculty are required to produce a syllabus, whereas an iLearn page, while certainly the norm, is currently optional. Adjunct faculty, in particular, may have less time to produce content in two different forums. Therefore, in an effort to be consistent among classes in our curriculum review, course syllabi are used as the document of reference in our matrices.

Competency One: Demonstrate ethical and professional behavior

In mapping out the curriculum against this competency, we noted that this competency and the behaviors that operationalize it are addressed extensively throughout the BASW curriculum. Through our pre-mapping process, we decided to focus on two courses that cover this competency and its corresponding behaviors more strongly in the curriculum matrix.

Upon entering the major, the students read about the NASW Code of Ethics and discuss its implications for practice in SW 302. In this class, students visit a number of community service organizations working with diverse populations at different levels of practice. Examples of social service organizations include a domestic violence shelter for women, a boys and girls’ club, adult day centers, a health coalition in Chinatown, an agency providing case management to individuals with mental illness, agencies serving families, a youth services organization, and an administrative office of the court. Through class discussions and reflection papers, students then reflect on their agency visits in light of the core values, principles, and standards outlined in the Code of Ethics. These activities
enable students to connect concepts learned in the classroom with what they observe in their agency visits. Students are able to concretely identify what ethical and professional practice means through the agencies’ programs and staff.

This competency is further strengthened as students’ advance through the program and do their field internship in their Senior year. The field seminar class, SW 502, builds on this competency through its class content and learning activities. The class reviews the NASW Code of Ethics and goes over the SSW’s Fieldwork Manual. Both materials underscore for the students what professional demeanor is in terms of behavior and their interactions in the field agencies; in terms of appearance; and in terms of communication. In addition to the Code of Ethics, the lecture on HIPAA and its implications for practice provide students with tools and guidelines for conducting ethical decision-making in a practice setting. Using supervision and consultation to guide professional judgment and behavior is fostered through discussions of case vignettes on best practice standards in supervision. The narrative summary and learning contract assignments provide additional hands-on experiences for students on the use of supervision and consultation in a practice setting.

**Competency Two: Engaging diversity and difference in practice**

Upon completing our pre-mapping process, it did not surprise us to find that engaging diversity and difference in practice is addressed extensively throughout the BASW curriculum. As a microcosm of the city of San Francisco, the SF State campus reflects the diversity of the city in which it is located. As a result, consciousness around celebrating difference and diversity is infused throughout curricular and extra-curricular activities. The matrix shows just a sample of courses where this competency was strongly addressed.

SW 470 and 352 are the main courses in the curriculum that cover content on intersectionality and diversity based on gender, race and ethnicity, class, ability, sexual orientation, age, nationality, language, and other markers of identity. SW 470 unpacks what is meant by human diversity and difference, and goes over social differences in various contexts. SW 352 includes discussions of gender as a social construction and the different forms of embodiments of gender identification and presentation. The class covers
content about women’s bodies and size diversity, the social construction of sexuality, and violence against women, gender minorities, and persons with disabilities.

A number of courses have assignments that allow students to understand how diversity and difference shape life experiences and practices at all level. SW 470’s blind spot assignment enables students to analyze how blind spots pertain to relationships at the micro, mezzo, macro, and global levels. In the gender analysis paper in SW 352, students apply Capabilities and Vulnerabilities Assessment framework and the Women’s Empowerment framework to examine how gender norms differentiate the experiences of women, gender non-conformists, and men in how they avail of provisions of a social policy or program. The assigned readings for SW 410 from Rogers (2016) illustrate additional examples of how diversity and differences mediate experiences at all levels of practice. SW 350’s article reviews and reports on child welfare issues and the videos on related issues provided students with particular examples of social differences and diversity play out in child welfare practice.

In terms of presenting themselves as learners and engaging with clients and constituents as experts in their own experiences, SW 401’s Values & Ethical Dilemma paper gives students an opportunity to demonstrate that behavior. The paper asks students to write about a case based on their field placement about a social worker involved in a micro-level practice and analyzing the mezzo and macro forces that impact it. Students are expected to identify the values, the competing values, and ethical dilemmas implicated in the case. Although the engagement with clients and constituents is indirect, this assignment nonetheless allows students to learn through the ethical dilemma(s) identified how diversity and differences play out at all levels of practice and how the ethical dilemma(s) is/are reflected on or thought through by engaging clients and constituents.

Applying self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal bias and values in working with clients and constituents is done through on-going self-reflection. There were many assignments across the curriculum that helped hone students’ competency in doing this. SW 470’s blind spots assignments allow for reflection on how this plays out in different levels of practice. In SW 352, students write a reflection paper on their identity and social location. Students reflect on who they are and how micro, mezzo, macro, and global forces inform different dimensions of their identity. Conducting
reflections such as this are part of socially-lived theorizing and creating situated knowledge, both of which are elements of feminist theorizing and the deconstruction of gender norms that perpetuate gender oppression.

**Competency Three: Advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice**

The BASW curriculum is also replete with content, learning activities, and assignments that enable students to hone their competency in advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental studies. The matrix presents a sample of courses show this. SW 301 and 352 includes content that introduces students to social justice discourses particularly debates on the basis on which justice claims are made by different social policies and programs. SW 301’s discussions on the American Welfare System and Discrimination in American focus on how the welfare system in the U.S. reflects societal values around who should be deserving of government assistance. The discussions touch on how these values intersect with discrimination based on race, class, gender, age, sexual orientation, immigration status, and ability. SW 352’s discussions on sexism, patriarchy, heteronormativity, homophobia, and transphobia enable students to understand how these forms of oppression inform social policy provisions on who gets what, how, how much, and when. In the gender analysis paper that students write as part of their signature assignment for the class, students apply two gender frameworks – the Capabilities and Vulnerabilities Assessment (CVA) and the Women’s Empowerment (WE) – to an analysis of a social policy or program. Students learn how social policy provisions may vary depending on one’s gender identification or gender representation.

Students learn to understand issues of economic justice in SW 301 (discussions on Poverty in America, Tax & Income Distribution, Social Insurance Programs, Public Assistance Programs, and Housing & Food Policies); SW352 (Gender Division of Labor, Women and Globalization), and SW 350 (Human Trafficking). Understanding economic justice means making poverty central to social work practice, which was what the profession centered on during its earlier years. Student learn the importance and primacy of addressing socio-economic inequality and analyzing how structural oppression accounts for many of the challenges that clients and constituents face. The discussions on poverty
and different anti-poverty initiatives in SW 301 help students develop an initial understanding of economic justice issues. The discussions on the gender division of labor, the gender implications of economic globalization in SW 352 and human trafficking in SW 350 expands on the students’ understanding of economic justice by examining how the intersection of gender with these issues leads to an analysis of further oppression and exploitation of women and gender minorities.

The BASW students are first introduced to the concept of environmental justice in SW 352 where they cover a chapter from Kirk & Okazawa-Rey (2013) on Women and the Environment and Dominelli’s (2012) book on *Green social work: From environmental crisis to environmental justice*. The class focuses on theoretical and activist perspectives on women and the environment and ecofeminism; explores issues of sustainability and connection; examines the intersection of gender, race, class, and nation on issues of environmental sustainability and conceptualizes what green social work means and theorizes its convergence with gender equality and justice. In SW 456, students learn about a community-based project that promotes environmental justice. Guest speaker Geoffrey Grier of Garden-to-Table describes sustainable community programs that focus on building the capacities of low-income youth to improve their health and their environment through green and sustainable practice.

In terms of engaging in practice that advance social, economic, and environmental justice, some examples can be culled from the BASW curriculum to demonstrate this. SW 301’s government body journal compels students to engage in practice that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. Students participate in a government meeting or forum where policies are being deliberated. Students reflect on the policy decisions and the process in which different stakeholders participate in the decision-making. Additional credit was given to students who participated in Legislative Lobby Days in Sacramento. Students who participated in Lobby Days had the opportunity to participate in a day-long conference to analyze bills addressing social justice issues. This was followed by another day of lobbying and meeting with legislators at the Capitol to get their support for the bills being lobbied for. Students also participate in a mid-day social action rally at the steps of the Capitol where they use more creative approaches lobbying for social justice bills (See Lobby Days section of the Implicit Curriculum chapter).
Competency Four: Engage in practice-informed research and research-informed practice

The BASW curriculum has one research course that is offered in the final semester of the program. As stated in Section 2.0.2, SW 450 is an introductory research class that provides an overview of research methodology, a perspective on the social work practitioner as a consumer of social work research, and methods employed in the evaluation of their practice. The class is a CSL-designated class and also serves as a capstone class for the BASW Seniors. The signature assignment for the class, a Mini-Research Proposal, serves as an integrative project where students propose a research project based on their field placement and draw on the theories and methods learned in all their classes to formulate a question and write a literature review.

Through this class, students are able to use their practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research. The Mini-Research Proposal includes three components: a problem statement, a literature review, and a variable definition section. It is called the mini-research proposal since it does not include a methodology section. The three components of the mini-research proposal would suffice to meet the learning outcomes of this introductory research class. Students are encouraged to carry on with and amplify their project idea perhaps when they pursue a graduate program or when they get an opportunity to conduct research in their future place of employment. For the problem statement, students were highly encouraged to formulate a research question based on their field placement. They were advised to speak with their field instructors and/or co-workers about what would be a good research to conduct that would benefit the agency’s programs. Having students develop an agency-based mini-research proposal enabled them to see the relevance of research in a practice setting. For the literature review section, students were encouraged to draw on theories that they learned in their practice, policy, and social differences classes. The social work librarian at the J Paul Leonard Library conducted workshops with the students on searching social work and related databases for state-of-the-art peer-reviewed journal articles to use for their literature review. The librarian has been available for advisement and consultation about the students’ literature reviews.

To further enhance how students can draw on practice experience and theory in conducting or consuming research, the students undertook two learning activities that
allowed them to learn from “role model” researchers not just about the research process, but also about infusing social justice values in the research process. One assignment was a group project that involved interviewing a second year MSW student who was conducting research for a culminating experience. Students asked questions about the second year MSW students’ research projects, how they formulated their research question, what inspired them to conduct the study, what their positionality was, the methodology they used, what they hope to do with the findings, and what they liked most and least about the research process. The second learning activity was a research colloquium where Dr. Andrew Jolivette, SF State Professor of American Indian Studies, presented on the concept of research justice as illustrated by his latest research on Two-Spirit Dissolution and Intergenerational Colonial Trauma. Both learning activities modeled for the students how social justice research is conducted by a more seasoned researcher and by novice researchers.

Students also had the opportunity to apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of quantitative and qualitative research methods and research findings by conducting a class research project. The students conducted a mixed method needs assessment to inform campus-wide programs to promote food and housing security among SF State students. This research project builds on a California State University (CSU)-wide study conducted in 2016 by Rashida Crutchfield, PhD, Assistant Professor at CSU-Long Beach School of Social Work, and commissioned by the Chancellor’s Office on hunger and homelessness among students in the CSU system. This class research project also supplements other campus-wide initiatives to address food and housing insecurity among SF State students. Before conducting the study, the students were required to choose between the online research ethics course offered by the National Institute of Health (NIH) or the Collaborative Institute Training Initiative (CITI). Students turned in their NIH or CITI certificate before conducting the study. They also develop an informed consent form based on the template provided by the SF State Institutional Review Board (IRB). For the quantitative portion of the study, the students developed and validated a survey instrument describing the forms of food and housing insecurity experienced by SF State students and possible solutions that they propose. The students administered the survey to 110 SF State students who were recruited using availability or convenience sampling. The students then
developed a dataset for their survey and entered the survey responses in the dataset. Upon entering all the data, the students ran descriptive statistics, mostly frequency distributions, measures of central tendency, and measures of variation, on their food and housing security. For the qualitative portion of the study, the original research plan was to sample around 30 students from the 110 who participated in the survey to conduct a Photovoice project. However, due to time constraints that semester, the class decided to forego this portion of the study, but instead conduct their own Photovoice project. Each student took a photograph of a scene, a locale, or an object that somehow symbolizes for them what food and housing security mean and wrote a short description of the image and their own interpretation of how the image represented their thoughts on how hunger and homelessness of SF State students can be addressed.

Through the class research project in SW 450, students had the experience of using and translating research evidence to inform and improve programs, policies, and service delivery. The data collected through the survey and Photovoice project can be used to inform campus initiatives to address food and housing insecurity experienced by SF State students. The university created an ad-hoc committee tasked to address these twin issues on campus. Convened by the Heath Promotion and Wellness Center, the ad-hoc committee is made up of staff, students, and faculty and meets bi-weekly to plan strategies to curtail hunger and homelessness of SF State students. The ad-hoc committee has been aware of the class research project conducted by the SW 450 class of Spring 2017 and has requested to have a copy of the both the quantitative and qualitative findings of the needs assessment. Knowing that the university ad-hoc committee was interested in their findings, the students became more engaged in conducting their needs assessment research. They witnessed first-hand how their survey and Photovoice project can be used to influence policies and improve on current programs addressing hunger and homelessness on campus.

**Competency Five: Engage in policy practice**

The BASW curriculum addresses this competency extensively through the two courses in the policy sequence: SW 300 and 301. SW 301 enables students to identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services. Throughout the semester, SW 301 covered topics ranging
from discrimination, poverty, tax and income distribution, social insurance, public assistance, healthcare, mental health and substance abuse, criminal justice, housing, and food security. Within each of these topics, the class discussed particular policies as examples for how the students can apply their policy analysis framework. For instance, in discussing public assistance, the class discussed how the Assistance to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) led to the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). The Affordable Care Act (ACA) or Obamacare was covered during the week when the class delved on healthcare. The class analyzed policies such as the Zero Tolerance policy when they discussed criminal justice. Policies such as Women, Infant, & Children (WIC), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and CalFresh were discussed and analyzed when the class covered issues around food security. Two learning activities for the class offer students opportunities to demonstrate this behavior. The government body journal is one of them. A government body meeting is an ideal setting for students to learn about various policies at different levels of government. Observing such meetings also helps hone students’ ability to analyze policy and decision-making processes. The signature assignment for the class, a policy proposal and analysis paper, is the second learning activity that addresses this behavior. Applying Karger & Stoesz’ (2014) model for policy analysis, students developed policy proposals on one of the issues cited above which were randomly assignment to them by the instructor. Another set of students applied Karger & Stoesz (2014) model for policy analysis to the policy proposals that their peers developed. This assignment gave students an opportunity to identify a range of social policies lodged at all levels of government.

Both SW 300 and 301 ensure that students are able to assess how social welfare and economic policies impact the delivery of, and access to, social services. The preceding paragraph detailed how the signature assignment for SW 301 provided students with the learning experiences of analyzing social policy and evaluating how well they enable the delivery of social services. Karger & Stoesz’ (2014) model included questions that asked how the policy “contributed to greater social equality” (p. 31) and how it “positively affect the redistribution of income, resources, rights, entitlements, rewards, opportunities, and status” (p.31). These questions get to the heart of assessing the implications of the policy that students are analyzing to the delivery and access to social services. In SW 300’s group
presentation and paper assignment, students described a current social problem, identified the oppressed population affected, summarized the major policy approaches and policy development across history that sought to address the problem, identified the values, philosophies, ideologies, attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions underpinning these policies; and drawing lessons and policy suggestions based on these lessons. Analyzing policy approaches across different historical periods will depict for the students how these policies affected access to services in the history of the profession.

Students are able to apply critical thinking to an analysis, formulation, and advocacy of policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice through their assignments and class discussions in both SW 300 and 301. The group presentation and paper in SW 300 where students apply a historical perspective to their analysis of various social policies and propose policy recommendations, entail critical thinking in their formulation and advocacy of alternative policy solutions. SW 301’s policy proposal and analysis paper also requires the same critical thinking in breaking down the policies to its components and analyzing them. The class discussions in both courses are replete with content on advancing human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice. SW 300’s modules focused on issues of human needs, economic security, public and private responsibility for these, and the societal values that underpinned these across different historical epochs. SW 301’s modules also covered the application of critical thinking in analyzing policies that addressed social justice (modules on discrimination, criminal justice policies), economic justice (modules on poverty, tax and income distribution, public assistance, healthcare, housing, and food security policies), and environmental justice (modules on housing, mental health and substance abuse, and international policies).

Competency Six: Engage with individual, families, groups, organizations, and communities

The BASW curriculum addresses this competency extensively through most of its practice courses, field experience, and field seminar. Students are able to apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment and other theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituents, and use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills for more
effective engagement. In terms of engaging individuals, practice courses SW 400 and the field seminar course SW 502 included content and learning experiences where students acquired the competency to establish relationships with individual clients. SW 400 had a role play class exercise where students assumed the role of the social worker, the client, or an observer. Using a checklist of competency levels, students role-played how they engaged with individuals using positive listening skills, facilitative conditions (empathy, positive regard, and congruence), summarizing and paraphrasing, clarifying, and appropriate use of questions (open-ended, close-ended, and Socratic). SW 502 also has a role-play class exercise where students are given a case scenario asking them to practice engagement with an unmotivated and unwilling client. The student assuming the role of social worker is tasked to practice engagement skills to help motivate the client. The process recording assignment in SW 401 asks students to select an engagement session with a client and prepare a process recording based on an outline that was handed out in class. In their field experience (SW 503), students conduct in-take sessions with individual clients making sure to build rapport with diverse clients through individual sessions.

Students learn to engage families through modules in SW 350 and 400. In SW 350, the class discusses the controversial “Failure to protect children” policy and child protective services. Students also read Downs et al’s (2009) article on child welfare and family services policies and practices. SW 400 includes a module on Working with Families. Students learn about approaches to engaging families through a chapter on strengthening family functioning from Boyle et al’s book (2009), and Boyd et al’s (2006) article on developing a family-based depression prevention program in urban community mental health clinics.

In terms of engaging groups, SW 402 has an entire module on communicating in groups. Students read a couple of chapters from Adler et al’s (2015) book, *Understanding human communication* and participate in a class activity where students’ role play different scenarios of group work dynamics. Students then try to draw lessons from this activity in a class discussion that follows. In their field instruction experience (SW 502), student conduct or facilitate the initial session with groups and are asked to apply approaches building rapport with groups.
Students learn to engage organizations mostly through SW 302 and 456. SW 302 is one of the introductory courses where students conduct field visits to different social service agencies in San Francisco. During the agency visits, students are encouraged to ask questions to agency representatives as a way to engage them. Below is a list of the agencies that the students visited:

- On Lok 30th Street Senior Day Services - Services to Spanish speaking seniors
- Our Family Coalition – LGBT advocacy organization
- Stepping Stones – Senior and disable services
- La Casa de Las Madres – Domestic violence shelter
- Boys and Girls Club – After school organization for youth
- Rally Family Visitation Services – Providing supervised visitation services to families referred by the family and dependency courts
- NICOS – Coalition of agencies serving the San Francisco Chinatown community
- Administrative Offices of the Court – Policy making body for the Court system in California
- UCSF Citywide – Adult behavioral health services

Additional content on engaging organizations can be found in SW 456 in its module on How organizing works: Leadership and meetings. The class focuses on the role that meetings play in building the strategic capacity of organizations and the approaches to running meetings effectively. The class discusses a chapter from Rubin & Rubin’s (2008) book on expanding organizational capacity through empowering and participatory meetings.

In terms of engaging communities, SW 456 includes a module on How organizing works: Organizations. The class discusses the different approaches to engaging communities and reads a chapter in Pyles’ (2009) book on Organizing people: Constituents and coalitions. The field instruction experience (SW 503) provide students with additional opportunities to do community outreach and education on various issues and services.
Competency Seven: Assessing individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities

The BASW curriculum addresses this competency through the practice courses, the field instruction, and the field seminar. Students are able to collect data from clients and constituents and apply critical thinking in interpreting them. In their assignments, students are able to apply different theoretical perspectives such as human behavior and the social environment, and person-in-environment in interpreting assessment data. Through their field education instruction, students work with their constituents and clients in developing intervention goals and selecting intervention approaches based on assessment data.

Students learn a variety of approaches to assessing individuals in SW 400. Its interviewing skills paper and presentation allows students to role-play an initial interview with a new client demonstrating assessment skills. In another assignment, students are given the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST) and life stress assessment measures to practice assessing alcohol problems and life stress of clients. The course also includes a class exercise wherein students are given several case scenarios on assessment and asked to analyze them using assessment theories covered in class. Designing genograms and ecomaps was another exercise that gave students an additional assessment tool for working with families. Finally, students watch a film depicting a child with behavioral and family issues and assess the situation using the biopsychosocial-historical-spiritual/cultural assessment framework and identify intervention methods. In their field instruction (SW 503), students conducted biopsychosocial assessment of individuals with substance abuse and problem-gambling issues through interviews, building rapport, using active listening, and assessing “where the client is.” They then discuss this experience in their field seminar in addition to undertaking other assessment exercises in class, such as a risk assessment exercise for child maltreatment, partner violence, and elder abuse; assessing suicidality risk using the Columba Suicide Severity Rating Scale; and a process recording assignment where students record an interaction with an individual client with whom they have had several contacts. Students reconstruct the narrative of their interaction and their thoughts and feelings about the client.

In terms of assessing families, SW 401 includes a class activity called Mining for Strengths. It also has a number of assigned readings that directly inform students about
how to assess with families: Assessment: Identifying strengths in Miley et al (2016), with a particular section on identifying strengths in families; Solution focus: Its history and practice in Blundo and Simon (2016); and Family-centered practice in Dulmus and Sowers (2012). SW 350’s module on the Failures to Protect Children Policy and Child Protection Services also covers content on assessing with families. Its assigned reading, “Services to prevent maltreatment and support families” in Downs et al (2009), provides additional content on assessing families to prevent maltreatment.

Both practice classes, SW 400 and 401, outline for the students how to assess with groups. SW 400 has a discrete module on working with groups as part of macro practice and assigns students to read “Intervention with larger systems” from Boyle et al (2009). SW 401 has a class exercise where students practice and videotape a role-play of their client interviews with an emphasis on solution-focused interventions and nonverbal behaviors. Students also read “Assessment: Framing solutions” in Miley et al (2016); “School Social Work” in Dulmus and Sowers (2012); and “Solution-focused planning and assessment” in Blundo and Simon (2016)

In terms of assessing organizations, SW 456 has an entire module on Understanding Power where students try to map out where power is, its dimensions and manifestations in organizations, communities, and social work practice. Students conduct a power analysis assignment where they map out the faces of power that they observe in an organizational setting. Students read three chapters in Rubin and Rubin (2008): “Empowering individuals; Building community to create capacity for social change”; and “Empowering through building progressive organizations.” In their field seminar, SW 502, students conduct a field agency assessment including the following information: the agency’s philosophy, mission, organizational structure, and theoretical orientation; funding sources; characteristics of client population; and description of areas of social work development and growth.

Students learn about assessing communities through SW 302 and 456. In SW 302, students get an overview of non-profit organizations, the populations they serve, and the micro, mezzo, and macro service delivery. Students read Grobman’s “Days in the lives of social workers”; and undertake a group research paper and presentation where they analyze three non-profit organizations in terms of its populations, its legal status, its structure,
history, its efficacy, and whether or not it would serve as a good field placement site for students. SW 456 includes a module on How organizing works: Community profiles which covers techniques for undertaking a community profile. Students read the chapter, “Learning about personal, community, and social needs through action research” in Rubin & Rubin (2008). They also conduct a community profile as a group assignment where they use asset-based and rights-based approaches to identifying issues and social problems in the community. Their paper includes demographic and ecological information about the community and research that has been done to assess them.

**Competency Eight: Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities**

The BASW curriculum effectively addresses this competency in practice courses and their field instruction experience. Through these learning experiences, students are able to choose and implement interventions to achieve goals and enhance the capacities of clients and constituents; use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate; negotiate, mediate, and advocate with diverse clients and constituents; and facilitate effective transitions.

Students learn to intervene with individuals in SW 400 and their field seminar class. In SW 400, students undertake an interviewing skills paper and presentation where they demonstrate in class a segment of an interview involving basic interviewing skills focusing on an intervention with a client. Another class exercise involves watching a film showing a child with behavioral challenges and family issues. Students are asked to identify intervention methods for the child. Their field seminar class has a dedicated module on crisis intervention where they discuss their current cases, the challenges during crisis intervention, developing self-awareness after crisis, and self-care post-crisis. The students read the chapter on crisis intervention in Hamaoka et al (2007)’s book.

Content on intervening with families can also be found in SW 400 and their field seminar. In SW 400, students watch a film showing a child with behavioral challenges and family issues. Based on their assessment of the family, the students identify intervention methods. The field seminar includes a module on trauma-informed care. The class covers what it means to be trauma-informed in working with families, what vicarious trauma is,
and how to do self-care. Students read “Creating Trauma-Informed Systems” in Ko et al (2008), and SAMSHA’s “TIC in Behavioral Health Systems.”

Students learn about intervening with groups in SW 401. The class includes a module on intervention and creating alliances, which covers working alliances with voluntary and involuntary clients, dealing with roadblocks, and respecting differences. Students read a chapter in Miley et al (2016) on “Intervention: Creating alliances.” The chapter details how to develop alliances through groups (groups and empowerment; mutual aid in groups; self-help groups; and social action through group work). Other readings on intervening with groups include: “An experiential approach to group work; Interpersonal skills and nonverbal communication” in Matsumoto et al (2013); and “Military” in Dulmus and Sowers (2012). Students also watch a film on solution-focused interviewing with involuntary clients.

In terms of intervening with organizations, SW 456 includes a number of modules on undertaking action in an organizational setting. The module on How organizing works: Leadership and meetings focuses on leadership development as a sustainable approach to increasing the capacities of organizations. Students learn that leaders build relationships that foster solidarity within organizations; leaders facilitate interpretation of what is going on in the organization to promote understanding; leaders motivate members to increase participation; leaders strategize on how to use resources to achieve organizational goals as a way to foster initiative; and leaders mobilize other leaders and members to facilitate action. Students learn how to organize and develop leadership-rich organizations. The module also delves on the role of meetings in building an organization’s strategic capacity. Meetings serve as the place where leadership and relationships are fostered and where leaders take responsibility. Students learn how to run meetings more effectively to achieve this goal. They watch the film, Making government work. The module on How organizing works: Campaigns provides additional content on intervening with organizations. Campaigns are actions pursued by organizations that manifest their strategic capacity. Students learn about the lifeline of campaigns, the steps and mechanics of conducting them, and strategies and tactics to strengthen the organization. They also view the film, Changing the world: Makers, Women who make America. Finally, the module on How organizing works: Organizations underscores for the students that the organization is the
expression of people’s capacities and power. Organizations are the manifestations of communities in action. Here, students learn how organizations are bound, how they deliberate between continuity and change, unity and diversity, and part versus the whole. Students learn how to manage these tensions within organizations, exact accountability, acknowledge dissent, broaden participation, and celebrate gains and victories. To learn about an example of such organization, Geoffrey Grier of San Francisco Recovery Theater and Garden to Table guest spoke to the students about how organizational interventions were carried out in his experience.

Students learn to intervene with communities in SW 456. The second part of class’ signature assignment is a community organizing plan, which provided students with a direct experience on coming up with community interventions. Based on the first part of the assignment, which was a community profile, groups developed a Community Organizing (CO) plan that included their goals and objectives of their plan, a description of the particular organizing perspective they will use, and a step-by-step strategy to achieve this goal. Since SW 456 is also cross-registered as Urban Studies and Planning (USP) 456, students also experience interprofessional collaboration with their Urban Planning counterparts in designing a CO plan. The social work students emphasized the social justice (concern for human rights and equity) and biopsychosocial implications and goals of the CO plan, while the urban planning students made sure that the spatial and environmental goals of the CO plan were ensured. Students presented their CO plan in class and wrote a final group paper.

Competency Nine: Evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities

The BASW curriculum addresses this competency in its courses and field instruction. In conducting evaluations in different levels of practice, students are able to apply the different theoretical frameworks, can critically analyze findings from evaluative research, and apply their findings to an improvement of practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

Students gain competency in evaluating with individuals primarily in their field instruction (SW 503 and 505). Students analyze various data sources to evaluate the
interventions that they implemented with individual clients. Students use their process recordings as a tool for self-evaluation and reflection on the outcomes. They also take advantage of individual and group supervision to evaluate their interactions with clients and the practices and interventions with clients. In addition, students also have the opportunity, along with their supervisor and agency colleagues, to participate in the analysis of data to evaluate the process and outcomes of agency programs. For instance, students who were interning in a hospital social work setting were involved in the analysis of client data from a medical social work department.

In terms of evaluating families, SW 400 covers content on terminating and evaluating the helping process. This class covers the principles and approaches to terminating an intervention process with families. Students read a number of chapters from three practice textbooks on this content: “Knowledge & skills evaluation” from Boyle et al (2009); “Evaluation and termination” from Sheafor & Horejsi (2011); and “The final phase: Evaluation and termination” from Hepworth et al (2006).

Students learn to evaluate with groups in SW 401. The class includes two modules on how to evaluate with groups. In the first module, Evaluation and recognizing success and Professional writing, students learn techniques for monitoring and evaluation particularly for solution-focused interventions. The class undertakes an activity called Practice writing SMART goals. The students also read a chapter from Blundo and Simon (2016) called “Keeping it brief: Monitoring progress, outcomes, and transitions out of service.” In the second part of this module, students participate in three activities to enhance evaluation with groups: 1) assessment of other students’ goals and objectives, strengths, and areas of improvement based on a rubric handed out; 2) identification of stages of change based on client statements; and 3) creating service goals based on client stage of change. Students read a chapter from Miley et al (2016) called “Intervention: Integrating gains”, and Dulmus and Sowers (2012) called “Forensic social work settings.”

In terms of evaluating with organizations, the field instruction (SW 503) offered an opportunity to analyze agency data to evaluate a community program, the California Gambling Education and Treatment Services (CalGETS). Students collected and analyzed data from health education projects and programs to address problem gambling, and evaluated the effectiveness of their agency’s community education initiatives.
Students also had a direct experience in evaluating with communities in the class research project that they undertook in SW 450. As one of their assignments for the class, the students conducted a mixed method needs assessment of food and housing security of SF State students. The research project sought to build on the CSU system-wide study conducted in 2016 on the rate of hunger and homelessness among students in all 23 campuses. To complement campus research initiatives on these twin issues, the students decided to conduct an evaluative study assessing the needs of SF state students in terms of food and housing security with the end view of informing campus initiatives addressing these concerns. For the quantitative component, the students designed a survey instrument with questions asking students to evaluate current programs, whether campus-wide or unit-based, addressing hunger and homelessness, and their proposals for solutions to promote food and housing security among SF State students. The students sampled 110 student participants using availability or convenience sampling. They then created a database on SPSS and entered the survey results. For the qualitative component, the students decided to scale down the original plan to conduct focus groups from the 110 students who were surveyed. They decided instead to conduct their own Photovoice project where each of them took a photograph of an object, a setting, or locale that symbolizes for them their own ideas for promoting food and housing security. They included a text with each photograph describing the image and explaining their ideas for programs and initiatives that the campus should undertake to address hunger and homelessness of students. This participatory evaluative study provided students with direct experiences of evaluating their own community of SF State students.
FIELD EDUCATION

Educational Policy 2.2 Signature Pedagogy: Field Education

Signature pedagogies are elements of instruction and of socialization that teach future practitioners the fundamental dimensions of professional work in their discipline – to think, to perform, and to act ethically and with integrity. Field education is the signature pedagogy for social work. The intent of field education is to integrate the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practical world of the practice setting. It is a basic precept of social work education that the two interrelated components of the curriculum – classroom and field – are of equal importance within the curriculum, and each contributes to the development of the requisite competencies of professional practice. Field education is systematically designed, supervised, coordinated, and evaluated based on criteria by which students demonstrate the Social Work Competencies. Field education may integrate forms of technology as a component of the program.

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

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. Internships provide the opportunity to 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 their 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 medical model and traditional diagnostic frameworks. Consideration is consistently given to behavioral health within the contexts of cultural specificity and socioeconomic disparities.

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, colleges, and universities; as well as community organizing, criminal justice, advocacy, governmental, policy-making agencies, as well as child and adult protection 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, as well as in the School’s selection of placement sites that include Newcomer High School and La Clinica de la Raza, which serve largely immigrant populations, including new arrivals of unaccompanied minors. 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.

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 with diagnostic assessments to act as a launching point for researching their interest in a particular evidence-based practice, and to then serve as the inspiration for an anti-oppressive policy analysis, to name a few.
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.

Finally, the field experience is explicitly supported by the weekly field seminar 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. The seminar instructor also serves as the field liaison between the students enrolled in this 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.

2.2.2. The program explains how its field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities and illustrates how this is accomplished in field settings.

Field Program provision of generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate social work competencies with IFGOC.

At the SSW, all BASW students must complete an internship during the fall and spring semesters in their senior year. The foundation generalist practice model serves as the framework for the BASW curriculum. Consistent with the mission of the School, the urban generalist model is designed to address the needs and aspirations of disadvantaged and oppressed communities. Special attention is given to student's mastery of the urban
environment as a distinctive context for practice, promoting an awareness of those societal forces that influence the distribution of life chances, power, and resources. During their spring semester of their junior year, students are encouraged to select a field placement that develops and refines their skills associated with this core practice model for the following academic year. The internship is meant to provide students with foundational experiences that will prepare them for professional, bachelor-level practice.

The baccalaureate program prepares students for generalist practice. The generalist model stresses the principles and processes common to all social work endeavors, and students are encouraged to develop and refine skills associated with the following four core components: (1) developing working relationships with clients and other constituents under diverse conditions (voluntary referral, involuntary contact, outreach, transfer); (2) formulating a plan of action which recognizes both personal and environmental elements in the change process; (3) undertaking a variety of practice roles (advocate, coordinator, counselor, mediator, negotiator, support group leader, etc.); and (4) facilitating the development of client autonomy and empowerment in achieving goals.

Throughout the year, the Field Director engages in contact with community members, providers and individual agencies to identify, encourage and recruit placement sites that reflect generalist social work practice. Direct practice settings include those in day treatment programs, substance abuse programs, K-12 schools, counseling/wellness centers in community colleges and university settings, legal settings, juvenile justice facilities, and community mental health settings where students are exposed to serving individual clients, families, and groups, while engaging at organizational and community levels to facilitate change and engage in multi-level practice.

Site agency applicants are carefully reviewed for appropriateness of the practice experiences offered to help ensure that robust, generalist practice opportunities are both clearly articulated and readily available for students to demonstrate social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities.

Upon acceptance, placement agency descriptions and contact information are entered into the “S4” database. All BASW students have access to this database, and sites are screened for and categorized within this system as BASW generalist placements, first
year MSW generalist placements and specialized settings for second year MSW students. The Field Director meets with each student to identify at least three agencies where they would like to interview for a field placement opportunity. This meeting includes a discussion of the student’s top three interview choices and how these fit into both their past experience through a review of their resume, and their long-term career goals. Students are encouraged to not only explore whether generalist practice opportunities are available at the placement site, but to find out more about how these opportunities are made available to student interns. Students return from site interviews to meet again with the Field Director and discuss their impressions. Sometimes, follow up appointments between the student and the prospective agency and/or between the Field Director and the agency are necessary before clarifying that the site is a good match that will provide ample opportunity to demonstrate their generalist social work competencies with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities.

Whatever the unique opportunities offered in a given placement, students are required to have extensive contact with various components of the urban service delivery system. The nine social work competencies included in the students’ learning agreements are considered as a base for the knowledge and skills-building activities identified. In the learning agreement, after each area of competency, there is a qualitative section in which the field instructors, in consultation with the students, are asked to describe the student’s specific learning activities intended to develop the skills and meet the objectives outlined in each particular competency (Appendix A: Field Learning Agreement). This format serves to explicitly prompt the student and the field instructor to seek out and articulate a specific, diversified set of practice opportunities in the student’s foundation year practice setting. In listing out goals in this competency-specific format, the field program, which consists of the field liaison who goes out to the site and maintains more regular contact with an individual field instructor, and the field director, who is responsible for the recruitment and retention of viable placements, can more quickly and accurately assess whether students might be missing out on important opportunities to demonstrate generalist competencies within the agency, and can reach out to correct this through advocacy for additional learning opportunities.
Accomplishing generalist practice opportunities in field settings

Once the student actually begins their fieldwork, the field instructor and student engage in a series of collaborative meetings to jointly prepare the formalized learning agreement, which is signed by the student, field instructor and, eventually, the Field Director. Following a recruitment and registration process replete with competency-based expectations for the field setting, and after a student has worked with the individual instructor to verbalize how the site will provide generally practice opportunities, the Learning Agreement finds all parties well prepared to articulate the student’s individual learning goals that serve as a commitment to generalist practice opportunities in the field setting.

Through weekly supervision and agency support, students are given a set of parameters during their agency orientation process, wherein it is articulated how students will find out about their training and observation periods, and the period after which they may begin to demonstrate their competencies in working directly with individuals, families, groups, communities and organizations. During weekly seminar, students discuss their internship experiences from the prior week. The instructor for this course, who is also the field liaison, is uniquely situated to notice students who may not have adequate practice opportunities, or perhaps the opportunities selected are ill-matched to the student’s skill set in that they are too easy or perhaps too advanced. In these situations, students are counseled by their field liaison to bring their questions, concerns and observations to their field instructor with an eye toward increasing opportunities. If this is unsuccessful, the field liaison and/or Field Director may also be brought into the picture to discuss the concerns with agency/field instructor directly. Once a student is actively engaged in their generalist practice opportunities, their accomplishments and learnings are reflected on the mid- and final-year evaluation, which is jointly prepared by the field instructor and forwarded to the school. Students making satisfactory progress receive academic credit for the field experience gained in a given semester.

It should be noted that in September 2013, SF State SSW faculty invited field instructors to a gathering on the SF State campus where the 2008 EPAS standards were discussed in relation to the student Learning Agreement and goals. Approximately 25 field instructors participated in this gathering, and together identified tangible means by which a
given standard may be demonstrated by a student in placement. Field instructors were asked to brainstorm ideas of how they might know if a student had achieved a given competency/behavior. Next, the group engaged in a ranking activity, where “the most important practices” for each competency were identified for generalist practitioners. The idea was that this list would serve as a “launching point” from which individual student/field instructor dyads could progress to articulate additional, student-and site-specific goals to the agreement. The outcome of this activity was compiled in a documented entitled, “Education Policy & Accreditation Standards (EPAS) Practice Behaviors in Field”. This document has served as a resource for field instructors who have come on board since this activity was conducted. While the standards have changed, its use is encouraged to help jump-start ideas. Another such meeting is planned for late Spring 2018 with an eye toward the integration of, and specialized adaptation to, the 2015 EPAS standards.

2.2.4 The program explains how students across all program options in its field education program demonstrate social work competencies through in-person contact with clients and constituencies.

Student practice opportunities vary widely depending upon the field placement setting, and yet all internship placements accepted by the field education program and identified on the S4 database highlight student opportunities to demonstrate social work competencies through in-person contact with clients and constituencies. Within these practice settings, students are afforded opportunities to demonstrate their social work beginning competencies, as appropriate, through practice that is observed, monitored and supervised by approved field instructors who have made a commitment to student learning guided by EPAS competencies.

A student’s ability to demonstrate social work competency begins with the very definition of their learning goals. Because our field learning agreement explicitly prompts both the student and the field instructor to generate learning goals under each of the nine social work competencies, a student’s opportunities, experiences and learning are each geared toward, and measured against them.
During their actual practice experiences in the field, students are expected to implement the goals articulated in their Learning Agreement under the support and supervision of their on-site field instructor, and university-based field liaison, both of whom are either directly observing and/or inquiring about the student’s in-person contacts with clients and communities. Both the student and the field instructor are regularly called upon to reflect upon how and whether the student’s in-person contact with clients and constituencies reflect one or more of the nine social work competencies. This regular, and often less formal form of reflection also occurs in the weekly field seminar, where students are asked to bring and discuss (de-identified) reflections about their in-person contact with clients and constituencies.

Whether in class or in supervision, student work that is below standard is directly addressed through any one (or more) of the following: direct instruction, shadowing opportunities, corrective action planning.

Field instructors rate student abilities in a way that connects their in-person contact with clients and constituencies directly to EPAS in more formal ways on the mid-and year-end evaluations (Appendices B & C: Field Mid-Year Evaluation; End-of-Year Evaluation, respectively) These evaluations offer a Likert Scale for each of the nine competencies and corresponding (generalist or specialized) behaviors, as appropriate, where students are given a rating of 1-5 with definitions as follows:

- 1: No evidence of skill development
- 2: Beginning level of skill development
- 3: Satisfactory progress in skill development
- 4: Good demonstration of skill development
- 5: Excellent demonstration of skill development

A sixth category, “UA: unable to assess” is also included for those behaviors that may not be germane to the setting, and/or may have not occurred during the current review period. There is also space to include a narrative section, both for the student’s self-assessment of their progress, and their instructor’s comments where specific examples are expected. The mid-year evaluation further asks to revisit student goals based upon the first
semester’s learning experiences, which contributes to student growth based upon demonstrated growth and change.

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.

As stated in the field agency recruitment and application materials, the students’ learning agreements which are distributed to students and their field instructors at the start of the fall semester, and the SF State SSW Field Education website, baccalaureate-level Social Work students are required to complete 480 hours of internship during the academic year. Undergraduate students are expected to be in the field for two days per week (16 hours).

It is notable that the total number of hours required of our BASW students exceeds the minimum number of field hours, as set by the CSWE. This reflects a strong commitment on the part of the school that our students have meaningful opportunities to become integrated into professional practice settings. Indeed 2-to-3 times per week in a placement setting is not unlike the weekly requirement for a part-time job, and as such helps to prepare students for the demands and expectations of the professional field.

While the weekly hours are standard, students and their field instructors can together articulate how best to implement this schedule to meet the unique needs of the population being served and, at times, the needs of the student. For example, many students have jobs and families outside of their school-related duties. When available under appropriate levels of supervision and support, students may participate in placement hours that are in the evenings and/or on weekends, which may be of particular benefit to programs such as mental health clinics offering services outside of traditional work hours, or for mobile crisis teams that have available shifts 24/7. Schools may have more of a need for students between 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. and students with a 16-hour/week placement in these settings may spread their time over three days, versus going to the site for two, eight-hour days.
Field instructors and students are both asked to track student hours on the internship site each week. Field liaisons may request these logs at regular intervals, particularly when attendance may be in question. The degree of recording varies significantly by placement site and per field liaison preferences. As such, the program would benefit from a standardized practice of recording hours at the placement site that is both included in the policy manual and in field instructor orientation sessions.

2.2.6 The program provides its criteria for admission into field education and explains how its field education program admits only those students who have met the program’s specified criteria.

In order to receive a BASW degree, students are expected to complete a minimum of 120 units in the university. The first two years are spent meeting general university requirements. Students enter the Social Work major in their junior year. The lower division prerequisite courses for the major include Introductory Sociology, Introductory Psychology, Human Biology, Macroeconomics, and Second Year Written English Composition.

At the SSW, all BASW majors must complete an internship during the fall and spring semesters of their senior year. Students may register for and enter Field Experience in the Social Services (SW 503 and SW 505) and its accompanying seminars on their field experience (SW 502 and SW 504) after completing 24 units of required junior-level social work courses with a "C-" grade or better in each. In addition, the student must have completed the required number of units (90 units) to be classified as a senior at SF State.

Prior to meeting with the Field Director to discuss their internship preferences, BASW students must complete the Field Experience Eligibility Form (Appendix D: Field Experience Eligibility Form) and bring the form to a designated counselor in the university Office of Student Programs and to their SSW advisor for review and signature to verify completion of the aforementioned prerequisite course requirements.

Admission to the field program for BASW students is automatic once a student has submitted their Field Experience Eligibility form and met with the SSW Field Director.
Before interviewing with, or accepting a field placement, students must first meet with the Field Director to discuss their interests, review their resume to attend to an appropriate match between interest and skill set. Special consideration is given to background check, and/or medical examination requirements that may preclude certain students from participation in particular placement settings. While the school does not require these points of verification to enter the field education program more generally, these matters are addressed with students outright during meetings, and students are encouraged to disclose to the Field Director whether they can foresee any challenges with placements of interest in light of their background and/or health history, in particular.

A student’s suitability for ongoing placement from one semester to the next is assessed through a composite of their formal performance scores on the mid-year field evaluation, observations of the seminar instructor, who also serves as the student’s field liaison, the Field Director and additional faculty members as appropriate. For example, if a student continuously shows no evidence of skill development, violates the school policy on prohibition of weapons at the internship or the NASW Code of Ethics, and/or is struggling with significant personal difficulties such that being physically and/or emotionally present for clients is not possible, students may be counseled out of the field placement for a period of time, and/or dismissed from the program as appropriate.

While these areas are closely monitored and addressed by the program in its current form, the program would be strengthened by including an explicit policy in the Field Manual that pertains to the specific steps involved in terminating a student from placement and its concomitant impact upon their overall progress in the BASW program. Such a policy is currently being considered by the social work faculty for inclusion in a revision of the Field Policy Manual.

2.2.7 The program describes how its field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; supporting student safety; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the social work competencies.

Policies, Criteria, and Procedures for Selecting Field Settings
The Field Education program posts its policies, criteria and procedures for selecting field settings on the SSW Field Education web page, as well as in its recruitment and selection materials, both in writing (Appendix E: Field Policy Manual) and in personal contacts as agencies interested in hosting internships make contact with the Field Director.

To serve as a placement site, the agency must arrange for a member of their supervisory staff to meet with the Field Director in order to ensure that the program meets the requirements specified in this section. Such meetings initially take place over the phone, though the Field Director also goes into the field to meet on site with agency staff to explore their interest in, and appropriateness for, a host site for field instruction. During these meetings, the Field Director seeks to ensure that the agency meets the criteria listed in this section.

First and foremost, the agency must practice according to the values and standards of the *NASW Code of Ethics*. Additionally, the agency must be a legal entity with legitimate entitlement to provide the services that it is offering, and the agency must be a public agency or designated as a non-profit 501(c)(3) public benefit corporation. Agencies must certify a policy on non-discrimination as related to students, staff, and clients based on gender identity, sexual orientation, age, race, ethnicity, marital status, physical ability, political persuasion, country of origin, and religious affiliation (Appendix F: Non-Discrimination Agreement). The agency must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act or be making reasonable efforts to do so.

On the Field Agency Application (Appendix G: Field Agency Application) and in subsequent discussions with the Field Director after having received this application, the agency is required to identify the specific disadvantaged or oppressed constituencies that it serves and to demonstrate how it offers services consistent with the mission of the School.

Additionally, the agency, board, and staff must be willing to accept students for field-based learning. This acceptance includes an understanding that the emphasis will be on the educational process and not solely the completion of agency tasks. Thus, students should be treated as learners and not as paid employees. The agency further agrees to design learning agreements based on the CSWE Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards Core Competencies.
Agencies are advised that they should have a field education policy that includes both the designated field instructor(s) and a general outline of the educational process to be followed in the student's training, and that they should accept the responsibility for submitting the Field Instructor Information Form (Appendix H) and the resumes for all of the MSW-level staff being considered as field instructors.

**Agency Application Procedures**

Once these matters have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Field Director, an agency is invited through the Field Agency Application Instruction letter to formally submit the Field Agency Application (Appendix G) and Field Instructor Information Form (Appendix H) to the Field Director.

The agency application includes qualitative sections in which to delineate the general program description, the primary Issues that the program addresses, the populations and clients served, the types of services offered by the program, intern assignments and learning opportunities, and other specialized training and educational opportunities. Preferred internship schedules are ascertained, as well as whether the agency offers evening and/or weekend hours. The agency profile is identified (e.g., non-profit, public/government, educational institution, or other).

The Field Instructor Information Form serves as an application to become a field instructor, and reminds the prospective instructor of the expectation to provide individual supervision for a minimum of one-hour-a-week per student, and that additional, group supervision is also encouraged. Agencies applying to be intern sites are informed by the Field Director that the field instructor must be provided with the necessary administrative support for supervising a student. This includes time for preparation and follow-up, time to meet with the faculty field liaison, time to complete the mid-year and final evaluations, and time to attend meetings on campus, which are commitments that are included on the form.

The Field Director carefully reviews submitted material, including whether the agency has the breadth of services that can provide the student with opportunities to engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities through a variety
of roles (e.g., counselor, advocate, broker, case manager, group facilitator, community organizer, etc.).

Upon approval of the agency as a field education site, information about the placement is posted on the School’s S4 field database. Students and faculty have access to this information while exploring and selecting appropriate internship sites.

It is specified on the School’s website that approval as a potential internship site does not guarantee the placement of interns since there are more eligible agencies than students at the School; however, all approved agencies are available for student review and selection. Agencies are asked to ensure that their contact information is up-to-date so that students are able to reach the appropriate individuals during their internship search. Agencies are contacted directly by the students as they become interested in the site as a placement, in consultation with the Field Director. Agencies are also urged to return student inquiries in a timely fashion as students are typically considering a variety of options and working within a limited timeframe to secure an internship.

**Policies, Criteria, and Procedures for Placing and Monitoring Students**

**Information Used to Facilitate the Placement Process**

In preparation for meeting with the Field Director, students are asked to submit their current resume and a sample cover letter, which are then reviewed and editing suggestions are made. Additional student information is gathered through the Field Education Form (Appendix I), which assesses factors relevant to the placement process. Questions address whether the student plans on working during the time that they are completing the internship and if so, how many hours per week they anticipate working. They are asked about whether they have a valid California Driver’s License and if so, do they both have a car available for regular use and auto insurance.

Students are queried as to whether they speak any languages fluently other than English and if so, to indicate those languages. They are asked to list their geographic preferences for the internship in descending order (East Bay, Marin/North Bay, Peninsula/South Bay, San Francisco, or other). In addition, they are asked if they have a
particular interest in a specific population or field of practice and if yes, to indicate their five top choices in descending order (1 = top choice) based on the following categories: children and youth, community organizing and advocacy, criminal justice, disability, domestic and intimate partner violence, family services, gender-related issues, health and medical social work, homelessness, hospice, immigration, legal services, LGBTQI communities, mental health, older adults, policymaking and legislation, school-based and educational services, substance use, other (specify). Finally, the students are asked to review the placement descriptions on the online field database, S4 that align with their top choices, and to list their five top field placement preferences in descending order (1 = top choice).

Placement information that is logged into S4 is based upon the specifications offered in the original agency application. This information includes preferred characteristics in the candidates for internships, including whether generalist or specialized levels of practice are offered. Agencies indicate any particular qualities and skills that would be desirable for the placement (e.g., language capacity, knowledge of specific computer programs, etc.). In addition, the number of SF State SSW students previously placed at this agency is indicated. Also included in the agency application are any special placement procedures or requirements, such as fingerprint clearance, background checks, TB clearance, other health examinations, immunizations, or a vehicle for placement-related duties. Agencies are asked whether they will cover the cost for any background checks or health procedures and whether there are any other special placement procedures or requirements.

In relation to intern benefits, agencies indicate whether they offer a stipend and if so, how much is offered and what the particular requirements are to receive the stipend. They are also asked whether there are other benefits available (e.g., work study matching funds, food, transportation, subsidies for travel expenses and conferences, etc.).

Having reviewed this information on S4 in advance, the student brings their completed form and resume to an individual meeting with the Field Director to discuss their interests in terms of client population and/or field of practice. This meeting includes encouragement for the student to try new things, while also enriching their social work
experience in terms of both depth and breadth. Together, the student and Field Director discuss a plan of action for their interviews, and students are asked to interview with at least three agencies and to make sure that they meet the proposed field instructor before making their final decision. The Field Director is available via phone, in person, email and video chat to discuss student questions and concerns along the way. Once a decision has been made, the student and field instructor sign the Field Placement Contract (Appendix K). As noted on this form, the placement is not considered final until it has been signed. The Field Director must also sign the agreement, and if concerns are noted (i.e. the listed instructor and/or agency is not yet approved, or there appears to be a mismatch between the student’s articulated goals and the placement arrangement), the Field Director will make contact with the student and, as necessary the agency, prior to signing the agreement and thus, finalizing the placement.

**Monitoring Student Work**

Once assigned to their field placement, student work is monitored in several important ways. First, the field instructor receives a timely message from the field liaison assigned to the student before the placement begins so that the field instructor has their contact information should questions or concerns arise, and instructors are encouraged to provide students with an orientation to their field site. By engaging in this practice, field instructors receive a message that preparations for, and observations about student work is important, and that the school is available and interested in supporting the field instructor’s work. During the weekly field seminar, students are asked to report on their activities in the field, and through this disclosure, the field liaison receives regular updates about how the student is doing in the field, and is trained to listen for areas where the student may be feeling stuck, concerned, worried, excited, overwhelmed, etc. The field liaison may ask the student to meet outside of class as needed to discuss their observations, and, if necessary, to involve the field liaison.

Within the first 4-5 weeks of placement, students are asked to complete their Learning Agreement, which is generated collaboratively with the field instructor to outline the student’s specific goals for the placement. As noted above, this agreement is divided by
EPAS competency to reinforce the foundation or generalist competencies of focus for the particular student. This agreement is submitted to the field liaison, who is also asked to sign the document before forwarding this to the Field Director. This signature reinforces an important set of reviews for the student’s goals and helps to reinforce the idea that there is a team of support behind their learning. Several weeks thereafter, the field liaison comes out to the agency site for their first visit. Both students and field instructors are asked in advance to consider what is working well, where they would like to see things work differently, and what they hope to achieve by the end of the semester so that topics might be more readily explored during the in-person meeting.

By mid-December, students are required to submit their Field Mid-Year Evaluation (Appendix B). The school promotes a collaborative approach to assessment, where evaluations are jointly prepared and reviewed between the student and their field instructor in response to how the student is faring in each of the nine competency areas. This form is submitted to the field liaison, who uses it to inform the student’s grade for the placement, and to also serve as a guide for any additional follow up that may be useful before the start of the next semester. If there are concerns raised by the field instructor or the student, once again, the field liaison can meet with the two to address how best to respond in support of student learning outcomes as articulated at this particular agency site.

It is traditional that the field liaison remains in this role for the entire academic year, in part to promote the continuity of attention to the student and their field agency between the fall and spring semesters. The weekly seminar continues in the spring as in the fall, and it is customary as the year goes forward that expectations for student client presentations increase and that finer levels of detail in their questions emerge in the field seminar. The field liaison remains in contact as needed with the field instructor and vice versa, throughout the spring semester, culminating in a second visit in the mid-late spring. At this visit, the field liaison address student successes, questions, concerns, as well as ensuring that termination is being addressed in a timely manner in preparation for the student to leave the internship. This is also a space to reflect upon student growth, progress and professional development. Several weeks later, the student and their field instructor collaborate to complete the Field End-of-Year Evaluation (Appendix C). As in the
previous semester, this final evaluation is submitted to the field liaison that, in turn, uses it to inform the student’s final grade.

Through this mixture of weekly contact with the student in both supervision and field seminar, the regular, as-needed and planned contact between the field liaison, field instructor and student, and the written documentation contained in the Learning Agreement and Mid-as well as Final Evaluations, student work and progress is monitored closely. That said, field instructors are often extremely busy and may not give the university feedback as often as one might hope about student progress and/or challenges. One notable improvement would be for the Field Director and/or field liaison to make contact at least one additional time each semester for no particular purpose other than to say “thank you” and “thinking of you and your work with our student.” By keeping the relationship between the agency and university “top of mind,” field instructors may be more apt to reach out for support and/or questions should the need arise. Continued attention to including “low stakes” means that increase contact between the field and the university would likely serve to benefit the field experience, and is a part of ongoing efforts to improve our field education program.

**Policies, Criteria, and Procedures for Supporting Student Safety**

Students entering internships through the SSW are covered under the California State University group policy for professional liability while in field during the academic year with agencies that have a formal Memo of Understanding (MOU) and/or contract with SF State that explicitly lists the SSW. To this end, the Field Director works closely with the Office of Procurement for the university to ensure that the university has a fully executed agreement between newly accepted agencies/placement sites and SF State SSW before a student can officially begin their placement.

Field instructors are required, together with other agency staff, to review safety procedures with the student as part of their orientation process at the start of the internship and that interns are not put at risk during the course of their ongoing daily activities. The intern’s safety is then consistently monitored by the faculty field liaison through the weekly field seminar, as well as more frequently as indicated.
The Field Policy manual contains specific policies on sexual harassment, including the definition and stated requirement that field agencies have written policies with their agency that reflect an adherence to this policy. The Policy on Travel and Transportation states that agencies cannot require students to transport clients in their personal vehicles.

The Field Policy Manual (Appendix E) states the prohibition of weapons at the internship and both defines weapons for this purpose and addresses procedures for students who desire to carry weapons due to fears of personal safety related to an internship. Students in this situation are directed to discuss these matters with the Field Liaison, Field Instructor and Field Director as a basis for changing internships and/or creating more effective ways of increasing personal safety. The policy ends by stating “no student is expected to enter or remain in an internship where fear for personal safety affects their educational process” (p. 20).

Certain practice locations carry additional risks, either to student interns, or possibly to the clients, particularly in the area of physical infection in medical settings. Hospital settings are increasingly insistent that universities take the lead in student on boarding requirements, including securing student background checks, drug tests and immunizations. The School has engaged the services of CastleBranch, a background check service that facilitates student access to low-cost, confidential “on boarding” services that addresses student, patient, and hospital safety. Once students have been fully cleared, they may begin their agency placements.

In addition to physical risks, the School is also attendant to supporting student psychological safety. As a part of regular social work practice, students may be exposed to a host of traumatic stories, experiences and scenes. Student interns may bear witness to trauma directly, in examples such as seeing a client soon after an accident or an episode of abuse, or indirectly, such as hearing about traumatic material during a family therapy session. In addition to modeling trauma informed practices within the classroom spaces, the field seminar serves as a space for students to share their experiences and receive support from both professionally trained faculty members with experience in the field, and from their peers. Attending directly to traumatic exposure is a topic regularly addressed throughout the social work curriculum, and efforts are made to integrate grounding and
mindfulness practices into seminar spaces, as opportunities to share with student’s strategies for coping in the face of traumatic material. If a student is particularly triggered and/or presents with possible mental health concerns that may impact their work in the field, the field liaison, Field Director and/or student faculty advisor may encourage a student to seek out mental health support. The School has a list of referrals both on and off campus that is readily available on field seminar class websites, posted bulletin boards with the school, and the SSW website.

Field agencies also take a key role in efforts to address psychological safety. For example, as of this writing, there have been several recent tragedies: the mass shooting in Las Vegas, and the pervasive wildfires just north of the School that caused thousands to lose their homes, schools and businesses, and many others to lose their lives. In the face of both tragedies, the Field Director was in contact with field instructors, field liaisons to discuss the impact of student work when returning to sites of active crisis (as with the fires, which impacted not only clients, but also numerous staff and employees of internship sites) and how to processing the unexpected shooting of a colleague in Las Vegas. In this latter example, the host site at UCSF alerted the Field Director to the concern, encouraged faculty reach out to our students who were peers with the injured student, and they provided debriefing and crisis counseling services on the internship site the following day. For students returning to internship placements that are themselves sites of crisis, the field liaison and Field Director are reaching out more regularly to students for individual support and encouraging field instructors to make added time to check in with students about how to process such difficult and pervasive crisis material.

While formal policies and common-sense practices relating to safety are currently in place, the current Field Director, who assumed this role in June 2017, is aware of several areas that would greatly enhance efforts to support student safety, all of which are currently underway as of this writing. These include: updating the Field Policy Manual by writing a section dedicated to both physical and psychological safety, adding a section to the Field Agency Application that explicitly asks agencies to indicate whether their setting presents any unusual risks to students, and by adding a line on the Field Instructor Information Form where applicants must initial that they provide orientation about safety in the workplace and their practice settings. Future Field Instructor orientations will
include a handout on suggested topics for safety training, including, but not limited to: emergency contact protocols, common crisis both on site and in the field and how to respond, as well as separate sections for physical and emotional safety. The Field Director will further develop an incident reporting form and procedures for appropriate debriefing and support services following student exposure to a traumatic event. The school will then train students, field instructors and field liaisons about the use of these incident reporting forms and procedures for appropriate debriefing and support services following exposure to a traumatic event. Another important area relates to the management of sensitive student data such as drug test results, background check results, and medical screenings. While currently precautions are taken to maintain all PHI in a sensitive and secure manner consistent with agency standards outlined by HIPAA, the demands of hospital placements in particular has not kept up with the existing Field Policy Manual. Clear policies outlining how student information is managed, maintained and later destroyed, are necessary. In the meantime, a continued effort to minimize the role of the Field Director in viewing, managing and/or summarizing sensitive student information is both necessary and ongoing.

**Policies, Criteria, and Procedures Evaluating Student Learning and Field Setting Effectiveness Congruent with the Social Work Competencies**

Student learning is outlined through the use of a comprehensive learning agreement based on the nine 2015 CSWE competencies and their accompanying practice behaviors.

**The Field Education Learning Agreement**

The Field Manual addresses overall objectives of field education, which includes a call to “field agencies to develop a student learning experience that reflects an understanding and application of the CSWE 2015 Education Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)” (Appendix E, p. 6).

This learning experience is reflected in the student’s field education learning agreement, which, as noted previously, is organized into nine sections based on the
CSWE’s Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards (EPAS). The learning agreement takes into account the student’s academic year and area of emphasis (BASW, first-year MSW, second-year MSW, second-year Title IV-E), along with a shared assessment of the student’s knowledge, skills, strengths, interests, previous experiences, areas for growth, and approaches to learning.

The Learning Agreement Guidelines articulated on page 2 of the agreement, clearly outline how the agreement itself is organized into nine sections based on the CSWE EPAS. Directions are given that the agreement should take the student’s academic year into account, together with a shared assessment of the student’s knowledge, skills, strengths, interests, previous experiences, areas for growth and approaches to learning. Based on these considerations and the placement’s models of service delivery, the student and field instructor are asked to identify learning objectives and activities for each area within a given competency, with efforts made to include all of the EPAS when creating the Learning Agreement. From here, each competency and practice behavior is listed on the agreement, with a prompt directly underneath which reads, “Please list and describe below the student’s specific learning activities intended to develop the skills and meet the objectives outlined in Competency ‘x’.” This helps to set a clear, competency-specific expectation for student learning upon which to compare during later periods of assessment.

Based upon the appropriate considerations and unique placement models for service delivery, the student and field instructor work together to identify learning objectives and activities for each competency. While the activities and skills to be developed are unique to each student learner, both students and instructors are encouraged to include all of the EPAS competencies when creating the learning agreement.

It is required that the learning agreement be developed at the beginning of the academic year and then reviewed and revised, as necessary, throughout the course of the internship to ensure that the agency adequately addresses the student’s evolving learning goals. Once the learning agreement has been completed and/or modified, both the student and the field instructor sign it. The student is responsible for delivering a copy of the agreement to the SSW’s faculty field liaison. The contents of the learning agreement are
intended for review by the student, field instructor, field liaison, and Field Director, and are otherwise held confidential.

Student learning is monitored and evaluated through the use of the weekly field seminar, which is facilitated by the student’s faculty field liaison. The liaison is required to conduct a minimum of two site visits per academic year and more frequently if additional support is needed. Field liaisons are also available to the student and/or the field instructor for consultation over the phone and in other ways as mutually agreed upon.

The Mid-Year and Year-End Evaluation documents described earlier in this section, are similarly designed to directly align to 2015 EPAS competencies and specific practice behaviors. For example, the field instructor is asked to rate the student using the Likert Scale described above (section 2.2.4) for each practice behavior under a given competency. This section is followed by three prompts:

- Student’s self-assessment of progress
- Based on the first semester’s learning experiences, the student’s upcoming goals (mid-year evaluation only)
- Field instructor comments

In this way, student learning is monitored in direct comparison to the EPAS practice behaviors throughout the academic year.

**Student Evaluation of the Faculty Field Liaison**

Students evaluate their field liaisons on a Likert Scale of 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree, at the end of the spring semester in relation to their experiences of the liaisons’ availability, candor, awareness of current trends, availability for support and meetings with both the student and those including the student and their field instructor. For more information, please see Chapter 4.

Students are also queried as to the number of agency visits made by the faculty field liaison, and qualitatively to offer any other feedback about these visits. They are asked to specify, overall, whether their experiences with the faculty field liaison were excellent, good, marginal, poor, or not sure. There is also space for any additional
comments. The Field Director reviews this feedback and shares observations as appropriate to the Director of the School in support of field liaison professional growth and development.

**Students’ Final Evaluation of the Field Agency**

Students have the opportunity to evaluate their field agency experiences, ordinarily at the end of the spring semester, although in 2016-2017 the (then new) Field Director noted it had been several years since that type of evaluation had been conducted, students were also asked to complete the evaluation form at the end of the fall semester. This evaluation represents an important aspect of the student's learning process and has been helpful in maintaining consistency between the School's curriculum and the field components of the program. The evaluation of the field placement agency is intended to allow for a critical analysis and review of the field practice experience. The information is not shared with the agency or the field instructor unless the student is in agreement with doing so. In the evaluation form, students specify their educational status (BASW, First-Year MSW, Second-Year MSW [non-Title IV-E], Second-Year MSW [Title IV-E]), the agency’s name, and the field instructor’s name.

Students are then asked to rate on a Likert Scale from 1: Strongly Disagree to 5: Strongly Agree a range of internship experiences (Appendix J: Student Final Evaluation of Field Agency). The students are asked overall, how they would rate this internship experience: (Excellent, Good, Marginal, Poor, Not Sure) and whether they would recommend this placement to other students. They are asked to provide qualitative responses as to what the strengths of the internship might be and to identify any concerns. In addition, they are asked for recommendations that they would give to future interns at this placement. Students are queried as to whether they would be willing to have other students view their responses to the questionnaire and whether they would be available to talk with other students about this placement. If they answer “yes” to this last question, they are asked to include their contact information. As this is sensitive information, confidentiality is important and the questionnaires have been held in hard copy in a binder in the Field Director’s office. The Director reviews each of the student evaluations and contacts students as needed for additional information in an effort to continually re-assess
the appropriateness of a given internship site for future student placements at both generalist and specialization levels of practice.

Finally, as noted on the university website, field instructors are asked to maintain contact with the university, for example: alert the faculty field liaison as early as possible about any challenges associated with the internship process, consult with the faculty liaison and/or the Field Director before taking action related to those concerns (e.g., dismissing a student from the agency). Instructors are asked to inform the faculty field liaison and/or Field Director about any changes at the agency with a potential impact on the internship process, to submit the mid-year and final evaluations to the School by the due dates indicated on the appropriate field calendar and attend the Field Instructor Orientation at the start of the fall semester and as relevant, any other group meetings, workshops, committee meetings, etc.

The evaluation measures already in place offer a helpful launching point in focusing one's observation of student practice, and a uniform means to rate student practice. Still, the School is aware that it would be valuable to more carefully and closely define student “competence,” and to continue working with field instructors to give timely, supportive feedback that is specific to the matter at hand, whatever that may be.

While between the website, policy manual, application process instructions, agency application and field instructor information form, information about the role of a field instructor is definitely articulated, additional streamlining is necessary. For example, consistency is needed between the list of required actions/activities and the current application form, which appears to mostly focus on individual supervision, attending the orientation and participating in the learning agreement, mid and final-year evaluations and “meeting other requirements,” which are neither explicitly specified on this application form, nor on its instructions. This is currently being rectified with changes being posted for recruitment starting in January 2018. Another important step is to include an agreement that field instructors agree to follow privacy guidelines that pertain to student interns as outlined in FERPA, and to sign a statement to that effect. Lastly, both students and field instructors will be asked to sign a form stating that they have read and agree to abide by the terms of their role [student or field instructor] as outlined in the [upcoming, fully
revised Field Policy Manual. This will help to ensure that the full extent of the role has been made clear and agreed to by the instructor in advance.

2.2.8 The program describes how its field education program maintains contact with field settings across all program options. The program explains how on-site contact or other methods are used to monitor student learning and field setting effectiveness.

Maintaining Contact with Field Settings Across all Program Options

As noted in earlier portions of this self-assessment, the field education program has several means of maintaining contact with field settings in the BASW program, as well as the generalist and specialist settings in the MSW program.

Each summer, the Field Director makes contact with agencies and field instructors to confirm the status of student placement contracts and to finalize field instructor approvals and assignments. This sets the stage for the Field Instructor Orientation, held annually in early September as the BASW and second year MSW students are starting in placement, and a few weeks before the first year MSW students begin.

The Field Instructor Orientation includes time for individual field instructors to meet the field liaison to whom they have been assigned for the academic year. In this way, in-person introductions are made to increase familiarity, and contact information exchanged in support of ongoing communication. During the actual orientation sessions, the role of direct, open, and most importantly regular communication between the university and the field agency is emphasized, and the role of the field seminar as a weekly contact point between the university and the student is reviewed.

Once the year is underway, the field liaison meets with the student in weekly field seminar groups, and is available to address questions and concerns during posted office hours, as well as other times outside of these hours to meet with the student and/or their field liaison. The Field Director is available for consultation when field liaisons have concerns where they need support, and/or in cases where the field liaison may be out ill, the Field Director can cover seminar meetings, address emergent concerns, and the like. By late September, field liaison and the Field Director follow up with field instructors to remind them of the Learning Agreement forms and process for completion.
Once submitted, both the field liaison and the Field Director review the Learning Agreements to check for appropriateness of learning goals based upon the student’s training and level of professional development, and considering the depth of the nine competencies. Soon thereafter, the field liaison goes out for their first planned site visit of the academic year and discusses student goals, field instructor and student impressions about how things are going so far, the students’ goals, and any questions or concerns that either person might have. This meeting might also include, as needed, specific follow-up steps for any part of the group in redressing matters raised.

Throughout the semester, the field liaison continues to meet with the student in weekly field seminar, receives and initiates contact with the field instructor as appropriate, and reviews the mid-year evaluation before issuing the student a grade. If there is content in the mid-year evaluation that is surprising in nature to the field liaison based upon their contact with the student and placement site to date, additional contact is initiated by email and/or phone to discuss it.

In the spring semester, the weekly field seminar continues, most always under the same faculty field liaison as held this role in the fall to support continuity of both learning and communication. The field liaison will continue to maintain contact with the student and field instructor as needed, and in early-mid April, they return to the site for an end-of-year visit. Here, the student, field instructor and field liaison discuss reflections upon the year, the status of student termination work with clients, and future thoughts about their second-year placement/and or post-graduation career goals.

While the funding for this event has not been consistent, last year the school was able to host a field instructor luncheon. This is a meaningful way to express appreciation and goodwill toward field instructors, who often incur higher workloads and no pay differential when taking on a student intern. In this more relaxed atmosphere, relationships have an opportunity to deepen.

Despite the many ways that communication is already taking place between the field education program and field settings, there is certainly room for improvement. For example, field liaisons could reach out to field instructors earlier, and a standardized email with orientation reminders for each field instructor would offer clarity to the task at hand.
Securing additional funding to ensure that the appreciation luncheon is an annual event for all field instructors, including those working with our BASW students, would be a welcome gesture. This year, the Field Director plans to implement a personalized letter for each field instructor for Social Work Appreciation Month in March. This past year at the field orientation, the Field Director also asked field instructors if they would like to engage in even further contact with the School during the year; for example, attending additional training for CEUs, field instructors coming in as guest lecturers and helping instructors to form relevant assignments that bridge classroom theory and field practice experience. Several field instructors have indicated their interest in becoming more involved with the School, and indicated appreciation for being asked. The intention is that this is built upon each year, and that the program includes a newsletter or similar project where timely information is disseminated (i.e. in response to natural disasters, review of recent, relevant scholarly journal articles, community trainings, etc.) in an effort to enhance the depth of our shared learning community.

**Monitoring Student Learning and Field Setting Effectiveness**

The on-site contacts, weekly field seminars and interim contacts between the field liaison and field instructor (with or without the student present) each include a formal check where each party discusses what has changed since the last point of contact, references to the (once complete) Learning Agreement and a careful review of changes between the mid-and year-end review. Whereas the Likert Scales used on the mid-and year-end evaluations for each of the nine competency areas offer a clear means to measure student learning over the academic year, the weekly seminar sessions offer a more gradual means to assess students step-by-step progress in the internship, and serve as a window into the effectiveness of the field setting, itself. Assignments including process recordings and reflection journals offer opportunities to assess student ability to assimilate and deliver and/or reflect upon new skills, and it is not uncommon to invite a student in for office hours following such assignments to review key observations that relate to the student’s learning goals.
When field liaisons visit agencies, observations are made about the timeliness in scheduling and arriving at the meeting, degree of preparedness of the field instructor and the student, the state of the overall site (i.e. client and/or agency-focused), whether the field instructor appears sufficiently aware of and in tune with the student’s individual learning needs and progress. When, for example, the field liaison hears in seminar that multiple staff are leaving the agency, a field instructor is going on vacation and there is no plan for the student’s supervision, and/or if the student is not having regular supervision, these are all signs that changes may be necessary. If said problems are chronic, lead to lack of appropriate student supervision, training opportunities or support, the placement’s approval with the university as a placement site may be rescinded. As noted above, student evaluations of the field placement are another important factor in monitoring field setting effectiveness. While each student may have their own unique perception about “effectiveness,” trends noted from one year to the next with different student cohorts may tell an important story about what tends to work for students, and what (or who) does not.

While the reality of regular communication between the School and the field setting is a strength of the school, improvements can also be made. For example, conducting a brief exit interview/survey from the perspective of the field instructor, and not just the student, could be useful in ensuring that placement settings are appropriate. The inclusion of a field instructor evaluation of the interaction with the field liaison and the field program more generally is needed.

2.2.9 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 masters’ students hold a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have two-years’ post-master’s of social work degree practice experience. 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.
Credentials and Practice Experience of Field Instructors

As noted on the program website, and in the Field Instructor Information Form (Appendix H), and Field Policy Manual (Appendix E), in order to be considered qualified to supervise MSW interns from SF State’s SSW program, the prospective field instructor must minimally have an MSW degree from an accredited graduate school of social work with a minimum of two-years post-master's experience in urban-oriented practice with oppressed and disadvantaged populations and a minimum of one-year of experience in the agency in which the intern is to be placed. Before accepting a new field instructor into the field education program, the field director reviews the application form and attached resume to ensure these criteria are met. Further review addresses that the instructor also has demonstrated competence in relevant areas of social work practice, the ability to motivate, support, and enhance the student's knowledge and practice skills and competencies, a commitment to providing weekly supervisory sessions and additional informal support, including time to observe students directly, and finally, a willingness to participate in campus-based events related to field education.

As noted on the program website and Field Instructor Information Form, field instructors are expected to carry out the following tasks in association with their supervisory role: develop a learning agreement in collaboration with the student and SSW faculty field liaison, based on the CSWE Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards Core Competencies, address specific educational activities and objectives to be met through the internship process, and provide at least one-hour of individual supervision per week, which can be supplemented by group supervision. Additionally, field instructors are asked to create and maintain appropriate space and facilities within the agency for the student to meet the identified learning objectives, and to hold periodic conferences with the faculty field liaison about the student’s learning process and other relevant topics.

Potential field instructors are asked to submit a resume and complete the Field Instructor Information Form, in which candidates are asked to list undergraduate and graduate degrees as well as other credentials/Licenses (e.g., LCSW, PPSC, other). They are asked to include their present job description and their previous student supervisory experiences including the agency, the number of students supervised, the schools that the
students came from, as well as the number of years spent in providing supervision (Appendix H: Field Instructor Information Form).

Program responsibility for reinforcing the social work perspective in cases in which a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited MSW degree or does not have required experience

In certain, rare situations, a student is drawn to a placement setting that is social work in nature, but may not have an available or appropriate supervisor on site with a MSW degree from a CSWE-accredited university, or the particular supervisor may otherwise lack required experience. When this has happened in the past, a student might live in a smaller community and face limitations in selecting a placement further from home, or they might have a very particular niche or interest where there may only have a licensed marriage and family therapist (LMFT) on site. In these situations, attention is given to the nature of the overall agency setting. For example, do other social workers work here? Is there a clear social work focus or set of tasks in the placement? Could a MSW staff member serve as a task supervisor? Does the field instructor know what social work is/means? The unique set of circumstances presented by the student’s petition for this particular arrangement, the unique level of training and experience posed by the individual student (i.e. is this student a first year MSW student who has a BASW degree from a CSWE accredited university and did they have a supervised placement with a MSW supervisor as a part of that prior experience?) and the availability of the field instructor and/or Field Director to be able to provide additional 1:1 support to this student are considered.

It is notable that while there is clearly a set steps and behaviors that have been “passed down” through the years, there is no explicit policy outlining such cases. The informal protocol, which is in the process of being codified into policy recommendations for the faculty, is as follows: the Field Director first has a discussion with the prospective field instructor to assess for their willingness and ability to explore what it means for the student to be a student of social work, how to frame experiences from this perspective, and the added support needed to ensure that the social work perspective is adequately
reinforced. The field liaison is then alerted by the Field Director to the situation and the field liaison will meet with the student to discuss particular ways in which they will be asked to present cases in seminar for feedback on a regular basis; and the liaison will also meet with the field instructor in advance of the learning agreement deadline to ensure that student goals and learning opportunities are both defined as, and will be measured by, a social work perspective.

Prompting the student to bring their articulation of a social work perspective to weekly supervision is another means of reinforcing the social work perspective. These issues are additionally explored in reflective journal entries and process recordings, which are read and reviewed by the field liaison who is available to provide focused support both in and outside of the classroom. Specific, explicit attention to “the social work perspective” is further given during the mid-and year-end review, and the field liaison is both listening for and drawing out examples that highlight it. At regular intervals throughout the year, the field liaison and Field Director meet to discuss whether it was felt that the placement is viable in light of the degree of success with which the social work perspective is being conveyed and reinforced. Concurrently, the Field Director is continuously recruiting new MSW field instructors and remains available as needed if the student needs an additional, outside “neutral ear” to help elicit and infuse added opportunities to reinforce a social work perspective. The Field Director is also working to develop a training module for supervisors on how best to infuse a social work perspective into the internship experience.

2.2.10 The program describes how its field education program provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialogue with field education settings and field instructors.

An annual field instructor orientation is held at the beginning of each fall semester. During the three-hour orientation and instructional training on September 9, 2016, topics included a general overview to the role of a field instructor, best practices in field instruction, common challenges, suggestions for providing constructive and compassionate feedback, the learning agreement, and both mid-and year-end evaluation. Noted with greater specificity in Appendix L: Field Instructor Orientation Agenda, topics were
covered through lecture, small and large group discussion, and included both visual slides and paper handouts.

Instructors received the invitation to save the date for the event in late spring 2016 with subsequent reminders and an RSVP sent out as the date approached. Field instructors each received a hard copy packet that included handouts pertaining to the content listed above, and the learning agreements, mid-year and year-end evaluations that are particular to the student(s) they are supervising. Instructors are invited to sit at a table led by their field instructor to facilitate early dialogue between them that will carry throughout the academic year.

As was highlighted to the field instructors, most important is the discussion that they will have with the student about the learning process, and that they do not wait until the end of the semester to give feedback to the student — there should be no surprises when completing the evaluations.

As noted, during this year’s orientation/instructional meeting on September 8, 2017, field instructors received a written form as a prompt: “Hey partner, let’s collaborate!” (Appendix M: Field Instructor Orientation Prompt) where agency partners are explicitly invited to engage in enhanced opportunities to work together and increase dialogue.

Other ways to increase dialogue with the field education setting and field instructors include things like sharing journal articles germane to the agency practice setting, attending agency functions such as, open houses or holiday events, or, as happened recently and unfortunately, the Field Director attended a celebration of life event for a longtime field education coordinator at a local community mental health clinic. In these settings, where a direct link to a particular student may be more diffuse, the university field education program and field agency settings and staff members can engage in less directive settings, and in from such spaces, opportunities for collaboration and/or mutual support can be realized.

2.2.11 The program describes how its field education program develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed.
To ensure the role of student as learner, student assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student’s employment.

Policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is already employed

Our field education program strongly discourages students from completing their internships at their places of employment. Exceptions to this policy can be made with a waiver, and only under specific circumstances; generally, in the face of a financial and/or familial hardship caused by commuting to what for most students is an unpaid internship for 2 days/week, and with a commitment from the agency about using the work site as a field placement. As with any field site, a placement contract is needed stating the proposed field instructor will provide the necessary instruction, supervision and training in order that the student fulfill the learning objectives of the BASW program.

For the school to consider this option, the student must first demonstrate financial need for this arrangement in order to remain in the program. Next, the agency and student must both agree that the student would engage in different activities within a different unit and being supervised by someone other than the students’ job supervisor.

Careful consideration is given to sites that have a sufficiently differentiated service portfolio, such that a student can realistically obtain new, robust and distinctly different experience from that of their employment duties in the same agency. In this way, students can view their internship as a step forward in their professionalization, and not merely a placement of convenience or a “holding pattern” to allow them to cope and finish school.

Distinguishing field education from employment

When these agreements are made, the school requires a letter from the hosting agency to articulate that the student may conduct their internship while simultaneously being employed there. The student’s responsibilities and supervisors are articulated in writing, and must be distinctly different from their paid employment.

While the school has a clear policy in place, improvements are both necessary and in progress, including the production of a separate request form for employment-based placements. Here, such an agreement will be clearly articulated between the school,
student, and place of employment. The use of a structured form would help to streamline the process, as currently, these steps happen as addenda to the original field agreement. Further, the current Field Policy Manual does not differentiate this policy for BASW and MSW students, and stipulations such as only allowing one year of placement to be in one’s place of employment do not apply to BASW students who are only in the field for one year. The School has agreed to allow this year to be in one’s place of employment under the parameters otherwise described in the manual and summarized in this section.

Field Education Summary

In closing this section, it should be noted this summer welcomed the third Field Director in three years for the School. The current Field Director has multiple projects in progress to address the needs of the field education program as outlined throughout this document. Continued monitoring and consistency within the field education program will be enhanced by rewriting the Field Policy Manual, and through the introduction of additional standards of practice for the Field Director and field liaisons. As numerous placement sites have been approved prior to this Director starting in her role, it would behoove the program to revisit each approved internship placement site to check for ongoing goodness-of-fit between agency needs, and student needs and skills. Further assessing how and whether each site adequately differentiates generalist from specialist placement opportunities is in order given the changes in staffing at the university (if not also at the agency level) over the past three years.

Given litigious tendencies within the state of California, added attention to the time-consuming efforts involved in securing agency contracts, particularly with governmental agencies, such that each student is fully covered under the university professional liability insurance may require added support for the field education team in future years. This is a relatively new procedure for many practice locations and resistance has appeared in numerous forms that have caused delays in student placement start dates.

Costs associated with student background checks being relegated to the university and student vs. being managed by the internship site, as we see in trends among hospital placements, is another area for continued attention. First, these costs can be prohibitive for some students, having the unintended consequence of barring some students from even
exploring medical social work practice. Thus far, the pool of students interested in health care has been small, and arrangements have been such that either a program or the School would cover these costs. In the long run, it would be advisable to have a budget line item for this cost in an effort to level the playing field among students and field placement alternatives.

Chapter 2: Explicit Curriculum References
CHAPTER 3: BASW IMPLICIT CURRICULUM

3.0.1 The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment that models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference.

Diversity is the core of everything we do – to ensure all SSW constituents honor, respect, and appreciate differences among people. It takes into account the many types of intersectionality involving race, culture, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion/spirituality, ability, socio economic status, immigration status, nationality, age, and all other forms of identity. Our goal is to create an academic environment that is focused on diversity and inclusion to increase our students’ knowledge, values, and skills in becoming generalist social workers.

SF State and its SSW have a long history of respect for, and appreciation of, diversity. The school was built on social justice foundations, and its mission and goals over the last fifty years have consistently reflected this fact.

University Context of Diversity

SF State is located in the exceptionally diverse city and county of San Francisco. Table 1 compared the racial demographic data of the 2016 Census for San Francisco to the racial demographic data of SF State for 2015. One significant difference is that the Latino(a) population is double on the campus of SF State than in the city as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percent in City of SF (Census, 2015)</th>
<th>Percent at SF State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino(a)</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Indigenous</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53.6% (non-Hispanic 41%)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more races</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The university’s diversity policies are wide-ranging and strong, as the campus is one of the most diverse campuses in the country. As you can see above, in the Fall 2016, over 75% of the SF State undergraduate students are students of color, and 45% of the student population are low income.

SF State has many noteworthy accomplishments in the area of diversity. Following the nationally-recognized 1968-1969 strike on campus, the university established the first School of Ethnic Studies Program in the country. A few years later, the university elevated the program to the level of a College, and in 2019 the College of Ethnic Studies will celebrate its 50th Anniversary.

### University Strategic Plan

SF State is currently in the middle of a strategic planning process which is focused on diversity and equity. One of the five main values underlying of the university’s current Strategic Plan is ‘Courage.’ An initiative within Courage is to “Foster a diverse and lively marketplace of ideas by creating a long-term enrollment plan that reflects our University mission and values and that is aligned with our budget, including setting specific goals for groups, such as international students, out-of-state students and under-represented communities.”

Another main value of the Strategic Plan is ‘Equity.’ Specifically, the newest plan states, “SF State’s distinctive identity is founded on our commitment to equity. The principles of fairness and inclusion guide our educational mission, our institutional practices and our relations with the community around us. Our commitment to equity fosters an environment of respect, diversity, support and dignity for all of our members - faculty, staff, and students. A commitment to equity is that the campus:

- sees educational access and academic quality as reciprocal goals;
- affirms that resources are distributed according to need;
• empowers students who make the world a better place; and

University Non-Discrimination Policy

SF State’s Academic Policy S199-124 states, “An Affirmative Action Policy for San Francisco State University was first issued in September 1971, in conformity with federal legislation. Revisions were made in 1975 and further revisions were made in 1983 to conform to the revised CSU policy statement of 1980. Federal law (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Orders 11246 and 11375) regarding employment for minority group members and women requires that we initiate an effective Affirmative Action Program. San Francisco State University has long had a commitment to non-discrimination, referred to as Equal Opportunity Employment, which depended on good-faith efforts for enforcement. It is now the policy of California State University adopted by the Board of Trustees to go beyond the ‘non-discrimination’ of Equal Opportunity and to encourage positive efforts towards opportunities for employment and advancement of women, members of minority groups, the disabled, disabled veterans, and veterans of the Vietnam era. In accordance with this policy and federal guidelines, we have set realistic Affirmative Action Program goals and have developed plans which enable us to make substantial progress toward those goals; we maintain detailed statistics by which to demonstrate such progress and complete a Federal Compliance Report as required. The concept of Affirmative Action Programs includes knowledge of where we are now; goals for where we should be; and immediate, imaginative and sustained efforts to devise recruitment, training and career advancement programs that will result in wider representation of the above mentioned groups. It also requires frequent evaluation and analysis to ensure that implementation of the plans continues” (SF State University, Academic Policy S199-124).

University General Policies

The Trustees of the CSU adopted this Policy Statement on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in 1980. All personnel shall be hired in full compliance with Title VII
of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, on the basis of Executive Orders 11246 and 11375 and according to the California State University Policy Statement of Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action in Employment and the 1983-86 Agreement of the California Faculty Association and the California State University.

**University Nondiscrimination**

It is the policy of the CSU to provide equal employment opportunities to all applicants and employees regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual preference, marital status, pregnancy, age, disability, disabled veterans or Vietnam era veterans status. Employment, retention and advancement of employees shall be based on merit and be responsive to the needs of the CSU for quality and excellence.

**University Affirmative Action**

It is the policy of the CSU to promote employment opportunities for the following groups thereafter referred to as affirmative action groups: women, members of minority groups, the disabled, disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era. In accordance with Executive Order 11246, minority group members are defined as Afro-Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, and Asian-Americans (Executive Order 11375 added Women by amendment). (see https://senate.sfsu.edu/content/academic-affirmative-action-policy-statement)

**University Equity Programs and Compliance**

Effective July 1, 2017, SF State developed a new position, named the Dean of Equity Programs and Compliance. This position will be responsible for executing SF State’s responsibilities under CU Executive Orders 1095, 1096, 1097, and 1098 and will be the senior deputy Title IX coordinator/ DHR (discrimination, harassment and retaliation) administrator for staff/faculty and third parties who wish to report complaints or incidents to the University. The Dean will also serve as an ombudsman for faculty and staff. Lastly, the Dean will coordinate the response to complaints of discrimination filed through external agencies.
College of Health & Social Sciences

The SSW sits in the College of Health and Social Sciences and is extremely responsive to the needs of students. For example, the SF State College of Health & Social Sciences conducted a survey with students in the Spring 2017 about their experiences with the campus climate and curriculum, with a special emphasis on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and other (LGBTQ+) issues and students. The College will use the information from the survey to improve the climate and curriculum related to LGBTQ+ issues in the college (See Appendix N).

School of SW and Diversity

Guided by our mission, SF State’s SSW programs have a deep and ongoing commitment to advancing a culture of diversity, equity, social justice, intersectionality and inclusion within its teaching, community service, field education, social work research, and administration activities. We are dedicated to fostering and maintaining a learning environment that emphasizes the importance of celebrating diversity as a strength, value, ethic, and valued component in the profession of social work.

The mission and philosophy of the School, the composition of the faculty, staff, and study body, the density and cultural richness of the SF State campus, and the breadth of the Bay Area’s multicultural communities combine to create a distinctive diverse learning context. In the classroom, the field seminar, and the field placement there is a constant exchange of different perspectives and life experiences in addressing material ranging from social policy analysis content, to values and ethical conduct, to advocacy and empowerment, working at the micro, mezzo and macro levels.

The mission of the SSW is to educate diverse learners to achieve progressive development and promote social change throughout the Bay Area and beyond. The School cultivates ethical leadership for social justice and promotes professional advocacy, versatility, activism, and cultural humility.

Other evidence of the School’s commitment to human diversity and nondiscrimination is the actual diversity among faculty, staff, students, and advisory board. Throughout the years, the majority of the faculty, staff, students, and advisory board have been persons of color. All who choose to be affiliated the SSW have
perspectives consistent with the School’s mission and focus on human diversity and respect for differences.

Table 2. Faculty Diversity in AY 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic/Cultural Background</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American, Indigenous, First Nations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx, Chicano/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial (2 or more)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Staff Diversity in AY 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic and Cultural Background</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Indigenous, First Nations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx/Chicana/o</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial, two or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SSW Community Advisory Committee

In 2010, the SSW developed a Community Advisory Board comprised of alumni and others in the Social Work field, who occupy positions of influence in the broader Bay
Area community. The primary purpose has been to build a bridge between the university and the community to highlight the need for social work professionals and encourage the university to provide the necessary resources to fill such need. The board meets each semester and rotates the meetings location between campus and at the Commission on the Status of Women’s downtown SF office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic/Cultural Background</th>
<th>Number of Advisory Board Members</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Advisory Board Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Indigenous, First Nations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx/Chicana/o</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-racial, two or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASW Program and Diversity**

**BASW Program Goals**

Of the ten goals of our BASW program, four of them are related to diversity. The first goal of the BASW program is related to having Diverse Learners. This goal is to, “Expect, accept, and appreciate human differences in all areas, including diversity of ethnicities, cultures, values, backgrounds, learning styles, problem solving approaches, and more. Promote diversity to enrich environments, thought processes, experiences, and more.”

The second goal is related to Equity and Social Justice. This goal is defined as “Identifying, understanding, and evaluating multiple forms of justice (e.g. social, economic, environmental, political, and legal justice) and rights (human and civil). Promote and achieve fairness, equality, and human/civil rights.”
The third goal related to diversity is Cultural Humility. Cultural Humility is defined as “Appreciating the fact that cultures and values evolve and change, and that one never “arrives” with respect to knowledge, skills, and practices related to diversity. Identifying and analyze the intersectionality of forces that impinge on lives.”

The last BASW goal related to diversity is Collaboration and Participation, which involves “Respecting, valuing and honoring one another’s personal and professional experiences, knowledge, skills, and values. Seeking, receiving, and utilizing inputs from diverse persons, groups, and communities and make diversity - sensitive and appropriate decisions. Engaging and utilizing the voices of many through participatory means.”

**BASW Coursework and Diversity**

Some of these different learning opportunities include our Gender, Sexism and Social Welfare (SW 352) and Social Difference in SW Practice (SW 470) courses. Diversity content is also infused into all of our BASW courses. For example, in the Introduction to SW Practice course (SW 400) the weekly lesson plans include examples of diverse client populations at the micro, mezzo and macro levels. In addition, the Social Work Research course (SW 450) includes examples of practice informed research at agencies serving diverse client populations, including those that have been systematically oppressed or those that have experienced institutionalized racism. In addition, BASW students are also able to take courses in the University’s College of Ethnic Studies, and in some cases, double major in a department in Ethnic Studies. This increased knowledge base also supports our students in serving diverse populations in social work.

**BASW Field Placements and Diversity**

Many of our BASW students have field placements in diverse agencies in the Bay Area which offer the best opportunities to understand and work with diverse populations and inclusion, not just on a conceptual and theoretical level, but on a practical level of impacting the real lives of individuals and families via their social justice mission driven goals and competencies related to inclusion and diversity. The SSW endorses the principle that field education is the “heart of social education” and requires that all students have educational experiences in professionally supervised field placements. Signature pedagogy represents the central form of instruction and learning in which a profession socializes its
students to perform the role of practitioner. The purpose of field education is to provide the student with the opportunity to develop competence in social work skills and professional values in actual service settings. The total curriculum of the School encourages the student to integrate theory, knowledge, values, and skills learned in the classroom and in field to demonstrate mastery of social work practice behaviors and development of professional competencies. The SSW recognizes the need for high-quality field placements, which can provide a range of learning experiences in a professional environment. Some of the field placements include a variety of settings that offer learning about social justice, inclusion, and respect for the dignity of the individual and all levels of intervention (individuals, families, groups, agencies, and communities). The following practice areas and relevant agencies highlight the wide diversity of available field placements: Aging: Stepping Stones; Child Welfare: East Bay Children’s Law Offices, SFUSD, DHS, SF State Guardian Scholars Program; Mental Health: El Cerrito High School; Justice System: Ella Baker Center; Developmental Disabilities: Janet Pomeroy Center; Housing/Homelessness: Larkin Street Youth Services, many more.

**BASW Students and Diversity**

Our BASW student population has always been extremely diverse in terms of race, ethnicity, gender, age, immigration background, and ability. Their life experiences bring such a richness to the classroom learning environment and school events. Our BASW students are very comfortable sharing their diverse upbringings and experiences which allows our instructors to discuss intersectionality and inclusivity at a micro level in the classroom. Table 5 illustrates our the racial/cultural diversity of our BASW students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic/Cultural Background</th>
<th>Percentage of Total BASW Students n=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Indigenous, First Nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx/Chicana/o/Hispanic</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our students are also diverse in terms of their socio-economic status. See Table 6 below that illustrates the percentage of students receiving financial aid and those that are working. It is important to note that 32% of our BASW students work 30+ per week.

| Table 6. BASW Student Socio-Economic Data* AY 2016-2017 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Receive Financial Aid?**                             | **Percentage of BASW Students** | n=20                       |
| Yes                                                    | 71%                                    |
| No                                                     | 29%                                    |
| **Working While in BASW Program?**                     | **Percentage of BASW Students** | n=20                       |
| Yes                                                    | 86%                                    |
| No                                                     | 14%                                    |

*from SWEAP exit survey

**BASW Scholarships**

Some of our BASW scholarships are related to working with diverse populations. For example, we currently have a scholarship available for students in memory of Stella Chan, a SF State SSW alumna. The fund is to be used as an annual scholarship for BASW social work students who are committed to working in the Asian/Asian American community. The scholarship stems from an endowment. The number and amount of award vary per year, based on interest rates.

**Study Abroad Programs**

As previously outlined in chapter 2, the SSW offers two study abroad programs to BASW students as part of its commitment to fostering a global perspective to social work practice and SF State’s tradition of promoting equity in international education. These
programs are part of bilateral exchanges between SF State and partner institutions overseas, which offer students unique opportunities for long-term study abroad as part of their social work degree. In exchange, the SSW also serves as a host institution to exchange students from these partner universities in an open enrollment arrangement. The SSW’s partner institutions are City University of Hong Kong and Hochschule Fulda in Hessen, Germany. A new bilateral exchange program was established recently with the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) in Australia.

Hochschule Fulda, Germany Bilateral Exchange Program (Fall, Senior Year). Students participate in the International Social Work Course, a cohorted program offered by Fulda Hochschule Department of Social Work. The program runs only in the Fall semester and is taught in English except for one course in German as a Foreign Language. In addition, students fulfill two days of field instruction in different social service agencies in Fulda.

City University of Hong Kong Bilateral Exchange Program (Fall and Spring). Students take a minimum of 12 units of social work courses offered by the City University of Hong Kong through open enrollment. Students have the option of studying abroad in either the Fall or Spring semester. The courses are taught in English. Proficiency in Cantonese and Mandarin is required for field instruction classes.

Students who participate in study abroad come back to share lessons they gathered from their experiences of being a student in another country. More importantly, these students are able to share their insights about social work and social welfare in their host cities and how they compare to the U.S. At the same time, exchange students in our partner universities greatly enrich the classroom with the perspectives they bring in about social work and social welfare in their respective localities. Last Spring 2017, two students who participated in a study abroad in HS Fulda presented a poster at the annual Spring Research Showcase of the College of Health & Social Sciences about their experiences in working
with refugees, asylees, unaccompanied minors, and other displaced communities from their perspectives as Latina students from immigrant backgrounds.

**SSW Lobby Days**

Each Spring semester, students in all cohorts of the BASW program participate in the NASW CA Legislative Lobby Days in Sacramento. The two-day event starts on a Sunday at the Convention Center in downtown Sacramento. Social work students from social work schools throughout the state of California gather that day to discuss the bills that will be lobbying for, the process of how a bill becomes a law, and strategies for effective lobbying. On the second day, students break up into legislative teams and meet with legislators at the Capitol to lobby for the bills. At mid-day, all Lobby Days’ participants hold a social action rally at the steps of the Capitol.

The SSW views Lobby Days as an excellent opportunity for students and faculty engage in policy practice and to connect the curriculum in policy classes with hands-on policy experience. The SF State contingent of students and faculty sponsors participate actively in Lobby Days. Some students serve as legislative team leaders or volunteers. The SF State participants also hold a debriefing session at the end of the first day where students take stock of what transpired that day and share their insights and lessons learned about policy practice. The debriefing session is then followed by a community gathering where students from all four cohorts break bread and socialize. Since there are very few occasions when all the four cohorts come together, the community gathering provides that opportunity for all the students to have a social gathering.

While the SF State contingent is much smaller compared to other schools of social work in California, it has nonetheless made its presence felt during Lobby Days. Here are some examples of how students, with support from their faculty sponsors, make Lobby Days a more meaningful policy experience for them:

In Spring 2015, SF State did a creative presentation about one of the bills being lobbied for, SB 23 Repeal the Maximum Family Grant. The presentation started with a modified silent witness project where five students narrated their stories in
English, Spanish, and Cantonese of how they experience poverty and other effects of the Maximum Family Grant Rule. An analytical portion followed where one baccalaureate student laid out the how the MFG rule exacerbates poverty. The presentation ended with a spoken word performance by two students.

In Spring 2017, the SF State students led a symbolic action at the steps of the Capitol before the social action rally in response to the Muslim ban, the crackdown on undocumented immigrants following the November 2016 elections, and the ongoing violence and police brutality of communities of color and indigenous communities and water protectors in the Dakota Access Pipeline. The students led all Lobby Days’ participants in forming a large circle. A transgender-identified student opened the action with a short testimony about standing with all oppressed communities because other people stood by him. The group then held a moment of silence followed by chants made in multiple languages declaring solidarity with all oppressed communities. The students also created their own artwork and logo to accompany the action.

3.0.2 The program explains how these efforts provide a supportive and inclusive environment.

**BASW Student Feedback**

We survey our BASW students periodically and they are able to give anonymous feedback about our program, including its level of inclusivity. They are asked about how inclusive and supportive the learning environment is, and how the SSW needs to improve its efforts to make the environment as inclusive as possible (e.g., faculty teaching, guest speakers, brown bag lunch content, student events, etc.). As can be seen in our Explicit Curriculum document, the SSW is very much committed to integrating cultural humility and cultural responsiveness into all course work and course design, and BASW students are able to give direct feedback on this. Table 7 below illustrates the feedback BASW students gave us in 2016-2017 on the SWEAP exit survey related to being able to: “Apply
and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro level, mezzo, and macro levels.”

**Table 7. BASW Student Feedback on Importance of Diversity***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Likert Scale Response to Importance of Diversity</th>
<th>Percentage of BASW Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Very Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Poor/Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Adequate/Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Adequate</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Adequate/Good</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Good</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Good/Very Good</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=Very Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*from SWEAP exit survey

Table 8 below illustrates the feedback BASW students gave us in 2016-2017 on the SWEAP exit survey related to being able to: “Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituencies.”

**Table 8. BASW Student Feedback on Self Awareness***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Likert Scale Response to Importance of Self Awareness</th>
<th>Percentage of BASW Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Poor/Very Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Adequate/Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 below illustrates the feedback BASW students gave us in 2016-2017 on the SWEAP exit survey related to being able to: “Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Likert Scale Response about Working with Diverse Clients</th>
<th>Percentage of BASW Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Very Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Poor/Very Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Adequate/Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Adequate</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6=Adequate/Good</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=Good</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8=Good/Very Good</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9=Very Good</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*from SWEAP exit survey

The data above clearly show that we are doing a primarily Adequate/Good to Very Good job of preparing and training our students to be aware of the importance of diversity and inclusivity in social work, to be self-aware regarding differences and biases, and to work with diverse populations in social work.
**BASW Field Seminar**

The SSW also has a one-hour and 40-minute weekly field seminar (specific only to the field placement) for our BASW students which is incredibly unique and helps promote a supportive, inclusive environment. Students are able to use the field seminar course to discuss diversity, challenges with working with populations different than themselves, and any other strengths or wins that come up regarding inclusivity and diversity in their field placements. No other schools of social work in the Bay Area have a set aside weekly field seminar course like ours.

**Preferred Gender Pronoun Introductions**

In the academic year 2016-2017 the SSW began the practice of having BASW students and faculty introduce themselves with their names and preferred gender pronouns (PGPs) any time we have a meeting or class in the SSW. In addition, we are very pleased that SF State now allows students to add preferred gender pronouns (PGPs) in the on-line university system through the Registrar’s office so faculty can see PGPs before they begin teaching a course.

**Student Resources**

Inclusivity is also related to students receiving the support they require for success in their academic program. Last year, the SSW also put together a Student Resource Webpage; its goal was to connect BASW students to the vast university resources such as, but not limited to: 1) Health Promotion and Wellness unit (food and housing security programs), 2) Dream Resource Center, 3) Counseling and Psychological Services, and 4) Tutorial Services (CARP and LAC), and 4) the Student Resource Center.

**Field Experience**

The SSW is also committed to ensuring inclusivity into the field experience for students. We want to make sure that all of our constituents (faculty, field instructors, field liaisons, and students) are on the same page related to student expectations in the field. The SSW hosts an annual Field Orientation for all Field Instructors which allows us to directly communicate student expectations. Students have attended this field orientation in the past.
This year our Field Director specifically discussed diversity and inclusivity in our annual Field Orientation.

**Student Involvement in SSW Affairs**

Our BASW students are given many opportunities to be involved in the SSW. For example, we practice and model inclusivity by allowing BASW students to participate in our bi-monthly School meetings (which includes faculty, staff and students) if they choose. They can attend the school meetings and the one (1) official BASW student representative can formally vote on curricular items that come before the school. Students were also represented on all CSWE Accreditation Self-Study committees. They provided feedback on all data collection and analysis.

We also practice inclusivity by having faculty oversee our BASW student led-group for Bachelors of Social Work students called SWAVE (SWAVE will be discussed in 3.1.10 section of this self-study). Lastly, BASW and SWAVE students are also directly involved in the planning and fundraising for the Social Work Graduate Recognition Ceremony. In June 2017, we also increased our inclusivity by having the opening remarks at the ceremony read in Spanish and English.

**SSW Director “Cawfee Hour”**

Last year our SSW Director began a monthly “Cawfee Hour” where she invited all students to her office to give them an opportunity to talk, to share, to get to know each other. These were informal meetings so she could get to know students, and students could get to know each other. This was also a space where students could bring up strengths of the program and areas of improvement with regard to curriculum, advising, brown bag lunch ideas, field experiences, etc. The meetings were very successful in that students regularly attended and shared experiences with the Director.

**Holiday Potluck with Students**

In the academic year 2016-2017 we began an annual tradition by inviting all faculty, staff and students to share in a potluck holiday celebration. This celebration allows us to all gather to celebrate our cultures, our food and our traditions. This event was
incredibly inclusive as most faculty and students attended – and we were able to talk and gather outside of the classroom environment.

3.0.3 The program describes specific plans to continually improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.

NEW SSW Community Day

In August 2017, the SSW hosted its first SSW Community Day. The entire SSW community (faculty, staff and BASW and MSW students) came together on campus before classes began to get to know one another and do team building activities to help build a sense of community. This event was incredibly successful and we gathered feedback from students about it (see Appendix O). During SSW Community Day we consciously made an effort to bring students together and talk about our diversity and inclusivity. We created activities to talk about how better to affirm difference in our SSW constituencies and how to gather feedback about doing so. This was a very successful event and we plan to make it an annual get-together.

New Introductory Course for BASW Students

We also plan to develop a one unit course (for Fall 2018) for our BASW students to orient them to the BASW Program, including requirements, procedures, expectations, and protocols. Students will have the opportunity to identify their preferred learning styles and the ways in which their individual strengths might most effectively be applied. It will focus on successfully utilizing academic writing skills in completing course assignments. Students will learn how to organize and structure an academic paper, create a thesis statement, and identify principal questions and sub-topics. They will also engage in productive and efficient literature searches and obtain information on the APA style guide. They will gain knowledge of how to utilize iLearn and other electronic sources relevant to their course of study and practice. In addition, there will be a review of campus resources, programs, and services.

Supporting Gender Identity
Preferred Gender Pronoun (PGP) introductions will continue for each academic year as we have institutionalized that practice of introductions. By adding PGP on our application, we will know up front what students want to be referred as. The SSW has also been advocating for gender-free bathrooms in the building where most of our classes are held. There are some gender-free bathrooms on the SF State campus, but the bathrooms in our building are still currently male and female.

New SSW Community Space 2017-2018

The SSW office has moved and we have created a student community space to allow BASW students to hang out. This was recommended in past student surveys and we created it this academic year 2017-2018 after our office space was moved. Our SSW Administrative Office Coordinator has done an excellent job reaching out to all students to invite them to enjoy the space and get to know one another better.

Faculty Meetings and Content

In AY 2017-2018 we have begun the practice of carving out time during school meetings to discuss current events in the political world and how we might address these events in our social work classes (e.g., the military transgender ban, the travel bans for seven countries, the end to DACA, etc.).

3.1—Student Development: Admissions, Advisement, Retention and Termination: and Student Participation

3.1.1 The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program.

The SSW’s BASW is impacted, so students are required to apply for admissions. All prospective students apply to SF State through the CSUMentor portal and are admitted if they meet admission requirements for the CSU system. There are two entry points to the BASW program: (1) a SF State student applies to the BASW program as early as their sophomore year or thereafter, once they have completed all of the general education requirements; or (2) a transfer student applies to CSUMentor and completes the BASW
supplemental application for admission, also requires all general education requirements are met.

**BASW Admissions Criteria and Processes**

The Social Work process involves answering a series of questions that are designed to garner information about the applicant’s values, commitments, and visions about social work.

Applicants must meet the following criteria to be eligible for review by the SSW:

- Admission to the Bachelor of Arts in Social Work major is limited to students at the upper division level (60 units or more).
- Be a current SF State student OR eligible for admission to undergraduate studies at SF State. If they are NOT a current SF State student prior to applying for the social work program, students must complete an online application to the University via CSU Mentor at [www.csumentor.edu](http://www.csumentor.edu). The CSU Mentor application period is from October 1, 2016 to November 30, 2016.
- Meet the general university admission requirements for upper-division applicants. Students must have completed the Lower Division General Education curriculum (both Segments I and II, or equivalent) and have junior standing (60 units or more) at SF State.
- Have an all-college total GPA of 2.0 (California residents) or 2.4 (non-residents) or higher at the time of application.
- Complete the five required prerequisite courses with either a “C-“ grade or higher prior to admission into the BASW Program. If applicants have not completed all five prerequisites and are considered for admission, they will be placed on the waiting list.
  - Introductory-level course in Human Biology (BIO 100 or equivalent-lab not required)
  - Macro Economics (ECON 100 or ECON 305 or equivalent)
  - Introductory Psychology (PSY 200 or equivalent),
  - Introductory Sociology (SOC 105 or equivalent), and
e. English 214 (Second Year written composition) or equivalent prior to entering the BASW program

In response to the School’s mission and to its commitment to serve disenfranchised and oppressed communities, emphasis is placed on a consideration of the applicant’s values, goals, and responsibilities, experiences with people of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and lifestyles, and identification and experience with such communities. These criteria have been adopted by the faculty to recruit and select baccalaureate students who demonstrate a connection with the mission and philosophy of the SSW.

The distinctive philosophy and mission of the School is directly communicated to prospective applicants through brochures, the School’s website, recruitment and outreach orientations and representation of the School to the public through student and faculty community projects.

To better serve specific disenfranchised communities of the Bay Area, the School draws upon the personal and professional networks of our graduates, conducts periodic outreach, information sessions, recruitment events, and orientation meetings, attends and participates in diverse community events, and encourages contacts with high schools and community colleges so that the pool of prospective applicants continues to reflect the dynamic evolution of constituencies throughout the Bay Area and beyond, both national and international.

The BASW Program Committee handles BASW admissions. It is composed of tenured/tenure-track faculty and lecturers. The BASW Coordinator serves as the chair of admissions, and the Chair reports to the general faculty and student body at the monthly SSW meeting. Administratively, the SSW’s AOC, Office Assistants, and student assistants provide consistency in responses to inquiries and provide ongoing liaison with the Office of Admissions. All applicant and admissions material is maintained in a secure file and computer data environment.

A standardized evaluation form is used to award points in the designated areas. As the scores are tabulated by the Admissions Administrative Assistant, folders with discrepant 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.
3.1.2 The program describes the policies and procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision and any conditions associated with admission.

Timing of notifications will vary. The BASW Program has three types of admissions notifications.

- **Admitted**: The SSW reviews all application very carefully based on criteria aforementioned. Students receive notification about admission status through the mail and email.
- **Waitlisted for admission**: Every year, the SSW far exceeds applications received from students than space available. A small percentage of applicants are selected for the waitlist. If space becomes available before June 1, applications are removed from the waitlist and offered admission.
- **Denied admission**: There is rigorous competition for entry into the SSW programs. Those who are not selected receive denial notification through the mail.

3.1.4. The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.

Requirements about transfer of credits are written in the University Bulletin. To summarize, the STAR Act (Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act/SB 1440) “guarantees that students who earn as Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) will receive admission to a CSU campus with junior status; furthermore, students who pursue a B.S. or B.A. in a program that is deemed ‘similar’ to their transfer degree will be able to complete the degree by taking no more than 60 units at the CSU” [http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/past-bulletin-archive/2016-2017/policies-procedures/academic-standards/academic-standards.pdf](http://bulletin.sfsu.edu/past-bulletin-archive/2016-2017/policies-procedures/academic-standards/academic-standards.pdf).

When a student has taken college courses at another institution or has an associate’s degree, the Registrar reviews the transcript for articulation for all general education credits. When an accepted student has an upper division course that is completed with a C- or
better, the Registrar consults with the SSW to determine if a course is acceptable for transfer and possible waiver for a BASW required course.

3.1.5. The program submits its written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience.

The SSW does not award credit for life experiences. The University must meet accrediting standards of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. One may not be given credit for prior life or work experiences. This is written in our BASW student manual which is distributed to all students.

Advisement, retention, and termination

3.1.6 The program describes its academic and professional advising policies and procedures. Professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff or both.

Academic and professional advising is provided by tenured and tenure-track (T/TT) faculty in the program. In July of each year, the SSW Director, in collaboration with the BASW Program Coordinator, divide the number of incoming students to all T/TT faculty so there is equal distribution of students amongst faculty. Each T/TT faculty advises students during the duration of the student’s time in the BASW program. The incoming students are notified of their assigned advisor in August before they begin the program. Each faculty member advises approximately 10-12 BASW students, along with their MSW advisees (approximately 15 MSW students).

The students keep the same advisor during their time in the program and they are expected to meet with their advisor at least once each semester. The advisor first orients the student to the program including required academic courses, prerequisite courses, grade point average expectations, elective options, and advising expectations. Professional advising is also offered in areas such as MSW programs, other graduate degrees, post-graduate job opportunities, post-masters credential opportunities (e.g., Pupil Personnel Services Credential), California ASW and LCSW requirements, etc. Student advisement is
provided on a consistent basis, and expectations of advising are specifically described in the BASW student manual.

Students also receive professional advising from the SSW Field Director prior to choosing a setting for their field practicum experience each year. Each student spends at least 1-2 hours meeting with the SSW Field Director to discuss their past social work experience, skill levels, and professional interests – before interviewing for field internships.

We also provide faculty advising information to students during our required BASW Orientation, which occurs before each school year begins.

3.1.7 The program submits its policies and procedures for evaluating a student’s 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.

Information for evaluating student academic performance and professional performance, including policies and procedures for grievance is provided in the BASW student manual (see Appendix P). In addition, each social work course syllabus provides specific information about the evaluation of academic performance in each individual course.

**Evaluating Academic Performance**

Each social work course syllabus provides the criteria for evaluating academic performance in that course, including the attendance policy, expected conduct in the classroom, the expectation that the student follows the university code of student conduct and that violations of that code (e.g. plagiarism) will be reported, ways the students’ performance (e.g. exams or papers) will be evaluated and the weights of those evaluations.

The expected student code of conduct at SF State was developed in the SF State Office of Student Conduct. The Office of Student Conduct’s (OSC) mission is to “support the University’s educational purpose and goals set forth by interpreting and enforcing standards of student behavior, related policies and procedures under the State of California
Code of Regulations, Title V, sections 41301-41304 through Executive Order 1098, Student Conduct Procedures. Cases involving alleged violations of University policies or campus rules by students should be referred to this office, which is responsible for ensuring the fair and confidential administration of the Student Conduct Procedures. The OSC strives to facilitate student learning, ethical development in connection with the student disciplinary process, promote academic integrity and responsible conduct through outreach, conduct outcomes, and education. The OSC works to maintain a safe and orderly campus environment. The student code of conduct can be found at: https://conduct.sfsu.edu/standards and is explicitly spelled out in all syllabi.

Each instructor teaching BASW courses monitors students who are not performing well in the instructor’s course. If a student is in danger of receiving a C- or below, the instructor may request an informal meeting with the BASW Coordinator and the student to discuss the student’s progress in the course. If the student’s academic performance in the course does not improve over the semester, and the BASW student receives a final grade of a C- or below, the faculty member will inform the BASW Coordinator and the SSW Director. The BASW Coordinator and SSW Director will then meet with the student to remind the student that they will need to retake that particular course in order to complete the BASW program requirements. This information is provided to students during our BASW orientation.

**Evaluating Professional Performance**

Students’ professional performance in the field is evaluated by the Field Supervisor, Field Liaison, and reviewed by the Field Director. That process is outlined in the Field Manual. Field Liaison and Field Instructors meet in the field internship placement site two (2) times per year to ensure the student’s professional performance is adequate.

Students who show an inability to insightfully understand and resolve their own issues so that these issues do not interfere with generalist social work practice is a student concern (adapted from Bemak, Epp, & Keys, 1999, p. 21). The student concern can be reflected in one or more of the following ways: “(a) an inability and/or unwillingness to acquire and integrate professional standards into one’s repertoire of professional behavior, (b) an inability to acquire professional skills in order to reach an acceptable level of
competency, and (c) an inability to control personal stress, psychological dysfunction, and/or excessive emotional reactions that interfere with professional functioning” (Lamb, Presser, Pfost, Baum, Jackson, & Jarvis, 1987, p. 598). We use this definition to decide upon a lack of professional performance.

This definition of student concern is in sync with the NASW Code of Ethics, Section 4.05:

(a) Social Workers should not allow their own personal problems, psychological distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties to interfere with their professional judgment and performance or to jeopardize the best interests of people for whom they have a professional responsibility.  
(b) Social Workers whose personal problems, psychological distress, legal problems, substance abuse, or mental health difficulties interfere with their professional judgment and performance should immediately seek consultation and take appropriate remedial action by seeking professional help, making adjustments in workload, terminating practice, or taking any other steps necessary to protect clients and others.

3.1.8 The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance. The program describes how it informs students of these policies and procedures.

Termination from the SSW Program Policy

Students Performance that May Result in a Review and/or Possible Dismissal from the SSW

Student reviews can occur under any of the following circumstances:

- Failure to meet or maintain academic requirements as stated in the University Bulletin
- Scholastic dishonesty, including cheating, lying, plagiarism, collusion, falsifying academic records, or any act designed to give unfair academic advantage to the
student (Faculty must adhere to university guidelines. For complete University policy and procedures, see Student Code of Conduct.)

- Behavior judged to be in violation of the current NASW Code of Ethics
- Any threat or attempt to harm oneself or someone else
- Commission of a criminal act that is contrary to professional practice, occurring during the course of study or occurring prior to admission to the SSW and becoming known after admission
- Consistent pattern of unprofessional behavior
- Failure to meet obtain a C or better in any academic course (that is not a Credit/No Credit course)

The Three Levels of Review

**Level 1**

A Level 1 review involves a faculty member and a student. When a faculty member has concerns about a student enrolled in the social work program meeting any of the academic criteria, whether related to professional behavior or scholastic performance, that faculty member will:

- Discuss those concerns directly with the student and seek to work with the student to resolve the difficulties.
- Apprise the appropriate BASW Coordinator or Field Director of the concerns in order to identify potential patterns and issues related to the student
- Document dates and content of meetings with students.

If a problem arises in field, the agency-based field instructor will discuss concerns directly with the student and with the Faculty Liaison. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Liaison to apprise the SSW Director of the concerns. In many instances, meetings between faculty and students resolve the concerns and do not necessarily lead to further reviews, pursuant to this section.

**Level 2**

A Level 2 review involves the faculty member, student, BASW Coordinator (and/or Field Director) and SSW Director. Faculty and SSW Director will meet with the
student when the student is not meeting or following program or university standards, policies, and procedures or when concerns have not been resolved at Level 1. If a problem arises in field, the agency based Field Instructor, Faculty Liaison, and Field Director will conduct the review with the student.

In this information gathering process, the SSW Director will determine the nature of the concern and gather sufficient information to develop a plan to address that concern, if one is needed. No further action may be required, or the student may be asked, in writing, to modify his or her behavior and/or seek appropriate help. This process is designed to assist students in dealing with identified concerns that have an impact on their performance.

The SSW Director will assess the nature of these concerns with appropriate faculty, consult with the student’s Advisor and maintain documentation, and decide if it is necessary to conduct a more comprehensive review, pursuant to Level 3.

Level 3

A Level 3 review involves the Associate Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences, faculty member, student, SSW Director, and any other faculty who have had direct experience with the student in classroom or field. Generally, this level review is called when problematic patterns are identified with students or when the issues are serious enough to require formal consultation with other faculty and the student. A Level 3 review more often is conducted when concerns have not been resolved in prior reviews; when issues relate to a student not meeting the criteria for academic performance (often involving professional or ethical behaviors); or when the student is being considered for withdrawal or discontinuance in the program.

In most instances, a Level 3 review is sufficient to deal with student performance and is the last decision-making step in the review process at the SSW.

When a Level 3 review is called, the Associate Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences and the SSW Director will convene a meeting with the appropriate faculty and the student to gather information, determine the nature of the problem (if one is confirmed to exist), and identify alternatives for its remediation. Appropriate faculty to be
involved in a review will include, but are not limited to those who have direct knowledge of, and experience with the student.

The student will be notified in writing of the concerns and meeting date, with sufficient time to prepare for and attend the meeting.

After the review meeting has occurred, the Associate Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences will consult with the Director of the SSW to discuss the problem situation and make recommendations regarding the student. Based on the review, conference with the Associate Dean, and an objective assessment of the information provided, the Associate Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences will inform the student of the decisions, which can include one or more of the following actions:

• *Continue the student in the program with no conditions.* In these situations, the concern has been addressed and no further action by the student or program is required.

• *Establish formal conditions for the student's continuance in the program.* In these situations, specific conditions must be met in order for the student to remain in the program. Action may include establishing goals, a plan, a timeline, and appropriate monitoring; providing mentoring and support; placing the student on probation and monitoring the student during the probationary period; referring the student to counseling and/or advising services; allowing the student to follow a reduced course load or delay entry to the field practicum; or requiring the student to withdraw from the program with the option of reapplying.

• *Consult with and/or refer to the Dean of Students.* In some instances, depending on the nature of the problem, the University's Office of the Dean of Students may be consulted. Situations which may result in referral to the Office of the Dean of Students include scholastic dishonesty, hazing, racial or sexual harassment, unlawful possession or use of firearms or other weapons on University property, damage or destruction of University property, and/or conduct that endangers the health or safety of any University student, employee, or campus visitor.

• *Counsel the student to change majors/degree programs and/or discontinue the student in the program.* In some situations, it will be recommended that the student no longer continue in the social work program. The student may be counseled to
voluntarily change majors or degree programs and/or the student will be
discontinued from the program. In either case, the student will be provided with
documentation regarding the specific reasons for their dismissal and the conditions,
if any, under which they may re-apply.

In any Level 3 review, there must be clear, concise documentation of the problem areas
as well as verification that these concerns have been discussed with the student and
attempted to be ameliorated, where appropriate. Students must be notified of the decision
in writing within ten business days of the review. It is the responsibility of the Associate
Dean of the College of Health and Social Sciences to communicate the decision to the
student.

This policy is in the BASW Manual that is given to students upon Orientation to the
program and is available online on the Student iLearn page.

3.1.9 The program submits its policies and procedures specifying students’ rights and
opportunities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic
and student affairs.

The SSW’s Policies and Procedures Manual clearly stipulates that students have a
right to participate in School meetings, and have one (1) vote in curricular/academic
matters. Students are directly involved in the ongoing evolution and refinement of the
School’s policies and governance process. Three recent examples have been: 1) the
recruitment and selection of the new Director of the SSW, 2) the realignment of course
scheduling days (BASW from Tuesday and Thursday to currently Wednesday and
Thursday), and 3) active and formative participation in Accreditation School Mission and
Goals formulation.

The SSW’s commitment to student inclusion and involvement is presented in the
SF State iLearn page School of Social Work Process. This site provides easy and
immediate student access to academic and student affairs resources, rights, procedures,
policies and opportunities. It is regularly updated and throughout the student’s two years at
the School provides a central reference and entry point for student inclusion and participation.

The SSW introduces newly admitted students to the SSW Process iLearn site at the time they are admitted to the program. It is reviewed at the orientation of new students held in late May and is available to students online throughout the summer.

The iLearn site is organized in a series of distinct content information areas that offer links to specific policy, procedures, or resource sites. The current information areas are:

a. School Mission Statement
b. School Policies and Procedures: Shared Governance and Student Participation
c. Student Organizations and Social Work Professional Organizations
d. SF State and Related Support Resources
e. SF State Undergraduate Policies, Resources, and Forms
f. Campus Writing Support and Resources
g. Library and Campus “Learning Productivity” Resources
h. Field Internship Resources and Forms
i. Troubled Waters Resources (student rights and advocacy resources)
j. Culminating Experience Pathway and resources
k. Professional Development Support Resources and Services
l. Health Center Resources and Community Services
m. Financial Aid and Scholarship Resources
n. Parking and Transportation Services

During the academic year, additional student related information areas are updated to report on and update special projects and initiatives. Two frequent areas are 1) Student Lobby Days and 2) Graduation Ceremony. Student Lobby Days occurs in late Spring in Sacramento. It is an event sponsored by NASW California and provides an opportunity for students to learn more about legislative process and to meet with legislators about current issues being considered. The Graduation Ceremony section is a place for students, faculty
and staff to collaborate on what is primarily a student organized event. It provides an easily accessible timeline and resource procurement site for coordination.

Box 2 in the iLearn site presents the School Policy Manual and the School Committee structure. As set in the Policy Manual, students have a number of votes at School meetings. Box 2 presents the names of MSW Representatives and Alternates elected through the MSW organization MSWC Policies and the BASW Representative and Alternate elected through the BASW organization SWAVE. Procedures: Shared Governance and Student Participation. As specified in the School Policy Manual, students have a defined representative role in formulating, adopting, and implementing School policies.

3.1.10 The program describes how it provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests.

BASW students have organizations to address their shared experiences and represent their interests. The BASW organization is Social Work Advocates for Visions of Empowerment (S.W.A.V.E.) and as stated in its constitution, the main purpose of S.W.A.V.E. is “to maintain communication between Juniors and Seniors in the Undergraduate Social Work Department at SF State as well as create a collaboration between students and faculty.” Beginning with the orientation of newly admitted Juniors, S.W.A.V.E. members assist new students in ‘settling in’ and represent all students in policy issues addressed at School meetings. Each year S.W.A.V.E. initiates a series of special project activities such as food drives, toiletry distributions, and sexual assault prevention campaigns. S.W.A.V.E. also orders and distributes the highly valued SSW hoodies worn by students and graduates throughout the Bay Area.

S.W.A.V.E. also assists the School in organizing the School graduation ceremony. The group plays a central role in obtaining the location of the ceremony and on arranging for the speaker at the ceremony. The successful nature of the group’s effort is reflected in the stature of last year’s speaker, U.S. House Representative Barbara Lee. The event was an unforgettable moment for the students’ families as well as students, faculty and staff.
BASW students can apply to the SF State Chapter of Phi Alpha, the national honor society for social work. Eligibility is a GPA of 3.25. The students are then welcomed into the SF State chapter of Phi Alpha in a ceremony of recognition and inclusion. This chapter was created for, and by, BASW students at our school in 2004.

SSW 21st Century Suggestion Box

In response to consistent student requests that the SSW, as a whole, be more responsive, reflective, communicative, and open, the Director of the School alongside the administrative office coordinator, are developing a 21st century “suggestion box” mechanism whose purpose is to have a codified system of ways for all stakeholders to communicate to the School about their ideas, concerns, and contributions. We are calling the suggestion box, the Forward Project. For details about the Forward Project, see Appendix Q. The plan is to unveil this project with instructions and guidelines to the whole SSW community at the beginning of the Spring 2018 semester.

Educational Policy 3.2 Faculty

Faculty qualifications, including experience related to the Social Work Competencies, an appropriate student-faculty ratio, and sufficient faculty to carry out a program’s mission and goals, are essential for developing an educational environment that promotes, emulates, and teaches students the knowledge, values, and skills expected of professional social workers. Through their teaching, research, scholarship, and service – as well as their interactions with one another, administration, students, and community – the program’s faculty models the behavior and values expected of professional social workers. Programs demonstrate that faculty is qualified to teach the course to which they are assigned.

3.2.1 The program identifies each full-and part-time social work faculty member and discusses his or her qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, and years of service to the program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Status and Rank</th>
<th>Years Teaching at SF State SSW</th>
<th>Time base (1.0 = full time status)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Bardacke, LCSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsey Crowe, PhD</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>One semester</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Feliciana, LCSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriela Fischer, LCSW</td>
<td>Title IVE Project Coordinator &amp; Lecturer</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akiko Giometti, MSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Hermoso, PhD, MSW</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Jones, PhD, MSW</td>
<td>Professor &amp; Director</td>
<td>1.5 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeonshim Lee, PhD, MSW</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja Lenz-Rashid, PhD, LCSW</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-Ann Lott, LCSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Melara, MSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Rickerson, LCSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Sandoval, LCSW</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Scudder, LCSW</td>
<td>Field Director &amp; Lecturer</td>
<td>Field Director: As of Fall 2017 Lecturer: 4 years</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jerry Shapiro, PhD, LCSW  |  Professor  |  41 years  |  1.0  
Rita Takahashi, PhD, MSW  |  Professor  |  28 years  |  1.0  

Faculty Qualifications, Competence, and Expertise

Jaime M. Bardacke, LCSW received her undergraduate degree from University of California at Los Angeles with a major in History, and her Masters of Social Work from the University of California at Berkeley. Ms. Bardacke was a Title IV-E training program participant, and worked as a Child Welfare worker in San Francisco County for many years. During her time as a Child Welfare Worker, Ms. Bardacke received specialized clinical training in trauma treatment and became licensed as a Clinical Social Worker. Ms. Bardacke moved from Child Welfare into private practice, where she sees children, families, and individuals. Ms. Bardacke maintains her connection to Child Welfare by providing clinical supervision at the San Francisco Human Services Agency, as well as other local agencies focused on serving foster youth. Ms. Bardacke has been a lecturer at SF State for five years. She has taught the Child Welfare Policy course to second year Masters’ level students, and has served as the Field Liaison for the first year Title IV-E Masters’ students.

Kelsey Crowe, Ph.D. is a part-time faculty member and started teaching in Fall 2017 for SF State. For several years prior, she taught social policy, evaluation, law and social work, and the history of social work for San Jose State University. She also taught social work for two years in Ghana, West Africa at the University of Legon. Dr. Crowe has her PhD in Social Welfare from the University of California, Berkeley and an MSW from the City University of New York. She has over fifteen years of leadership experience in the public policy sector, and in consulting for nonprofits and foundations. She has conducted and overseen several evaluation and capacity building projects in the fields of youth development, family services, homelessness, and children with special needs.

Christina Feliciana, LCSW, has worked as a field liaison and lecturer at SF State since 2002. In 2006, she assumed the role of PPSC Coordinator. Feliciana also works as a field consultant and lecturer at the School of Social Welfare at UC Berkeley. Feliciana is a
licensed clinical social worker and has served as a social worker in school- and
community-based settings in Alameda and San Francisco counties, specializing in the
delivery of wraparound services for foster youth and emancipating foster youth. She has
coordinated the Foster Youth Services Program in the Mt. Diablo Unified School District
and supported students as a school social worker. Feliciana won the National Heart of
Social Work Award from the Council of Social Work Education in 2006 for excellence in
Field Instruction.

Gabriela Fischer, LCSW received her undergraduate degree from University of
California at Berkeley with a double major in Psychology and Latin American Studies, and
her Masters of Social Work from the University of California at Berkeley. Ms. Fischer
was a Title IV-E child welfare training program participant, and worked as a Child Welfare
worker in Contra Costa County for many years. Ms. Fischer transitioned from Child
Welfare into Child and Adolescent Mental Health, providing therapy to children,
adolescents and their families. During this time, Ms. Fischer obtained her license as a
Clinical Social Worker. Ms. Fischer has been a lecturer and the Title IV-E Project
Coordinator at SF State for five years. She has taught the Field Seminar and has been the
Field Liaison for the 2nd year Title IV-E Masters students.

Akiko Giometti, MSW, has over 10 years of experience in school-based services in
Oakland and San Francisco working with youth and families. Her focus has been on youth
development, academic enrichment and counseling support services. In her most recent
role as lecturer at SF State’s SSW, she demonstrated exceptional adaptability and
flexibility by tailoring teaching and counseling methods to diverse student needs. Giometti
employs a range of pedagogical methods to effectively work with culturally, and socio-
economically diverse groups.

Jocelyn Hermoso has a PhD in Social Work from The Catholic University of
America, National Catholic School of Social Service (NCSSS) and an MSW from Boston
College with a concentration in community organizing, policy, planning, and
administration. Since joining the faculty in 2006, Dr. Hermoso has taught courses in global
poverty, policy analysis, research methods, social welfare history, community organizing,
diversity; gender studies and social welfare, and independent studies in international social
work peacebuilding, and hunger and homelessness among college students. Dr. Hermoso has led SSW’s efforts in redesigning the baccalaureate and MSW curricula. Through a grant from the SF State’s Institute for Community and Civic Engagement (ICCE), she redesigned the baccalaureate research class to incorporate community service learning. As part of her commitment to internationalizing social work curricula, Dr. Hermoso developed study abroad programs for undergraduate and graduate students at SF State. Before coming to SF State, Dr. Hermoso worked extensively in international social development with NGOs and multilateral organizations globally doing policy research and advocacy, and community organizing and training. She also worked with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) with its Strengthening Aging and Gerontology Education in Social Work (SAGE-SW) program in developing course materials to infuse aging content in social work curricula. In 2014, Dr. Hermoso was a visiting professor at Hochschule Fulda in Hessen, Germany where she taught in the Department of Social Work and the Department of Social and Cultural Studies. She was also an affiliate faculty of The Catholic University of America NCSSS for their Social Work Education Program (SWEP), a master’s level professional training program developed to train social workers in conflict-affected areas in Mindanao.

Susanna Jones, Ph.D., MSW received her undergraduate degree from California State University at Northridge with a major in Psychology, and her Masters of Social Work from San Jose State University. Dr. Jones received her Ph.D. in Social Welfare along with a Women’s Studies Certificate from the City University of New York, Graduate Center. Dr. Jones came to SF State as the Director of the SSW in August, 2016. Prior to assuming the position of director at SF State, Dr. Jones was a tenured faculty member at Long Island University, Brooklyn, NY for over 15 years. Dr. Jones has taught across the curriculum in both undergraduate and graduate courses. Her scholarship and research are best described as an examination of the intersections of social policy, social work practice, feminism and justice surrounding constructs of citizenship, immigrants and immigration policy and practice. Lastly, although Dr. Jones is new to the SSW at SF State. However, she brings a wealth of experience (a) in social work education, (b) in administrative duties to run social work programs, and (c) in post masters practice.
Yeon-Shim Lee, Ph.D., ACSW, Associate Professor, received her undergraduate degree from Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea with a major in Social Work and a minor in Law; her Masters of Social Welfare from Yonsei University and Michigan State University; and her Ph.D. from Columbia University School of Social Work in New York City, with an emphasis on Social Policy Planning and Policy Analysis and Economics. She has received rigorous post Ph.D. training in the multidisciplinary field of gerontology as well as epidemiology, including a 2-year post-Ph.D. Geriatric Faculty Training at the University of California at San Francisco (Internal Medicine) and National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). She is a National Institute on Aging (NIA) Scholar on Resource Centers for Minority Aging Research (RCMAR). For the last 13 years, Dr. Lee’s research has focused on geriatric care, health/mental health disparities, intergenerational transmission of violence and trauma across the life course, substance use, acculturation, and sociocultural health/mental health interventions among diverse racial/ethnic populations. For over 15 years, her social work practice experience has included a wide range of social services, such as NGO executive director, activist/lobbyist for youths at risk and immigrants, mental health counselor, mental health rehabilitation specialist, case manager, and vocational rehabilitation trainer while working mainly with people with mental health conditions, violence, trauma, and/or alcohol/drug use. She has extensively taught and worked both in the U.S. and South Korea. Dr. Lee had been a lecturer at Columbia University School of Social Work for three years before joining SF State as a tenure-track faculty member in 2005.

Sonja Lenz-Rashid, Ph.D., LCSW received her undergraduate degree from San Jose State University with a major in Business/Marketing, her secondary teaching credential from San Jose State University, and her Masters of Social Work from San Jose State University. She then received her Ph.D. in Social Welfare from UC Berkeley in 2003. She has 19 years of post-MSW social work experience. Dr. Lenz-Rashid has been a professor (now an Associate Professor) at SF State since 2003 and has been an LCSW since 2001. Lastly, she is a Co-founder and Faculty Research Evaluator of the SF State Guardian Scholars Program (GSP). Launched in 2005, the GSP serves over 90 current and former foster care youth on campus and has an annual budget of over $1 million (and is a non-profit on campus).
De-Ánn Lott, LCSW received her undergraduate degree from SF State with a major in Psychology. She obtained her Masters of Social Work from SF State. Ms. Lott was a Title IV-E training program participant and worked as a Child Welfare Worker in Alameda County for 7 years before transferring to Behavioral Health Care Services for the past 11 years where she continues full-time employment. During her time as a Child Welfare Worker, she worked in the Adoptions unit receiving specialized training in trauma, attachment and treatment. After receiving her LCSW, Ms. Lott simultaneously moved into private practice where she sees children, families and adults, and provides clinical supervision. Ms. Lott has been a lecturer at SF State since January 2016. She has taught in both the BSW and MSW programs.

Sonia Melara, MSW has been on the part-time faculty of the SSW since 2011. She has served as Field Education Director and the BASW Program Coordinator. She received her BA in English and MSW from SF State. In her regular professional career, Ms. Melara is the Executive Director of Rally Family Visitation Services of Saint Francis Memorial Hospital. Ms. Melara has over 30 years of administrative experience in government, the non-profit and for-profit sectors, including an appointment to serve as Executive Director of the San Francisco City and County Department on the Status of Women.

Jana Rickerson, LCSW received her undergraduate degree from SF State with a B.A. in Liberal Arts and a Clear Multiple Subjects Teaching Credential, which she has maintained throughout her entire career. Ms. Rickerson received her Master’s of Social Work degree from SF State. Ms. Rickerson has decades of experience in child welfare, public health and HIV services. She was the Assistant Director of Family and Children’s Services for Santa Clara County, and previously served as a consultant and leader with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, where she provided training and technical assistance on the local and national level to address the needs of foster youth in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems, particularly permanency issues. She developed curricula and training materials for a team of consultants, and coordinated the training schedule across the Pacific Region. Ms. Rickerson has also served on several national work groups for foster youth, including Racial Disparity and Disproportionality in Foster Care, as well as for LGBTQI foster youth.
Silvia L. Sandoval, LCSW has an undergraduate degree in Sociology from the University of Maryland at College Park. Her master’s degree in Social Work is from The Catholic University of America. She is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Social Work from the Smith College School for Social Work. Silvia has been practicing professionally for the last 17 years. Her experience has been in providing clinical and direct services to marginalized communities, working with immigrants and refugees, homelessness, vulnerable populations in clinical research, and most recently working in the queer community.

Christine Scudder, MSW, LCSW received her Bachelor of Arts from Hamilton College in Clinton, NY with a major in History and her Masters of Social Work from SF State SSW, where she received the Graduate Student Award for Distinguished Achievement. Ms. Scudder’s holistic perspective on serving children, youth and families stems from her experience in public child welfare, community mental health, intimate partner violence and youth development services. On the micro level, her background includes extensive crisis intervention experience in a wide range of settings, and on the macro level she has several years’ experience with statewide public policy work. Ms. Scudder has served as an adjunct faculty with SF State SSW, where, since 2014, she had been the Field Director. She has also served as adjunct faculty with the University of California, Berkeley School of Social Welfare, and lectures on topics including child welfare, social work and the law, public policy, human behavior, social work practice methods and clinical disorders. Ms. Scudder has served on the board of directors with the California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, and currently serves as guest faculty with the Judicial Council of California. She maintains a small private practice with an emphasis on clinical supervision for child welfare and mental health professionals. She offers consultation and training to a variety of public and non-profit agencies on topics including intimate partner violence, mandated reporting, cultural humility, and personal and professional self-care.

Jerald Shapiro, M.S.W. (SF State, 1973), D.S.W. (University of California, Berkeley, 1978), M.P.H. (University of California, Berkeley, 1980), J.D. (John F. Kennedy University, 1998), has been a faculty member since 1976. He also served as an Adjunct Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San
Francisco, Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute, from 1985 to 2005. Outside the academic setting, Professor Shapiro has been a Licensed Clinical Social Worker (L.C.S.W. 5905) since 1977. He has a private practice as a psychotherapist, supervisor and consultant. He supervises Associate Social Workers for their licensing hours while they are employed in agencies such as Child Protective Services (all Bay Area counties), Adult Protective Services (San Francisco and Contra Costa County), Third Street Clinic, AIDS Foundation, Mission Hospice, Maternal and Child health hospital programs, and community mental health programs. Between 1991 and 2006, Professor Shapiro served as an Examination Consultant, Examiner, and Question Writer for the California Board of Behavioral Sciences. He represented California during the period California participated in national exam writing and through AASWB (American Association of State Social Work Boards) from 1994 thru 1997 when California returned to its own examination process. He currently teaches practice methods and facilitates field internship seminars. In the past, he has taught in the areas of HBSE, Family Social Work and Family Therapy, and Legal Advocacy in Social Work Practice.

Rita Takahashi has an MSW degree from University of Michigan; MPIA degree from the University of Pittsburgh; and Ph.D. in social work from University of Pittsburgh. She has dual baccalaureate degrees in sociology and psychology from the University of Hawaii. After receiving her MSW degree, Dr. Takahashi has been a social work educator for 36 years; a social service supervisor and social worker for 3 years; and a civil rights political activist/lobbyist/administrator for 2 years. She has been a professor of social work at SFSU since 1989 and at Eastern Washington University from 1979 – 1987.

3.2.2 The program documents that faculty who teach social work 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.

Below is a list of all of our BASW practice courses along with the faculty who taught the course during AY 2016-2017. A description of their practice experience with confirmation that the faculty has at minimum 2 years post-MSW practice experience is provided.
**BASW Faculty Practice Experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Number of Years Post-MSW Practice Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Social Service Organizations (SW 302)</td>
<td>Sonia Melara</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Children, Youth, and Families (SW 350)</td>
<td>Sonia Melara</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Practice Methods I</td>
<td>Dr. Yeon-shim Lee</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Practice II (SW 401)</td>
<td>Christine Scudder</td>
<td>14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing Skills in Social Work (SW 402)</td>
<td>Akiko Giometti</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Community Organization and Citizen Action (SW 456)</td>
<td>Sonia Melara</td>
<td>39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work Seminar (SW 502)</td>
<td>Dr. Yeon-Shim Lee</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Sonja Lenz-Rashid</td>
<td>19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Differences and Social Work Practice (SW 470)</td>
<td>Dr. Rita Takahashi</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the above chart, Akiko Giometti does not have post-master’s practice experience, although she does have an MSW degree. This came to the attention of the school’s director after the commence of the Spring 2017 semester. As a result, Ms. Giometti will not teach any practice courses at SF State SSW in the future.

3.2.3 The program documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio not greater than 1:25 for the baccalaureate program and not greater than 1:12 for master’s programs and explains how this ratio is calculated. In addition, the program explains how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty’s teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities.

**BASW Program Full-time Faculty-to-Student Ratio AY 2016-2017**

Fall 2016 – Spring 2017

Number of Junior Level BASW Students = 24
Number of Senior BASW Students = 24
Total Number of BASW Students = 48
Number of Full Time Faculty whose primary assignment is to the BASW program = 2

**Full-time Equivalent Faculty-to-Student Ratio = 1:12, calculations detailed below**

*FTES*: All BASW students in the program are required to be full-time students, therefore our FTES is 48 for AY 2016-2017

*FTEF*: The following chart shows the teaching resources available to the BASW program during AY 2016-2017 and describes the workload effort (referred to as time base) that each faculty member contributed to the BASW program.

*Note: Most faculty teach across programs (BASW & MSW), therefore their time base is spread between both programs. Time base for BASW courses and effort are reflected below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Time base assigned to course</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Time base assigned to course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melara</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermoso</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Giometti</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scudder</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Hermoso</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takahashi</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>Takahashi</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>Lenz-Rashid</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenz-Rashid</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FTEF</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL FTEF</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall and Spring Combined FTEF AY 2016-2017 = (2.1+1.9) = 4

To calculate the full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio, we take the total number of full-time students (48) and divide by the AY FTEF (4) = 48/4=12.

For the AY 2016-2017, our BASW full-time equivalency faculty-to-student ratio is 1:12.
3.2.4 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 undergraduate 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.

The story of SFSU SSW is complex, and we outline the specifics below. During the self-study period under review, academic year 2016-2017, there were 9 full-time faculty. All 9 faculty graduated from an accredited MSW program. Eight of the 9 have doctoral degrees in either social work or social welfare.

Because we are a small program and value both MSW and BASW programs equally, all faculty have the option to teach across both programs. We also recognize the need for commitment and continuity for each of the programs to have faculty identified whose principal assignment is to teach within the undergraduate program.

As noted in the chart below, during the AY 2016-2017, the school was in compliance of this standard given that three faculty were teaching more than half of their workload in the BASW program. (Note: Our program defines “principal assignment” as 50% or more of a faculty member’s teaching assignment - across the academic year). The data chart below show that in AY 2016-2017, 3 faculty (Dr. Lee, Dr. Lenz-Rashid, and Ms. Melara) were assigned to the BASW program.

It should be noted here that Dr. Susanna Jones was hired as the new director and MSW program coordinator in August 2016. Prior to her arrival, teaching assignments for AY 2016-2017 were already established and set. During the year, Dr. Jones worked with faculty and staff to learn about the programs and work toward full compliance of all matters EPAS 2015 for both the BASW and MSW program and ensure compliance with all policies and processes of SF State.

Three important programmatic changes were made. First, Dr. Hermoso was appointed as the BASW Program Coordinator given her depth and breadth of knowledge on all matters related to the BASW program. As the BASW Program Coordinator, Dr. Hermoso will have continuous principal assignment to the BASW program. Second, Dr.
Dina Redman was asked to return to the classroom to teach and Christine Scudder (a long-time lecturer) was appointed to the role of Field Director.

As a result of these changes, beginning AY 2017-2018, the SSW is in compliance with the minimal number of faculty assigned to the MSW program (6) and BASW program (2), respectively. Also, see chart below.

Lastly, given that two faculty members retired, effective 9/2017, this left two faculty lines vacant. The late notice of the retirements prohibited any replacement hires for AY 2017-2018. Dr. Jones has discussed with Dean Alvin Alvarez, College of Health & Social Sciences, the need for replacement hires as full-time tenured track faculty lines. Further, Dr. Jones will be submitting the request for 3 FTTT faculty lines in Spring 2018. The anticipated search process will take place during the AY 2018-2019 with the new faculty start date for Fall 2019. Dr. Jones will be submitting replacements for Drs. Levy and Redman (both of whom retired in 9/2017) and Dr. Shapiro has announced that he will be retiring at the end of the Spring 2018 semester.

In summary, Dr. Jones will work closely with Dean Alvarez to ensure full compliance of CSWE mandates and faculty positions.

### Principal Teaching Assignment Designation for *AY 2016-2017*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Courses Taught F16 &amp; S17</th>
<th>Principal Assignment Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jocelyn Hermoso</td>
<td>MSW 721, 895</td>
<td>MSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASW 352, 450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Susanna Jones</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>MSW Program Coordinator &amp; SSW Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Yeon-shim Lee</td>
<td>MSW 820</td>
<td>BASW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASW 502/503, 400, 504/505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sonja Lenz-Rashid</td>
<td>MSW 895</td>
<td>BASW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASW 502/503, 504/505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eileen Levy</td>
<td>MSW 770</td>
<td>MSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASW 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Melara</td>
<td>MSW 855, 780</td>
<td>BASW Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BASW 302, 350, 456, 301, 350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dina Redman</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Field Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.5 The program describes its faculty workload policy and discusses how the policy supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals.

SF State is one of the few California State University campuses (hereafter CSU) that has an across the board three course teaching mandate per semester. Most CSUs across the state require that faculty teach four courses per semester. At SF State, all full-time tenure track and some full-time lecturers (like Sonia Melara in the SSW), are therefore a 1.0-time base, which means they are full-time faculty. For all full-time faculty, their workload breakdown is as such: .60 teaching; .20 service; and .20 scholarship = equaling
1.0. That time base of .60 translates into three courses, each roughly counting as .20-time base (aka: weighted teaching unit/WTU). The normative practices at SF State require that schools and departments comply with this mandate. Furthermore, in September, 2002, the Academic Senate passed a resolution (RF02-203) that articulated this .60 teaching time base (http://senate.sfsu.edu/documents/resolutions/rf02-203). Lastly, the issue of workload is also determined by the California Faculty Association’s Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). In Article 20, section 20.1 of the CBA addresses Instructional Faculty: Professional Responsibilities (https://www.calfac.org/resource/collective-bargaining-agreement-contract-2014-2017#workload).

As an institution and SSW who prides itself on and values deeply the role and prominence of teaching, the abovementioned normative workload practices are well-aligned with our university’s mission and the mission of the SSW.

3.2.6 Faculty demonstrate ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship, exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies, and through other professionally relevant creative activities that support the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals.

[Note: Given that most faculty can teach across the programs, BASW and MSW, we have included all faculty statements in these sections].

Jaime M. Bardacke, LCSW currently graduated from the Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy Program at the San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis (SFCP). In addition to completing this program, Ms. Bardacke is involved in the Coalition for Clinical Social Work at SFCP, serving as a co-chair to the education extension committee, co-facilitating a case consultation group, and participating in various community events. In addition, Ms. Bardacke leads trainings at community based agencies on topics such as trauma, mindfulness, and clinical issues associated with child abuse and neglect.

Dr. Kelsey Crowe participates regularly with other public, nonprofit, and private institutions for her work on empathy. She does public speaking at venues like the
Commonwealth Club of California, Google, and a keynote at the Cleveland Clinic. She does workshops for university and hospital settings like Stanford University and UCSF, and works with nonprofits like StoryCorps and Seeds of Peace. Two separate documentary film makers are working with her to capture her work on empathy for film and for a web series. She recently published a book on empathy in times of suffering based on her primary research. It has been featured on several media outlets such as NPR, the Washington Post, Slate, Salon, Oprah, and several others. She is working on a second book at a Visiting Scholar at the University of California, Berkeley about conversations across the political divide.

Christina Feliciana is the clinical consultant for SOAR for Youth, an organization that matches volunteers to serve as academic advocates for foster youth in the Bay Area.

Gabriela Fischer, LCSW continues to participate in trainings regarding current child welfare issues and practices, as well as clinical workshops. She has facilitated trainings at community-based agencies on topics such as vicarious trauma and self-care. She is currently training to become a Resource Family Approval trainer for Contra Costa County.

Akiko Giometti’s comprehensive experience in social work and school counseling programs has allowed her to develop a level of expertise and adaptability in various positions in her social work career. In all of her roles, she has been successful in engaging diverse student populations to facilitate their emotional learning and incorporate “Mindfulness” in their daily lives. Practicing from a place of respect has proven to not only in her professional career, but rewarding as well.

Jocelyn Hermoso’s research interests are in the areas of international social development, gender and peacemaking, human rights, displaced populations, social capital, civil society, community organizing, community-driven development, and social justice pedagogy. She continues to conduct studies using participatory action research (PAR) approaches in her current projects; 1) a qualitative study exploring how a gender is mainstreamed in peace-building processes in Mindanao; 2) policy research on UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on women, peace, and security; 3) a participatory needs assessment of African-American women who are CalWorks recipients; and 4) social
justice pedagogy. Along with her community partner, Goals for Women, a Berkeley-based agency providing mental health services to women of color participating in the CalWorks program, Dr. Hermoso presented their methodology and findings at a round table discussion on translational research organized by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) California Chapter in Sacramento. In addition, Dr. Hermoso continues to present her research at CSWE’s annual program meetings and the biennial meetings of the International Consortium for Social Development (ICSD) and the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW). Dr. Hermoso has published in *International Social Work*, *Social Development Issues*, *Social Work Review*, *Advances in Social Work*, *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, and *Non-Profit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly* and was cited for a Frank Turner Award in 2006 for best article in a volume of *International Social Work*.

Susanna Jones, Ph.D., MSW consistently strives to strike a balance between her work as a teacher, scholar, and practitioner by engaging in research that examines the intersections of policy and practice as they impact the lives of immigrant populations. As one can see in her CV, Dr. Jones disseminates her research through her publication record and consistently engages in presentations at national social work conferences. Dr. Jones is well informed about social work education on the national front. She regularly attends the CSWE Annual Program Meetings as well as the Baccalaureate Program Directors Annual Conference. She is a member of the National Association of Deans and Directors and attends their biannual meetings. Further, Dr. Jones is the elected secretary for the California Association of Deans and Directors. Most recently, Dr. Jones was accepted into the Leadership Academy of Deans and Directors, Cohort 10. Lastly, in addition to Dr. Jones’s engagement in her professional development, she is also building a network of support for the SSW among service providers and alumni in San Francisco and the greater Bay Area region. This work includes working closely with the SSW Community Advisory Board, comprised of human service and social work leaders and elected officials in San Francisco who have a commitment to the success of the school, and view the social justice mission of SF State and the school of social work as central to needs of the Bay Area residents.
To date, Dr. Lee has over 30 peer-reviewed research publications with several more to be published in the near future, and has given over 50 presentations to national and international audiences. More than half of her publications and presentations include students or junior faculty mentees as co-authors/co-presenters all across the U.S., reflecting her commitment to preparing the next generations of young social work scientists. She is a recipient of numerous awards, including Junior Career Achievement Award (Council on Social Work Education, Korean American Social Work Educators Association), NIA-RCMAR Scholar Award (NIA), California State University-Presidential Award (SFSU), and NIMH-Most Outstanding Junior Scholar Award. Dr. Lee has committed herself to various committees to support social work practice and research in the larger community, in addition to her commitment to the SF State SSW program. She currently serves on several government advisory committees, national/international task forces, regional advisory committees, the editorial board of a professional journal, and a consulting editor/reviewer for four additional professional journals in the areas of ageing, family violence, multicultural health interventions, and health access. She engages in international social work through transdisciplinary research collaborations with scholars in Korea, China, India, and Mongolia and provides pro bono social service and consultation to South Korea (Health/Mental Health Intervention for Elder Abuse), Tijuana, Mexico (Social Development of Low-Income Communities), and Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia (Social Development and Mental Health).

Dr. Lenz-Rashid has studied the outcomes of, and best practice models for, former foster care youth at the national, state and Bay Area levels. Her research and publications have provided valuable feedback to child welfare administrators, legislators, and program developers in how best to serve these disenfranchised young people using evidence-based practice. Dr. Lenz-Rashid maintains her connection to the child welfare, mental health, juvenile justice, and practice communities by providing clinical training and supervision with a variety of local agencies focused on serving foster youth and youth with mental health challenges. In addition, Dr. Lenz-Rashid facilitates trainings at community-based agencies on topics such as trauma and other clinical issues associated with foster care, mental health and the justice systems.
De-Ánn Lott, LCSW is actively involved in research and writing projects at SF State working across disciplines to co-author research related to trauma, family, mental health and treatment as well as translational research between research and practice. Ms. Lott participates in faith and community-based events focusing on children and family mental health and treatment. She is in the process of developing training materials addressing the needs of African American men who experienced trauma as children and their unique needs in psychotherapy.

Ms. Melara has a long history of community participation as a member of several non-profit boards and commissions. She has served under five San Francisco Mayors and has been appointed to several posts. Presently, she serves as a member of the Police Commission. She has served as member and President of the San Francisco Health Commission. She served as member and President of the Immigrant Rights Commission as well as others. Ms. Melara is a co-founder of California’s first shelter for survivors of domestic violence, La Casa De Las Madres. She is co-founder of La Cocina, a business incubator for low-income women who want to start their own business in the food industry. President Carter appointed her to serve on the National Advisory Commission on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Ms. Rickerson currently serves as a consultant to Open House, which provides housing, services and community to LGBTQ seniors, and a group facilitator for Kids Turn, a San Francisco-based program offering support to children and parents through parental separation and divorce. Previously she has served as Vice President of the Board of Directors of Family Builders Inc., and as a member of the national All Children, All Families Advisory Board at the Human Rights Campaign. Ms. Rickerson has also worked as a consultant for the Family Acceptance Project and Consortium for Children.

Silvia Sandoval’s MSW was conferred in May 2000 by The Catholic University of America. In addition, Silvia completed two professional certificate programs in 2010. The first one through the Harvard Program in Refugee Trauma and Instituto Superiore di Sanita, Orvieto, Italy in Global Mental Health: Trauma and Recovery Certificate, 2010; the second professional certificate is from McGill University in Social and Transcultural Psychiatry, 2010. Silvia currently works serving the queer community of San Francisco
providing integrated services at a primary care clinic. In addition, she conducts mental health assessments of client’s readiness for gender-reaffirming surgeries. Silvia is currently working on conducting a Systematic Review of the Literature on Depression in Latino immigrant males. In the community, she conducts trainings on domestic violence in the queer community with a focus on eliminating barriers in accessing care.

Ms. Scudder provides clinical consultation and supervision for agencies serving children, youth and families, including foster family agencies, and child protective services that contribute to her ongoing connections in the field. She attends trainings on topics including changes to the DSM, Safety Organized Practice, Structured Decision Making and meeting the needs of sexually-exploited minors for her professional development, and in the spirit of generating course material reflective of current practice, particularly in the fields of mental health and child protection. Ms. Scudder regularly engages with practitioners in mental health, educational and legal settings, including giving numerous presentations delineated in her CV.

Professor Shapiro initiated curricular development that integrated practice methods with the student’s field internship experience. For the same cohort of students, he is the classroom methods instructor who visits the student’s internship agency and confers with their internship supervisor, and who facilitates in the weekly field seminar of the student’s process of fitting all the pieces together. Knowledge of the internship experience informs classroom discourse and classroom content is communicated to supervisors to articulate with agency learning experiences. His own ongoing social work practice (clinical and legal advocacy) contributes to the ongoing updates and refining of course syllabi, case studies, and PowerPoints. In support of the framework of ongoing professional development and self-care, Professor Shapiro has set up a ‘closed’ Facebook page (available only to members) that provides an online professional development ‘conversation’ covering job opportunities and experiences, community resources, social justice initiatives, and ‘social work life’ challenges. Almost all participants are SF State graduates, but there are some agency supervisors and graduates of other programs he has supervised. There are currently more than 900 members of this Facebook page. Professor Shapiro’s written work has consisted of the professional development ‘book’ he writes for each yearly cohort and material from other projects that are ‘in progress’. In his work in SF State’s Academic
Senate and the Academic Senate of the California State University, he has authored a number of Resolutions, and served as a lead author in the report to the CSU Board of Trustees from the Chancellor’s Select Committee on Mental Health. He is looking forward to his June 2018 retirement to be able to concentrate on finishing a number of books presented in parts in his classes.

For more than 42 years, Rita Takahashi has been actively engaged as a professional social worker in the community, as well as at academic institutions. She has been involved in professional organizations, including the Council on Social Work Education, National Association of Social Workers, Asian American Social Work Educators Association, Asian Pacific Island Social Workers, California Faculty Association, American Association of University Professors, National Education Association, Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), JACL-Legislative Education Committee, National Japanese American Historical Society, Japanese American National Museum, Japanese American National Library, United Way, YWCA, Art, Research and Curriculum Associates, International Radio Project, and more. Through the years, she planned, organized and implemented community programs on a range of subjects pertaining to diverse populations; made numerous public and professional presentations; published her research in newspapers, journals, and books; and produced videos and audiotapes. In addition, she wrote numerous works that were disseminated to colleagues, community associates, students, and more. For the past 35 years, she conducted more than 500 oral history interviews and life histories, which will be deposited at research facilities and made available to the public, in addition to researchers, scholars, and professional service providers.

3.2.7 The program demonstrates how its faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program’s educational environment.

SSW Faculty models the behavior and the values of the profession in their role as leaders in the classroom, as participants in the SSW community, and as participants in the broader Social Work community. While all faculty approach this responsibility in an individualized manner and at many different levels, each of us takes the stand that we are
responsible to model the behaviors and values of our profession. Below is a list of examples of how faculty models these behaviors and values. The list is by no means exhaustive, but meant to provide an overview.

**Modeling in the Classroom**

- Work in collaboration with students to create “safe spaces” in the classroom through use of ground rules, introductions including preferred gender pronouns, and shared decision making related to aspects of course structure.
- Provide particular attention to social justice issues in the classroom, including lesson plans about cultural humility and family engagement.
- Respect the diversity of students’ experiences and create opportunities in the classroom for students to share their experiences and to learn from each other.
- Commit to creating a respectful, engaging, and highly-informed classroom environment. Support peer learning with group exercises, public presentations with peer feedback, and group participation in selecting and running various group activities. Discuss a range of beliefs systems that are conservative to liberal, providing space to discuss triggers, differences in opinion, and expectations that participation be informed with a solid understanding of the reading.
- Work in collaboration with students to create and nurture a classroom atmosphere of respect, courtesy, and professional integrity to develop sensitivity and competence working cross-culturally with clients, with particular regard for the impact of gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion and social class.
- Create opportunities in the classroom for students to share their personal/professional experiences and to provide ongoing input/feedback in shared decision-making and student participation related to aspects of course structure.
- Integrate different teaching modalities, research, and practice methods that allows students to critically reflect on social work values and practice behaviors of the profession.
• Maintain rigor of coursework and high professional standards and expectations

• Create an educational environment that examines social work ethical dilemmas and the NASW Code of Ethics, and models the values of the social work profession.

• Work in collaboration with students to create learning spaces to engage and promote critical thinking and discussion about intersecting identities such as race, gender, social class, ableism, sexuality, ethnicity, language, nationality at the micro- mezzo- and macro levels. Respect and validates student’s experiences and creates opportunities in the classroom for students to share their experiences.

• Facilitate and model a safe learning container by addressing use of ground rules, expectations for risk-taking, and direct communication and managing conflict.

• Attention given to trauma-informed practices, which include the use of statements prior to changes to classroom environment (i.e. change in lighting, introduction of loud sounds, presence of guests, introduction of traumatic/provocative video material, etc.).

• Attend to confidentiality by including explicit expectations that students maintain client confidentiality for any and all references, case consultations, and/or assignments that are based upon actual client work in the field.

• Make a conscious effort to model the behavior and values of the profession in courses, as well as in other implicit curricular activities by reflecting the six core values of the profession. For instance, in Dr. Hermoso’s class, the syllabus starts with an acknowledgement of country to help frame the learning that takes place in the classroom. Recognizing the original and rightful inhabitants of the land in which the class takes place incorporates what Wehbi (2011) identifies as the three central concepts in teaching social work - contextuality, power, and responsibility: situating the class in its socio-economic, political, and cultural context; recognizing power differences in the classroom; and acknowledging responsibility by centering subjugated knowledge and perspectives in the classroom. Other statements are also included in the syllabus to frame the class (statement of commitment to equity by SF State faculty; statement of basic needs and security).

• Seek and include reading materials authored by women of color and indigenous social work academics and/or practitioners. Signature assignments, projects, and exams are
designing using various formats to accommodate different learning styles and diverse ways of demonstrating learning.

- Developing relationships with students and between students are also fostered outside of the classroom. Holding weekly office hours to give students access to mentoring and advisement is optimal, and models sound professional practice of being present.

- Helping to create a culture of conversation and debates particularly around complex and challenging social issues is another way by which the faculty demonstrates social work values and behavior. Efforts are made to create time and space in the classroom to unpack these issues. In the past academic year following the November 2016 presidential elections, several faculty organized forums and meetings with students to process their reactions and reflections about the election results and their aftermath.

- Foster a culture of assessment to ascertain what students are learning both in the classroom and outside, and what they hope to do with what they learn.

**Modeling in the SSW**

- Share personal experiences about professional decision making and on-going professional development to model the possibilities inherent in a career in social work as well as the importance of continuing education.

- Work in collaboration with faculty, staff and students to create opportunities for safe exchange of opinions and experiences that promote professional growth.

- Provide a safe space for students to share their lived experience as a way to enrich the knowledge and understanding of the diversity of the student body.

- Share professional experience working with immigrant communities to shed light on the importance of cultural sensitivity and its application in the field.

- Respect social work values and ethics in all aspects of the educational environment, including egalitarian relationships with students and colleagues, and pro bono service in the community.
Model sensitivity to students’ concerns and needs and interact with and learn from diverse students through advising both in and out of the classroom, and consult with students as appropriate and as needed.

Commit to macro practice as the way to create change for marginalized communities. Share community participation in issues and organizations that specifically address macro practice.

Attend to confidentiality through attention to HIPAA and FERPA, and ensure privacy while discussing sensitive topics, such as student grades, as well as personal matters and practice challenges that are brought up outside of the classroom.

Use of iLearn to include referral information for students’ own personal and professional self-care.

Emphasize faculty’s continued use of consultation, while encouraging this same degree of professional humility with students.

Co-facilitate an environment of respect for diversity and open dialogue to understand differences by modeling non-judgmental, dismissive or toxic communication strategies

**Modeling in the Community**

Experience with diversity and cultural humility training, outreach and advocacy in youth and family-focused social services and health care programs, particularly on behalf of children of color and LGBTQ foster youth.

Commitment to creating safe spaces for true dialogue and change in the community, as evidenced by one faculty serving as a facilitator with the Center for Courage and Renewal and the Public Conversations Project.

Serve on a number of major shared governance committees including Academic Senate, Graduate Council, University Interdisciplinary Committee, and University Budget Committee, and the Executive Board of the SF State State Chapter of the California Faculty Association.
• Provide graduates of the program with an informal group format to ‘catch up’ on working with the challenges of ongoing professional development and the daily experiences of ‘social work life’. Groups meet in San Francisco and the East Bay, in participants’ homes/apartments, and are open to all. There is no financial involvement and a faculty member donates his time to facilitate. Participants span from recent graduates to individuals who graduated 20 years ago.

• Serve as faculty advisors, School, College, and University committee members and chairs, civil rights organization activists, lobbyists, community agency board members and officers, social work organization board and committee members, and more.

Educational Policy 3.3 Administrative and Governance Structure

Social Work faculty and administrators, based on their education, knowledge, and skills, are best suited to make decisions regarding the delivery of social work education. Faculty and administrators exercise autonomy in designing an administrative and leadership structure, developing curriculum, and formulating and implementing policies that support the education of competent social workers. The administrative structure is sufficient to carry out the program’s mission and goals. In recognition of the importance of field education as the signature pedagogy, programs must provide an administrative structure and adequate resources for systematically designing, supervising, coordinating, and evaluating field education across all program options.

3.3 Administrative Structure

3.3.1 The program describes its administrative structure and shows how it provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program’s mission and goals.

The SSW at SF State is housed in the College of Health & Social Sciences (CHSS, or HSS), previously known as the College of Health and Human Services (HHS). Many years’ prior, the SSW was housed in the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSS). The university administration engaged in a large-scale reorganization and during that time
the SSW moved out of BSS into HHS. The College of HSS is currently made up on the following departments, programs, schools, and institutes.

**Departments:**
- Child & Adolescent Development
- Counseling
- Family Interiors Nutrition & Apparel
- Health Education
- Kinesiology
- Physical Therapy
- Recreation, Parks & Tourism
- Sociology & Sexuality Studies

**Schools:**
- Nursing
- Public Affairs & Civic Engagement
  - Criminal Justice Studies, Environmental Studies, Gerontology, Public Administration, Urban Studies & Planning
- Social Work

**Program:**
- Clinical Laboratory Science Internship Training Program

**Institutes:**
- Center for Research and Education on Gender and Sexuality (CREGS)
- Health Equity Institute
- Marian Wright Edelman Institute
- Pacific Leadership Institute

The administrative structure is as follows. The SSW has two programs: the BASW (begun in the 1930s) and the MSW program (begun in 1968). Each of those programs has a Program Coordinator, who reports to the SSW Director. The school Director reports to the Dean of the College of Health & Social Sciences who himself reports to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. The SSW has one full-time Administrative Office Coordinator and one-half time Administrative Support Coordinator. Additionally, we have
one-full time Title IVE Project Coordinator and one full time administrative Title IVE analyst. Lastly, we have one full-time Field Director, for both the BASW and MSW programs. All of these positions report to the Director. See SSW Organizational Chart on the next page.
The faculty unionized with the California Faculty Association, which provides clear directives and protections that ensure and promote administrative autonomy. Furthermore, the SF State Senate, our faculty’s governance body, is another mechanism that protects all curriculum and programmatic decisions as sacred matters within the purview of faculty, rather than the administration. The dean of the College of Health and Social Sciences values autonomy and respects the faculty and staff in the SSW to lead programmatic and pedagogical decisions.

Therefore, it is the faculty within the SSW who make decisions about the program’s mission, goals, and curriculum.

3.3.2 The program describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies.

As stated in standard 3.3.1, the faculty at SF State SSW are solely responsible for defining curriculum and do so according to the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards 2015 set forth by the Council on Social Work Education.

Each department or school at SF State has its own curriculum committee. All temporary curricular changes can be implemented by the SSW without oversight. Permanent changes to the SSW’s curriculum must be approved by the College and subsequently by the Senate. The Office of Academic Planning works closely with programs when they are undergoing any substantive change to the curriculum. Academic Planning helps to make the process seamless, as opposed to putting up roadblocks.

3.3.3 The program describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel.

All policies relating to recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure in the SSW are specified in the SSW Policies and Procedures Manual and some key elements of the policy are excerpted below (for the full policy, see Appendix S).

Formulation of recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure policies
Title 5 of the California Administrative Code describes tenure as "the right to continued employment in a particular university or college or in the Office of the Chancellor unless dismissed for cause, lack of funds, or lack of work." The SSW Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy is structured according to the guidelines set forth in the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy (Revised Academic Senate Policy #F06-0241) and in compliance to the Agreement Between the Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA). Revisions of this document may be needed to comply with the new Agreement that is currently being signed between the Trustees of the CSU and the CFA (May 2017).

The typical pattern of awarding tenure involves the annual assessment of a faculty member's performance over a period of five successive, academic years and for those faculty not awarded tenure, a terminal year. Modifications of this regular pattern pertain to transfers from other universities and from one CSU campus to another. In such situations, the academic employee may be appointed with credit toward tenure as determined by the President of the University to which s/he transfers. If the appointment is at the rank of professor, s/he may be considered for tenure during the first year of employment and not later than June 1st of the second year.

**Duties of the SSW Retention Tenure and Promotions Committee:**

- Comply with the Academic Senate Policy for tenure and promotions of tenure-track and tenured faculty;
- Review, evaluate, recommend and forward retention, tenure and promotion reports;
- Develop School policies and procedures for retention, tenure and promotion decisions;
- Provide consultation and advice to the Director of the School on temporary faculty hires (lecturers); and
- Provide consultation to the School and the Director on personnel matters.
Retention Tenure and Promotions (RTP) Committee Membership

School RTP Committee shall be elected by secret ballot by the probationary and tenured faculty in the School. Only tenured full-time faculty are eligible to serve on the RTP Committee. Faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure are ineligible to serve on the RTP Committee. Faculty on leave are eligible to serve only if they are willing to serve throughout an academic year. Faculty on early retirement (Faculty Early Retirement Program) may serve if the President so agrees. School RTP Committee members must have a higher rank than the faculty being considered for promotion.

Elections for vacancies to the RTP Committee are held at the first faculty meeting of the fall semester of each academic year (generally held in August), with the term of office beginning in September of the Fall semester immediately following the election. The School RTP Committee shall consist of a minimum of three members. The membership will consist of a three-year term and members may be elected for subsequent terms. In order to ensure continuity of membership, there will be staggered membership and at least one member will be carrying over from the previous year. In the event a committee member cannot fulfill the term of office, a substitute shall be selected to fill the unfulfilled term.

The chairperson shall be elected by the RTP Committee at the beginning of the fall term to serve for the academic year; s/he may be re-elected for subsequent terms. The primary function of the chairperson of the committee is to facilitate the work of the committee; therefore, any procedural decisions are subject to committee discussion and/or review.

The School Director is ineligible to serve as a membership of the RTP Committee and should not participate in the RTP Committee deliberations. The Director will make a separate and independent decision on each retention tenure review.

RTP Committee Election Procedure

The Director of his/her designee shall be responsible for the preparation and dissemination of the ballot for all elections to the Committee. All elections shall be by secret ballot and faculty receiving a plurality of the ballots received will be elected. Completed ballots will be placed in double envelopes, sealed, and affixed with a signature
of validation. Ballots will be returned to the chair of the committee or authorized representative. Ballots for the yearly RTP election will be tallied not later than three working days after the date of the first faculty meeting of the fall semester. Sealed ballots will be opened by the School secretary in the presence of the Director and one member of the RTP Committee. In the event of a tie vote, a run-off election will be held immediately.

Upon completion of the vote tally and verification of the accuracy of the count, the Director shall disseminate the results of the election to all faculty members of the School and the respective chairs of both graduate and undergraduate student organizations.

**General Principles and procedures for Retention, Tenure, And Promotions Procedures**

Readers must refer to the full text of the Academic Senate Policy #06-241 for the University’s criteria and procedures for retention, tenure, and promotion. Additional guidelines set forth by the School are provided herein to further explicate the School criteria and procedures for personnel actions. The School procedures shall be reviewed annually by the College dean and the Dean of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development to ensure consistency with the University policy and the Agreement.

**Confidentiality**

The School Director informs the eligible faculty in writing of any special procedures developed by department peer review committees; and all committee deliberations are confidential. Recommendations regarding retention, tenure, and promotion are confidential except that the affected faculty member, department peer review committee, department chair, dean/university librarian, and the University Tenure and Promotions Committee shall have access to the written reviews and recommendations for all levels of review.

**Preparation of the Working Personnel Action File**

The faculty member being reviewed is responsible for the preparation and submission of an up-to-date curriculum vitae and all materials he/she wishes to have considered prior to the date the file is closed. An index of all materials submitted shall be prepared by the faculty member and submitted with the
materials. Materials for evaluation submitted by the faculty member are returned to the faculty member after the tenure or promotion decision has been made by the President and are deemed to be incorporated into the **Personnel Action File (PAF)** by reference in the index.

It is the obligation of every person involved in the evaluation process to make a diligent effort to obtain factual evidence, to verify the accuracy of data offered, and to evaluate the performance of the faculty member under consideration. School RTP Committee, School Director, and administrators are responsible for identifying materials related to the evaluation not provided by the faculty member and for placing these materials in the **Electronic Working Personnel Action File (eWPAF)** prior to the date the file is closed. Reviews and recommendations for the purpose of decisions relating to retention, tenure, and promotion shall be based solely on material contained in the eWPAF and PAF. Faculty members shall have access to all materials to be placed in the eWPAF at least five days prior to such placement.

As of spring 2017, all WPAF materials are submitted on-line through the Faculty Affairs website and portal.

**Operational Calendar for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Recommendations (Academic Senate Policy #F06-241)**

Dates for the closing of the WPAF and the submission of reviews and recommendations to the next level of review shall be determined annually and published in the Executive Calendar. There shall be a minimum of two weeks for review at successive levels. All cases involving tenure and promotion must allow a minimum of one month total for consideration by both the Provost and the President. All evaluations shall be conducted and completed within the period of time specified by the Executive Calendar. The WPAF shall be forwarded in a timely manner to the next level of review. If any level of a retention, tenure, or promotion review has not been completed within the specified period of time the review shall be automatically transferred to the next level of review or appropriate administrator and the faculty member shall be so notified.

**Notification of Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Decisions**
Faculty in their first and second year of probation shall be notified of the final decision on retention by February 15. The decision shall be for retention or termination.

Faculty in their third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years of probation shall be notified of retention, appointment with tenure, or terminal year appointment by June 1. If tenure is awarded, the letter shall indicate the effective date, which is the beginning of the academic year following the year in which tenure is awarded. Terminal year appointments are limited to probationary faculty who have served a minimum of three (3) years of probation. Faculty being considered for promotion shall be notified no later than June 15. If promotion is awarded, the letter shall indicate the effective date, which is the beginning of the academic year following the year in which promotion is granted.

The University Level Review Procedures

For Retention Decisions

The decision for retention of candidates rests with the President, or designee. As the President's designee, the Provost may authorize reappointments in consultation with the college dean and others as required in each instance.

For Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Upon completion of the Dean of the College of Health and Social Science's review, the WPAF shall be forwarded as follows: The eWPAF is now submitted on-line through the eWPAF portal on the Faculty Affairs website. Everything is made accessible to the Dean, the University Tenure and Promotions Committee, the Provost and the President. The eWPAF must be uploaded according to the deadlines in the Executive Calendar.

Tenure and promotion decisions are made by the University President. At the University level, the eWPAF is reviewed by the University Tenure and Promotions Committee and by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The University Tenure and Promotions Committee and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall each review the recommendations from previous levels and the eWPAF and prepare the recommendations for the President. Copies of their separate recommendations and reasons therefore shall be sent to the candidate seven days prior to forwarding the eWPAF to the President, according to deadlines published in the Executive Calendar.
Recommendations shall be made as early in the year as possible and shall be forwarded to the President no later than May 15.

The University Tenure and Promotions Committee and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall meet to discuss their recommendations prior to forwarding their final recommendations to the candidate and the President. The President shall meet together with the University Tenure and Promotions Committee and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to discuss their recommendations prior to making his/her final decision.

Confidentiality is to be maintained at all levels of deliberations. All proceedings of the Promotion evaluation reports and recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the University Tenure and Promotions Committee. Abstentions shall be counted as a no vote. The President shall state his/her reasons for approval or denial in his/her letter of decision.

At the end of the tenure and promotions process, after tenure and promotions decisions have been announced, the complete eWPAF and copies of the President's letter informing faculty of his/her decision shall be sent to the official Personnel Action File in the Faculty Records Office. Indexed supplemental materials shall be returned to the faculty member by the designated custodian at the University level.

Following the final promotions announcement by the President, the University Tenure and Promotions Committee shall report to the Senate the number of its positive and negative recommendations. This report may also call attention to ways in which the promotions operations may be improved. The report must be signed by all Committee members.

**Retention and Tenure Recommendations**

An annual review of each probationary faculty member is conducted by the School RTP Committee, the School Director, and the college dean for the purpose of recommending retention, termination, terminal year appointment, or tenure to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
The purpose of retention and tenure review is to assess the probationer's performance against the School and University criteria in order to make personnel recommendations and to provide helpful information to the candidate about performance expectations. The candidate understands that he or she is an integral part of the evaluation process and must provide requested information on time and in the format specified. The School RTP Committee and School Director take full responsibility for conducting the review at the School level.

- The first-year review will, of necessity, occur during the first semester of probation. This review shall be limited to a recommendation for retention or termination. The purpose of this review is to discuss with the faculty member the department’s criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion, the content and organization of the eWPAF, and the university policy for retention, tenure, and promotion.

- The second-year review will be based upon performance during the first year of probation. It shall contain an evaluation of teaching effectiveness and any other descriptive material or commentary relevant to the other retention criteria. The recommendation shall be for retention or termination.

- The third-year review shall be an update of the second-year review. The recommendation shall be for retention or reappointment for a terminal year.

- The fourth-year review shall be a comprehensive evaluation of the first three years of probation addressing all criteria for retention. The recommendation shall be for retention or reappointment for a terminal year.

- The fifth-year review shall be an update of the fourth year review. This review will identify any recurring problems that must be resolved prior to a tenure decision. The recommendation shall be for retention or a terminal year appointment.

- The sixth-year review shall be a comprehensive summative evaluation of the five years of probation according to all criteria for tenure. The recommendation shall be for tenure or a terminal year appointment.

- The department reserves the right to perform a comprehensive evaluation in years when a comprehensive review is not required by this policy. The
probationary faculty member may request a comprehensive evaluation in any year.

_Early Tenure Policy_

The President in special circumstances may award tenure earlier than the normal six-year probationary period. A recommendation for the award of early tenure shall be accompanied by a comprehensive evaluation of the entire probationary period according to all the criteria for tenure. If teaching experience from another institution is to be considered, the candidate is responsible for assembling all necessary documents. A probationary faculty member may request review for tenure in any probationary year.

A faculty member on a professional leave with pay shall, when otherwise eligible, accrue a maximum of one (1) year service credit as part of the probationary period. The granting of full or partial leaves without pay to probationary faculty is at the discretion of the School and college dean.

If the maximum allowable time credited towards the probationary period has not been reached, probationary faculty on partial professional leave without pay shall be evaluated for retention and tenure according to the same procedures, criteria and time frames in effect for all probationary faculty. The time spent on a professional leave of absence without pay counts as part of the probationary period.

_Tenure at Time of Appointment_

The President in special circumstances may award tenure at the time of appointment.

Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by the appropriate School and shall be based upon an assessment of performance prior to the time of appointment. The criteria to be used are the same as those for regular tenure and promotion.
University Guidelines for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

The University, along with the college deans, and RTP committees establish the general criteria for evaluation faculty for retention, tenure, and promotion.

The criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion are divided into three areas (a) teaching effectiveness, (b) professional achievement and growth, and (c) contributions to campus and community. Candidates for retention, tenure, and promotion shall be evaluated on all criteria. For teaching faculty, excellence in teaching is required. For faculty whose primary assignment is other than teaching, excellence in the primary assignment is required. To merit tenure and/or promotion all candidates must meet the standard of excellence normally expected of faculty and required by the University, effective teaching is exhibited in the classroom, research laboratory, or in the community. It is demonstrated when faculty join with students to develop knowledge and skills through classroom experiences, scholarly research, creative activities, and community service. The School decides the priority of non-teaching criteria. Achievements in current rank should demonstrate promise of meritorious activities comparable to the achievements and services expected of faculty who serve at the rank to which the individual is to be promoted. The intensity of the evaluation process will vary in accordance with the academic position of the faculty member; thus, promotion to Professor requires more rigorous standards than promotion to Associate Professor, as determined by department criteria.

It is the responsibility of the School to establish the School’s expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion consistent with the University criteria. These criteria will be approved by the School tenured and probationary faculty. School criteria will be developed in consultation with the Dean of the college and the Dean of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development, and must be approved by the College Dean and the Provost, via the Dean of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development.

A candidate’s collegial relationship as a member of the faculty (i.e., demonstrating professional ethics and principles, and accepting responsibility for working effectively with colleagues to achieve department, college and university goals) and fit of the candidate within the future plans and needs of the department must be specified within one of the three criteria and must be included in the School’s criteria for retention, tenure and/or promotion.
The School and the candidate are responsible for documenting the quality and relevance of the work accomplished.

**Appeal of Decisions**

A faculty member who has not been retained, tenured, or promoted may request reconsideration of his/her case. The faculty member requests reconsideration by filing a notice of dispute according to the provisions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The faculty member or his/her representative must file the notice of dispute within 21 days of receiving the Provost and Vice President’s decision not to retain or the President's decision not to tenure or promote.

*For any additional information about recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and/or tenure, please refer to Appendix S, SSW Policies and Procedures Manual.*

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.**

Susanna Jones, PhD, MSW serves as the Director of the SSW and she also serves as the MSW program coordinator. Jocelyn Hermoso, Ph.D., MSW serves as the BASW program coordinator.

*[Note: The SSW has undergone disruptive change in the past several years and has had three different directors in a three-year period of time].*

3.3.4(a) **The program describes the baccalaureate program director’s leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program with a doctoral degree preferred.**

The BASW Program Coordinator demonstrates leadership in coordinating the baccalaureate program. Since joining the faculty in 2006, Dr. Hermoso has taught the following baccalaureate courses: SW 3003 U.S. Social Welfare I: Past, Present, & Future; SW 301 U.S. Social Welfare II:
Problems, Programs, Policies (Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement); SW 352 Gender, Sexism, & Social Welfare; SW 450 Introduction to Research in Social Work; SW 456 Urban Community Organizing & Citizen Action; SW 470 Social Differences in Social Work Practice; and SW 699 Independent Study.

Dr. Hermoso has also participated in the following scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) initiatives as ways of strengthening the baccalaureate curriculum and assessing student learning: a) an interactive workshop on assessing competency-based learning in writing-intensive courses at the Northern California Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Conference in 2014; b) an SF BUILD-funded research collaborative exploring how social justice pedagogy can be incorporated in baccalaureate quantitative research courses; and c) research assessing global perspective and cross-cultural world mindedness of students who participate in study abroad programs. Dr. Hermoso has also made conscious efforts to integrate her teaching, scholarship, and service. She has brought her research on gender and peacebuilding into the classroom by including an article in her reading list for her SW 352 class. Dr. Hermoso has also involved students in her SW 450 and 470 classes in her collaborative research project with Goals for Women, which is a participatory needs assessment using Photovoice.

Prior to coordinating the BASW program, Dr. Hermoso has led redesign efforts for the curriculum. Through a grant received in 2012 from SF State’s Institute of Community and Civic Engagement (ICCE), Dr. Hermoso redesigned the SW 450 course to be a community service learning course. As a result, students in the class have had a chance to gain hands-on research experience through the following community-university research collaborations: a) analyzing the survey results and co-authoring the report, *Family law remedies for DV across California: A survey*, with the California Partnership to End Domestic Violence (The Partnership); b) Photovoice needs assessment project for women of color receiving CalWORKS with Goals for Women; and 3) a mixed-method participatory needs assessment for food and housing security of SF State students, which was presented to the university ad hoc committee tasked to address these issues. In 2016, the SSW was awarded a Teagle Curriculum Redesign Initiative grant, which Dr. Hermoso wrote to redesign its BASW curriculum. Through this grant, Dr. Hermoso led the SSW’s curriculum redesign process by coordinating assessment activities, planning and organizing a faculty retreat, meeting with the university faculty learning community, and meeting with curriculum consultants. The SSW’s curriculum redesign efforts were cited in the October 2017 issue of *Inside Ed* and
presented at a panel on revising curricula in the majors at the 2017 annual meeting of the American Association of College & Universities (AAC&U) as well as the California State University (CSU) Redesigning Majors Symposium held in August 2017 in San Francisco.

In terms of administrative experience, Dr. Hermoso has only recently assumed the position of BASW program coordinator. Nonetheless, she has undertaken efforts to ensure that BASW students are able to meet their learning outcomes and the program’s goals and objectives. These include: holding weekly office hours for students; streamlining information and communication with students through the BASW webpage and listserv; holding information sessions for applicants and coordinating the admissions process; organizing writing workshops for students; holding information sessions for study abroad programs; conducting orientations and exit interviews with exchange students (students from partner universities); and coordinating with other units on campus, such as the Division of Undergraduate Education & Academic Planning (DUEAP) and the Office of International Programs (OIP).

Dr. Hermoso has also participated in faculty learning communities on campus as a way of gaining resources and support for the BASW program. She participated in the Teagle curriculum redesign initiative faculty learning community. Dr. Hermoso was also involved in the writing of pedagogy faculty learning community supporting the GWAR courses, and was a mentor during the pilot implementation of the GWAR Mentoring Program. As coordinator of the study abroad programs for BASW students, Dr. Hermoso also communicates with colleagues in the SSW’s partner universities (City University of Hong Kong; Hochschule Fulda) to work out the course articulation and develop alternative road maps to ensure that students, both SF State students and exchange students from partner universities, who study abroad graduate in time.

Dr. Hermoso has also encouraged and mentored BASW students to participate in research and scholarly activities. In the last academic year, she encouraged students to present projects or papers they worked on in their classes at conferences and professional meetings. One student presented a poster at the 2016 Military Social Work Conference in Austin; four students presented posters at the 2017 Latino Social Work Organization Conference in Berkeley; and four students presented posters at the SF State College of Health & Social Sciences Spring Research Showcase. During this academic year, Dr. Hermoso is working with a BASW student for an ongoing research project on food and housing security of SF State students.
3.3.4(b) The program provides documentation that the director has a full-time appointment to the social work baccalaureate program.

Dr. Hermoso has a full-time position in the SSW. As mentioned above in 3.3.4, Dr. Hermoso serves as the BASW Program Coordinator.

See Appendix T for a letter from HR with documentation of full time appointment to the SSW.

3.3.4(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 this time is sufficient.

During our self-study data year, Sonia Melara held the position of BASW Program Coordinator. After the arrival of Dr. Jones as the new director, Dr. Hermoso moved into the role of BASW program coordinator, beginning Fall 2017. During the Fall 2017 semester, Dr. Hermoso was granted one course release to oversee her duties as the BASW program coordinator. In Fall 2017, Dr. Hermoso taught two courses (SW 352 and SW 721). Her workload in the fall provided a 33% release time. Dr. Hermoso is scheduled to teach three courses in the Spring 2018 semester. Dr. Jones requested one course release for Dr. Hermoso for Spring 2018, but was denied the request. Dr. Jones will work with the dean’s office to advocate for one course release for the BASW program coordinator per semester. In order to provide the most optimal administrative and programmatic leadership, one course release per semester is necessary.

3.3.5(a) The program identifies the field education director’s ability to provide leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work.
Ms. Scudder has over 20 years of practice experience (13 of which are post-MSW), with, and on behalf of children, youth and families, in a range of non-profit and government agencies addressing issues of intimate partner and community violence, child abuse and neglect, psychiatric crisis intervention, and severe mental illness. The breadth of her experience serves as a tangible point of departure in her ability to integrate “real life” experiences into field seminar and other courses, and to inform her understanding of the range of training opportunities afforded to social work students in various practice settings. Her direct service and collaborative work with programs and social work professionals throughout the Bay Area further informs her access to key decision makers and potential field instructors within local agencies. Ms. Scudder draws upon her knowledge and relationships to help advise students in matching their skills and educational goals to appropriate placements, and to expand upon available field education opportunities for both bachelor-level and master-level social work students.

Ms. Scudder has served in multiple leadership positions, including that of the Director of Program Services for a youth development agency serving children in six Bay Area counties, and manager of a confidential emergency crisis shelter and transitional housing program for battered women and children. Ms. Scudder’s experience includes work at the statewide level as board member and secretary for the California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, the federally recognized statewide domestic violence coalition.

Her public policy and systems change work includes generating the idea, proposed language and public testimony for a policy that was eventually signed into law, SB 1735 (Karnette, 2002), as well statewide monitoring, supporting and, at times opposition to legislation with a particular impact on families experiencing domestic violence and/or child abuse. She has served on the Contra Costa County Domestic Violence Death Review Team and helped promote internal policy changes within the public child welfare system as a domestic violence liaison, where she trained county child welfare staff on how to recognize and respond to domestic violence, and went out on cases with line staff to model best practice interventions. Here, she facilitated stakeholder groups to identify service gaps, and prepared the language for a Memorandum of Understanding between a local domestic violence agency and the county child welfare department to minimize out of home placements and strengthen the protective capacity of non-offending parents.

Upon graduation from SF State, Ms. Scudder served as a child welfare social worker as a case manager working with families to reunite with children placed in foster care, and later,
responding to investigate initial child abuse and neglect referrals. Given her past experience with this system, she was often assigned cases involving severe and highly lethal cases of domestic violence.

At Comprehensive Child Crisis Services, in addition to engaging in mobile crisis response for children and youth to assess for emergency psychiatric hospitalization, she was a clinician specializing in PTSD in children, served as the hospital discharge planner for youth transitioning back into the community, and as a shift supervisor for teams of clinicians responding to crisis calls in homes and hospitals. She was also the designated change agent to facilitate integration of, and cooperation between, mental health and substance abuse treatment and intervention services through the San Francisco Department of Public Health programs for children and teens.

Ms. Scudder later served as the lead clinician for a clinical team in a Full-Service Partnership program funded by the Mental Health Services Act for transition-age youth with severe mental illness. The program served Alameda County, taking a “whatever it takes” approach to support youth to remain in the community and minimize inpatient hospitalization. Her work included daily task supervision, coordinating a team of four clinicians, teaming with interdisciplinary practitioners such as psychiatric nurses and psychiatrists, and providing direct service to youth and their families through mobile crisis intervention, clinical case management, individual and family therapy, and community-based psychosocial rehabilitation supports.

For over 15 years, Ms. Scudder has been invited to present throughout the state of California in counseling and law schools, regional conferences, youth development agencies and mental health clinics on topics including mandated reporting, understanding, assessing and addressing intimate partner violence, understanding vicarious trauma, cultural humility, and personal and professional self-care. Since 2015, she has been a guest faculty for the Judicial Council of California, where she provides training to dependency judges on the impact of intimate partner violence exposure to children. Ms. Scudder also provides individual and group supervision for those pursuing clinical licensure in California, with an emphasis on those currently serving in public child welfare and foster family agencies.

Ms. Scudder has served as an adjunct faculty member with the SF State SSW since January 2014, and has taught both masters and bachelor-level courses including: human behavior and the social environment, public policy, group work, social work and the law, disordered behavior, and child welfare practice. She has also been a public policy lecturer with UC Berkeley School of Social
Welfare. In each of these courses, Ms. Scudder demonstrates a steadfast commitment to integrating direct practice at the micro, mezzo and macro level into her teaching methods, course assignments and practice examples.

Ms. Scudder also served as the Field Instruction Coordinator for the Title IV-E Program at SF State, where she worked to integrate social work educational content into local public child welfare agencies, while also integrating current public child welfare practices into the SF State social work classroom instruction. This involved multiple meetings with public child welfare agencies, Title IV-E field liaisons and seminar instructors to discuss and explore likely spaces for integration and praxis. Ms. Scudder has served as a field liaison for both first-and second-year MSW students through SF State SSW, where she became the Field Director in August 2017.

Ms. Scudder is actively involved as a social work faculty advisor for a variety of interprofessional educational opportunities with UCSF and Samuel Merritt College. In these settings, social work students engage with students in fields of medicine, dentistry, nursing, physical and occupational therapy and/or psychology through a variety of opportunities in specialized simulation labs. These activities give social work students the opportunity to engage in practice alongside of student peers in allied professions to address complex health issues with paid actors who stand in the role of “patient.” Their work is videotaped with opportunities to review, discuss and debrief what worked well, with an emphasis on patient engagement and the ability to work across disciplines.

Ms. Scudder is also currently a social work faculty advisor for the Samuel Merritt College/Western Hub of Camden Coalition of Healthcare Providers’ national “Hotspotting” program, which targets high-end users of the emergency room to help stabilize through increased interdisciplinary support and access to tangible psychosocial resources. Here, SF State social work students are paired with graduate level students of other allied professions to engage, and support actual patients with complex medical and psychosocial needs. Her interest in the areas of interprofessional practice, simulation, and problem-based learning includes a commitment to find ways to bring these into the field education program at SF State, including on our own campus, in future years.

Ms. Scudder engages in other campus activities outside of the SSW as a trained and designated “Safe Ally.” As such, she is identified as a supportive member of the SF State community who is available to talk with students about issues including coming out, feelings of
isolation and inclusion, personal safety, and in promoting other “queer positive” activities and spaces on campus. She also serves on the LGBTQQI Advisory Committee for the College of Health and Social Sciences, working to identify and help respond to gaps in educational opportunities, faculty/staff training needs, and best practices to promote a safe and welcoming educational environment for LGBTQQI students, faculty and staff.

3.3.5(b) The program documents that the field education director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least 2 years of post-baccalaureate or post-master’s social work degree practice experience.

For documentation of Ms. Scudder’s MSW degree, please see Appendix U, Copy of Christine Scudder’s MSW transcript.

As stated in 3.3.5 (a), Ms. Scudder has more than the minimal number of years of practice experience. In fact, Ms. Scudder has 14 years of post-master’s practice experience.

3.3.5(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.

Christine Scudder, LCSW is the full-time SSW Field Director. Ms. Scudder was hired as the Field Director in August 2017. Given administrative structures and limitations of the California State University system, Ms. Scudder was hired as both lecturer and staff. Written into her employment contract is that she will teach one section of MSW field, that includes one section of field work seminar (SW 740) and act as the field liaison for that same class and cohort of students (SW 741). Therefore, her teaching time equates to less than half of her workload responsibilities and duties. It must be noted that during the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 academic year, Ms. Scudder was asked to teach two sections of field seminar as a result of the short notice retirement of Dr. Redman. During the academic year 2018-2019 onward, Ms. Scudder, as Field Director, will teach
one section, which ensures full compliance of 75% assigned time for her duties as BASW and MSW Field Director.

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 meets its mission and goals.

In addition to the full-time appointment of Christine Scudder, LCSW, as our Field Director, we have a half-time staff employee, Mira Pasikov, who provides administrative support for the field program. As the new Field Director, Christine is beginning to work together with Mira to codify the job duties that are required to support the field. In addition, the full-time Administrative Office Coordinator, Victoria Lee, provides support as needed to field education. As both the school’s director and field director find their way in their new jobs, we will work to ensure that field education gets the resources and support that it requires, needs, and deserves.

Educational Policy 3.4 Resources
Adequate resources are fundamental to creating, maintaining, and improving an educational environment that supports the development of competent social work practitioners. Social work programs have the necessary resources to carry out the program’s mission and goals and to support learning and professionalization of students and program improvement.

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 SSW receives its budget from the College of Health & Social Sciences. Given that we are at a large public university, there is little to no room for budgetary latitude. Fiscal matters are largely regulated by the CSU system and the campus. Although these restrictions apply, once the SSW receives its yearly budget, the SSW has a moderate degree of autonomy. The Dean along with the Director of Operations/Controller and the Director of the SSW regularly review the budget to monitor adequacy of resources and propose adjustments. The SSW receives its budget at the
beginning of the fall semester and we have one SSW budget. At this moment in time, no separation between BASW and MSW spending exists and the needs of both programs are considered equally.

Type of Program: X Baccalaureate  X Master’s

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

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

Other: Work Study Allocations

3.4.2 The program describes how it uses resources to address challenges and continuously improve the program.

The SSW budget requires a level of modest spending yet allows us enough flexibility to ensure the priorities of the SSW are resourced. For instance, faculty are provided with professional development funds each year, yet the amount varies year-to-year. The SSW receives one budget to be spent on both the BASW and MSW program. Monies in our budget are to be used for faculty
development, travel to conferences, presentations, local travel as it pertains to the program, business meetings, all events, office supplies, computer equipment, media resource center, office services, books, and copier charges.

Resources are used to support faculty day-to-day operations, such as purchasing computer hardware when necessary, essential software, texts, and other amenities that are not covered by the library or other entities on campus. Resources also go to support faculty travel to professional conferences and other trainings that benefit the Program and Department, such as CSWE’s Reaffirmation training. Resources are also utilized to help grow our field program. Lastly, in the past and hopefully in the future, the SSW has financially supported students to attend conferences and Lobby Days in Sacramento.

3.4.3 The program demonstrates that it has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support all of its educational activities, mission and goals.

Overall, the Program has adequate support staff and technological resources. The SSW has a full-time administrative office coordinator, Victoria Lee, who is dedicated to both the BASW and MSW Programs. In addition, we have one half-time administrative support coordinator, Mira Pasikov. As needed, we hire graduate assistants and work-study are available for students who can assist the Program with research and administrative tasks; these have proven invaluable to our department over the years. At this time, we have two work-study students who provide 20- hours of work each week to the SSW.

The University has been forthcoming in providing necessary technological assistance. Academic Affairs is committed to providing full-time faculty with new computers every three years and the College just instituted a new policy for lecturer refreshes. Every four years, lecturers who meet the criteria will receive a new computer.

Technological support for all faculty is readily available. Academic Technology http://at.sfsu.edu provides comprehensive resources, such as, but not limited to, support with classroom teaching and learning, support around our course management system (iLearn), media support, lab spaces, and more. Most of the classrooms at SF State are smart classrooms, which are in high demand yet available to faculty.
3.4.4 The program submits a library report that demonstrates access to social work and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving its mission and goals.

Librarian’s Report – SSW, Fall 2017

SF State
Prepared by, Joe Daniels, selector and library liaison to the SSW
Email – jad43@sfsu.edu

1. Holdings of books, monographs, journals, and other collection resources pertinent to social work study and research.

The total number of books in J. Paul Leonard Library is: 1,580,912

The total number of books associated with the study of social work:

Social Work is an interdisciplinary area of study and presents some difficulty quantifying the specific amount of books related to the area. Typically, the Library of Congress call number range HV includes many social work-related titles. Our HV range includes approximately 8,000 titles. Given that social work-related material is covered in other call number ranges, the total number of associated material is much higher.

Journals and Electronic Databases

It is important to note that most of our journal subscriptions (roughly more than 90%) are bundled into database purchases and included as part of those databases. We purchase just under 200 electronic databases for our library collection, though the databases do not categorize journal titles in such a way that we can identify only social work-related titles. It is possible, however, to attempt to verify if certain important or necessary titles are included in our collection if a list is provided. Below, are listed a sampling of the principle databases (including the full text to many journals) that the library purchases access to which include social work and related material and the scope, coverage and descriptions of each, with the text provided by the database provider:

Social Work Abstracts - offers extensive coverage of more than 450 social work and human services journals dating back to 1965. Produced by the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the database provides indexing and abstracts dealing with all aspects of the social work field, including theory and practice, areas of service and social issues and problems. Researchers seeking scholarly and professional perspectives on subjects such as therapy, education, human
services, addictions, child and family welfare, mental health, civil and legal rights, and more will find *Social Work Abstracts* to be an indispensable resource.

**Social Services Abstracts** - provides bibliographic coverage of current research focused on social work, human services, and related areas, including social welfare, social policy, and community development. The database abstracts and indexes over 1,406 serials publications and includes abstracts of journal articles and dissertations, and citations to book reviews.

**Sociological Abstracts** - abstracts and indexes the international literature in sociology and related disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences. The database provides abstracts of journal articles and citations to book reviews drawn from thousands of serials publications, and also provides abstracts of books, book chapters, dissertations, and conference papers. Records published by Sociological Abstracts in print during the database's first 11 years, 1952-1962, have been added to the database extending the depth of the backfile of this authoritative resource.

**Academic Search Complete** - Academic Search Complete is a comprehensive scholarly, multidisciplinary full-text database, with more than 8,500 full-text periodicals, including more than 7,300 peer-reviewed journals. In addition to full text, this database offers indexing and abstracts for more than 12,500 journals and a total of more than 13,200 publications including monographs, reports, conference proceedings, etc. The database features PDF content going back as far as 1887, with the majority of full text titles in native (searchable) PDF format. Searchable cited references are provided for more than 1,400 journals.

**PsychINFO** - the American Psychological Association's (APA) renowned resource for abstracts of scholarly journal articles, book chapters, books, and dissertations. It is the largest resource devoted to peer-reviewed literature in behavioral science and mental health, and contains over 3 million citations and summaries dating as far back as the 1600s, with one of the highest DOI matching rates in the publishing industry. Ninety-nine percent of its content is peer-reviewed. Included is information on the psychological aspects of related fields such as medicine, psychiatry, nursing, sociology, education, pharmacology, technology, linguistics, anthropology,
business, law and others. Journal coverage, which spans from the 1800s to the present, includes international material selected from around 2,500 periodicals in dozens of languages.

**Criminal Justice Database** - a comprehensive database supporting research on crime, its causes and impacts, legal and social implications, as well as litigation and crime trends. As well as U.S. and international scholarly journals, it includes correctional and law enforcement trade publications, dissertations, crime reports, crime blogs and other material relevant for researchers or those preparing for careers in criminal justice, law enforcement and related fields.

**Abstracts in Social Gerontology** - includes bibliographic records covering essential areas related to social gerontology, including the psychology of aging, elder abuse, society and the elderly, and other key areas of relevance to the discipline. The index contains more than 35,700 records, which are carefully selected from the most important sources within the discipline, such as: *Journals of Gerontology Series, American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, Experimental Gerontology*, etc. EBSCO has digitized the full archive of this index, bringing coverage back to 1990.

**Family & Society Studies Worldwide** - is a core resource providing the most comprehensive coverage of research, policy, and practice literature in the fields of Family Science, Human Ecology, Human Development, and Social Welfare. FSSW covers popular issues as well as meeting the requirements of professionals in all fields of social work, social science and family practice. Coverage spans from 1970 to the present indexing publications from a wide range of social science disciplines including anthropology, sociology, psychology, demography, health sciences, education, economics, law, history and social work. Source documents include professional journals, conference papers, books, book chapters, government reports, discussion and working papers, statistical documents, theses & dissertations and other sources. FSSW is an anthology of four database files providing access to more than 1.3 million records.

**GenderWatch** - This is a database of unique and diverse publications that focus on how gender impacts a broad spectrum of subject areas. With its archival material, dating back to 1970 in some cases, GenderWatch is a repository of important historical perspectives on the evolution of the women's movement, men's studies, the transgender community and the changes in gender roles over
the years. Publications include scholarly journals, magazines, newspapers, newsletters, regional publications, books and NGO, government and special reports.

**Humanities & Social Sciences Index Retrospective** - offers a broad range of subject coverage in the humanities and social sciences with high-quality indexing of more than 1,300,000 articles in nearly 1,100 periodicals, dating as far back as 1907, as well as citations of over 240,000 book reviews. Topics covered include communications & mass media, criminal justice, anthropology, economics, art, film, environmental studies, archaeology, international relations, law, literary & social criticism, literature, music, performing arts, planning & public administration, political science, sociology, religion & theology, gender studies, gerontology, psychiatry & psychology, addiction studies, urban studies, and much more.

**LGBT Life with Full Text** - contains all of the content available in *LGBT Life* as well as full text for more than 120 of the most important and historically significant LGBT journals, magazines and regional newspapers, as well as more than 150 full-text monographs/books including *Classics in Lesbian Studies, Gay Science: The Ethics of Sexual Orientation Research, Handbook of Research with Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual & Transgender Populations, Queer Theory & Social Change*, etc. The database includes comprehensive indexing and abstract coverage as well as a specialized LGBT Thesaurus containing over 6,400 terms. Full text content available in *LGBT Life with Full Text* includes *The Advocate, Gay Parent Magazine, Girlfriends, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian & Gay Studies, James White Review, ISNA News, Ladder, Lesbian Tide, New York Blade, ONE, Tangents, Washington Blade*, and many more. Additionally, all relevant bibliographic data from NISC's *Sexual Diversity Studies* is also included.

**Urban Studies Abstracts** - includes bibliographic records covering essential areas related to urban studies, including urban affairs, community development, urban history, and other areas of key relevance to the discipline. The index contains more than 51,600 records, which are carefully selected from the most important sources within the discipline, such as: *Urban Affairs Review, Urban studies, Journal of Urban Affairs*, etc. EBSCO has digitized the full archive of this index, bringing coverage back to 1973.
Dissertations & Theses - With more than 2 million entries, PQD&T is the single, central, authoritative resource for information about doctoral dissertations and master's theses. Dissertations published from 1980 forward include 350-word abstracts written by the author. Master's theses published from 1988 forward include 150-word abstracts. UMI offers over 1.8 million titles for purchase in microfilm or paper formats. More than 600,000 are available in native or image PDF formats for immediate free download.

2. Staffing pertinent to the provision of library services to social work students
Joe Daniels is the librarian liaison to the students and faculty in the SSW. In this role, he is responsible for communicating with faculty, purchasing curriculum relevant materials, and for teaching Course Integrated Seminars (by request) for faculty in the School.

3. Budget for social work library resources (excluded from the below numbers are the above database packages and other bundled journal packages that are paid for by the collective CSU as well as general electronic resource funds locally).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>$6826.00</td>
<td>$7288.00</td>
<td>$7187.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>$988.00</td>
<td>$1877.00</td>
<td>$3193.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equipment and technology available to social work
The library provides 2 extended hours computer labs, the Research Commons, offering 115 desktop computers split between the Mac and PC platforms as well as 350 laptops for student borrowing. The Study Commons offers 95 desktop computers split between Mac and PC platforms. There are 50 scanners spread throughout the 2 Commons. There are multiple print release stations in the 2 Commons as well as print stations on all 4 library floors including copy machines in each. There is also available, a Digital Media Studios and Makerspace with 3D printing and various editing and production software and hardware.

4. Circulation or utilization data
This type of data is not collected
5. **Circulation policies and procedures**

Most of the items in the Library are included in what is called the Main collection and may be checked out for use by students, faculty and staff for a circulation period of 16 weeks. These items may also be renewed by our users if no other request has been made for the material. Students may also access inter-library loan material, for items not available in our collection, through CSU + (a book lending collaboration with the entire CSU system) for 60 days and ILLiad (a worldwide lending library network) for no fee.

6. **Library’s online catalogue, email, computerized search services, document delivery, interlibrary loan, media, and other related services available to students**

The library has an online catalog ([http://library.sfsu.edu/](http://library.sfsu.edu/)) where material can be located and retrieved. Our library includes collections located in the open stacks, online and delivered through a robotic library retrieval system accessed via the catalog. Students not finding material available in our collection may order through our inter-library loan offerings by way of the catalog, either CSU +, a collaboration with the entire CSU, or through ILLiad, a worldwide network of lending libraries, at no charge/fee to the students.

Media may be streamed through our services including Films on Demand and Academic Video Online. Media may also be borrowed from library room 85 for viewing and use in the library.

7. **Reference coverage and related services**

Research Assistance is available 10am – 8pm M-TH; 10am – 5pm Fri; 12pm – 6pm Sun.

Additionally, Instant Message assistance is available during all hours that research assistance is offered. Joe Daniels, the library liaison to social work, is available by appointment, email and telephone to consult with students and faculty.

8. **Is there a library staff member assigned to a liaison role for the social work program?**

Joe Daniels (librarian) is the principle liaison to the students and faculty in the SSW. In this role, he is responsible for communicating with faculty, purchasing curriculum relevant materials and for teaching Course Integrated Seminars (by request). Meetings/research consultations with students are also done on a regular basis outside the Course Integrated Seminars, both in person and
frequently via email. The Course Integrated Seminars are targeted at the undergraduate research methods course as well as the government information course and towards the incoming graduate cohort and their culminating experience class. Mr. Daniels is often listed as a resource in syllabi and the course management system, iLearn. Additionally, the library provides video tutorials and screencasts for research assistance located here: http://libguides.sfsu.edu/c.php?g=331116&p=2221683 Currently, there are no services provided to alumni or for outreach or community service.

9. **Is there a procedure used by social work faculty to recommend items for purchase?**

Faculty are regularly solicited (following Course Integrated Seminars, by email and during Department meetings) for suggestions of material for the library to purchase. Faculty may also suggest materials by way of our online request form http://library.sfsu.edu/form/suggest-purchase or directly from Mr. Daniels where in the vast majority of cases the material will be purchased by the library.

10. **How often are new acquisitions in social work listed and reported to program faculty?**

The library publishes a list of new book purchases linked to the library’s main page: http://library.sfsu.edu/post/borrowing-books New purchases of databases or other electronic collections are reported via newsletter to the faculty.

11. **Traffic or other counts of users of social work collection or social work resources.**

This data is not collected

12. **Instructional sessions**

Course Integrated Seminars are taught in computerized library instruction rooms. Each seminar’s content is directed at the particular research need of the class. Coverage includes library navigational basics, research techniques related to catalog and database searching and training in discipline specific resources. The library instruction rooms encourage both hands-on learning as well visual lecture based instruction. Informal evaluations come by way of student feedback at the end of sessions and is combined with informal feedback from teaching faculty. Often, the seminar is mentioned in the electronic course evaluations at the end of each semester.
2014/2015

Course
SW 855
SW 710
SW 720
SW 450

2015/2016

Course
Incoming MSW cohort 25 students
SW 301.02 10 students
SW 301.01 16 students

2016/17

Course
Incoming MSW cohort 30 students
SW 352 25 students
SW 450 25 students
SW 855 23 students
SW 820 15 students

13. Location of library/social work collection relative to classroom and other social work student services.

The location of the library is in a central campus location adjacent to the building where the SSW offices and classrooms are located.

14. Library hours for the main library and social work collection library for the full calendar year.

The library hours may be linked to here: http://library.sfsu.edu/hours  Fall and Spring semester hours are identical. There are also truncated hours offered during the winter and summer intersessions.

15. Samples and results of assessment/evaluation surveys of library services.

The library is engaged in the planning stage, in conjunction with the campus committee University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC), to assess information literacy at SF State.
The assessment will include sections of classes which participated in a library led Course Integrated Seminar and sections of the same class that did not, creating a comparison that will be scored using the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) Value Rubric for information literacy.

16. Strengths, areas of concern, projections for and assessment plans of the social work collection.

There are numerous areas of strength in the social work collection. The monograph fund is quite robust and is spent out each year. Our database and electronic collections are strong and well received by students and faculty. We have on offer a great deal of technology, both hardware and software, for our students and faculty.

There also is room for improvement and areas of potential growth. The monograph collection, though robust, is not as sought after by students as Mr. Daniels would like it to be. Mr. Daniels sees an increase in library instruction and marketing services to the SSW as a potential solution.

3.4.5 The program describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer-mediated access to achieve its mission and goals.

The practices and policies of classroom allocation is controlled at the college-level. The SSW’s Administrative Office Coordinator (AOC) works closely with both the college’s Academic Resource Coordinator (Tianne Feliciano) and the college’s Facilities and Operations Coordinator (Samantha Ward) to locate appropriate classroom space, that includes the use of Smart classrooms, as needed. As a result of the SSW’s office move during summer 2017, two new classrooms were made available to the college, which has made classroom allocation easier and more seamless. The SSW will continue to collaborate and work with the college to ensure adequate and optimal learning environments for our students.

3.4.6 The program describes, for each program option, the availability of and access to assistive technology, including materials in alternative formats.
The Disability Program and Resource Center (hereafter, DPRC) collaborates with SF State's diverse community to ensure that all aspects of campus life - learning, working and living - are universally accessible. The DPRC provides the University with resources, education and direct services in order that people with disabilities may have a greater opportunity to achieve social justice and equity. Students at the graduate and undergraduate level are eligible for all of the below resources. The DPRC services and programs are detailed below. For additional information, please refer to, http://access.sfsu.edu

**Accessible Technology Commons**

The Accessible Technology Commons (ATC) is an assistive technology lab run by the DPRC. The ATC opened in Spring 2013 to provide services to students with disabilities who are registered with the DPRC. It is a quiet place for students who want to do homework, group projects, use a computer, or need a study space. It also meets the technology needs of students with disabilities as each room has an assistive technology computer. Each room also has a height adjustable chair and computer table. Eligible students may also request headphones at the DPRC Front Desk located at Student Services Building Room 110.

**Hours**

The ATC hours of operation for are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Thursday</td>
<td>8am to 2am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8am to 10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>12pm to 10pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12pm to 2am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For holiday hours and exceptions, please see the [Library's holidays and exceptions website](#)*

**Room Use Policy**

- Students may use any of the available rooms on a first come, first serve basis.
- Students may reserve rooms in advance (see below).
Whiteboards

Certain rooms have one wall covered with IdeaPaint, which lets students use them as a whiteboard. They are to write only on the walls that are indicated. The IdeaPaint in Room B is on the left wall after you entering and the the IdeaPaint wall in Room E is directly across from the door. Dry erase markers and erasers are provided.

Software and Hardware List

Each room has a Windows PC and the following assistive software installed: JAWS, NVDA, MAGic, ZoomText, Kurzweil 3000 and Dragon Naturally Speaking. In addition, the following features ae available in each room. Note that the rooms with webcams have Sorenson nTouch VRS software and the room with the Braille Embosser has Duxbury Braille Translator.

Assistive Software available at SF State

The following assistive software licenses are available to the SF State community via the DPRC. The software listed below is available in the Accessible Technology Commons and select locations on campus. To view a complete list of locations where assistive software is installed, please visit the assistive technology locations page

Assistive Software for Windows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Disability populations served</th>
<th>License Type</th>
<th>PC/Mac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAWS</td>
<td>Screen Reader</td>
<td>Blind or low vision</td>
<td>Concurrent Site License</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZoomText</td>
<td>Screen Magnifier and Screen Reader</td>
<td>Low vision</td>
<td>Concurrent Site License</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGic</td>
<td>Screen Magnifier and Screen Reader</td>
<td>Low vision</td>
<td>Concurrent Site License</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Disability populations served</td>
<td>License Type</td>
<td>PC/Mac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury Braille Translator</td>
<td>Braille Translation Blind</td>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>Limited Per Seat License</td>
<td>PC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurzweil 3000</td>
<td>Text-to-Speech</td>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>Web License</td>
<td>PC and Mac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragon Naturally Speaking</td>
<td>Voice Command</td>
<td>Mobility Impairments</td>
<td>Limited Per Seat License</td>
<td>PC and Mac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom Accommodations**

**Ability to Get Up and Move Around**

This accommodation gives students the option to stand up and move around without disrupting others to alleviate disability symptoms during class and exams. Students are advised to make sure and discuss their need for this accommodation with a DPRC specialist during the initial intake or a follow-up appointment.

**Advocacy/Liaison with University Faculty and Staff**

DPRC provides advocacy and liaison support so that university faculty and staff may learn how to best implement approved reasonable accommodations. DPRC encourages university faculty and staff to discuss student’s questions about reasonable accommodations directly with them, and also the use the reasonable accommodation verification memo as a guide. In the event questions remain, faculty and staff can contact the DPRC at 415-338-2472 for further clarification.

**Assistive Listening Device**

An assistive listening device (ALD) consists of a small, portable electronic transmitter and receiver, both of which are relatively unobtrusive. The transmitter picks up an instructor's speech by microphone and sends it to the receiver by either an infrared or FM radio signal. If a student is hard of hearing, she/he might benefit from borrowing one of the DPRC's ALDs. See the Assistive Listening Device page to learn how to request an ALD.

**Audio Recording of Lectures**
Audio recording classroom lectures is an accommodation that is available to students with a permanent or temporary disability that may or may not be apparent or visible and impacts seeing, hearing, concentrating, processing information, sitting, or using writing/typing tools. See the Audio Record Lectures page to learn about recording lectures in class.

**Breaks**

If students’ experience disability-related symptoms that gets in the way of their ability to concentrate or tolerate sitting for extended periods of time, they may need the option to take a short break without disrupting others to alleviate disability symptoms during classes and exams. Students are advised to discuss their need for this accommodation with a DPRC specialist during the initial intake or a follow-up appointment.

**Computer-Aided Real-Time Transcription (CART)**

CART, also known as Real-Time Captioning, which is an application of technology that has been used by court reporters for many years, involves the use of a trained stenographer, known as a CART Reporter, who transcribes spoken communication, such as lectures and discussion, into conventional written English verbatim using specialized equipment and software. If a student is hard-of-hearing, CART may be able to provide real-time access to classroom instruction. See the Computer-Aided Real-time Transcription (CART) page to learn more.

**Classroom Furniture**

The DPRC can offer students some alternatives to standard classroom furniture if unable to access what may already be available in the classrooms. See the Classroom Furniture page to learn how to request accessible classroom furniture.

**Flexible Deadlines and/or Attendance**

If a student has a chronic health condition or a disability that is prone to periodic exacerbation (flare ups) of symptoms, the student be eligible for flexibility with deadlines and/or attendance. It may include modification of attendance requirements and/or flexibility with assignment deadlines and in scheduling exams. See the Flexible Deadlines and/or Attendance page to learn more about it.
Instructional Materials in Accessible Format

The DPRC provides conversion of instructional materials into accessible formats for students who cannot access standard print. See the Accessible media page to learn how to request accessible instructional materials, such as text in a digital or audio format, or captioned multimedia.

Interpreting Services

The DPRC coordinates sign language interpreting services for Deaf students at SF State in the classroom, during academic advising appointments, and other campus activities. See the Interpreting Services page to learn about our Interpreting Services.

Lab Assistant

If you a student enrolled in an activity class, such as a science lab, and need assistance manipulating objects or viewing visual material, the DPRC can assist the student in obtaining a lab assistant. The student is advised to discuss the need for this accommodation with a DPRC specialist during the initial intake or a follow-up appointment.

Media Captioning

The DPRC works closely with faculty to ensure that all multi-media used in the classroom for instruction is captioned for Deaf and hard-of-hearing students. See the Captioning Services page to learn more about captioning services.

Note Taking Assistance

If a student’s disability impacts his/her ability to take notes in the classroom, the DPRC has a few options for the student to explore so that he/she may have equal access to instruction. See the Note Taking page to learn how to request note taking assistance for classroom lectures.

Priority Registration

All students registered with the DPRC with a permanent disability are eligible to register on the first day of a priority registration period for a full class load. Many students with temporary disabilities are eligible for this accommodation as well. Use of priority registration is a tool to be able to put a
student’s accommodations into place well in advance of the first day of classes, and to create a class schedule that works with students’ disability-related needs. See the Priority Registration page to learn about dates, deadlines and procedures for class registration.

**Reduced Course Load**

For some students with disabilities, taking less than a full course load is equivalent to another student taking a full course load. If this is the student’s case, the DPRC can work with the student and the SF State financial aid counselors to retain financial aid eligibility. See the Reduced Course Load page to learn about the reduced course load accommodation.

**Reserved Seating**

The DPRC can help a student with preferential seating if the disability impacts where the student needs to sit in the classroom in order to access instruction. See the Reserved Seating page to learn about the accommodation for preferential seating arrangements in class.

**Scent-Free Environment**

It can be difficult to ensure classrooms are scent-free but if a student has multiple chemical sensitivities, the DPRC can work with the student and his/her instructors to request that classmates refrain from using scented products on the days they are in the students’ classes. The student is advised to discuss the need for this accommodation with a DPRC specialist during the initial intake or a follow-up appointment.

**Seizure Protocol**

If a student anticipates experiencing a seizure at some point while in the classroom, the DPRC can provide the student with a memo to share with instructors in advance about the appropriate protocol for responding when, and if, this occurs. The student is advised to discuss the need for this accommodation with a DPRC specialist during the initial intake or a follow-up appointment.

**Exam Accommodations**

Accommodated testing (AT) is a nationally-recognized, appropriate reasonable accommodation for students with certain disabilities. Testing accommodations should not fundamentally alter the intent
of the exam or lower the program standards of the university. Test accommodations may include additional test time, alternative test formats (e.g., large print, audio or Braille), or the use of adaptive equipment (word processors, electronic spelling checkers, text enlargers). Some students experience episodic impairments (e.g., epilepsy, depression, migraines, multiple sclerosis) which may need to be considered in determining exam accommodations.

Other Accommodations

Campus Housing Accommodations

The DPRC works closely with the SF State Housing office to accommodate your disability-related needs in university residences. See the Housing Accommodations page to learn how to request disability-related accommodations for on-campus housing. The priority deadline for requesting reasonable accommodations based on disability for Housing is June 1st for Fall semester move-in and accommodations must be requested on a yearly basis if the student is a returning resident. Reasonable accommodations for Housing do not carry over year-to-year.

Orientation and Mobility training

Students with visual disabilities may request an orientation to the campus. Students are advised to schedule an appointment with a DPRC Specialist to set up this service.

On-Campus Shuttle

If you are not able to walk long distances, the DPRC coordinates on-campus shuttle services from building to building on a pre-scheduled and call-in basis. See the On-Campus Shuttle page to learn how to arrange rides for the On-Campus Shuttle.

Parking

There are parking options for students needing accessible parking for both DMV placard holders as well as those without a DMV placard. See the Parking page to learn how to request and obtain a permit for accessible on-campus parking spaces.

Stand-In-Line Bypass
If a student experiences a disability-related symptom(s) that make it difficult for the student to stand in long lines at service counters on campus, he/she may be eligible to bypass lines to avoid exacerbating the disability-related symptoms. The student is advised to discuss the need for this accommodation with a DPRC specialist during the initial intake or a follow-up appointment.
CHAPTER 4: BASW ASSESSMENT

Educational Policy 4.0 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

4.0.1 The program presents its plan for ongoing assessment of student outcomes for all identified competencies in the generalist level of practice (baccalaureate social work programs) and the generalist and specialized levels of practice (master’s social work programs). Assessment of competence is done by program designated faculty or field personnel. The plan includes:

- A description of the assessment procedures that detail when, where, and how each competency is assessed for each program option.
- At least two measures assess each competency. One of the assessment measures is based on demonstration of the competency in real or simulated practice situations.
- An explanation of how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, as described in EP 4.0.
- Benchmarks for each competency, a rationale for each benchmark, and a description of how it is determined that students’ performance meets the benchmark.
- An explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving the benchmark.
- Copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies.

The BASW program at SF State assessed each of the nine competencies using two measures during the 2016-2017 academic year. In order to compile a comprehensive picture of both classroom and field work, one of the measures was the Social Work Education Assessment Project (SWEAP) Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory (FCAI), and the other was an assessment of real practice performance in field. Additionally, we assessed all generalist behaviors in the field evaluation. Both measures are detailed below:

Assessment Procedures: The When, Where, & How (Bullet #1 and #2 Above)

The following chart provides our BASW assessment plan and describes when data is collected to access each competency.
Measure 1: Field Evaluation

The first measure is the Field Evaluation, which is an assessment measure that is based on demonstration of all nine competencies in real practice situations. The field evaluation is completed by the student’s Field Instructor on two occasions during the academic year: mid-year evaluation (at the end of the fall semester in December) and final evaluation (at the end of the spring semester in May). The Field Evaluation instrument asks the agency’s field instructor to rank the student on each competency and each behavior using a Likert Scale scoring comprised of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No evidence of skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Beginning level of skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Satisfactory progress in skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good demonstration of skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent demonstration of skill development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Unable to assess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To assess competence at the undergraduate foundation level, we developed the Field Evaluation that includes all nine competencies along with the thirty-one behaviors (See Appendix B
and Appendix C). Again, this evaluation is administered to field supervisors mid-year and end-of-year for all BASW students.

**Measure 2: Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory**

Measure 2 is a direct measure of all nine competencies through the administration of the Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory (FCAI, SWEAP) (See Appendix V: Blank copy of the FCAI). The FCAI measures each competency holistically and does not directly measure each of the behaviors. As detailed in the BASW program’s assessment plan chart (see below), the dimensions of each competency are presented. During the beginning of the Fall 2016 semester, the BASW program faculty decided to utilize the FCAI exam as a pre-test/post-test measure. Given that 2016-2017 was our first year implementing this assessment plan, our point one/pre-test data group is different than our point two/post-test data group. In other words, our junior level BASW students completed the pre-test and since we have one year of data (2016-2017), the graduating seniors completed the post-test. Although this is not ideal, we recognize the time limits of our data collection method and in the future, we will be comparing the same cohort for pre-test and post-test results. More specifically, the juniors took the FCAI pre-test in August, 2016 and that same cohort will take the FCAI post-test in May, 2018. Beginning May 2018, we will have true pre and post test data results where the same student completes both exams.

An explanation of how the assessment plan measures multiple dimensions of each competency, as described in EP 4.0.

At the beginning of the Fall 2016 semester, an assessment sub-committee was formed that consisted of three full-time faculty members and the Field Director. The charge of the sub-committee was to review the assessment plan and to link competencies and behaviors to dimensions.
### 4.0.1 SFSU BASW ASSESSMENT PLAN

**Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Make ethical decisions by applying the standards of the NASW Code of Ethics, laws and regulations, models for ethical decision making, ethical conduct of research, and additional codes of ethics as appropriate to context (field instrument item #1a)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 1</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations (field instrument #1d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY</td>
<td>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</td>
<td>MEASURES</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DIMENSIONS</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
<td>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory (FCAI)</td>
<td>FCAI Multiple-choice exam</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Apply and communicate understanding of the importance of diversity and difference in shaping life experiences in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels (field instrument #2a)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 2</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present as learners and engage clients and constituents as experts of their own experience (field instrument #2c)</td>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply self-awareness and self-regulation to manage the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse clients and constituents (field instrument #2d)</td>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY</td>
<td>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</td>
<td>MEASURES</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DIMENSIONS</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
<td>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Apply understanding of social, economic, and environmental justice to advocate for human rights at the individual and system level</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 3</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY</td>
<td>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</td>
<td>MEASURES</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DIMENSIONS</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
<td>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(field instrument 3b) Engage in practices that advance social, economic, and environmental justice (field instrument #3c)

Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes

obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark
### Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Use practice experience and theory to inform scientific inquiry and research (field instrument #4a)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 4</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apply critical thinking to engage in analysis of research methods and research findings (field instrument #4b)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use and translate research evidence to inform and improve practice, policy, and service delivery (field instrument #4c)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency.

**Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Identify social policy at the local, state, and federal level that impacts well-being, service delivery, and access to social services (field instrument #5a)</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 5</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apply critical thinking to analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance human rights and social, economic, and environmental justice (field instrument 5c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks to engage with clients and constituencies (field instrument #6a)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 6</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use empathy, reflection, and interpersonal skills to effectively engage diverse clients and constituencies (field instrument #6c)</td>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct

**Measure 2:** SWEAP FCAI

**Knowledge; C/A Processes**

FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency.

Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct

---

### Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Collect and organize data, and apply critical thinking to interpret information from clients and constituencies (field instrument #7b)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 7</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the analysis of assessment data from clients and constituencies (field instrument #7a)</td>
<td>Competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives based on the critical assessment of strengths, needs, and challenges within clients and constituencies (field instrument #7C)</td>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select appropriate intervention strategies based on the assessment, research knowledge, and values and preferences of clients and constituencies (field instrument #7d)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCY</td>
<td>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</td>
<td>MEASURES</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DIMENSIONS</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
<td>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Critically choose and implement interventions to achieve practice goals and enhance capacities of clients and constituencies</td>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field evaluation question 8</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5 Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the benchmark for each outcome measure. Average the percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(field instrument #8a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in interventions with clients and constituencies (field instrument #8b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use inter-professional collaboration as appropriate to achieve beneficial practice outcomes (field instrument #8c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate, mediate, and advocate with and on behalf of diverse clients and constituencies (field instrument #8d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate effective transitions and endings that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark.
Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups,</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Instrument</td>
<td>Select and use appropriate methods for evaluation of</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Aggregate scores of field</td>
<td>For Measure 1: Students must score a 4 out of 5</td>
<td>Determine the percentage of students who attained the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Organizations, and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCY</th>
<th>COMPETENCY BENCHMARK</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
<th>OUTCOME MEASURE BENCHMARK</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outcomes (field instrument #9a)</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment, person-in-environment, and other multidisciplinary theoretical frameworks in the evaluation of outcomes (field instrument #9b)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td>evaluation question 9</td>
<td>Likert Scale or higher</td>
<td>benchmark for each outcome measure Average the percentages together to obtain the percentage of students demonstrating competence. Determine whether this percentage is larger than the competency benchmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes (field instrument #9b)</td>
<td>Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate intervention and program processes and outcomes (field instrument #9c)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes (field instrument #9c)</td>
<td>Apply evaluation findings to improve practice effectiveness at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels (field instrument #9d)</td>
<td>Knowledge; Values; Skills; C/A Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI</td>
<td>Knowledge; C/A Processes</td>
<td>FCAI answer sheets are analyzed and data presented in the aggregate. Mean scores of questions answered correctly are available along with a comparison of mean scores nationwide with an n=15230. The final data point is the percent of our students who met and exceeded the competency</td>
<td>Meeting and exceeding competency means students answered 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To summarize what is detailed in the above chart, we assessed multiple dimensions of each competency using multiple measures. In a nutshell, given the comprehensive nature of the field evaluation instrument, all four dimensions (knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes) are cumulatively covered for all competencies. The SWEAP Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory (FCAI) measures knowledge and cognitive processes. Again, these details are presented in Appendix V.

**Benchmarks for each competency, a rationale for each benchmark, and a description of how it is determined that students’ performance meets the benchmark (Bullet #4 Above)**

The development of our benchmarks was discussed and shared among all social work faculty. Prior to the administration of any assessment data in the Fall 2016 semester, the faculty met, thoroughly reviewed and discussed each of the assessment measures so that we could establish benchmarks for each data collection instrument. When establishing the benchmarks, faculty took into consideration (a) the timing of the data collection; (b) where the course fits in the overall curriculum; and (c) expectations of students’ level of competence and training at that snapshot in time.

Below is a description and rationale for each benchmark.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASW Benchmarking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An explanation of how the program determines the percentage of students achieving the benchmark (Bullet #5 Above).

In order to determine if our students achieved the overall benchmark for each instrument, aggregate scores were calculated accordingly:

We set our benchmarks, we analyzed all data for each competency and each behavior and determined if the aggregate score met the benchmark standard. The summary data chart shows where and when students met both benchmarks: field and FCAI. Given the differences between the two measures (again, Field evaluations and FCAI) it was not possible to generate a combined score of the two instruments. Each measure generated an aggregate score of mastery of the competency but how the scores were collected did not allow for us to combine them in a way that felt meaningful or instructive to us. Therefore, you will see that mastery was defined for the competencies in instances when both benchmarks were met.
Copies of all assessment measures used to assess all identified competencies (Bullet #6 Above)

See the following Appendices for the all assessment measures:

Appendix W: Mid-Year Field Evaluation Results
Appendix X: End-of-Year Field Evaluation Results
Appendix V: Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory Pre-test and Post-test Results (FCAI)

4.0.2 The program provides its most recent year of summary data and outcomes for the assessment of each of the identified competencies, specifying the percentage of students achieving program benchmarks for each program option.

4.0.2 BASW
2016-2017 SUMMARY DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Benchmark</th>
<th>Outcome Measure Benchmark</th>
<th>Percent Attaining</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Achieving Competency</th>
<th>Competency Attained?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 1: Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation Students must score a minimum of 4 out of 5 on Likert Scale</td>
<td>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 94 Behavior 2: 94 Behavior 3: 96 Behavior 4: 94 Behavior 5: 98</td>
<td>94+94+96+94+98 =476/5=95%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Measure 2: SWEAP FCAI Pre-test 76%</td>
<td>76+62=138/2=69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation</td>
<td>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 96  Behavior 2: 98  Behavior 3: 94</td>
<td>96%+98+94=288/3=96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Measure 2: FCAI</td>
<td>Measure 2: Pre-test 80%  Post-test 38%</td>
<td>80+38=118/2=59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>Measure 1: Field Evaluation</th>
<th>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 96  Behavior 2: 96</th>
<th>96%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Measure 2: FCAI</td>
<td>Measure 2: Pre-test 92%</td>
<td>92+43=135/2=68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed research and Research-informed Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation</td>
<td>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 77 Behavior 2: 88 Behavior 3: 79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Measure 2: FCAI</td>
<td>Measure 2: Pre-test 48% Post-test 33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation</td>
<td>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 79 Behavior 2: 87 Behavior 3: 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Measure 2: FCAI</td>
<td>Measure 2: Pre-test 64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct.

Post-test 43%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>Measure 1: Field Evaluation</th>
<th>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 96 Behavior 2: 100</th>
<th>Measure 2: FCAI Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct</th>
<th>96+100=196/2=98%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Measure 1: Field Evaluation</td>
<td>Measure 1: Behavior 1: 93 Behavior 2: 89 Behavior 3: 93 Behavior 4: 96</td>
<td>Measure 2: FCAI Meeting and exceeding</td>
<td>93+89+93+96=371/4=93%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure 1:

- Behavior 1: 96
- Behavior 2: 100

Measure 2:

- Pre-test 68%
- Post-test 33%

50%
| Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | 85% | Measure 1: Field Evaluation | Measure 1: Behavior 1: 96 Behavior 2: 96 Behavior 3: 98 Behavior 4: 96 Behavior 5: 88 | 96+96+98+96+88=474/5=95% | Yes |
| Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities | 85% | Measure 1: Field Evaluation | Measure 1: Behavior 1: 86 Behavior 2: 93 Behavior 3: 95 Behavior 4: 88 | 86+93+95+88=362/4=91% | Yes |
| | 50% | Measure 2: FCAI | Measure 2: Pre-test 100% Post-test 90% | 100+90=190/2=95% | |
Meeting and exceeding competency relates to students answering 50% or more of the total number of questions correct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test 84%</th>
<th>Post-test 76%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84+76=160/2=80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the summary data analysis, we learned our BASW students did not fully meet the benchmarks for competency 4 and competency 5 when taking both the Field Evaluations and the FCAI into consideration. In the field evaluations, both mid-year and final year, students achieved the benchmarks for all competencies. After engaging in a deeper analysis of the data, we see that the mean field evaluation aggregate score did improve from mid-year to end-of-year in all nine competency areas. See Appendix W and Appendix X for the mean scores during both time points: mid-year and end of year.

We learned that the cumulative scores on the SWEAP Foundation Curriculum Assessment Inventory (FCAI), however, were comparatively low. When taking the FCAI exam, our BASW students struggled. When juniors took the exam during their second class of their first semester as BASW majors (pre-test data), their scores ranged from a low of 48% of students responded correctly to a high of 100%. Specifically, 48% of our junior-level BASW students answered half of the questions correctly for competency 4, while 100% of our students answered 50% of the questions correctly for competency 8.

When examining the FCAI post-test results with our senior-level BASW students, we learned that this cohort did not perform well on the FCAI exam. In fact, this cohort scored significantly lower than their junior-level incoming BASW classmates. During post-test analysis, we see that students did not perform well. On several competencies, a mere 33% of students got half of the questions correct for competencies 4, 5, and 6. Like their junior-level counterparts, the seniors scored highest on competency 8 (at 90% of students answering half or more of the questions correct). Overall, the post-test FCAI results were weak. These FCAI data are less
instructive than we had hoped given the wide variation. For all FCAI data results, see Appendix V.

Lastly, when comparing our students’ scores to the national mean (n=1673) section score, our junior level students outperformed the national mean score in every competency, except competency 1: “demonstration of ethical and professional behavior”. For the post-test scores, our BASW seniors scored below the mean national score for all nine competencies. These results complicate and obscure our understanding and interpretation of the data. We will continue to closely monitor our assessment results to determine how best to assess student learning and ways we can improve these processes.

[Note: The pre-test and post-test comparison groups were not the same students given that we instituted the SWEAP FCAI during the Fall 2016 semester and could only generate “post-test” data using the BASW seniors. The SSW is committed to establishing and continuously improving our on-going assessments processes and will have more reliable pre-test/post-test data after the AY 2017-2018 since the same individuals will be assessed over time].

Lessons Learned & Limitations of our Assessment Process

After analyzing the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 data, it became apparent that the BASW students struggled with the FCAI and that is concerning in that we need to develop stronger assessment measures that elicit more meaningful data. We need to develop a more complete and reliable method for measuring our students’ learning, which in turn can help us continue to identify gaps in our curriculum as well as strengths.

The FCAI proved to be less instructive than we had hoped. The use of the FCAI may indeed elicit better quality data when pre-test scores can be compared to same student post-test scores. Given that we began using the FCAI in Fall 2016, we could not generate truly comparative results since we did not have pre-test scores from the previous year (2015-2016). We are, however, continuing to collect FCAI results and as of May 2017 will have both pre-and post-test scores for our graduating cohort. It will be interesting to see if those data will provide any richer meaning for us to assess our curriculum.
At the same time we will continue to collect FCAI data, the faculty have begun discussing, and will continue to discuss, the optimal and feasible assessment plan that will yield the richest data given our current capabilities. One example that we are considering is the development and adoption of a signature assignment, whereby we identify key particular competencies and write an assignment that can be used in multiple classes to assess students learning and integration of ideas, concepts, and theories. Signature assignments that can be used throughout the curriculum, utilizing a scaffolding approach, to better assess their learning outcomes across the curriculum. This approach, we believe, will also help integrate student learning that can help make connections among and between micro, mezzo, and macro practice.

Lastly, it is important to mention that given the realities of the SSW and lack of consistent leadership, assessment plans were not in place leading up to the fall 2016 semester. Upon the arrival of the new director, the assessment plan was developed. The students reported experiencing assessment fatigue throughout the year and this may be one of many variables that can be offered to understand the low scores for the FCAI post-test. As a result of this self-study experience, we have collectively come to understand the need to develop and commit to engaging in quality and meaningful continuous assessment every year. As stated above, the faculty are collectively discussing how best to complete this very important task.

The retirement of two faculty: Drs. Levy and Redman further complicated matters and left the remaining faculty with additional work and two fewer team members to assist in self-study matters.

**4.0.3 The program uses Form AS 4(B) to report its most recent assessment outcomes for each program option to constituents and the public on its website and routinely updates (minimally every 2 years) its findings.**

See Appendix Y for 4(B) completed data form. Additionally, the following link shows that assessment data available on our SF State SSW website. The program is committed to the continuous assessment and will post our data results at minimum every two years.

[http://socwork.sfsu.edu/content/basw-program-assessment](http://socwork.sfsu.edu/content/basw-program-assessment)
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.

After all data were analyzed and summarized, the faculty have begun – and will continue to – examine and explore the whole curriculum; where we can strengthen and align our teaching, coursework, and assignments to all competencies, but we will take great caution to begin with, and focus on, the weaker competencies.

The SSW embarked on our self-study process in Fall 2016 for our data collection year 2016-2017, and are being evaluated based on the EPAS 2015. There has been quite a bit of change for the SSW and regardless, our team pulled together and got through. We did not have time to proactively develop an evaluation and renewal process, but we are discussing how to implement the changes that are reflected in the data and will continue to plan for ongoing program renewal. As reflected in our BASW self-study, in the short-term, our immediate tasks will be the following:

- Step One: Presentation of findings to SSW community. The chair of the Self-Study Assessment Sub-Committee will meet with the sub-committee and discuss the data results, examine the results together, and collectively will develop a presentation to all faculty, staff, and students in the SSW. Timeline: Sub-Committee meeting will be called for first week of classes in the Spring 2018 semester to begin the discussion and plan for presentation.

- Step Two: Charge the Curriculum Committee to closely review all data outcomes and help devise an action plan for continuous improvement that can design and implement the necessary changes during AY 2018-2019. Timeline: Curriculum Committee will meet in early Spring 2018. The BASW curricular redesign efforts that resulted from the Teagle grant work will continue through the Spring 2018 and onward.
Step Three: Strategic Planning Process will begin after data is reviewed and analyzed by the assessment and curriculum committees. The entire SSW will work to develop a strategic plan about curriculum, programmatic development, and explore the option of developing an advanced standing program. The SSW will explore the question about how to best prepare our undergraduate students with the knowledge, skills, and values to move onto the terminal degree. As a school, we need to be more responsive to our current undergraduates and explore ways to provide the best outcomes to help them succeed in the pursuit of the BASW, and in their practice outcomes.

Step Four: Examine Assessment Methodology. This process has revealed the need to develop better assessment tools that are seamlessly aligned to the competencies, and provide deeper and more meaningful data to the faculty. Identification of the most appropriate courses for each competency and data gathering tools/instruments are essential. When necessary, employ inter-rater reliability techniques to strengthen our instruments and outcomes. The faculty also need to revisit the process of benchmarking. Although we worked collaboratively on this process in Fall 2016, we can revise and strengthen this process for future data collection efforts. Providing training to all faculty on assessment instruments and benchmarks will help us all gather more instructive and rigorous data.

Curricular and/or Programmatic Changes Based on Assessment Outcomes

As mentioned earlier, because of the timing of the self-studies coupled with the large degree and nature of change in the school, processes and plans to address our data results have not been fully articulated or implemented. Given that our data were collected in AY 2016-2017, we have not had adequate time to engage in this complex task. We have, however, been talking extensively about devoting substantial time as a faculty to dive into this work in Spring 2018 and onward. The overarching plan is that in Spring 2018, the SSW will begin to develop committees to continue with the curricular improvements that begun with the Teagle grant for the BASW curriculum. With the recent retirements, the SSW will be requesting new full-time tenured track faculty lines. This opportunity to bring new faculty onboard requires that we identify our future
goals and future emphases/concentrations. Following these steps, and after we receive our COA decision in October 2018, we will move forward with the process of fully implementing the BASW curriculum redesign that begun as a result of the work of the Teagle grant. Securing community partners and leaders in the field outside of the academy to help the SSW strengthen and redesign our curriculum is critical. We plan to invite community partners to assist in this project. Those larger scale efforts of curriculum redesign are planned to commence Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 and continue beyond.

4.0.5 For each program option, the program provides its plan and summary data for the assessment of implicit curriculum as defined in EP 4.0 from program defined stakeholders. The program discusses implications for program renewal and specific changes it has made based on these assessment outcomes.

The BASW program at SF State administered two separate surveys to the undergraduate social work students during the 2016-2017 academic year. The first survey is what we referred to as, the “Implicit Curriculum Survey”. The second survey is entitled, “Student Evaluation of the Faculty Field Liaison”. Results of both surveys are discussed below, along with the implications and continuous improvement plan.

Implicit Curriculum Survey

The explicit curriculum sub-committee met throughout the year to discuss all issues related to our formal curriculum. The sub-committee members included students and both part time and full-time faculty. In an effort to learn about the experiences of our students, the sub-committee developed a “Self-Study Survey” (See below). The survey asks all cohorts of students to respond to two sets of questions: questions having to do with the explicit curriculum and questions about the implicit curriculum. Student members of the sub-committee took the lead in developing the questions with the assistance and support of faculty.

For the purposes of this accreditation standard, 4.0.5, we will highlight the key findings of the implicit curriculum set of questions and responses. The implicit curriculum section of the survey asks students to respond to three areas of inquiry: (a) responsiveness of the program to
student learning; (b) faculty effectiveness; and (c) student awareness of school of social work policies.

The results of the survey, see chart below, show that the students agree favorably that most faculty engage in anti-oppressive practice, and that the program engages in continuous improvement. Student responses in the areas of seeking input from stakeholders and conducting ongoing assessment of student learning were mixed. When asked about faculty currency of research and professional development, most students responded that faculty are current and demonstrate professional development although several students were neutral and one disagreed. The last set of questions about the policies and procedures of the SSW elicited more mixed results. Although the majority of students indicated that they are aware of the policies and their rights as students, some students responded “not at all” – showing a lack of knowledge about such issues.
### 4.0.5

**BASW Student Responses the Implicit Curriculum Survey embedded in the Explicit Curriculum Survey**

**N=**

**(Spring, 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the following statements, think of the school or program as a whole instead of particular faculty or staff.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty and staff implement anti-oppressive practice (AOP).</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If you do not know what AOP means, check this box:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school conducts regular evaluations to receive feedback from students, alumni, staff, and faculty.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school conducts regular assessment of student learning.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical classrooms are conducive to learning.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program maximizes its resources to address challenges and engage in continuous self-improvement.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the following statements, think of the faculty as a whole instead of particular faculty or staff.</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty members manage to keep themselves current in their research and practice.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My instructors demonstrate a commitment to ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For the following statements, consider your own level of awareness</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the policies and procedures used to evaluate my academic and professional performance.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please use this space to elaborate on your answers above and provide concrete examples.

One qualitative comment made:

“Feedback (surveys) provide better learning environments for the future”.
Student Evaluation of the Faculty Field Liaison

At the end of each academic year, students complete an evaluation of their faculty field liaison. The data (See below) reveal that most students felt positively about the role and outcome of the faculty field liaison, yet there is room for improvement, particularly in the areas of purpose and function of the site visit, clarity of roles, and how to utilize the faculty liaison to improve the evaluation process of the student. Below, we discuss implications and improvements that result from the data.

4.0.5 Student Evaluation of Faculty Field Liaison
BASW Survey Results
N=22 (Spring, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with the Faculty Field Liaison</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison was available as needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison provided feedback as needed on my learning agreement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison was candid in discussing my strengths and areas for growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison showed an awareness of current trends in social work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison was available for support and assistance in mediating field issues and concerns as necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison held sufficient field meetings with me on an individual basis as well as conjoint meeting(s) with my field instructor at the agency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose and content of the faculty field liaison’s meetings with my field instructor and me were clear and enhanced my field experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculty field liaison provided help as needed in the evaluation process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of agency visit by my faculty field liaison: Range = 1-2. Mode: 1

Overall, my experiences with the faculty field liaison were: Excellent (17); Good (4); Marginal (0); Poor (1); Not Sure (0)

Summary of qualitative feedback (Any other feedback about the faculty field liaison’s site visits):
“She talks main point at the meeting and reminds my supervisor about the need for supervision hours”
“My field liaison is really interested in my placement and my learning”
“She is very supportive”
“She was extremely insightful. I felt like I was able to debrief my internship experience”
“[FL] asked very good questions and made helpful suggestions to my field instructor”
“It was really nice to have [liaison] get direct feedback on my work from my supervisor”

“I think individual meetings with the student and field instructor may be better so I have a chance to discuss my concerns not in the group meeting”

Implications for Program Renewal and Specific Changes Resulting from Implicit Curriculum Assessment Data

After review of the data, we have identified particular areas where growth and improvement are essential. The faculty and staff will collectively work on implementing the following plan for continuous improvement.

**Improve Communications**

Lines of communication between and among students, alumni, staff, and faculty need to improve. The program will devise ways for communication to happen, both formally and informally, although the formal mechanism is the focus. One strategy already adopted in the Spring 2017 semester was the initiation of a monthly email newsletter from the Director to all alumni. Faculty, staff, and even students will have input as to the content of the monthly alumni newsletters. Additionally, at a minimum of once-per-semester, the Director will send out an email to all students, faculty and staff about events, announcements, and any pertinent
information relevant to the SSW. Lastly, in an effort to make communication a two-way street, the faculty will explore the possibility of asking our students for input about continuous improvement of the program by perhaps using our end of the semester university-wide teaching evaluations as one way to capture and include data.

From the data, we glean that the program needs to formalize our process by which students are informed of and making contributions to the policies and procedures of the school. For example, upon entering the BASW major during one’s junior year, each student will be given a BASW program manual and indicate receipt of the manual. Another idea that we can explore and resource we can tap is the student club. Student members of the undergraduate social work club can work with the faculty advisor and each review the program manual for updates, edits, and improvements. The SSW has standing committees that include student members, yet the committees tend to meet as needed. One way to enhance open communication could include more regular committee meetings where issues can be addressed proactively.

Another element of communication centers around how faculty communicate with students about their research, scholarship, and ongoing professional development and its impact on their teaching and classroom learning. Faculty can explore ways that they share more about the intersections between their research and scholarship and student learning. A few concrete strategies to aid in this process include the following: highlighting faculty publications and research in both the biannual Notes from the Director newsletter as well as the monthly alumni newsletter. Recruiting social work students for participation in research projects and publications is another way in which students can become more informed about faculty research.

**Codify Role of Faculty Field Liaison**

From the student responses to the survey, it became apparent that we need to improve the practices of the faculty field liaison in part by standardizing and codifying the purpose, function, and role of the faculty field liaison. We can develop an expectations inventory of all parties in field: student, field instructor, task supervisor, and faculty field liaison. Relatedly, the faculty can revisit and discuss when and how site visits take place, and clarify the purpose of the site visit.