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Accreditation Standard M2.0.2: 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. The program discusses the logic model and provided course descriptions. However, the program did not provide a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

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

SF State Response:

The self-study quotes the following: “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” (SF State MSW Self Study, 2017, p. 19)

In order to address these goals, the MSW program designed a curriculum (foundation and specialized practice) that incorporates coursework and field and seeks to expose students to various theoretical and conceptual frameworks for analyzing problems and solutions and informing practice at different levels (micro, mezzo, macro, and global). Intersectionality and anti-oppressive practice are the main conceptual frameworks that underpin the MSW curriculum. Crenshaw (1993) offered intersectionality as a framework for practice to highlight the “need to account for multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed” (p. 1245). She posits that the framework conveys the different ways in which markers of identity shape the multiple dimensions of people’s experiences. Dominelli (1996) defines anti-oppressive practice (AOP) as “a form of social work practice that addresses social divisions and structural inequalities in the work that is done with people whether they be users (“clients”) or workers ...an egalitarian value system concerned with reducing the deleterious effects of structural inequalities upon people’s lives ...and a way of structuring relationships between individuals that aim to empower users by reducing the negative effects of social
hierarchies on their interaction and the work they do together.” (pp. 170-171). An MSW curriculum informed by both intersectionality and AOP is fitting in preparing students for practice in an urban generalist setting, such as the Bay Area, where the complexity of identities factor into how students understand client and community identities, how these impact an analysis of the root causes of poverty and oppression, and how programs and policies are formulated and implemented. The foundation curriculum emphasizes an urban generalist practice with diverse clients and client systems. This more holistic—micro, mezzo, macro, and global - approach to social work practice in the foundation year then lays the ground for a specialized practice with individuals, families, and groups (IFG) within a social structural context.

The curriculum logic model below visualizes this integration of coursework and field instruction and the application of theories and conceptual frameworks to an analysis of social problems and the design of appropriate interventions at various levels of practice. The bottom part of the MSW logic model shows the foundation courses that students take in the Fall semester of their first year. These particular courses are sequenced in the first semester of the program to allow students to engage in various analytical perspectives on social problems and possible solutions that will inform their practice experience in field. For instance, the foundation content introduces students to the context of social work practice with individuals, families, and groups through a perspective on history, human behavior, social constructions of identity and systematic oppression, and social work practice. SW 700 History & Philosophy of Social Welfare covers key moments in the history of welfare state and the social work profession, and the philosophies that informed various approaches to promoting individual and community well-being implemented throughout different historical epochs. SW 710 Human Behavior in the Social Environment delves on notions of human behavior that are linked to social constructions in the environment. SW 770 surveys intersectional constructs of individual and collective identity, the role of oppression, and the use of self in working with under-represented communities. SW 730 Social Work Practice Methods introduces students to the meaning and practice of social work in meeting the needs of individuals, families, and groups. SW 740 Field Work Instruction and SW 741 Field Work Seminar serve as venues for where students can more directly bridge theory and practice.
Above the foundation courses on the logic model are the transitional courses which link the foundation with the specialized practice curriculum, which will be elaborated on later in M.2.1.2. The transitional courses are taken in the Spring semester of the first year. These include courses that amplify students’ analytic frameworks in examining social issues, programs, and policies, hone their practice competencies, and begin to orient students to use research to inform their practice as well as use their practice to inform research. SW 810 Health, Illness, & Disordered Behaviors allows students to apply frameworks learned in SW 700, SW 710, and SW 770 that recognize the role that the social environment plays in defining what is “normal” and what is “disordered”. SW 780 Global Poverty builds on SW 770 by including class-based and socio-economic based oppression to an intersectionality lens and anti-oppressive practice. Having taken courses in the foundational semester, students then take SW 720 Research Methods in Social Work and approach research from a more social constructionist perspective and are more cognizant of research’s political and ethical dimensions. Apart from their field experience (SW 740 and SW 741), students take additional practice courses during this transitional phase of the curriculum. SW 830 Social Casework where students hone their skills in working with individuals and families to address social problems. An elective, SW 843
Social Work with Children and Families, offered mostly for students in the Title IV E Stipend Program, covers assessment and interventions with children and families in public child welfare systems. As a whole, these first-year courses lay the groundwork for students for the material covered in the specialized practice curriculum during their second year.
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**Accreditation Standard M2.1.2:** The program provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design for specialized practice demonstrating how the design is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for both classroom and field.

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

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

**SF State Response:**

To address the goals of the specialized practice curriculum for individuals, families, and groups, the IFG curriculum for the second year of the MSW program lists courses which build on generalist practice, hone students’ practice with individuals with an emphasis on promoting strengths using a biopsychosocial approach and recognizing issues of diversity and difference as part of culturally humble practice. The MSW logic model shows the courses for the specialized practice on the top section and demonstrates how the courses lead to the goals of the MSW program in terms of cognitive and affective domains. At the cognitive domain, the specialized practice curriculum focuses on honing students’ ability to synthesize and evaluate content on social work practice for individuals, families, and groups. Students address the highest levels of creation through their culminating experiences (master’s thesis or practice project), where they build knowledge and create models of practice that demonstrate their integration of lessons drawn from coursework and field experiences. At the affective domain, the specialized practice curriculum focus on having the students expand their ability to receive, respond to, value, organize, and internalize diverse phenomena through advance practice and research courses and field experiences. In addition, courses in the specialized curriculum address the enhanced practice behaviors of the specialized practice (detailed in AS M2.1.3). For instance, one
of the advance behaviors for Competency 4 (Engage in practice-informed research, research-informed practice) is: “engage in research that is inclusive of the clients, communities, and organizations involved and that incorporates their participation in all aspects of the research process”. Students learn about participatory action research (PAR) or community-based participatory research (CBPR) in SW 721 Evaluative Research and SW 820 Advance Research Methods as approaches to engaging research participants and democratizing the research process. Another example that shows how the specialized practice curriculum relates to the advanced competencies is through SW 701 Social Policy Analysis which addresses Competency 5 (Engage in policy practice). In this class, students learn about various policy analysis frameworks which they apply to relevant social policies, thus addressing the following advance behavior: “create alternative policy solutions and interventions to social issues that are culturally relevant, appropriate, and sensitive to the diverse populations affected by these policies”.

**MSW Curriculum Logic Model**

Students take additional practice courses which seek to build on students’ general competency in engaging, assessing, intervening, and evaluating with individuals, families, and groups through participatory and collaborative processes using cultural humility. For example, in SW 831 Advanced Social Casework, students learn about a
range of evidence-based, and evidence-informed interventions for a variety of client populations. Students are given regular assignments where they are expected to bring direct practice examples from their advanced year field placement settings and apply these to theoretical frameworks. In this class, discussions frequently address noted discrepancies between “best practice” articulated in classroom settings and the “reality” of community-based practice where the funding, staff resources and the complexity of client presentations can make these “ideal” practices appear to be more the exception, rather than the rule. Students prepare both written and small group oral reflections on these discrepancies and use process recordings with an eye toward both advanced practice skills and either demonstration of, or opportunities for, engaging in evidence-informed practice in their practice settings. Following the first-year curriculum which addresses more basic-level, generalist skills, students enter SW 832, Social Work Practice with Groups, prepared to engage in the increasingly complex practice and ethical considerations of working with groups. As students learn about theories, principles, and skills on group dynamics and developmental processes, they begin to engage in a more critical analysis of policies and programs.

In SW 701 Social Policy Analysis, students apply human rights, social, economic, and environmental justice, and diversity perspectives learned through a historiographic analysis of the evolution of social welfare, the philosophies that inform social work practice, the social work profession to the analyses of specific social policies. Students also learn about the evolution of social welfare in SW 700. In Social Policy Analysis (SW 701) students are encouraged to use practice examples from their first or second year internship settings as a basis for identifying a particular policy that they apply to diversity sensitive and anti-oppressive policy analysis for their final paper. As one example, in AY 2016-17, a Title IV-E student analyzed a new state policy that pertains to increasing youth voice in juvenile court orders for psychotropic medication, and some of the unintended consequences that can arise when bills fail to articulate funding and/or parameters for social worker and attorney trainings that would increase the likelihood of its implementation. Indeed, this student paper was a wonderful illustration of the opportunity for students to incorporate ideas gleaned from 710, Human Behavior & the Social Environment, SW770, Ethnic & Cultural concepts, SW 843 Child & Family Services, and SW 810 Health, Illness, & Disordered Behaviors, to their analysis of social policies and programs.

In the specialized practice year, students build on their knowledge of the ethical and political dimensions of research learned in SW 720 Research Methods in Social Work, by learning more about the technical dimensions of scientific inquiry particularly quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodology data analyses in either SW 721 Evaluative Research or SW 820 Advance Research Methods. Both research classes are offered in the Fall semester of the second year to prepare students for the culminating experience (SW 895 Culminating Experience; SW 898 Master’s Thesis) which they carry out in the Spring semester of their second year. Students use either class to develop a proposal for their culminating experience. Students are encouraged, and frequently elect to base their research upon questions generated by their direct field practice experiences. From here, field instructors are encouraged by both the field director and field liaisons to
work together with the student to generate learning goals that focus on their research under competency four, which includes giving the student time during their internship to conduct and/or report out on research or findings. Indeed, when the topic is germane to their service sector or setting, our students are regularly invited to provide agency training based upon their research. For example, during FY 2016-17, a student created her own model of practice for effective strategies in engaging with sexually exploited minors in the child welfare system and wrote a master’s thesis about her model. This student became aware of the problem from her internship experience, and she later gave back to that setting by sharing her findings in an all staff training. Another student pair prepared a panel for child welfare social workers, focused on addressing the needs of trans and gender nonconforming foster youth, which was made available to, and held at the social services office to facilitate access for child welfare line staff and supervisors. In these ways, students both learn from, and contribute to field agencies through their own original research. These examples epitomize practice-informed research and research-informed practice.

In the advanced year, students also have the option of taking specialized practice elective courses for particular populations or practice settings as electives. These courses align with the specialized practice in that they expand on practice with individuals, families, and group in particular settings. For example, SW 760 Social Work and the Law incorporates legal principles, theories, and systems into a range of specific and interrelated practice settings with individuals, families, and groups. In this course, students are given an assignment to prepare the research component of a social work perspective on an amicus brief, which is centered around a debatable topic that is current to the students’ field placement environment. A recent example included the focus on assisted outpatient treatment (AOT) and the role of the court in compelling individuals not at immediate risk of harm to self or others to engage in mental health treatment. Students apply advanced levels of critical thinking to their biopsychosocial assessment of the policy question, take a stance, and also address the arguments of the opposing side of the argument. Later in the semester, student teams debate the questions and are asked to prepare reflection papers based upon their colleagues’ debate topics. In this way, students are asked to apply both research and direct practice experience to a current, field-related topic that is currently being debated in the law.

SW 840 Wellness, Recovery, & Psychosocial Rehabilitation in Social Work & Mental Health focuses on the principles, values, and skills for providing wellness, recovery, and psychosocial rehabilitation for individuals, families, and groups, and is a direct connection to both requirements of, and central tenants of the Mental Health Services Act in California, which places emphasis on going beyond generalist concepts of “treatment” and “disorder” to focus on holistic consumer (vs. “client”) care. This nuanced perspective allows students to at once apply, and to some degree question, the content that was shared in SW 810, Health Illness and Disordered Behavior, and, in some cases to the work that they encounter in community mental health settings, to explore, define, and through role-play and written reflection, practice anti-oppressive, consumer-centered interventions.
SW 865 Social Work Practice in Public Schools is an elective course that is also required for those students interested in obtaining their Pupil Personnel Services Credential. As such, most, if not all students in the class either had the prior year or are concurrently placed in a K-12 public school setting, and course instruction draws upon these experiences in generating vignettes and case examples. The course focuses on current policies, theories, and principles in working with individuals, families, and groups in public school settings. Classroom activities include opportunities for students to first learn as the evidence-informed crisis intervention models, and then to role play and practice how they might implement these points, using a sample school district policy as students practice engagement with parents, groups of students, administrators and, in some cases, necessary crisis collateral experiences.

In the Spring semester of the second year, students undertake a culminating experience (SW 895) or a master's thesis (SW 898) wherein they integrate competencies learned in their courses throughout the program with their field experience. Students undertake research or a project directly connected to their field placement or has implications for public human services policies, practice, and programs.

Examples of culminating experience from the last academic year included: an exploratory study on child welfare workers’ readiness to support foster youth in developing healthy intimate relationships, a finalist in the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) MSW Research Captstone Award; a know-your-rights curriculum for public high school students addressing the presence of student resource officers (SROs) in schools; an outcome evaluation of peer-to-peer mentorship programs in public high schools; an exploratory study of interpersonal violence (IPV) among men who have sex with men; an exploratory study of barriers to HIV treatment and PrEP among Black men who have sex with men; a model of practice with commercially sexually exploited children (CSEC) in the foster care system; a model of practice for employment transition of foster youth; a meta-synthesis on social services needs of LGBT older adults; a meta-synthesis on Filipino-American mental health care; and a meta-synthesis on child welfare interventions for children from families with mixed immigration statuses.

**Accreditation Standard M2.1.3:** The program describes how its areas of specialized practice extend and enhance the nine Social Work Competencies (and any additional competencies developed by the program) to prepare students for practice in the area(s) of specialization.

The program described how its area(s) of specialized practice extend and enhance the nine Social Work Competencies. However, it is unclear which are the behaviors for the area of specialized practice. The program described to the visitor how its area of specialized practice extends and enhances the nine Social Work Competencies (and any additional competencies developed by the program) to prepare students for practice in the area(s) of specialization by saying that they have one area of specialized practice, and that their core competencies are clearly outlined. There was a lack of clarity in the self-study; however, in the visit it became clear that students either enter the Individuals, Families, and Groups (IFG) practice emphasis or the Title IV-E IFG
emphasis. They specified that they have not developed advanced competencies but “expanded” the core competencies.

**SF State Response:**

The Individuals, Families and Groups Concentration

The Individuals, Families and Groups Concentration prepares our 2nd year MSW students to use strengths-based and evidence-based approaches to support and advocate for diverse individuals, families and groups. Through coursework and field internship placements, students develop and enhance their knowledge, values and skills to effectively engage with children, adolescents, adults, families, and groups. Students also increase their knowledge of the relevant policies that most effect these populations. This concentration provides a solid framework for students engaged in school social work, child welfare, juvenile justice, family-focused public agencies, or community-based private non-profits. Students will have mastered the nine core competencies and associated generalist behaviors in their foundation coursework. Through this advanced coursework, these emerging practitioners are expected to demonstrate mastery of the *Expanded Practice Behaviors* (under each Competency) as follows:

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

Students effectively engage in effective problem-solving and appropriate conflict resolution and utilize open communication.

Students can distinguish between personal and professional values in a practice context and exhibit an understanding of the ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions can influence professional judgment and behavior.

Students can engage with those from professions other than social work when involved in inter-professional collaboration and effectively employ consultation.

Students demonstrate a commitment through action to advancing the field of social work through advocacy and ongoing learning.

**Competency 2: Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice**

Students can identify forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination, including social, economic, political, and cultural exclusions that may marginalize and alienate, or alternatively contribute to privilege and power.

Students can address power and control factors that affect the experiences of diverse populations and modify intervention methods based on these evaluations.

Students can employ intervention methods that reflect cultural humility and sensitivity in relationships with clients and communities.
Competency 3: Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice

Students can articulate, analyze, and apply the ways in which every person, regardless of position in society, deserves fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education.

Students can advance social justice (through anti-oppressive practice) and economic justice (through poverty-aware practice) and demonstrate critical thinking on how to apply anti-oppressive practice in oppressive and restrictive systems and/or situations that run contrary to a social justice framework.

Competency 4: Engage in Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice

Students can engage in research that is inclusive of the clients, communities, and organizations involved and incorporates their participation in all aspects of the research process.

Competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice

Students can develop alternative policy solutions and interventions to social issues that are culturally relevant, appropriate, and sensitive to the diverse populations affected by these policies.

Students can engage action systems to achieve desired policy changes.

Students can evaluate the impact of change efforts, activist agendas, and practice results.

Competency 6: Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

Students can identify ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with a diversity of clients and constituencies.

Competency 7: Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

Students can apply critical and culturally informed practice and analyze differential diagnostic and assessment criteria including developmental and cultural considerations, as well as the impact of assessment methods, on client and community self-determination and empowerment.

Students can engage with individuals, families, groups, and organizations in ways that reflect cultural humility in assessing and analyzing their strengths and needs.
Students can demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may affect assessment and decision-making.

**Competency 8: Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities**

Students can plan with individuals, families, and groups to apply interventions through a variety of methods and strategies as appropriate to their contexts and needs for change.

Students can collaborate with clients in addressing long-term developmental goals and addressing obstacles that may be presented by institutional settings and their operational policies.

Students can create innovative therapeutic modalities contributing to culturally affirmative and individualized development and advocacy.

Facilitate growth and the realization of full potential among clients and communities.

**Competency 9: Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations,**

Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.

**Advanced Courses**

The Advanced courses below are only the *required* advanced courses for all IFG students. Elective courses are not described in this section below as not all IFG students take each elective course.

**SW 831 Advanced Social Casework**

This course adds a range of defined focus practice roles to Urban Generalist core knowledge and skills acquired in First Year foundational and transitional courses Social Work Practice Methods (S.W. 730) and Social Casework (S.W. 830). The presentation of knowledge and skills for each role is critically examined and narratively tailored with regard to cultural humility, trauma informed care, and personal developmental process considerations for urban service delivery system settings. Specific therapeutic modalities (e.g., CBT, DBT, ACT, motivational interviewing, narrative, mindfulness, psychodynamic and relational models) are aligned with the specific student internship settings, but they are addressed in terms of resources and interventions that relate to widespread areas of client experience. The topical areas of experience may include attachment/emotion dysregulation, anxiety and depression, conflict resolution, substance use and dependency, domestic and interpersonal violence, trauma support and service refinement, chronic illness and ability limitation, and death and dying. Actual process recordings (and discussion of challenging ethical dilemmas), case study case plan/treatment plan in class exercises, comparative methodology-setting-client group ‘tailored’ intervention exercises, and in class written reflection responses to case
presentations by community practitioners provide ongoing documentation of student engagement with, and application of, course content. The individualization of research-based evidence and best practices standards is adopted as a critical thinking medium for addressing the social justice implications of theory informed practice at the individual case, the organization operationalization, and the social policy analysis and advocacy levels of advanced social work practice.

All course objectives, including the **expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9** are assessed through the following assignments (and in class activities listed above): 1) Family origin paper, 2) Clinical case presentation paper, and 3) Personal model of practice paper and case presentation. The Family origin paper examines students' use of advanced conflict resolution skills and they are expected to analyze family dynamics in depth. The case presentation paper and process recordings examine students' ability to use consultation in their practice and how students' personal experiences and affective responses may affect their work on the case. The Process Recording Assignment evaluates students' abilities to examine how power and oppression, as well as clients' changes over time (evaluation). The Clinical case presentation paper: also examines students' ability to clinically assess clients related to DSM V diagnosis. In SW 810 students learned general DSM V diagnosis information, yet in SW 831 students are expected to conduct a thorough DSM V diagnosis (and a differential diagnosis), conduct a strengths-based assessment, examine mental health symptoms and needs, and describe the most effective evidence-based practice interventions (and therapeutic modalities).

**SW 832 Social Work Practice with Groups**

This course builds on the foundation practice courses (SW 730, Introduction to Practice and SW 830, Social Casework) competencies and was developed to provide students with advanced knowledge, values and skills associated with providing social work services to groups. The course is designed to teach students how to plan, develop, assess, facilitate and evaluate both treatment (mutual support, psychoeducational, therapeutic, social skills, process, etc.) and task groups (program development, community assessment, board meetings, senior management meetings, etc.). Group work theory guides the intervention content and is fully integrated into the course. Content related to: working with diverse group members, responding to power and control that may arise, and being a culturally responsive facilitator is also included in the readings, lectures, classroom activities and assignments. All course objectives, including the **expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 2, 7, 8** are assessed through the following assignments: 1) Midterm exam on theoretics, group work interventions and process, 2) Group Work Proposal Paper, and 3) Facilitation of a mock hour-long Psychoeducational Group for children, adolescents, or adults. The Mock Facilitation examines students' ability to be aware of power and oppressive dynamics in group settings. The Group Work Proposal Paper examine students' abilities to assess clients' readiness for group work, assess clients' mental and behavioral health needs prior to entering a clinical group setting. The Midterm examines students' understanding of group work interventions and how theories guide these interventions. This is also explored in the Mock Facilitation assignment – students needed to present the theory used in their group work curriculum.
SW 701 Social Policy Analysis

This course builds on the foundation history/policy course competencies (in SW 700, History and Philosophy Social Welfare) and is designed to provide students with an advanced understanding of key issues, concepts, and skills associated with policy analysis, the development of policy alternatives, and political action. In this course, students complete required readings, assignments, and exercises that develop their competencies as policy analysts and policy action planners and implementers. Assignments are designed to develop their knowledge, skills, and practice abilities to apply policy models and to utilize systematic and culturally sensitive frameworks for policy analysis. They identify and analyze a range of policy alternatives to address policy issues and problems, and they critically analyze with attention to implications for diverse populations, especially historically oppressed, under-served, and under-represented populations.

Students complete analyses of social policies that pertain to individual, families, groups, and communities in diverse societies. Students pinpoint diverse values (especially those pertaining to equitable rights and social justice) that influence the decision-making processes, probe the contexts (historical, political, social, cultural, economic, legal, and more) that shape and influence social policies and social policy alternatives, and pinpoint specific policy models that pertain to the policy analyses involved. Students are expected to address the impacts on civil and human rights for each step of the process involved. Students project in advance and create means of evaluating the policy change in terms of their impact on policy and practice results. Further, students plan steps and actions that can/should be taken to engage action systems to achieve desired policy changes and results to achieve greater equity and social justice. All course objectives, including the expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 3, 5 and 7, 8, 9 are assessed through the following assignments: 1) Policy brief and presentation, 2) Midterm exam connecting the New Jim Crow and federal policies, election platforms, and NASW Code of Ethics, 3) Anti-oppressive policy analysis paper, and 4) Impact Statement on a social issues and why we should be aware of it, and a Call to Action for the SW community. Students are able to illustrate their critical thinking skills related to anti-oppressive practice (with the midterm exam) and develop alternative policy solutions (with the policy brief assignment). Students are also able to hone the skills related to engaging with communities and planning with groups for change (with the impact statement and Call to Action assignment).

SW 721 Evaluative Research in Social Work

This is the first course (one option) of a 2-semester research sequence to complete a culminating project for the MSW degree at SF State. It builds on the foundational research course, SW 720. Under the weekly direction of a faculty thesis/project advisor and a thesis/project committee which approves the proposed project, students begin a research or scholarly project that contributes to the advancement of knowledge and practice in social work within this specialization. Research is defined broadly, including, but not limited to, case studies, single system designs, oral histories, community risk assessments, ethnographies, historical analyses, policy analyses, content analyses, and
agency-based research, as well as the development, implementation and analysis of qualitative interviews. Practice-relevant and/or agency-based research is encouraged. All course objectives, including the expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 4 and 9 are assessed through these assignments: 4 exams (research paradigm, quantitative data analysis, qualitative data analysis, evaluation project), final paper - proposal describing all phases of the thesis or project which must be approved by the committee. The culminating experience proposal includes; (a) statement of topic to be addressed (social indicators and interviews with stakeholders determine prevalence, incidence and need); (b) summary of the most current relevant literature; (c) statement of purpose; (d) definitions of terms, if appropriate; (e) cultural responsiveness relevance; and (f) relevance to the social work profession. A methods section that describes the entire process by which the student will successfully complete his/her research study or scholarly project is included in the proposal. The Final Paper can also be a Logic Model who will be doing an Evaluative Research Project for their culminating experience.

SW 741 Advanced Field Seminar (Fall Semester)
SW 741 Advanced Field Seminar (Fall Semester) This is the first of two semesters of advanced field placement in an agency with a focus on service for children and families, adults, and/or seniors. The second-year placement, and therefore the field seminar that accompanies it, is one that extends beyond a generalist practice model to engage student work and thinking to a more specialized population. For example, Title IV-E students are placed in a public child welfare setting in their second year and participate in a Title IV-E specific seminar course where this highly specialized practice is explored in detail. In this way, students are guided through an experience that promotes practicing the skills that will easily translate from one site, agency and/or county from one to their first post-MSW position. Similarly, other students who are not in the Title IV-E program but are otherwise continuing forward into their advanced year of study with a seminar class which is designed specifically for students to hone their practice and skill set with specified population settings including, hospitals, schools, law centers, and the like. The two-hour weekly seminar experience utilizes group process to develop advanced competencies in this area of specialization and further integrate theory and practice. Emphasis is placed on case presentation, demonstration and evaluation of practice skills, supervision use, cultural responsiveness, and professional ethics. Whereas in the first year, students were asked to present cases to the instructor for instructor guidance and structure/support, in the advanced seminar, students are asked to sign up to serve in the role of “consultants,” and to prepare in advance for their colleagues’ presentation. Students are further encouraged to identify a specific reason for their consultation, versus merely “presenting the case” or “going over the history.” Students are evaluated on all enhanced competencies through the following assignments: Learning agreement, process recordings, a journal of significant learning experiences, case analysis and reflection paper, and the field instructor evaluation of skills using the Learning Agreement tool. All course objectives, including the expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 are assessed.
SW 741 Advanced Field Seminar (Spring Semester)
This is the second of two semesters of field placement in an agency with a focus on service for children and families, adults, and/or seniors. As noted above, the second-year placement, and the field seminar that accompanies it, extends beyond a generalist practice model to engage with student field work in ways that apply critical thinking to more specialized populations. For example, Title IV-E students are placed in a public child welfare setting in this second year and participate in a Title IV-E specific seminar course where their higher-level practice is explored in detail. Similarly, other students who are continuing forward into the spring semester of their advanced year, find that they have the same classmates and the same instructor as the prior semester to support with continuity of the safe learning container and support from one primary person with the university for any challenge. A two-hour weekly seminar experience utilizes group process to develop advanced competencies in this area of specialization and further integrate theory and practice. Emphasis is placed on case presentation, demonstration and evaluation of practice skills, supervision use, cultural responsiveness, and professional ethics. With case presentations, students are asked to continue the process of honing their question to a specific reason for consultation, and to continue working on strategies to deliver complex information in a succinct manner. During case consultations in the advanced year, peers continue to serve in roles as case consultants who offer strategic suggestions about how one works with various groups or people in the community, etc.

Another example of expectations coming from the advanced seminar, is that students are able to apply a variety of frameworks to a given ethical dilemma, and to go beyond merely recognizing its presence, to consider how you felt about it. Students are evaluated on all enhanced competencies through the following assignments: Learning agreement, process recordings, a journal of significant learning experiences, case analysis and reflection paper, and the field instructor evaluation of skills using the Learning Agreement tool. All course objectives, including the expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9 are assessed.

SW 820 Advanced Research Methodology in Social Work
This is the first course of a 2-semester research sequence and one of two possible options for an advanced research course (other option is SW 721, see above) the MSW degree at SF State. It builds on the foundational research course, SW 720. Under the weekly direction of a faculty thesis/project advisor and a thesis/project committee which approves the proposed project, students begin a research or scholarly project that contributes to the advancement of knowledge and practice in social work within this specialization. Research is defined broadly, including, but not limited to, secondary data analyses, content analyses, agency-based research, and use of extant datasets, as well as the development, implementation and analysis of quantitative data. Practice-relevant and/or agency-based research is encouraged. Scholarly projects include but are not limited to grant writing and curriculum development. All course objectives, including the expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 4 and 9 are assessed through four assignments. Students will complete: 1) A survey instrument to collect sociodemographic information; 2) A qualitative interview guide with open ended questions; 3) A
culminating project proposal and presentation, and 4) In class computer lab statistics exercises.

SW 895/898 Culminating Project/Thesis
This is the second course of a two-semester research sequence (required in the Spring of 2nd year), and is a culminating experience incorporating analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of the prior coursework in the MSW curriculum. Implementation of knowledge, skills, values, and practice methods related to all size systems is emphasized using a culturally responsive perspective. This course is designed to be community-driven through assessment to implementation, working with clients, organizations, and public entities to understand key community strengths and challenges and then help communities identify evidence-based practices they can apply to prevent, reduce or lessen the challenge. All course objectives, including the expanded practice behaviors under competencies: 7 and 9 are assessed through one major paper assignment. Building from the research proposal in SW 721/820 in the first semester, students develop, implement, and evaluate the actual applied project. The main assignment is a final research report designed to articulate and demonstrate the development, implementation, and evaluation of the project that is a complementary deliverable aimed towards the community or stakeholder groups.

SW 831 Expanded Practice Behaviors Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 831 Advanced Social Casework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students effectively engage in effective problem-solving and appropriate conflict resolution, and utilize open communication with crisis intervention techniques.</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can demonstrate an ability to distinguish between personal and professional values in a practice context and exhibit an understanding of the ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions can influence professional judgment and behavior.</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can engage with those from professions other than social work when involved in inter-professional collaboration and effectively employ consultation.</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students demonstrate a commitment through action to advancing the field of</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice**
   - Students can identify forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination, including social, economic, political, and cultural exclusions that may marginalize and alienate, or alternatively contribute to privilege and power.
   - Students can identify ways of addressing power and control factors that affect the experiences of diverse populations and modify intervention methods based on these evaluations.
   - Students can employ intervention methods that reflect cultural humility and sensitivity in relationships with clients and communities.

6. **Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities**
   - Students can identify ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with a diversity of clients and constituencies.

7. **Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities**
   - Students can apply critical and culturally informed practice and analyze differential diagnostic and assessment criteria including developmental and cultural considerations, as well as the impact of assessment methods, on client and community self-determination and empowerment.
   - Students can engage with individuals, families, groups, and organizations in ways that reflect cultural humility in assessing and analyzing their strengths and needs.
- Students can demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may affect assessment and decision-making.

8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

- Students can plan with individuals, families and groups to apply interventions through a variety of methods and strategies as appropriate to their contexts and needs for change.
- Students can collaborate with clients in addressing long-term developmental goals and addressing obstacles that may be presented by institutional settings and their operational policies.
- Students can create innovative therapeutic modalities contributing to culturally affirmative and individualized development and advocacy.
- Facilitate growth and the realization of full potential among clients and communities.

9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

- Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.

Legend for all maps: I = Competency Introduced; E = Competency Enhanced.

**SW 832 Expanded Practice Behaviors Map**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 832 Social Group Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can identify ways of addressing power and control factors that affect the experiences of diverse populations and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
modify intervention methods based on these evaluations.
- Students can employ intervention methods that reflect cultural humility and sensitivity in relationships with clients and communities.

7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

- Students can apply critical and culturally informed practice and analyze differential diagnostic and assessment criteria including developmental and cultural considerations, as well as the impact of assessment methods, on client and community self-determination and empowerment.
- Students can engage with groups in ways that reflect cultural humility in assessing and analyzing their strengths and needs.

8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

- Students can plan with groups to apply interventions through a variety of methods and strategies as appropriate to their contexts and needs for change.
- Students can collaborate with clients in addressing long-term developmental goals and addressing obstacles that may be presented by institutional settings and their operational policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SW 701 Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 701 Social Policy Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can articulate, analyze, and apply the ways in which every person, regardless of position in society, deserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education

- Students can advance social justice (through anti-oppressive practice) and economic justice (through poverty-aware practice) and demonstrate critical thinking on how to apply anti-oppressive practice in oppressive and restrictive systems and/or situations that run contrary to a social justice framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Engage in policy practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students can develop alternative policy solutions and interventions to social issues that are culturally relevant, appropriate, and sensitive to the diverse populations affected by these policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can engage action systems to achieve desired policy changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can evaluate the impact of change efforts, activist agendas, and practice results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students can engage with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities in ways that reflect cultural humility in assessing and analyzing their strengths and needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Students can plan with groups to apply interventions through a variety of methods and strategies as appropriate to their contexts and needs for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate growth and the realization of full potential among clients and communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
   
   - Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.

**SW 721 Expanded Practice Behaviors Map**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 721 Evaluative Research in Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage in practice informed research, and research informed practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students can engage in research that is inclusive of the clients, communities, and organizations involved and incorporates their participation in all aspects of the research process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SW 820 Expanded Practice Behaviors Map**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 820 Advanced Research Methodology in Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engage in practice informed research, and research informed practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students can engage in research that is inclusive of the clients, communities, and organizations involved and incorporates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their participation in all aspects of the research process.

9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities
   - Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.

### SW 741 Fall Expanded Practice Behaviors Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 741 Advanced Field Seminar Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students can articulate, analyze, and apply the ways in which every person, regardless of position in society, deserves fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students can identify ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with a diversity of clients and constituencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students can apply critical and culturally informed practice and analyze differential diagnostic and assessment criteria including developmental and cultural considerations, as well as the impact of assessment methods, on client and...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community self-determination and empowerment.
- Students can engage with individuals, families, groups, and organizations in ways that reflect cultural humility in assessing and analyzing their strengths and needs.
- Students can demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may affect assessment and decision-making.

8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

- Students can plan with groups to apply interventions through a variety of methods and strategies as appropriate to their contexts and needs for change.
- Facilitate growth and the realization of full potential among clients and communities.

9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

- Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.

SW 741 Spring Expanded Practice Behaviors Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPAS Expanded Practice Behaviors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 741 Advanced Field Seminar Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic, and Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students can articulate, analyze, and apply the ways in which every person, regardless of position in society, deserves fundamental human rights such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Students can identify ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may impact their ability to effectively engage with a diversity of clients and constituencies.

### 7. Assess Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

- Students can apply critical and culturally informed practice and analyze differential diagnostic and assessment criteria including developmental and cultural considerations, as well as the impact of assessment methods, on client and community self-determination and empowerment.
- Students can engage with individuals, families, groups, and organizations in ways that reflect cultural humility in assessing and analyzing their strengths and needs.
- Students can demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which personal experiences and affective reactions may affect assessment and decision-making.

### 8. Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, Communities

- Students can plan with groups to apply interventions through a variety of methods and strategies as appropriate to their contexts and needs for change.
- Facilitate growth and the realization of full potential among clients and communities.

### 9. Evaluate Practice with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

- Students can identify evidence of change and development upon termination.
**Accreditation Standard 2.2.5:** The program describes how its field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and a minimum of 900 hours for master's programs.

The program describes that it provides a minimum of 900 hours of field education for the master's program. However, the program references that it would benefit from a standardized practice of recording hours.

**SF State Response:**

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

Given the small number of master-level students assigned to each field liaison, and the frequency of phone, email and in-person contact between school field liaisons, students and agency field instructors, the school has found that students' ability to achieve not only the established minimum of 900 hours, but the school requirement of 1200 hours
Thus, the Field Director has initiated a new practice being piloted in Spring 2018, with plans for full adoption in AY 2018-2019, whereby, as part of their grade for Field Education (SW 740), each student is expected to maintain a monthly timesheet for their time in internship, which records time in, time out, and time utilized for breaks/lunch. Students are responsible for bringing these forms to their field instructor every month for signature. The signature line on the form states that, upon signature, both parties further stipulate that they have participated in one hour of weekly supervision.

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

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

See Appendix A: Field Education Time Sheet

**Accreditation Standard M2.2.9:** 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 master’s students hold a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and have 2 years post-master’s social work 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.

The program described the credentials and practice experience of its field instructors. However, the program did not specify if field instructors for master’s students hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, the program did not explain how it assumes the responsibility for reinforcing the social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. If item #3 is required, the school will assist the organization/agency to formalize an arrangement where there is clear communication with the school and the organization/agency and the student, in terms of who is doing what, issues of confidentiality, etc.

5. If there is no other option, the Field Director will work with the field liaison to offer specific times to meet, that represents an increased level of contact between field liaison and the student/field instructor to discuss the student’s field education experiences.

6. The student and field liaison also meet during weekly field seminar classes, which serves as an additional opportunity to offer continued reinforcement of this standard.
Accreditation Standard M3.1.1: The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. The criteria for admission to the master’s program must include an earned baccalaureate degree from a college or university accredited by a recognized regional accrediting association. Baccalaureate social work graduates entering master’s social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

The program identified the criteria it uses for admission to the social work program. In addition, the program references a committee that examines similar courses in the BASW and MSW programs to ensure that the content is not repetitive. However, it is unclear how baccalaureate social work graduates entering master’s social work programs are not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

The site visitor is asked to have the program explain how baccalaureate social work graduates entering master’s social work programs do not to repeat what has been achieved in their baccalaureate social work programs.

SF State Response:

During the past three years, the SF State School of Social Work receives over 200 applications for admissions to the MSW program. The program is highly competitive as the School can only accommodate 25 new students each fall (14 Title IVE and 11 Non-Title IVE Individual, Families, and Groups [IFG] students).

At the time of writing this self-study, the SF State School of Social Work had not awarded advanced standing to MSW students. The School is in the process of exploring the development of an advanced standing cohort, but is aware of the constraints of programmatic change given that we are currently in the reaffirmation process. Despite not having an advanced standing track, since Spring 2017, the School of Social Work has put policies in place when a selected applicant has earned an undergraduate degree in social work from an accredited program by the CSWE or a recognized regional accrediting association.

Foundation course content is not repeated in other courses, even if the subject matter, or course title, may be similar. As student progress through the curriculum, they are expected to garner and display evidence that they have acquired higher levels of knowledge, skills, and practices. Bloom’s Taxonomy visually depicts the difference in cognitive levels students acquire as they move through the curriculum. Students are expected to perform at higher levels of cognition as they move through their respective programs and from baccalaureate to graduate social work education.

The MSW foundational curriculum is taught at a graduate level, with an understanding that master’s level students have more past professional social work experience. Thus,
MSW courses is significantly deeper than a baccalaureate program’s coursework, including more case vignettes, assignments that promote critical thinking, and general clinical content.

To ensure that the content is not repetitive, the SSW appoints a BASW/BSW Applicant Curriculum Review Committee to examine similar courses in the BASW and MSW programs. The BASW/BSW Applicant Curriculum Review Committee is responsible for the conduct of review and evaluation of graduates holding degrees from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by the CSWE. The Committee is comprised of the Director of the School of Social Work, the Chair of the MSW Admissions Committee, the Chair of the Curriculum Committee, and the Undergraduate Program Coordinator. The review and evaluation are conducted as follows:

Step 1: The Committee convenes when the SSW needs to review an admitted applicant with a BASW/BSW degree who has accepted a seat to determine courses that might be repetitive or similar;

Step 2: The Committee proactively reviews all transcripts and courses taken by the student; gets online of program where BASW was granted to read bulletin or course description; calls program if need be for course description; and

Step 3: The Committee votes on which courses to waive to avoid redundancy.

**Waiver of a course or course requirement** may be granted under one or more of the following conditions:

- Student has met the course requirements and associated competencies that are associated with a particular course required for the MSW program, within the last eight years (with a certain grade, such as B, or better).
- Taking a required course would duplicate previous efforts.

The School of Social Work will not waive practice and/or field education courses. Additional courses/electives will need to replace those classes waived. The onus of which courses to waive are responsibility of the Committee, not the student. The total required credit count for graduation is 60 credits/units.

For example, in Spring 2017, the SSW had admitted a total of 25 students. Of 25, two admitted applicants had earned a BASW/BSW degree from baccalaureate social work programs accredited by the CSWE. The SSW convened a BASW/BSW Applicant Curriculum Review Committee to examine similar courses in the BASW and MSW programs. The Committee proactively reviewed transcripts and courses taken; got online of program where BASW granted to read bulletin or course description; and called programs for course description. After the careful assessment, the Committee had determined that the two admitted students had met the SW710 Human Behavior and Social Environment course requirement and associated competencies with B or better, and they were granted a waiver of SW710. The two students were required to take an
additional master's-level course in the SSW or a related field to replace SW710 and had to get their advisors' approval before taking the said course.

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

The program described the procedures for evaluating applications and notifying applicants of the decision. However, it is unclear how the criteria outlined are used to evaluate applicant and make admissions decisions.

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

**SF State Response:**

This section details two parts: (1) policies & procedures for evaluating applications, and (2) policies & procedures for notifying applicants of the decision and any contingent conditions associated with admission.

### Evaluating Applications: Policies & Procedures

In this section, our focus is on as to how the criteria outlined are used to evaluate applicant and make admissions decisions.

As aforementioned above (M3.1.1), to be admitted to the School of Social Work, applicants must have a demonstrated record of achievement in a number of areas:

- **A.** Possession of a bachelor's degree or recognized equivalent from an accredited institution.
- **B.** A satisfactory scholastic average, generally a minimum grade-point average of B or better (3.0 on a 4-point scale).
- **C.** Writing Proficiency (A written response to an analytical question), See Appendix B, Writing Proficiency Rubric.
- **D.** Employment and Volunteer Experience (paid/unpaid work experience) in Social Work, Human Services, or Social Services with disenfranchised populations
- **E.** Professional/academic references
- **F.** Motivation, Commitment, & Parallel Values to Social Work
To be admitted to the SSW MSW program, a two-step process is used where the University Graduate Division and the SSW must both admit students.

Admission criteria A & B are evaluated and screened by the University Graduate Division (Review & Evaluation Process 1), and Admission criteria C through F are evaluated by the SSW MSW program (Review & Evaluation Process 2).

**Review & Evaluation Process 1: SF State Division of Graduate Studies (December)**

General University Admission Policies and Procedure for Evaluating Applications:

Admission Criteria: A (Possession of a bachelor’s degree or recognized equivalent from an accredited institution) & B (a satisfactory scholastic average, generally a minimum grade-point average of B or better [3.0 on a 4-point scale]) *(2017-2018 Admission Manual p. 9)*

Minimum requirements for admission to graduate study in the California State University are in accordance with Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 3, of the *California Code of Regulations*. At San Francisco State University, a student must at the time of enrollment:

1. hold an acceptable baccalaureate degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association, or shall have completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by appropriate campus authorities;

2. be in good academic standing at the last college or university attended;

3. have a 3.0 GPA in one of the following categories: undergraduate degree earned; last 60 semester (90 quarter) units attempted; documented post-baccalaureate degree; and

4. satisfactorily meet the professional, personal, scholastic, and other standards for graduate study, including qualifying examinations, as appropriate campus authorities may prescribe. In unusual circumstances, a campus may make exceptions to these criteria.

In the 1st Step of review, SF State Division of Graduate Studies screens all applications by transcripts. Applications that (1) have been verified as possession of a bachelor’s degree or equivalent from an accredited institution and (2) whose GPA scores are equal to or higher than 3.0 are sent to the School of Social Work for the MSW Departmental Review in December. Earliest denials are issued in December by the Division of Graduate Studies to those whose GPA under 3.0 and who do not possess a bachelor’s degree or equivalent from an accredited institution.

As described above, the applicant must first meet the requirements of the Graduate Division of San Francisco State University. Official transcripts must be submitted, which
conclusively establish the award of the Bachelor's degree. International students are evaluated on an equivalency basis where at least the minimum standards must be met.

Applicants who submit admission materials while completing their final work toward their Bachelor's degree must provide an official transcript prior to their formal acceptance by the University. The University requires all graduate students to have finished their baccalaureate degree before admission into Graduate Studies (see Graduate Admissions Criteria above).

**Review & Evaluation Process 2: School of Social Work (January – Mid March)**

Evaluation and Notification Related to Admission Criteria C through F:

**MSW Individuals, Families, and Groups (IFG) Admission Process**

The SSW's MSW application calls for documentation of work and volunteer experience related to social work values and practice. Applicants are asked to write narrative responses to a series of questions that relate to educational objectives, professional motivation, work/volunteer experience, as well as provide a writing assessment. All are designed to garner information about the applicant’s mesh with the School’s mission and goals.

A standardized evaluation form is used to award points in the designated areas (See **Appendix B: Admission Evaluation Form**):

- Writing assessment (Admission Criteria C-Writing Proficiency; 3 points; See **Appendix C: Rubric for Level 1 Writing Assessment**);
- Length and quality of work and volunteer experience related to social work values and practice (Admission Criteria D-Employment and Volunteer Experience; 5 points);
- Professional/academic reference (Admission Criteria E-Professional and Academic References; 3 points);
- Applicant’s values and perspectives consistent with the profession and the social work mission (Admission Criteria F-Motivation, Commitment, & Parallel Values to Social Work; 5 points);
- Diversity in practice (Admission Criteria F- Parallel Values to Social Work; 4 points); and
- BASW from an accredited undergraduate social work program diversity in practice (Admission Criteria F-Motivation & Commitment to Social Work; 1 points).

The MSW Admissions Committee handles MSW admissions. It is composed of tenured/tenure-track faculty and two full-time administrators (Field Director and Title IV-E Coordinator) but may include some part-time faculty teaching in the graduate program.
in a given year under an extenuating circumstance to be agreed upon the committee members.

- The School’s Administrative Office Coordinator, Office Assistants, and student assistants will screen all completed applications.
  - Incomplete applications (e.g., missing recommendation forms, etc.) will be screened out.
  - Completed applications are to be reviewed and separated into two applicant pools according to the emphasis and scholarship designated on the application form: (1) Individuals, Families, and Groups (IFG); and (2) Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program.
- All applicant and admissions material is maintained in a computer data environment by AOC, Office Assistants, and student assistants.
- Review of the MSW application is conducted by all tenured/tenure track faculty and Title IV-E Coordinator of the School of Social Work but may include some full-time or part-time faculty only under an extenuating circumstance to be agreed upon the Committee members.
- **For the IFG Applications,** the Admissions Committee Chair is responsible for assigning the application materials to the admission reviewers (“readers”) after they are trained in the review of the application with emphasis on selecting students with a standardized evaluation form developed by the School of Social Work.
- Each applicant’s material is independently reviewed by two faculty reviewers.
- Each reviewer receives e-mail notification when an application is ready for review.
- A standardized evaluation form is used to award points in the designated areas as aforementioned:
  - Reviewers each, independently review and render their evaluation scores, and provide supporting comments if appropriate.
  - The scores are then tabulated by the Admissions Administrative Assistant.
- **Folders with discrepant scores:**
  - 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.
  - Folders with the same scores are sent to a third faculty reader for further review to break a tie.
  - Folders with the writing assessment scores lower than 2 points are sent to a third faculty reader for further review of the writing assessment only. The three writing assessment scores are then averaged for arriving at the final writing assessment score, but do not have an impact on the total scores of the folders.

**Ranking the Candidates and Final Decisions (Mid March – April)**
- Approximately 25 candidates are considered to be admitted in Fall 2018.
• Two reviewer scores are used by the Committee Chair in making final decisions on admissions.
• The top tier of 25 candidates will be offered admission.
• The second tier (about 50 applicants rank-ordered) will be placed on waitlist.

**Notifying Applicants of the Decision: Policies & Procedures (and Any Contingent Conditions Associated with Admission)**

**Non-Title IV-E IFG**

**Notice of Admission or Denial**

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

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

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

The MSW Admissions Office, in consultation with the Committee Chair and the Division of Graduate Studies, must login to Campus Solutions and take one of the following actions for denials or waitlist:
- Enter the waitlist decision for those who are waitlisted (this will place the student in a holding pattern and the Division of Graduate Studies can hold)
- For those who are outright denials, then enter “deny.”

- Admitted applicants must respond to offers of admission within a specified timeframe (about 2 weeks).
As withdrawals occur by students who have been offered admission or if class size has not been reached, places are filled from the waitlist by the following:

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

MSW Orientation for the admitted MSW students is planned, organized, and implemented by the School of Social Work at least once per year (approximately in May).

Title IV-E Evaluation of Applications

All MSW applications go through the same evaluation process. Once students are ranked based on their MSW application, a committee formed by a faculty and the Title IV-E Project Coordinator review their Title IV-E application, including their personal statement, to look for case management experience and/or experience in direct services, an understanding of the Title IV-E program, a commitment to Title IV-E populations and working in the public sector, and their ability to be self-reflective. We also look for candidates that are county social service agency employees, that reflect the cultural/ethnic diversity of the child welfare population and that speak a high demand language. Once we review their applications, we rank them again and offer interviews to the top 20 students on our list.

The interviews are carried out by a panel of a School of Social Work Faculty, a Child Welfare Supervisor and the Title IV-E Project Coordinator. The interviews consist of 7 questions intended to inform us about the compatibility and commitment to the field of child welfare. Each question is ranked on a scale of 0-8, with a maximum score of 56 (See Appendix D: IVE Interview Questions). The ranking is as follows:

- 0-1: Demonstrates no/little knowledge/ability/potential
- 2-3: Demonstrates fair knowledge/ability/potential
- 4-6: Demonstrates good knowledge/ability/potential
- 6-8: Demonstrates exceptional knowledge/ability/potential.

After each interview, the panel members review their scores and make a decision regarding the candidate's suitability for the program. After all interviews are conducted, the Project Coordinator reviews the scores, notes from the panelists and assigns points for priority status. Priority is given to county social service agency employees, cultural/ethnic diversity reflective of child welfare population, and fluency in a high demand language. These characteristics are given a score of 0-5, 0=no and 5=yes. (See Appendix E: Priority Status).
Title IV-E applicants are also asked to participate in a 30 minute, on site, written examination to evaluate their writing skills. Given that child welfare practice requires strong writing skills, we ask our applicants to write a short response to an issue provided to the them. The Project Coordinator reviews their writing sample using a scale of 1-6 (See Appendix F: IVE Scoring Sheet and Writing Exercise):

- 6=outstanding: presents a cogent, well-articulated examination of the issue and conveys meaning skillfully
- 5=strong: generally thoughtful, well-developed examination of the issue and conveys meaning clearly
- 4=adequate; presents a competent examination of the issue and conveys meaning with acceptable clarity
- 3=limited: some competence in addressing the specific task directions, in examining the issue and conveying meaning, but is obviously flawed
- 2=seriously flawed; response largely disregards the specific task directions and/or demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing
- 1=fundamentally deficient: response demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing.

This writing sample is not part of their overall score; however, it is used to assess whether applicants will need additional writing support if they enter the program.

Notification of Admission Status

The Project Coordinator makes a final decision about admissions based on the interview scores, the priority status, and the recommendation by the panelists. Once this list is vetted by the Project Coordinator and School of Social Work Director, letters of admission (See Appendix G: IVE Letter of Admission) are sent out, together with a Stipend Acceptance Form (See Appendix H: IVE Stipend Acceptance Form). Students are given approximately two weeks to return the Stipend Acceptance Form informing our School of their decision to accept or decline admission.

The Title IV-E Program offers 14 stipends each year. Those students who do not make the top 14, after the interviews have been conducted, but were considered appropriate for the program are placed on a wait list in rank order. Students are informed of their wait list status and are given a date by which the School will inform them of any changes. If one of the 14 students offered admissions declines the offer, we move down our waitlist. Those students who were found not to be eligible for the stipend are informed via email, explaining they are still eligible for admissions into the MSW Program.

Diversity in the Applicant Pool and Admissions

The Bay Area, and San Francisco in particular, has become one of the most expensive places to live in the U.S. Currently, to rent a bedroom in San Francisco can be as expensive as $2,450 per month, while the median rent of a one-bedroom apartment is $3,420 (Brinklow, A, 2017). The result of these exorbitant housing prices has led to a mass exodus of working and middle-class families, particularly minorities and people of
color. According to the 2017 U.S. Census Bureau, San Francisco has a population of 870,887 residents 48% of whom are Caucasian (non-Hispanic), 33% Asian, 15% Hispanic/Latino, 6% African American, 4% more than one race, 4% Alaskan/American Indian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islanders and others. The African American population in San Francisco has declined in the last several decades. For example, according to the 2000 Census African-Americans made up 7.8% of the total population, compared to 6% in 2017, almost a 2% decrease. This continued trend of people of color moving outside of San Francisco and the Bay Area has also impacted the diversity of our applicant and student pool.

In addition to gentrification in San Francisco, the School of Social Work at San Francisco State is one of four Universities that offer an undergraduate and graduate degree in Social Work in the Bay Area. In closest proximity to San Francisco State University is University of California, Berkeley (21.7 miles). Next in proximity is California State University East Bay (38.4 miles) and finally, San Jose State University (50 miles). This allows applicants to apply to all four universities when considering a career path in social work. It also provides applicants with an opportunity to live in a less expensive area than San Francisco. Many students apply to our School but decide to go to another State University located in a less expensive area, like Hayward, for example. The average rent of a one-bedroom apartment in Hayward ranges from $1,600 to 2,100, considerably less than San Francisco. As housing costs continue to rise, San Francisco State University will continue to face challenges in recruiting and retaining a diverse student body.

Diversity in the Applicant Pool for the MSW Title IVE Stipend Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of African American Applicants to the MSW Title IV-E Program</th>
<th>Percentage of African Americans Offered Admission to Title IV-E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>18.18% of the 11.6% who applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8.89%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we look at the applicant pool to the Title IV-E, MSW Program, Years 2012-2018, we see a somewhat consistent decline of African American applicants. With the exception of 2016, our African American applicant pool was higher than that of the general population of San Francisco, as seen in the Census data provided above. Moreover, the percentage of African Americans offered admissions was generally higher than the percentage of African American applicants to the Title IV-E program. The Title IV-E Program continues to make active effort to recruit and retain African Americans and minorities.
represented in the child welfare population. If you look at the attached table A (Ethnicity of those who Applied and were offered Admission to the Title IV-E Program at SF State 2012-2108), you will see 75% of students offered admission into our program are representative of a minority group. Compared to the San Francisco 2017 Census data, our program has an over representation of minorities and people of color. From these data, we know we are on the right track to professionalizing a workforce in child welfare that mirrors the population served in the Bay Area and across the state of California. We also must continue our efforts to recruit African American students while continuing to sustain the diversity of other minority groups.

In terms of recruitment and retention efforts, our generous stipend of $18,500 per year has allowed many minorities and students of color to access graduate education. The stipend continues to draw first generation college graduates, immigrants and people of color. We also carry out yearly recruitment efforts in Child Welfare County Agencies, where many minorities work in the Eligibility Department with an undergraduate degree, but cannot access higher paying jobs in Child Welfare, without a master's degree. Many County agencies provide a leave of absence with paid benefits so their employees can attend a full-time master's program. With the support of their agencies and the Title IV-E stipend, many of these employees are able to return to school for graduate education.

Reference


https://www.numbeo.com/cost-of-living/in/Hayward-CA-United-States

Accreditation Standard M3.2.4: The master's social work program identifies no fewer than six full-time faculty with master's degrees in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and whose principal assignment is to the master's program. The majority of the full-time master's social work program faculty has a master's degree in social work and a doctoral degree, preferably in social work.

The program identified the baccalaureate and master's program faculty. However, it is not clear how the six faculty have full-time assignment and principal assignment to the master’s program.

SFSU MSW Program Response

Table 1 details the principal assignments for the MSW program. As shown, for both 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 the SSW was out of compliance. The explanation is outlined below.
The AY 2016/2017 and AY 2017/2018 witnessed significant change in the school of social work (SSW). As shown in Table 1 below, principal assignments of teaching MSW courses are detailed. The table shows that we were out of compliance with principal assignments during AY 2016/2017. The teaching schedule had been set prior to the new director's arrival and changes could not be made at the late date of when Dr. Jones started. During AY 2016/17 the following faculty were principally assigned to the MSW program: Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Takahashi, and Dr. Jones.

However, during the AY 2017/2018 semester, we show slight improvements to AS 3.2.4. Given the retirement of both Drs. Levy and Redman, we had 6 full time tenured faculty and 1 full time lecturer on faculty. Four of the faculty were principally assigned to the MSW program: Dr. Shapiro, Dr. Lenz-Rashid, Dr. Hermoso, and Dr. Jones.

Lastly, as shown in Table 2, principal assignments for AY 2018/2019 are shown. One new development is noted. In March, 2018 the school of social work became aware that a tenured faculty member would be returning to the school of social work beginning Spring, 2019. This faculty member previously taught at SF State SSW, has been gone for many years, and is returning to full teaching duties, commencing spring 2019. The data in Table 2 shows that the following faculty are principally assigned to the MSW program: Drs. Lee, Takahashi, Shapiro, Lenz-Rashid, and Gupta.

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

*MSW Courses are all those indicated by the numbers 700 and higher. The course numbers of 300, 400, and 500 are BASW courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Spring 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Spring 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Shapiro</td>
<td>730, 740, 741, 840</td>
<td>740, 741, 830</td>
<td>730, 740, 741, 840</td>
<td>740, 741, 760, 830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% assign to MSW</td>
<td>100% assign to MSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Levy</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>770, 300</td>
<td>50% assigned to MSW</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Redman</td>
<td>Full assign to field director</td>
<td>Full assign to field director</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeonshim Lee</td>
<td>820, 502, 503</td>
<td>400, 502, 503</td>
<td>820, 502, 503</td>
<td>895, 504, 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>17% assign to MSW</td>
<td>33% assign to MSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonja Lenz-Rashid</strong></td>
<td>502, 503, 895, 504, 505, 832, 401, 810, 843, 400</td>
<td>20% assign to MSW</td>
<td>60% assign to MSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joyce Hermoso</strong></td>
<td>721, 352, 895, 450, 721, 352, 780, 895, 450</td>
<td>50% assign to MSW</td>
<td>60% assign to MSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Susanna Jones</strong></td>
<td>502, 503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sonia Melara | 855, 302, 350, 780, 301, 350, 855, 302, 350, 301, 350, 304, 502, 503, 505 | 29% assign to MSW | 11% assign to MSW |

*SMS Courses are all those indicated by the numbers 700 and higher. The course numbers of 300, 400, and 500 are BASW courses.

Table 2: AY 2018-2019 Teaching Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerry Shapiro</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Spring 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>730, 740, 741, 401</td>
<td>740, 741, 760, 470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% assigned to MSW Program (6 divided by 8 = 75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rita Takahashi</th>
<th>701, 710, 410</th>
<th>780, 810, 402</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67% assigned to MSW Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeonshim Lee</th>
<th>700, 820, 300</th>
<th>830, 895, 301</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67% assigned to MSW Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joyce Hermoso</th>
<th>721, 352, one course assigned time as BASW coordinator</th>
<th>895, 450, one course assigned time as BASW coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33% assigned to MSW Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonja Lenz-Rashid</th>
<th>740, 741, 832</th>
<th>740, 741, 843</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% assigned to MSW Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rashmi Gupta</th>
<th>On Leave</th>
<th>720, 831, 400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67% assigned to MSW Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accreditation Standard M3.3.4(c): The program describes the procedures for determining 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 50% assigned time is required at the master’s level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

The program specified that the program director has at least 50% assigned time to carry out the administrative functions specific to responsibilities of the social work program. However, the program did not describe the procedures for determining the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe the procedures for determining the program director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program.

**SF State Response:**

The procedures for determining the MSW program director’s assigned time are as follows. The director of the school of social work has 100% assigned time from teaching to administer the operations of the school. For many decades, the director of the school of social work has had full release from teaching to focus exclusively on administrative duties of the school. The director also holds the role as MSW program coordinator. Given that the enrollment cap of admitting 25 MSW students each fall is still in effect, Dr. Jones holds both positions of MSW coordinator and director. Slightly more than half of the assign time (51%) is devoted to the role of MSW coordinator. This assign time is sufficient to complete the administrative duties necessary to run the program.

Accreditation Standard M3.3.5(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 50% assigned time is required for master’s programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

The program states that the field director’s teaching equates less than half of her workload responsibilities and duties. However, the program did not specify that the field director receives at least 50% assigned time. In addition, the program did not describe the procedures for calculating the field director’s assigned time to provide
educational and administrative leadership for field education or demonstrate that it is sufficient.

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe the procedures for calculating the field director’s assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. Additionally, the site visitor is asked to have the program confirm if the field director received least 50% assigned time to carry out the administrative functions of the field education program. In addition, the site visitor is asked to have the program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

**SF State Response:**

**AY 2016/2017**

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

**AY 2017-2018**

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

**AY 2018-2019**

For the AY 2018-2019, Christine Scudder will be released from the one section of field seminar and therefore 100% assigned to her role as Field Director.

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

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

The site visitor is asked to have the program describe how the resources (personnel, time and technological support) are sufficient to administer its field education program to meet its mission and goals.
In addition to the full-time appointment of Christine Scudder, LCSW, as our field director, we have a half-time staff member, Mira Pasikov, who provides administrative support for the field program at 8-10 hours per week. The new field director is working together with Mira to codify the job duties that are required to support the field program. These duties include redirecting community inquiries community about developing new field sites from the personal email of the field director, to a general field education email address managed by the administrative assistant, who is trained to address and assist with general inquiries. The field staff administrative assistant is also being trained to input newly approved field agency data into the S4 field site database, which is made available to students in reviewing available field placements.

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

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

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

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

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

<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>TOTAL</td>
<td>$1,483,540</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,356,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44
Technological Resources: Includes costs for IT equipment as well as reprographics.
Other: Work Study Allocations

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

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

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

**SF State Response:**

The SF State SSW submitted its’ self-studies on December 1, 2017 and had our site visit on March 5 and 6, 2018. Given the quick turnaround time and the small faculty, we have been challenged to make large scale changes to the MSW program based on outcome assessment that draws clear links to the data.

We have, however, made a commitment in the ways we can to engage in this work and we have made strides.

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

**Charges to the Curriculum Committee**

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

- 3: Advance Human Rights, Social, Economic and Environmental Justice;
- 5: Engage in Policy Practice; and
- 6: Engage with IFGOC.

As a result of our assessment and failure to meet benchmarks, we have started to make improvements to our curriculum. In the immediate, we have decided to focus on competency 5. We have revised an assignment for SW 701 (Social Welfare Policy Analysis), which is the course that we have identified that covers competency 5: Engage in Policy Practice. In the revision of a required assignment for SW 701 we have more explicitly linked the competency and behaviors to the assignment. We will continue to
work on our data and curriculum feedback loop and begin discussing ways to address the learning needs of our students with competencies 3 and 6 as well.

Please See Appendix I for the complete assignment instructions, grading, and presentation rubrics for SW 701 that addresses competency 5.

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

Curricular Re-Design
The SSW intends to embark on a curriculum re-design for the entire MSW curriculum and plans to partner with local SF agencies and social work practitioners (many of whom are alumni) to re-design the curriculum. The idea is that faculty would work in pairs and run focus groups with agency partners/MSW practitioners to help revise curriculum. The SSW plans to begin this process fall 2018. Done well, the process will take more than one year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Total Monthly Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Hours</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total hours completed in field**

| _________ |

**Signatures**

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

*By signing this form I attest to meeting the minimum one-hour weekly supervision requirements between student & Field Instructor.*
MSW Appendix B
San Francisco State University
School of Social Work (FINAL)

Admit Year Fall 2018 Confidential Admission Evaluation Form (MSW)

Applicant's Name: _______________________________ and ID # ________________________

Date

******* PLEASE GIVE EVIDENCE FOR EACH CRITERION *******

I. ACADEMIC POTENTIAL
   A. GPA (NO POINTS)
   B. BASW from an accredited undergraduate social work program (0-1pt)

II. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE POTENTIAL
   A. Length and quality of volunteer and paid employment experience in social work or the human service field working with disadvantaged communities within the last 10 years (0-5 pts)
   B. Professional/academic references (0-3 pts)

III. VALUES & PERSPECTIVES CONSISTENT WITH PROFESSION & SSW MISSION (0-5 pts)

IV. DIVERSITY IN PRACTICE
    Personal and/or professional knowledge of, appreciation for, and experience with human diversity, especially with respect to populations who have been under-represented, under-served, and historically oppressed (0-4 pts)

V. WRITING ASSESSMENT (See Level I Rubric of Writing Assessment)
   Personal statement is assessed in six areas: Completion; Knowledge & Understanding of Social Work; Critical Analysis & Development; Clarity & Writing Style/Language Usage; Organization & Structure; and Credibility. Each area is rated on a scale (0-3 pts) describing how consistently personal statement meets standards (Use an average score 0-3 pts)

Total Points

Potential Title IV-E Candidate: 

Evidence Notes:
# Rubric for Level I Writing Assessment: Masters of Social Work (2018 Admission)

Student Name: ___________________ Date: ___________________ Rater’s Code: ___________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Not Satisfactory (0)</th>
<th>Emergent (1)</th>
<th>Adequate (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Completion:</strong></td>
<td>Paper does not address each topic.</td>
<td>Evidence of some awareness about social work related issues, but understanding is tangential.</td>
<td>Discusses social work related issues.</td>
<td>Paper complies with specific guidelines provided by school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper does not follow page-count requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequately reflect awareness of successful strategies to address issues in social work.</td>
<td>Paper sufficiently addresses each topic specified on the instruction description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Knowledge &amp; Understanding of Social Work</strong></td>
<td>Relies primarily on popular notions of social work instead of professional and life experience/research-based evidence.</td>
<td>Supports evidence is presented, but is biased</td>
<td>Discusses social work related issues.</td>
<td>Consistently &amp; effectively demonstrates deep knowledge of the topic related to social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not demonstrate the full range of possible issues in social work.</td>
<td>Broad &amp; predictable arguments</td>
<td>Adequately reflect awareness of successful strategies to address issues in social work.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a multi-layered understanding of research-based evidence in social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not reflect the purpose and values of MSW education.</td>
<td>Shows little knowledge or overly simple perspective on the topic.</td>
<td>Adequately addresses the purpose of SW education.</td>
<td>Consistently identifies and applies successful and/or original strategies to address issues in social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate to meet the purpose and values of MSW education.</td>
<td>Some integration of the materials, but overall insufficient coverage of the topic.</td>
<td>Sufficiently meet the purpose of SW.</td>
<td>Sufficiently meet the purpose of SW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Critical Analysis &amp; Development</strong></td>
<td>Shows a flawed or missing statement</td>
<td>Fairly focused &amp; demonstrates knowledge of the topic</td>
<td>Paper reflects critical thought and logical development of arguments based on factual, theoretical, or value premises</td>
<td>Paper defines terms that are key to the central topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obvious missing or irrelevant evidence</td>
<td>Arguments are clear &amp; supported with evidence and/or reasoning.</td>
<td>Paper defines terms that are key to the central topic.</td>
<td>Paper develops each new idea or content area with relevant and specific supporting evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack original analysis</td>
<td>Adequate coverage of the topic and the integration of materials</td>
<td>Integration of materials of the topic.</td>
<td>Integration of materials of the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack sufficient complexity or perspective of the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of sufficient coverage of the topic and the integration of materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows a flawed thesis or lacks focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clarity &amp; Writing Style / Language Usage</td>
<td>Overall inappropriate level of formality throughout writing (e.g. word choice, sentence structure is too (in)formal)</td>
<td>Begins to show some clarity and coherence, yet deficiencies in their writing.</td>
<td>Appropriate level of proofreading errors.</td>
<td>Sentences are clear &amp; coherent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and structure or syntax make writing incoherent.</td>
<td>Inappropriate level of formality is used in many parts of the writing.</td>
<td>Some levels of clarity.</td>
<td>There are few proofreading errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and structure or syntax limit the reader's ability to comprehend the author's meaning.</td>
<td>Rare errors in tone and style.</td>
<td>Sentences are concise and/or easily understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation, and structure or syntax exist, but most do not affect the ability to comprehend the author's meaning.</td>
<td>Word choice is appropriate and precise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Writer uses punctuation and mechanics proficiently.</td>
<td>Writer uses active voice most of the time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Organization &amp; Structure</th>
<th>Grammar, spelling, punctuation, and structure or syntax make writing incoherent.</th>
<th>Evidence of attempted organization exists, but is inconsistent and meaning is compromised.</th>
<th>Paragraphs or overall organizations are good.</th>
<th>Paper is well-organized.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attempts to support claims with evidence but is inadequate or incomplete.</td>
<td>May have rare lapses in organization.</td>
<td>An introduction clearly described the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs an adequate argument and uses appropriate evidence to support claims.</td>
<td>Conclusion makes connections between content areas and describes the relevance of present evidence to the overall topic.</td>
<td>Body of paper relates directly to the topic described in the title and introduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correctly describes overall topic.</td>
<td>APA headings are used appropriately.</td>
<td>Conclusion makes connections between content areas and describes the relevance of present evidence to the overall topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraphs are focused on one topic.</td>
<td>APA headings are used appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph and organizations are good, &amp; transitions are good within and between paragraphs/sections.</td>
<td>Paragraph and organizations are good, &amp; transitions are good within and between paragraphs/sections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Credibility</th>
<th>Sources not cited or many sources incorrectly attributed within writing.</th>
<th>Numerous missing or inaccurate sources.</th>
<th>Most sources cited completely and accurately.</th>
<th>Paper uses APA style to cite a variety of credible sources.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All sources cited completely and accurately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Analytic essay is assessed in six areas above. Each area is rated on a scale describing how consistently analytic essay meets standards (Use an average score of all 6 areas for writing assessment; 0-3 points).
- Credibility is rated only when applicant cites work of others in writing assessment; Otherwise, the rest five areas will be rated and averaged.
- MSW Level I Writing Assessment Rubric is based on a modification of several sources, including:
  - GRN890: Integrative & Culminating Experience Assessment Rubric
  - Rubric for MA Level II Writing in Communication Studies.
  - MSW Level II Writing Assessment

***Overall Comments: Summarize specific strengths and areas for attention:
Applicant’s Name: ______________________________

SFSU Title IV-E Interview Questions
Class of 2018-2019

Score applicant’s response to each question taking into consideration their ability to conceptualize, organize, and present ideas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>Demonstrates no/little knowledge/ability/potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Demonstrates fair knowledge/ability/potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Demonstrates good knowledge/ability/potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Demonstrates exceptional knowledge/ability/potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oral Interview page 1

Q1. What factors influenced your decision to pursue a career in public child welfare?

- Career goals are congruent with the Title IV-E mission
- Expresses sincere commitment to public child welfare as a career choice
- References experience with clientele similar to public child welfare population

Comments:

Q2. Why do you think parents neglect or abuse their children?

- Demonstrates depth of understanding of the dynamics of abuse/neglect (i.e.: substance abuse, mental illness, lack of parenting skills, etc.)
- Willingness to see client’s strengths
- Non-judgmental and aware of personal biases

Comments:

Q3. What do you see as the role of Child Protective Services (CPS)?

- Demonstrates understanding for the complex role of a child welfare worker
- Acknowledges that protecting a child is the central role of a child welfare worker.

Comments:
### Oral Interview page 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4. The families served by the child welfare system in California come from many different ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds. Please discuss your background in working with clients who are different from yourself? (You may use an example from your past work to help illustrate your answer.)</td>
<td><em>(0-8)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Portrays comfort in working with people who are different from self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sensitivity/awareness of diverse cultures, backgrounds, and lifestyles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Please tell us what values you possess that make you an ideal candidate for this stipend program focusing in child welfare?</td>
<td><em>(0-8)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reveals value perspective that drives one's methods and practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrates one's capacity to critically think, apply, and self reflect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Connects the degree to which one's values perspective is congruent to the School's mission especially with regard to equity and social justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Addresses multiple areas of cognitive abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6. How do you feel about taking on a role where you have the authority to remove children, and how do you feel about working with involuntary clients?</td>
<td><em>(0-8)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrates understanding of the role of child welfare social workers and their comfort level with the possibility of removal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrates engagement skills, as well as ability to overcome the difficulties in working with involuntary clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oral Interview Score: ________
Applicant’s Name: ________________________________
SFSU Title IV-E Interview Questions
Class of 2018-2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Status</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. County Social Service agency employee. <em>(yes: 5 points, no: 0 points)</em></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural/ethnic diversity reflective of the child welfare client population in California.</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fluent in a high-demand language. <em>(Spanish fluency receives 5 points)</em></td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priority Status Score

(0.15)
Title IV-E Scoring Sheet – Writing exercise

Score 6 Outstanding
In addressing the specific task directions, a 6 response presents a cogent, well-articulated analysis of the issue and conveys meaning skillfully.

A typical response in this category:

- articulates a clear and insightful position on the issue in accordance with the assigned task
- develops the position fully with compelling reasons and/or persuasive examples
- sustains a well-focused, well-organized analysis, connecting ideas logically
- conveys ideas fluently and precisely, using effective vocabulary and sentence variety
- demonstrates superior facility with the conventions of standard written English (i.e., grammar, usage and mechanics), but may have minor errors

Score 5 Strong
In addressing the specific task directions, a 5 response presents a generally thoughtful, well-developed analysis of the issue and conveys meaning clearly.

A typical response in this category:

- presents a clear and well-considered position on the issue in accordance with the assigned task
- develops the position with logically sound reasons and/or well-chosen examples
- is focused and generally well organized, connecting ideas appropriately
- conveys ideas clearly and well, using appropriate vocabulary and sentence variety
- demonstrates facility with the conventions of standard written English, but may have minor errors

Score 4 Adequate
In addressing the specific task directions, a 4 response presents a competent analysis of the issue and conveys meaning with acceptable clarity.

A typical response in this category:

- presents a clear position on the issue in accordance with the assigned task
- develops the position with relevant reasons and/or examples
- is adequately focused and organized
- demonstrates sufficient control of language to express ideas with acceptable clarity
- generally demonstrates control of the conventions of standard written English, but may have some errors

**Score 3 Limited**
A 3 response demonstrates some competence in addressing the specific task directions, in analyzing the issue and in conveying meaning, but is obviously flawed.

A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:
- is vague or limited in addressing the specific task directions and in presenting or developing a position on the issue or both
- is weak in the use of relevant reasons or examples or relies largely on unsupported claims
- is limited in focus and/or organization
- has problems in language and sentence structure that result in a lack of clarity
- contains occasional major errors or frequent minor errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that can interfere with meaning

**Score 2 Seriously Flawed**
A 2 response largely disregards the specific task directions and/or demonstrates serious weaknesses in analytical writing.

A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:
- is unclear or seriously limited in addressing the specific task directions and in presenting or developing a position on the issue or both
- provides few, if any, relevant reasons or examples in support of its claims
- is poorly focused and/or poorly organized
- has serious problems in language and sentence structure that frequently interfere with meaning
- contains serious errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that frequently obscure meaning

**Score 1 Fundamentally Deficient**
A 1 response demonstrates fundamental deficiencies in analytical writing.

A typical response in this category exhibits ONE OR MORE of the following characteristics:
• provides little or no evidence of understanding the issue
• provides little or no evidence of the ability to develop an organized response (e.g., is disorganized and/or extremely brief)
• has severe problems in language and sentence structure that persistently interfere with meaning
• contains pervasive errors in grammar, usage or mechanics that result in incoherence

February 27, 2018

Dear XXXX,

Congratulations! We are pleased to inform you that you have been selected as a recipient of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project at the School of Social Work Master’s Program at SF State University. Due to the number of highly qualified candidates, we need to receive confirmation that you accept this offer. Please complete and return the Stipend Award Acceptance Agreement enclosed with this packet. Please read it thoroughly, accept or decline the stipend offer, sign, and date.

To ensure your participation in the stipend program, please return all of the forms to the School of Social Work office by XXXX. You may either mail to the address above or drop it off at the SFSU Social Work Office, HSS 222. If you accept our offer, you will receive a packet of information regarding our trainings and workshops that will take place the week before school begins in August. The packet will also include forms that you will need to fill out.

We will have a welcoming orientation on May; therefore, please keep us up-to-date with any changes in contact information so we can notify you about the orientation program and other workshops. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me at 415.405.3482.

Once again, congratulations and welcome to the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project!

Warmly,

Gabriela Fischer, MSW, LCSW  
Title IV-E Project Coordinator  
415.405.3482

Susanna Jones, PhD, MSW  
Director & Professor, School of Social Work
In applying for the full time Title IV-E Child Welfare stipend of $18,500, I understand this award requires that I fulfill all of the following requirements:

- Maintain a 3.0 GPA and full-time enrollment status in the MSW program.
- Complete and receive a grade of CREDIT for the required field work (first year placement will either be a non-profit agency that serves IV-E children and families or a public agency, and second year placement will be in a public child welfare agency)
- Complete the full-time, 2-year model of the MSW program within a normative period.
- Attend required Child Welfare Trainings and complete required coursework including:
  - The first and second year SW 740/741 Field Work courses.
  - A final project, SW 895/898, with emphasis on children and families.
  - Specialized trainings in the Fall and Winter semester and Spring semester for second year students.
- Attend regularly scheduled Title IV-E meetings and activities. Remain eligible for employment with county child welfare agencies. I understand that felony or misdemeanor crimes committed during my time in school could result in termination from employment.
- Within six months after receiving my MSW degree, complete the two-year work obligation in a public child welfare agency within 75 miles of my home or if no such position is available, I understand that I must seek appropriate employment in any available county within the State of California in a public child welfare agency.

I understand that, under advice from the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), this is a taxable stipend. Any questions about taxes should be referred to my tax consultant.

Since this program will prepare me to work in public social services with children and families, I declare that I am eligible for employment in a County Department of Social Services in the State of California because:

- I attest that I have never been convicted of a felony crime or misdemeanor crime that would disqualify me from service in a county child welfare service. These crimes involve harm to children, battery violence, and/or the sale, use or possession of narcotics or illegal drugs.
- I attest that I have a clean DMV record over the past three years (no convictions for DUI, multiple reckless driving, etc.)
- I attest that I have a valid California driver’s license and a personal automobile necessary for field placement.
- I attest that I am legally eligible to work in California.
- I understand that misrepresentation of any of the above information will constitute fraud and result in discharge from the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project and return of all monies plus interest.

Signature ________________________________ Date ________________________________
APPENDIX I

SW 701: SOCIAL WELFARE POLICY ANALYSIS FINAL

Anti-Oppressive Policy Analysis Paper (35%): 13-15 Pages
Due Date: TBD

Students will apply van Wormer's Anti-oppressive Policy Development framework, and the paper will follow the format provided below. For vanWormer's policy analysis framework, see reading for September 7 on iLearn (pp. 294-300) starting with, "Outline for Anti-oppressive Policy Development."

The policy should be different from the one chosen for the policy brief assignment. This paper will be 13-15 pages in length, and it is due at 11:59 p.m on TBD.

Students are strongly encouraged to discuss their topics and clear their policy with their instructor before engaging in the project/assignment.

Since writing is a process, I require that you submit a DRAFT of your policy analysis paper. That draft is due on DATE TBD for Fall 2018. I will give you detailed feedback and comments on DATE TBD and your final paper is due the last week of class, which is DATE TBD.

1. Pick a policy that you will be exploring. Sample policy areas or topics: poverty (TANF; SNAP; WIC), immigration (DACA, DREAM Act; Arizona SB 1070), jobs stimulus/recovery programs, family policies (FMLA), ACA, Legalization of Marijuana, "Bathroom Bills, Title IX protections for transgendered youth in K-12 public schools, to name a few.
2. Complete a literature review of your policy topic, ideally, with a focus on social work literature. The information found in the review of the literature will be organized and included in the appropriate section using van Wormer's policy analysis outline/framework.
3. Review the list of websites (located at the end of this document) and locate and utilize a minimum of 3 websites that address your policy.
4. Keep track of all the sources you will be using because you will need to include them in your references.
5. Conduct a policy analysis using van Wormer et al framework (see page 294-297) in the van Wormer, Kaplan, and Juby article, entitled, "Anti-oppressive policy analysis". Thoroughly respond to each component of the outline and stay true to the outline as written.

Policy Call to Action (5 points): 3-5 minutes
Due Date: TBD

Students will deliver a brief, verbal report of their topic and findings that includes a
clear call to action for the social work community.

Please note: there will not be computer screen visuals for this presentation. You should pretend that you are going before a formal committee without access to slides.

This presentation should include:
• A concise articulation of the social condition or problem that is oppressive.
• Why social workers should be aware or concerned about this policy issue. What social workers can or should do about this policy issue right now.
• Respect for time limits.
## SW701: Anti-Oppressive Policy Presentation

**Presenter:**

**Topic/Policy:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poise/Poise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-prepared, respects time limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to communicate verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor ..................................................................Excellent 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 4.5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of Oppression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly Identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation of the problem reflects unmet need(s) of a disenfranchised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor ..................................................................Excellent 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 4.5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of Social Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Policy is Clearly Articulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role for social in addressing this specific policy is evident. Evidence of critical thinking beyond blanket instead of stated connections to “social justice,” show how why there is this connection to social justice).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor ..................................................................Excellent 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 4.5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persuasiveness for Social Work Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents views in a that serve as a compelling call to action for social particular (whether or not observer agrees with taking action).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor ..................................................................Excellent 1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 4.5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to using electronic databases for research regarding the impact of social policies on the well-being of clients, client systems, workers, and agencies, you should use electronic resources like those listed below as you learn to research and analyze social welfare policies and programs.

1. **General Statistical Data**
   - U.S. Census Bureau: [www.census.gov](http://www.census.gov)
   - Citynet: [www.city.net](http://www.city.net)
   - Research Engines for the Social Sciences: [www.carleton.ca/~cmckie/research.html](http://www.carleton.ca/~cmckie/research.html)
   - General Social Survey: [www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss/](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/gss/)
   - Welfare Information Network: [www.welfareinfo.org](http://www.welfareinfo.org)

2. **Policy Analysis and Evaluation**
   - Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation Research Department: [www.aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/cyp/cyplist.htm](http://www.aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/cyp/cyplist.htm)
   - National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics: [www.ucdata.berkeley.edu/NAWRS/index.html](http://www.ucdata.berkeley.edu/NAWRS/index.html)
   - Urban Institute: [www.urban.org](http://www.urban.org)
   - American Public Welfare Association: [www.apwa.org](http://www.apwa.org)
   - Economic Policy Institute: [www.epinet.org](http://www.epinet.org)
   - Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: [www.cbpp.org](http://www.cbpp.org)
   - Center for Law and Social Policy: [www.epn.org/clasp.html](http://www.epn.org/clasp.html)
   - Families USA: [www.epn.org/families](http://www.epn.org/families)
   - Cato Institute: [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org)
   - Empower America: [www.empower.org](http://www.empower.org)
   - Institute for Research on Poverty: [www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp](http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp)
   - Brookings Institution: [www.brook.edu](http://www.brook.edu)
   - National Conference of State Legislators: [www.ncsl.org](http://www.ncsl.org)
   - Agency for Health Care Policy and Research: [www.ahecpr.gov](http://www.ahecpr.gov)
   - National Center for Children in Poverty: [www.cait.cpmc.columbia.edu/dept/nccp](http://www.cait.cpmc.columbia.edu/dept/nccp)
   - National Child Care Information Center: [www.ericpos.ed.uiue.edu/ncic/nccichome.html](http://www.ericpos.ed.uiue.edu/ncic/nccichome.html)
   - Dept of HHS Central Database: [www.os.dhhs.gov](http://www.os.dhhs.gov)
   - Progressive Policy Institute: [www.dlcpi.org](http://www.dlcpi.org)
   - Center for Child and Youth Policy, University of California-Berkeley: [www.csr.berkeley.edu/CCYP](http://www.csr.berkeley.edu/CCYP)
   - Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: [www.cbpp.org](http://www.cbpp.org)
   - Center for Law and Social Policy: [www.epn.org/clasp.html](http://www.epn.org/clasp.html)
   - National Conference of State Legislatures: [www.ncsl.org](http://www.ncsl.org)
   - Children’s Defense Fund: [www.childrensdefense.org](http://www.childrensdefense.org)
3. Legislative Information and Updates
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov
American Public Welfare Association: www.apwa.org
National Association of Counties: www.naco.org
National Association of State Budget Officers: www.nasbo.org
The Library of Congress (Thomas): www.thomas.loc.gov
Department of HHS: www.os.dhhs.gov
Administration for Children and Families: www.acf.dhhs.gov

4. Organizations of State and Local Officials
National League of Cities: www.nlc.org
U.S. Conference of Mayors: www.usmayors.org/home.html
American Public Welfare Association: www.apwa.org
Council of State Governments: www.csg.org
National Association of Counties: www.naco.org
National Conference of State Legislatures: www.ncsl.org

5. Selected Federal Agencies
Department of Health and Human Services: www.os.dhhs.gov
Administration for Children and Families: www.acf.dhhs.gov
Agency for Health Care Policy and Research: www.ahcpr.gov
National Child Care Information Center: www.ericps.ed.uiuc.edu/nccichome.html
Department of Labor: www.dol.gov
US Department of Labor Employment & Training Administration: www.doleta.gov
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning & Evaluation: www.aspe.os.dhhs.gov
Department of HHS Database: www.os.dhhs.gov
General Accounting Office: www.gao.gov
Administration for Children and Families Fact Sheet: www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/opa/facts
Centers for Disease Control: www.cdc.gov
Department of Justice: www.usdoj.gov
Department of Housing & Urban Development: www.hud.gov
HUD Library Page: www.hud.gov/toolkit.html
HUD Research Site: www.huduser.org
Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community Program: www.ezec.gov
6. **Newspapers**

7. **Generic Search Sites**
   Yahoo: www.yahoo.com
   Altavista: www.altavista.digital.com
   Google: www.google.com
   Northern Light: www.nlsearch.com

8. **Social Policy and Social Services Networks**
   Linking the Human Services Community Online: www.handsnet.org
   Electronic Policy Network: www.epn.org
   The Policy Community On-Line: www.policy.com
   Townhall: www.townhall.com
   Contacting the Congress: www.visi.com/juan/congress
   Action without Borders (volunteering): www.idealists.org
   List of Nonprofits: www.nonprofits.org
   Children, Youth, and Family Consortium: www.cyfc.umn.edu
   AIDS Clearinghouse: www.edenac.org
   Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Information: www.health.org
   Child Prevention Network: www.child.cornell.edu
   Violence and Abuse Clearinghouse: www.umn.edu/mincava
   World Wide Web Resources for Social Workers: www.nyu.edu/socialwork/wwwrs
   National Association of Social Workers: www.naswdc.org
   Council on Social Work Education: www.cswe.org
   League of Women Voters: www.lwv.org
   Michigan League of Women Voters: www.mlwv.org
   Research Engine for the Social Sciences: www.carleton.ca/~cmckie/research.html
   PRAXIS: www.ssw.upenn.edu/oth.html
   Influencing State Policy (based at Virginia Commonwealth University):
   www.statepolicy.org/
   Center for Child and Youth Policy, University of California-Berkeley:
   www.cssr.berkeley.edu/CCYP

9. **Social Security and Elderly Information Sites**
   Social Security Administration: www.ssa.gov
   National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare: www.spry.org/nc.html
   Benefits: www.benefitscheckup.org
   National Council of Senior Citizens: www.ncsinc.org

10. **Political Parties**
    Democratic Party: www.democrats.org/index.html
    Republican Party: www.rnc.org
    Green Party: www.greens.org
    Libertarian Party: www.lp.org
    Natural Law Party: www.natural-law.org
    Socialist Party: www.sp-usa.org
    Democratic Socialist Party: www.dsausa.org/dsa.html
    Social Democrats: www.idsonline.org/sdus
Reform Party: www.reformparty.org
Communist Party: www.hartford-hwp.com/cp-usa/

11. General Voting Relating Sites
Project Vote Smart: www.vote-smart.org
E-The People: www.e-thepeople.com
Democracy Net: www.dnet.org
Web, White & Blue 2004: www.webwhiteblue.org
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League of Women Voters: www.lwv.org
Rock the Vote: www.rocktheyvote.org

12. Other Health Issues
Initiative to Eliminate Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Health: www.raceandhealth.hhs.gov

13. Criminal Justice
FBI Crime Reports: www.fbi.gov/ucrpress.htm

14. Political Commentary
TomPaine.Com: www.tompaine.com
The Progressive: www.progressive.org
Eat the State: www.earthstate.org
Grassroots.com: www.grassroots.com
The Nation: www.thenation.com
Gallup Poll: www.gallup.com

15. Reproductive Rights
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of Michigan: www.miplannedparenthood.org
Planned Parenthood Federation of America: www.plannedparenthood.org
The Alan Guttmacher Institute: www.agi-usa.org

16. Legal Cases
Jenkins: www.jenkinslaw.org

17. Comprehensive Sites
How to Effectively Locate Federal Government Information: www.library.ucsb.edu/universe/dedecker.html
FedWorld: www.fedworld.gov
FedStats: www.fedstats.gov
U.S. Census Bureau: www.venus.census.gov/cdrom/lookup

18. Regulations
National Archives and Records Administration: www.access.gpo.gov/nara/cfr/cfr-table-search.html
National Center for Children in Poverty: www.cpmcnet.columbia.edu/dept/nccp/roleCDC.html

19. General U.S. Government Websites
The White House: www.whitehouse.gov/
U.S. Senate: www.senate.gov
U.S. House of Representatives: www.house.gov/
Library of Congress: www.loc.gov/
### Table A

#### Ethnicity of those who Applied and were offered Admission to the Title IV-E Program at SF State (2012-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Not Reported or Declined to State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity 1 (Please specify): Middle Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity 2 (Please specify): Filipino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity 3 (Please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity of those who Applied and were offered Admission to the Title IV-E Program at SF State (2012-2018) Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34.88%</td>
<td>35.19%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>32.61%</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>41.46%</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>32.56%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>20.37%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>26.83%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity Not Reported or Declined to State</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity 1 (Please specify): Middle Eastern</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity 2 (Please specify): Filipino</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnicity 3 (Please specify):</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SW 701: Social Policy Analysis Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone Milestones Benchmark</th>
<th>Problem Definition</th>
<th>Historical Context</th>
<th>Policy Formulation</th>
<th>Global Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrated ability to construct a clear and insightful problem statement w evidence of all contextual factors and details the oppressive factors.</td>
<td>Demonstrates the importance of the historical antecedents and contexts surrounding both the social problem and the policy.</td>
<td>Strongly identifies all policy goals, their intended and unintended consequences, articulates the role of public opinion about the policy, and details anticipated barriers to policy change.</td>
<td>Strongly details alternative policies and approaches, on a global scale, that meet the same need as said policy. Details fiscal arrangements of the policy and examines values, culture, diversity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Begins to demonstrate the ability to construct a problem statement w evidence of most relevant contextual factors, and problem statement is superficial and lacks specificity about oppressive conditions of the policy.</td>
<td>Begins to demonstrate the importance of the historical antecedents and contexts surrounding both the social problem and the policy, but lacks specificity of historical examples.</td>
<td>Begins to identify policy goals, their intended and unintended consequences, articulates the role of public opinion about the policy, and details anticipated barriers to policy change.</td>
<td>Details alternative policies and approaches, on a global scale, that meet the same need as said policy. Details fiscal arrangements of the policy and examines values, culture, diversity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Demonstrates the ability to construct a problem statement w evidence of most relevant factors, and problem statement is adequately detailed along with the oppressive conditions.</td>
<td>Demonstrates the importance of the historical antecedents and contexts surrounding both the social problem and the policy.</td>
<td>Identifies all policy goals, their intended and unintended consequences, articulates the role of public opinion about the policy, and details anticipated barriers to policy change.</td>
<td>Details alternative policies and approaches, on a global scale, that meet the same need as said policy. Details fiscal arrangements of the policy and examines values, culture, diversity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying a problem statement or related contextual factors and does not detail oppressive conditions of the policy.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited ability in identifying how history played a role in creating the social problem and the emergence of the policy as a result.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited ability to identify policy goals, lacks specificity about their intended and unintended consequences, articulates the role of public opinion about the policy, and anticipates barriers to policy change yet is weaker in all elements mentioned above.</td>
<td>Provides one or more alternative policies and approaches, on a global scale, that meet the same need as said policy but with little specificity. Details fiscal arrangements of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>How Cultural Values Help Explain the Policy</td>
<td>Cultural Values Help Explain the Policy</td>
<td>How Cultural Values Help Explain the Policy</td>
<td>Policy and Examines Values, Culture, Diversity and How Cultural Values Help Explain the Policy but Needs Expansion and Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Aspects of Policy</strong></td>
<td>Fully explores the fiscal elements of the policy that include proposed, or actual, cost, cost savings, a strong articulation of groups who(m) benefit from the policy, and examines the issue of economic oppression as it relates to the policy.</td>
<td>Explores the fiscal elements of the policy that include proposed, or actual, cost, cost savings, a strong articulation of groups who(m) benefit from the policy, and examines the issue of economic oppression as it relates to the policy.</td>
<td>Offers a cursory examination of the fiscal elements of the policy that include proposed, or actual, cost, cost savings, a strong articulation of groups who(m) benefit from the policy, and examines the issue of economic oppression as it relates to the policy.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited understanding of the fiscal elements of the policy that include proposed, or actual, cost, cost savings, a strong articulation of groups who(m) benefit from the policy, and examines the issue of economic oppression as it relates to the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Fully articulates the major players in the policy or policy development, details the major stakeholders, thoroughly examines the political, racial, gendered, cultural (etc) context in which the policy is being implemented or developed.</td>
<td>Articulates the major players in the policy or policy development, details the major stakeholders, thoroughly examines the political, racial, gendered, cultural (etc) context in which the policy is being implemented or developed.</td>
<td>Begins to outline the major players in the policy or policy development, details the major stakeholders, thoroughly examines the political, racial, gendered, cultural (etc) context in which the policy is being implemented or developed, yet is incomplete.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited understanding of the political context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Importance of Values</strong></td>
<td>Identifies linkages between the policy and the NASW Code of Ethics and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.</td>
<td>Identifies linkages between the policy and the NASW Code of Ethics and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.</td>
<td>Begins to demonstrate linkages between the policy and the NASW Code of Ethics or the Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
<td>Lacks connecting the policy to values and ethics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Self-Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Effectively evaluates human rights, social, economic and environmental justice issues as they relate to the policy.</td>
<td>Evaluates human rights, social, economic and environmental justice issues as they relate to the policy.</td>
<td>Begins to articulate how human rights, social, economic and environmental justice are impacted by the policy but incomplete.</td>
<td>Lacks examination of how human rights, social, economic and environmental justice issues relate to the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis/synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources with some interpretation/evaluation but not enough to develop a coherent analysis/synthesis.</td>
<td>Information is taken from sources without any interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis/synthesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>