



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CLASS
Department	Social Work
Program Unit	Full time and Part Time Programs
Reporting for Academic Year	2015-2016
Department Chair	Evaon Wong-Kim (until 7/1/16) Holly Vugia (interim 2016-17)
Date Submitted	3/21/2017

**1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)**

**A. Five-year Review Planning Goals**

From our last Five Year Report filed in Winter 2011, we identified three Planning Goals:

- (1) increase the number of tenure/tenure track faculty, in order to fully comply with Council of Social Work Education (CSWE) accreditation standards. The goal was to have seven full time TT faculty.
- (2) Make changes to the Integrative Seminar (Capstone) class in order to reflect Social Work (SW) values and enhance student learning experience. This course should offer an opportunity for students to work closely with faculty, to explore community advocacy projects that will combine practice with theory, use evidence-based and cultural responsive approaches to demonstrate their sound understanding of social work values. This course should also provide students a culminating experience so that students can demonstrated their mastery of the six Program Learning Outcomes.
- (3) Maintain the student faculty ratio of 1:12 as required by CSWE.

**B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress**

Goal 1: A New Faculty Justification was submitted to the CLASS Dean for new TT hires every year since the filing of the last Five Year Report. The last new hire (Assoc Prof. Naccarato) joined us in September 2014. In September 2015, one TT faculty member resigned (Asst. Prof. Braxton). At the same time, one TT faculty member (Assoc. Prof. Vugia) from the undergraduate Sociology/Social Services Department transferred to the Social Work Department. To facilitate this transfer, an arrangement was made for this faculty member to continue to support the undergraduate Social Services Option (SSO) until a planned SSO program discontinuance after spring 2017. Specifically, the faculty member taught a fall SSO course each year and coordinated student internship placements. For most of academic year 2015-2016, then, this gave the SW Department six TT faculty (Wong-Kim, Taylor, Wong, Payne, Naccarato, and Vugia)—just

below the goal of seven. Unexpectedly, the SW Department Chair (Wong-Kim) resigned in June 2016, shortly before the start of one tenured faculty's (Taylor) full year sabbatical, leaving the Department with 4 on-site TT faculty for 2016-2017.

Goal 2: The Department piloted a year-long community based participatory research project for two cohorts of the advanced year research sequence, as opposed to the traditional quarter-long integrative seminar model for the capstone experience. A cohort of students enrolls with the same instructor for all three advanced year quarters, culminating in an advocacy and research project/paper and poster session. The outcome has been positive, and all advanced year students will participate in the year-long model at the Q2S transformation, Fall 2018.

Goal 3: For the 2015-16 year, we achieved a student faculty ratio of approximately 1:14. Thus the program did not take admissions to the Oakland part-time (PT), self-support program for the next academic year (2016-2017).

### **C. Program Changes and Needs**

In addition to the TT faculty changes noted above, we have requested and approved by our College and University Extension to put our MSW Self-Support Part-Time program in admission hiatus. New admits will not be taken in Fall 2016 or Fall 2017. This allows time to concentrate on Q2S and CSWE reaccreditation/reaffirmation preparation work for 2018. The non-TT MSW level program coordinator for the Oakland PT program also resigned (Jackson), requiring other faculty to assume these advising, coordination duties.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Values and Ethics. Uphold the core values and ethical principles and standards of the social work profession as codified in the National Association of Social Workers' Code of Ethics. (ILO #5, #6)
2. Professional Use of Self. Conduct oneself autonomously in the professional social work role, including understanding personal values and biases and knowing their impact on clients, engaging in ongoing development of professional knowledge and skills, and exercising use of self in order to engage and collaborate effectively. (ILO #1 #2, #6)
3. Critical Thinking & Applying Research Evidence and Theory. Use critical thinking skills in the analysis and synthesis of information, including in the application of evidence-based practices and theoretical materials and in modifying intervention plans as needed. (ILO #1, #5)
4. Advocacy. Advocate for clients, groups, and communities in complex cultural, social, and political situations. (ILO #3, #5)
5. Acting with Diversity. Act with cultural humility, self-awareness, and knowledge of diverse populations, with the commitment of providing culturally competent services. (ILO #3, #4)
6. Communication. Communicate effectively, orally and in writing, across diverse client and social services systems. (ILO #2) Please list all outcomes in the box below, and append a curriculum map showing alignment of the Program Student Learning Outcomes and CSUEB Institutional Learning Outcomes.

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

#1. Values and Ethics (which aligns with ILO #5-Sustainability & ILO #6-Specialized Discipline and Competency #1-Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior, defined by the Council on Social Work

### **C. Summary of Assessment Process**

The objective was to evaluate Program SLO #1-Values and Ethics using a self-report instrument revised in 2015 called the Post-Questionnaire, which contains items evaluating all six Program SLO and all nine new CSWE Competencies. Five instructors (4 full-time, 1 part-time) teaching all sections of SW 6959-Integrative Seminar administered the questionnaire to their graduating full-time MSW program students in the final weeks of Spring quarter. An underlying objective was to evaluate CSWE-defined competencies in preparation for upcoming CSWE re-accreditation scheduled for 2018 (with a possibility of postponement to 2019).

The 32-item questionnaire contains the following 5 items relevant to SLO #1-Values and Ethics:

-- Item 5-Ethical Decision-making. I am able to make ethically sound professional decisions by applying relevant laws and regulations and codes of ethics that are appropriate to the context of the problem.

-- Item 7-Using Supervision. I am able to make use of supervision and consultation to guide my professional judgment and behavior.

-- Item 10-Appling Code of Ethics. I am able to make ethical decisions by applying the NASW Code of Ethics.

-- Item 14-Professional Behavior & Communication. I am able to demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior and appearance as well as in oral, written and electronic communication.

-- Item 22-Responsibility & Sustainability. I am able to act responsibly and sustainably as a professional and a local and global citizen at local, national and global levels.

Students respond using a five-option scale (1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neutral, 4-Agree, 5-Strongly Agree).

For graduating students, the MSW program applies as a threshold for each SLO an individual benchmark of 4.00 points (i.e., representing at least 4-Agree) and a group benchmark of 85%. In other words, for the program to be considered successful in attaining the SLO, the mean total score for the SLO must be at least 4.00 and at least 85% of students must score at least 4.00.

### **D. Summary of Assessment Results**

Results summarized below indicated that students showed attainment of SLO #1-Values and Ethics, which are mapped to ILO#5-Sustainability & #6-Specialized Discipline and CSWE Competency #1-Demonstrate Ethical and Professional Behavior.

The response rate was 87.9% (N = 58), with 61 students out of a graduating class of 66 students completing questionnaires and 3 questionnaires being returned blank. The mean total score of 4.62 was above the threshold of 4.00. Also, 100.0% of students had a mean score of at least 4.00, which is above the threshold of 85.0% of students. Furthermore, an examination of each item shows mean scores above 4.00 and at least 90% answering 4-Agree or 5-Strongly Agree on each item.

Mean Total Score (Mean of All 5 Items):

Mean (SD): 4.62 (.41)

Reporting Strongly Agree (Mean = 4.6-5.0): 65.5%  
Reporting Agree (Mean = 4.0-4.4): 27.5%  
Reporting Agree (Mean = 3.6-3.8): 6.9%  
Total: 100.0%

Item 5-Ethical Decision-making:

Mean (SD): 4.46 (.73)  
Reporting Strongly Agree: 58.6%  
Reporting Agree: 31.0%  
Reporting Neutral: 8.6%  
Reporting Disagree: 1.7%  
Total: 100.0%

Item 7-Using Supervision:

Mean (SD): 4.72 (.52)  
Reporting Strongly Agree: 75.9%  
Reporting Agree: 20.7%  
Reporting Neutral: 3.4%  
Total: 100.0%

Item 10-Applying Code of Ethics:

Mean (SD): 4.66 (.48)  
Reporting Strongly Agree: 69.0%  
Reporting Agree: 29.3%  
Reporting Neutral: 0.0%  
Reporting Disagree: 1.7%  
Total: 100.0%

Item 14-Professional Behavior & Communication:

Mean (SD): 4.74 (.52)  
Reporting Strongly Agree: 77.6%  
Reporting Agree: 19.0%  
Reporting Neutral: 3.4%  
Total: 100.0%

Item 22-Responsibility & Sustainability:

Mean (SD): 4.52 (.63)  
Reporting Strongly Agree: 58.6%  
Reporting Agree: 34.5%  
Reporting Neutral: 6.9%  
Total: 100.0%

### 3. STATISTICAL DATA

APR Summary Data  
Fall 2010 - 2015

Social Work							
	Fall Quarter						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
<b>A. Students Headcount</b>							
Graduate	187	156	172	146	144	254(Hay + Oak)	
Total Number of Majors	187	156	172	146	144	254	
	Academic Year						
	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
<b>B. Degrees Awarded</b>							
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	106	115	97	104	108	129	125
3. Total	106	115	97	104	108	125	125
	Fall Quarter						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
<b>C. Faculty</b>							
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>							
1. Full-Time	3	4	5	4	4	6	
2. Part-Time	1	1	1	1	0	0	
3a. Total Tenure Track	4	5	6	5	4	6	
3b. % Tenure Track	21.1%	38.5%	31.6%	21.7%	25.0%	35.3%	
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>							
4. Full-Time	4	3	4	5	4	3	
5. Part-Time	11	5	9	13	8	8	
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	15	8	13	18	12	11	
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	78.9%	61.5%	68.4%	78.3%	75.0%	64.7%	
7. Grand Total All Faculty	19	13	19	23	16	17	
<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>							
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	1.4	3.3	4.0	2.7	3.3		
9. Lecturer FTEF	9.8	5.6	6.6	9.0	7.9		
10. Total Instructional FTEF	11.2	9.0	10.6	11.7	11.2	10.64	
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>							
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	21.6	75.2	57.1	34.5	56.0		
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	12.3%	46.3%	32.7%	24.5%	38.5%		
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	153.9	87.3	117.3	106.7	89.3		
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	87.7%	53.7%	67.3%	75.5%	61.5%		
13. Total FTES taught	175.5	162.5	174.4	141.2	145.3	163 (H?)	
14. Total SCU taught	2633.0	2437.0	2616.0	2118.0	2180.0		
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>							
1. Tenured/Track	15.4	22.6	14.3	13.0	16.8		
2. Lecturer	15.7	15.5	17.8	11.9	11.3		
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	15.7	18.1	16.5	12.1	12.9	15.32 (H?)	
4. Lower Division	.	.	.	.	.		
5. Upper Division	.	.	.	.	.		
6. Graduate	15.7	18.1	16.5	12.1	12.9	15.32 (H?)	
<b>E. Section Size</b>							
1. Number of Sections Offered	36.0	31.0	32.0	33.0	32.0	28(H)	

						13(O)	
2. Average Section Size	20.5	24.5	21.1	18.3	19.4	17.43(H) 17.85(O)	
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	
5. Average Section Size for GD	20.5	24.5	21.1	18.3	19.4	17.43(H) 17.85 (O)	
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0	0	
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0	0	
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	4	10	9	9	13	12(H)* 0 (O)	
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	32	21	24	24	19	16(H) 13(O)	

H= Hayward O = Oakland

\*Vugia fulfilling undergraduate sociology commitment this quarter