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ACCREDITATION STANDARD 1: PROGRAM MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES
Mission of the CSUEB Department of Social Work

The mission of the Master of Social Work (MSW) program is to prepare advanced practitioners to serve the diverse, multicultural and multiracial communities in the areas of Children, Youth and Families and Community Mental Health. The emphasis is on educating culturally competent, urban social work practitioner-advocates who are grounded in the following areas:

- Social work history
- Purposes and philosophy of the profession
- Social work values as referenced in the *NASW Code of Ethics*
- Social work knowledge, including generalist and advanced knowledge
- Social work skills and knowledge, including generalist and concentration specific
- Strategies to combat racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination
- Multicultural and multiracial competence

The MSW program has a student body that represents the great cultural, ethnic, and social diversity of the San Francisco Bay Area. This diversity provides MSW students with a rich educational laboratory in which to experiment, understand, and grow in developing a comfort and awareness about the complexities of race, ethnicity, gender, age, and other forms of oppression and social injustice. The social work program was established to provide MSW trainees for Alameda, Contra Costa, and surrounding San Francisco Bay Area counties. In 2008, the population of both Alameda and Contra Costa counties totaled almost 2.5 million, representing 11% of the population of California. Most of the communities in Alameda County are multiethnic. The number of households living in poverty in Alameda County was 11%, while that in Contra Costa County was 8%.

The service area of the University is in close proximity to one of the largest metropolitan areas in the state with one of the most racially and ethnically diverse populations in the nation. Because of this diversity, the program will train social work students for urban, advocacy oriented social work practice, inclusive of the issues of culture, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, class and gender differences, religion and the effects of bias, prejudice, and institutional racism. If not recognized and addressed appropriately in the practice setting, these issues and concerns often obscure helping efforts, and impede social policy development and program implementation.
Therefore, the California State University East Bay MSW program purposes are consistent with the CSWE Educational Policy that intends to:

- Enhance human well-being and alleviate poverty, oppression, and other forms of social injustice among the urban disenfranchised and underserved population in the Bay Area.
- Enhance the social functioning and interactions of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities by involving them in accomplishing goals, developing resources, and preventing and alleviating distress.
- Formulate and implement social policies, services, and programs that meet basic human needs and support the development of human capacities.
- Pursue policies, services, and resources through advocacy and social or political actions that promote social and economic justice.
- Develop and use research, knowledge, and skills that advance multicultural social work practice.
- Develop and apply practice in the context of diverse cultures specifically those populations living in the urban area that are disenfranchised and underserved.

Specifically we aim to increase student understanding of the underlying causes and resulting effects of prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination, and institutional prejudice from a variety of perspectives. Students learn methods, strategies, and techniques of intervention to address these concerns and problems. The *NASW Code of Ethics* serves as a guide for the multifaceted activities of training social workers.

The **Mission, Values, Purpose and Vision Statement** of the Department of Social Work at California State University East Bay is as follows:
CSU East Bay MSW Program  
Vision, Mission, Values, and Purpose Statement

Vision
The vision of the CSU East Bay MSW program is to produce culturally competent urban social work practitioner/advocates who are engaged and committed to advocacy, social change, and social justice. Our belief is that the strengths of the faculty coupled with the synergistic relationship with the communities that we serve provide a powerful learning dyad for educational excellence for students. Our distinctive curriculum guides us on our journey to educational excellence and the development of social work practitioner/advocates prepared to service diverse communities and to be leaders in the social work profession.

Mission
"The California State University East Bay MSW program is committed to graduating culturally competent urban social workers in the areas of Children, Youth and Families and Community Mental Health. Social work graduates are prepared to address individual, family, group and community needs caused by inequalities of class, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation and other forms of social injustice. At the core of our program is an emphasis on advocacy for social justice, and social change in the public sector. As a diverse learning community, we are active in scholarship and professional leadership that advance an urban, culturally competent perspective in social work that promotes social activism and social justice."

Values
The MSW program’s values are based on the National Association of Social Work? Values and Ethics (revised 2008). The core values are:
- service
- social justice
- dignity and worth of the person
- importance of human relationships
- integrity
- competence
- commitment to diversity and inclusion

Program purpose
The California State University East Bay MSW program purposes are:
- To enhance human well-being and alleviate poverty, oppression, and other forms of social injustice among the urban disenfranchised and underserved populations in the Bay Area.
- To enhance the social functioning and interactions of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities by involving them in accomplishing goals, developing resources, and preventing and alleviating distress.
- To formulate and implement social policies, services, and programs that meet basic human needs and support the development of human capacities.
- To pursue policies, services, and resources through advocacy and political actions that promote social and economic justice.
- To develop and use research, knowledge, and skills that advance multicultural social work practice.
- To develop and apply practice in the context of diverse cultures, specifically those populations living in the urban area who are disenfranchised and underserved.
With this vision, mission, values, and purpose statement as a guide, the CSUEB MSW program prepares students for leadership positions in social service organizations that serve diverse and changing urban communities. Our commitment is to advance knowledge, encourage students to pursue life-long learning, and emphasize sensitivity to race, culture, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, disability, gender, and age over the lifespan.

**EP 1.1: Purposes of Social Work Education**

The purpose of social work education is to prepare competent and effective professionals to develop social work knowledge, and to provide leadership in the development of service delivery systems. Social work education is grounded in the profession’s history, purposes, and philosophy and is based on a body of knowledge, values, and skills. Social work education enables students to integrate the knowledge, values, and skills of the social work profession for competent practice.

The first sentence in our mission statement emphasizes preparation for practice that focuses on urban populations that are adversely affected by issues related to inequalities and variables related to oppression and discrimination. To that end, the program mission explicitly identifies an urban, culturally competent focus as a key framework for work with individuals, families, groups, and communities undermined by inequalities of class, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation, and other forms of social injustice.

The second sentence in our mission statement substantiates our commitment to contributing to social work knowledge and leadership aligned with our focus on cultural competence, urban realities, and social justice. Woven throughout our mission and goals is our commitment to advocacy for social justice and social change. Our mission is clearly aligned with the three purposes of social work outlined in EP 1.1 in the table below.

**Table 1.1: Linkage between the EP 1.1: Purposes of social work education and the department Mission statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP 1.1 Purposes of Social Work Education</th>
<th>Department of Social Work Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepare competent and effective professionals</td>
<td>&quot;The California State University East Bay MSW program is committed to graduating culturally competent urban social workers in two concentrations: Children, Youth and Families and Community Mental Health. Social work graduates are prepared to address individual, family, group and community needs caused by inequalities of class, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation and other forms of social injustice.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop social work knowledge</td>
<td>As a learning community, students and faculty are active in scholarship and professional leadership that advance an urban, culturally competent perspective in social work and promote social activism and social justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide leadership in the development of social service delivery systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) The MSW program mission is consistent with institution’s mission

The Mission, Values, Vision and Mandates of the University
The University is a social and cultural center for public enrichment. In partnership with surrounding communities, and the University helps identify and address issues of importance to the region. The development of an MSW Program at CSUEB is but one example of this cooperation between the community and the University. The Department, through its emphasis on excellence and innovation in teaching; its diverse student and faculty population; its tradition of town hall meetings and community forums; its connection to a strong community advisory board; its focus on meaningful and ongoing assessment; and its connection with regional and national social work organizations strongly supports the Seven mandates as outlined in the CSUEB Strategic plan.

The CSUEB MSW program compliments the University’s mission to respond to the diverse needs of its service area. The CSUEB campuses in Hayward, Concord, and Oakland serve the higher education needs of Bay Area residents. Many students enroll part-time and are employed, while some transfer from other institutions or resume their education after lengthy interruptions. The University also serves international students, who add to the heterogeneity of the campus, and contribute to education for a global society. The University is committed to small class size and year-round operation and the delivery of courses and some majors in evenings and weekends. Its students benefit from close contact with faculty and staff and access to current technology, services, and library materials. The MSW program at CSU East Bay uniquely fits the mission, values, and vision of the overall University, which states:

**CSU East Bay University Mission**

To provide an academically rich, multicultural learning experience that prepares all its students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful lifework, and to be socially responsible contributors to their communities, locally and globally.

**Values**

The University values learning in an academic environment that is inclusive and student-centered. We value engagement in the civic, cultural, and economic life of the communities we serve -- locally, regionally, and globally. We value critical and creative thinking, effective communication, and ethical decision-making and multi-cultural competence. We value the open exchange of ideas and viewpoints.

**Vision**

We strive to be known for:

- Outstanding academic programs, recognized for their excellence
- Curricula that foster active student participation through applied learning, research, and community service
- High academic standards along with services and support that ensure each student the opportunity for success
- A learning-centered experience where teaching is lively and engaging and individual differences are appreciated
- Dedication to open-minded inquiry, especially with regard to major social and global issues
- A welcoming campus atmosphere that is responsive to the unique needs of its campus community
- An inclusive campus community where students, faculty, and staff from vastly different backgrounds collaborate -- creating and sustaining a vibrant learning community
- An array of activities that promote students’ enjoyment and well-being
- Graduates who are innovative and effective problem solvers, skilled in organizing and expressing their ideas
- Engagement in and essential contributions to the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of its region and communities
Seven Mandates

- A tradition of teaching, learning and academic quality— emphasized and reinforced
- An inclusive campus climate that values students, faculty, and staff and fosters multicultural learning
- Strong growth and full enrollment with personalized learning and expanded access
- Vibrant University villages
- An efficient, well-run University with a culture of accountability
- A quest for distinction realized
- A University of choice through regional stewardship

http://www20.csueastbay.edu/about/mission-vision-and-values/seven-mandate.html downloaded 1/12/09

The Mission of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

The Department of Social Work is part of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS) and is housed in Meiklejohn Hall in Hayward and the Library Building in Concord. As such, the department’s mission is guided by the overall mission of CLASS. The Mission of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences is as follows:

"Our College is committed to educational engagement through theory and practice, which enables our students to enhance their understanding and appreciation of the human condition, diverse cultures and values, the natural world, and their own communities. CLASS students graduate with the foundation to be ethical and productive individuals, effective citizens, and informed participants in a global society."

The missions of California State University, East Bay University and CLASS share five (5) common themes, which are:

1. **An appreciation of diversity and cultural competence.** The MSW program is based on the premise that value exists in what all people bring to a multicultural environment, and that all cultures, ethnicities, races, religions and other oppressed populations should be respected;

2. **Knowledge concerning the social and economic circumstances and needs of urban communities.** The MSW program immerses students in foundation generalist and concentration-based scholarship in the context of an urban backdrop and field experience. The culminating research project and integrative seminar demand that students demonstrate an ability to integrate and apply knowledge about urban social issues and inner city conditions;

3. **Integration of teaching and public service through field learning opportunities.** Field education offers students an opportunity to integrate and apply theoretical knowledge and social work skills in an agency under the supervision of a qualified field instructor. Various social service agencies in the University service area provide placements and these reflect the diversity of social work employment settings;
4. Broad-based education regarding the service needs of individuals, families, groups, and communities. Students in the MSW program integrate their liberal arts foundation with a generalist practice perspective, while learning to provide effective services that meet the needs of the communities in the University service area; and

5. Leadership development. With courses focused on skill building, critical thinking and fieldwork, our MSW program educates students for autonomous practice. In addition, the program prepares them to assume leadership and training roles in staff development, administration, supervision, proposal writing, and management for the Bay Area social service programs.

A.S. 1.1: The program has goals derived from its mission. These goals reflect the purposes of EP 1.1. Program goals are not limited to these purposes.

Goals of the Department of Social Work

The California State University, East Bay MSW Program has identified six (6) goals to accomplish its stated mission. These goals are integrally related to the programmatic mission of the MSW program and center around educating social workers as change agents, preparing them to work autonomously, to be multi-culturally competent, to understand and be able to use research in social work practice, and to be able to engage in critical self-evaluation in practice with individuals, families, groups organizations and communities.

The goals of the Department of Social Work at CSU East Bay are:

1. To educate social workers who in their roles as change agents (practitioner/advocates) will be able to practice in increasingly complex, culturally and racially diverse communities. Students will develop skills to support and leverage their leadership roles in those public social service organizations charged with responding to societal problems (such as poverty, racism, sexism, homophobia, family instability, mental illness, child endangerment, and urban renewal);

2. To prepare social work practitioners who are capable of autonomous practice with diverse populations of individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities;

3. To prepare social workers who are committed to social justice and to serving, advocating for, empowering, and mobilizing client communities to address the special needs of underserved, poor, and oppressed populations;

4. To provide social work graduates with a foundation in ethical urban advanced practice methodologies and the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to and competence in addressing issues of race, culture, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, disability, gender and aging over the life course;

5. To prepare social workers who are research-informed and evidenced-based practitioners who engage in critical self-evaluation in practice settings with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities; and
6. To contribute to social work through professional leadership and scholarship that advances social work knowledge, practice and values (addressed in Section 7 of the Self-Study).

A.S. 1.2 EP3: The program has objectives that are derived from the program goals. These objectives are consistent with EP3. Program objectives are reflected in program implementation and continuous assessment.

Program Objectives

The program strives to realize its mission and achieve its goals by meeting a common set of student learning objectives. These program objectives specify seven abilities that students master to prepare for effective professional social work practice. The seven abilities constitute the objectives of the MSW program. Each objective is followed by a list of educational outcomes. These outcomes are expressed in terms of knowledge, values, and skills that each student is expected to achieve at the foundation and advanced levels. Students develop these abilities with increasing complexity and depth as they progress through the program. This progression is reflected in the differentiation of levels between foundation and advanced curriculum.

Foundation Year Program Objectives

Upon completion of the foundation year, students will be able to:

1. Apply critical thinking skills in professional context and use research to inform and evaluate their practice (Critical Thinking).
2. Demonstrate ability to understand, articulate, and integrate principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into practice (Values and Ethics).
3. Develop awareness of specific practice and competency skills in working with diverse populations, including addressing issues of age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation (Diversity).
4. Demonstrate knowledge of issues related to power, oppression, and institutional discrimination; understanding of the history and structure of the social work profession; and the ability to advocate effectively for social and economic justice (Advocacy).
5. Analyze and apply knowledge of the bio-psycho-social framework, strengths perspective and theories that explain human development and behavior across the lifespan as well as social systems’ development and interactions (Applying Theory to Practice).
6. Demonstrate oral, written, and interpersonal skills to communicate effectively and appropriately at individual, group, and community levels (Communication).
7. Demonstrate knowledge and ability for multiculturally competent professional use of self in practice, including appropriate use of supervision and consultation, ability to function
in the context of social service systems and organizations, and ability to seek necessary organizational change (Professional Use of Self).

Advanced Concentration Year Program Objectives

Upon completion of the advanced concentration year, Community Mental Health (CMH) and Children, Youth, and Family (CYF) students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge and use of critical thinking, scientific methods and empirical research to support choice of intervention and evaluation of practice within their area of concentration (Critical Thinking).

2. Integrate principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into their advanced practice, targeting diverse populations and issues around social justice (Values and Ethics).

3. Understand and analyze the effects of discrimination and oppression and advance social and economic justice for all populations-at-risk, with special attention to the urban underserved disenfranchised populations in relation to the concentration area (Diversity).

4. Analyze the impact of policies on client systems, workers, agencies, and organizations and understand methods for influencing policy formation and change (Advocacy).

5. Understand and apply theories, specialized knowledge, methods and skills for advanced autonomous practice with underserved and disenfranchised populations (Applying Theory to Practice).

6. Develop advanced communication, problem-solving and interpersonal skills with diverse systems of varying sizes (Communication).

7. Demonstrate achievement of multicultural competence and effective use of self in the context of diverse populations, social service agencies, and the service delivery system (Professional Use of Self).

Table 1.2 illustrates linkages between our program goals 1-5 and our foundation and advanced year objectives. (Goal 6 is addressed in Section 7 of the Self-Study). Table 1.3 illustrates the relationship between EP3.0 and our program objectives. Each of our seven core objectives are tracked in all course syllabi and evaluated in Standard 8.0 via direct and indirect measures.
## Table 1.2: Linkage between goals, foundation objectives, and advanced concentration year objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals*</th>
<th>Foundation Objectives*</th>
<th>Community Mental Health (CMH) and Children, Youth &amp; Family (CYF) Concentration Year Objectives**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To educate social workers who in their roles as change agents, will be able to practice in increasingly complex, culturally and racially diverse communities, and will develop strategies and skills to support and leverage their leadership roles in public social service organizations charged with responding to societal problems.</td>
<td><strong>1.1 Professional Use of Self.</strong> Demonstrate knowledge and ability for multiculturally competent professional use of self in practice, including appropriate use of supervision and consultation, ability to function in the context of social service systems and organizations, and ability to seek necessary organizational change. <strong>1.2 Communication.</strong> Demonstrate oral, written, and interpersonal skills to communicate effectively and appropriately at individual, group, and community level.</td>
<td><strong>1.3 Professional Use of Self.</strong> Demonstrate achievement of multicultural competence and effective use of self in the context of diverse populations, social service agencies, and the service delivery system. <strong>1.4 Communication.</strong> Develop advanced communication, problem-solving and interpersonal skills with diverse systems of varying sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To prepare social work practitioners who are capable of autonomous practice with diverse populations of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
<td><strong>2.1 Applying Theory to Practice.</strong> Analyze and apply knowledge of the bio-psycho-social framework, strengths perspective and theories that explain human development and behavior across the lifespan as well as social systems development and interactions.</td>
<td><strong>2.2 Applying Theory to Practice.</strong> Understand and apply theories, specialized knowledge, methods and skills for advanced autonomous practice in the CYF/CMH concentration with underserved and disenfranchised populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To prepare social workers who are committed to serving, advocating for, and mobilizing client communities to address the special needs of underserved, poor, and oppressed populations.</td>
<td><strong>3.1 Advocacy.</strong> Demonstrate knowledge of issues related to power, oppression, and institutional discrimination; understanding of the history and structure of the social work profession; and ability to advocate effectively for social and economic justice.</td>
<td><strong>3.2 Advocacy.</strong> Analyze the impact of policies on client systems, workers, agencies, and organizations, and understand methods for influencing policy formation and change in the concentration area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To prepare social workers for ethical urban advanced practice methodologies with the ability to demonstrate sensitivity to and competence in working with diverse populations.</td>
<td><strong>4.1 Values and Ethics.</strong> Demonstrate ability to understand, articulate, and integrate principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into practice. <strong>4.2 Diversity.</strong> Develop awareness of specific practice and competency skills in working with diverse populations, including addressing issues of age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.</td>
<td><strong>4.3 Values and Ethics.</strong> Integrate principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into their advanced practice work, targeting diverse populations and issues around social justice. <strong>4.4 Diversity.</strong> Understand and analyze the effects of discrimination and oppression and advance social and economic justice for all populations-at-risk, with special attention to the urban underserved disenfranchised populations in relation to the concentration area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To create social work practitioners who are competent consumers of social research and to engage in critical self-evaluation in practice settings with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</td>
<td><strong>5.1 Critical thinking.</strong> Apply critical thinking skills in professional context and use research to inform and evaluate their practice.</td>
<td><strong>5.3 Critical thinking.</strong> Demonstrate knowledge and use of critical thinking, scientific methods, and empirical research to support choice of intervention and evaluation of practice within their area of concentration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW Program Objectives*</td>
<td>E.P 3.0 Objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical thinking.</strong> Apply critical thinking skills in a professional context and use research to inform and evaluate their practice</td>
<td>#1: Apply critical thinking skills within the context of professional social work practice. #9: Evaluate research studies, apply research findings to practice, and evaluate their own practice interventions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Values and Ethics.</strong> Demonstrate ability to understand, articulate, and integrate principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into practice.</td>
<td>#2: Understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diversity.</strong> Develop awareness of specific practice and competency skills in working with diverse populations, including addressing issues of age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.</td>
<td>#3: Practice without discrimination and with respect, knowledge and skills related to client’s age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advocacy.</strong> Demonstrate knowledge of issues related to power, oppression, and institutional discrimination; understanding of the history and structure of the social work profession; and ability to advocate effectively for social and economic justice.</td>
<td>#4: Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and apply strategies of advocacy and social change that advance social and economic justice. #5: Understand and interpret the history of the social work profession and its contemporary structures and issues. #8: Analyze, formulate, and influence policies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying Theory to Practice.</strong> Analyze and apply knowledge of the bio-psycho-social framework, strengths perspective, and theories that explain human development and behavior across the lifespan as well as social systems development and interactions.</td>
<td>#7: Use theoretical frameworks supported by empirical evidence to understand individuals’ development and behavior across the life span and the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups, organizations and communities. #M6: Apply the knowledge and skills of a generalist social work perspective to practice with systems of all sizes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication.</strong> Demonstrate oral, written, and interpersonal skills to communicate effectively and appropriately at individual, group, and community levels.</td>
<td>#10: Use communication skills differentially across client populations, colleagues, and communities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Use of Self.</strong> Demonstrate knowledge and ability for multicultural competent professional use of self in practice, including appropriate use of supervision and consultation, ability to function in the context of social service systems and organizations, and ability to seek necessary organizational change.</td>
<td>#11: Use supervision and consultation appropriate to social work practice. #12: Function within the structure of organizations and service delivery systems and seek necessary organizational change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation and Assessment of Objectives

c) The program’s objectives are reflected in program implementation.

California State University East Bay’s MSW faculty regularly review all course syllabi, aligning course objectives and content as necessary with our program objectives. The MSW faculty review, critique and revise course level objectives. All department syllabi indicate linkages between course objective(s) and program level objective(s), ensuring that all full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and students recognize these linkages. We also create grids that map the relationship between our courses and our program objectives, allowing us to discover and correct curriculum gaps. (Grids describing the relationship between the Program Objectives/Educational Policies and Course Objectives are provided in Section 2.)

The sixth program goal-- contributing to social work through professional leadership and scholarship--is advanced primarily through faculty scholarship and service. Consistent with the history and mission of our department, faculty members are actively involved with a wide range of professional and service activities that both contribute to the profession and inform our curriculum. Faculty research interests and service engage our students and reflect our social justice, urban, and culturally competent perspective. Our faculty scholarship reflects our commitment to advancing the knowledge base and quality of practice in the social work field. (See faculty bios.)

d) The program’s objectives are reflected in program assessment.

As described in Section 8 of our Self-Study, success in achieving objectives and in ensuring that graduating students possess the knowledge, skills, and values for professional social work practice is systematically evaluated and adjusted when necessary through the application of targeted assessment procedures. Specifically, we use both direct and indirect measures for assessing each program objective. We have also identified strategies for regular evaluation of success in achieving objectives among graduating students.

Sharing Our Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Standard 1.3: The program makes its constituencies aware of its mission, goals and objectives.

The MSW program consistently informs all constituents about its mission, goals and objectives, and rationales for the two concentrations. The mission statement is prominently displayed and distributed widely.

- Students and faculty are our primary constituents. We communicate our mission, goals, and objectives to them in a number of ways. Students initially contact our department through our website, where our mission, goals, and objectives are prominently featured.
Our mission, goals, and objectives are printed in the admissions application, our newsletter, the graduate student handbook, and field manual. They are distributed at orientations and posted in the Social Work office and hallways. Finally, during 1st and 2nd years, each student develops and signs a unique learning agreement based on our seven program objectives. Thus, our students are fully informed and engaged with the mission, goals, and objectives of our program. Full-time annual and part-time faculty receives our newsletters, student handbook, and field manual. They attend orientation meetings and faculty retreats where we discuss the “state of the department” and review our goals, objectives, and plans for the new academic year.

- **Field Agencies**: Faculty from the MSW program regularly visits agencies in the service area to discuss the mission, goals and objectives of the program. We provide orientations for field instructors and sponsor an annual Internship Fair. During the summer, department faculty members perform administrative site visits to update agencies about the focus, purpose, and vision of the CSU East Bay Department of Social Work.

- **Community Advisory Board**: The MSW program has assembled a 10 member community advisory board. This board meets bi-annually and is responsible for reviewing and disseminating the program’s goals and objectives. Many of our advisory board members are associated with the following agencies and programs:
  - Alameda County Behavioral Health
  - Contra Costa County Employment and Human Services
  - La Familia Community Services
  - Alameda County Social Services
  - San Mateo County
  - The Greater Bay Area Workforce Collaborative
  - California Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies
  - Native American Community Health Center
  - Culture to Culture Chinese American Mental Health Professional’s Association
  - Contra Costa County Mental Health Services

We also collaborate with other social work schools, programs, and departments throughout the state. Through the Department, there is regular contact with the Directors of the Bay Area Social Services Consortium (BASSC) and through the California Social Work Education Consortium (CalSWEC). There are also ongoing meetings of the California Deans and Directors of MSW programs (CADD), the California Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, and social service providers from around the state. We also collaborate closely with Title IV-E and CalSWEC II, coordinators, and staff as well as faculty from the following universities:

- San Francisco State University
- U.C. Berkeley
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituent</th>
<th>Method of Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students and Faculty</td>
<td>• Application for admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Program’s <em>mission</em>, goals, and objectives are reviewed during orientation for incoming students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate Student Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Field Manual</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Mission</em> statement is posted in the main office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>Mission</em> statement is posted on the SW website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty Orientation through individual meetings with the Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department Brochure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department Fact Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instructors and Field Agencies</td>
<td>• <em>Field Manual</em> for field instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Field instructor trainings (2x per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board members</td>
<td>• Review of <em>mission</em> and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Departments</td>
<td>• Department Chair meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Grants and Affiliates</td>
<td>• Meetings with schools of SW funded by Title IV-E across the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings with other schools of SW funded by Title-IV-E in Northern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bi-annual meetings with state-wide network of Field Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>• Newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facebook/Google Group Alumni pages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 2: CURRICULUM
The MSW program has designed a coherent, integrated curriculum that prepares culturally competent, urban social work practitioner-advocates for advanced practice in the concentration areas of Community Mental Health and Children, Youth, and Family. The curriculum is developed and organized to be consistent with program goals and objectives and is based on providing effective services in the economically, ethnically, and culturally diverse environment of the greater San Francisco Bay Area. The curriculum prepares our graduates to work with disenfranchised and oppressed urban populations by providing direct culturally competent services that address social injustice and marginalized and oppressed populations.

We organize our curriculum around six content areas: Human Behavior and the Social Environment, Diversity, Practice, Policy, Research, and the Field Practicum. Our curriculum ensures that our graduates value the complexities of an urban environment, demonstrate cultural competence, and advocate for social justice. These three themes are reflected in the Department’s mission and are integrated throughout the foundation and concentration years. They are at the core of our six goals and our seven objectives.

The MSW faculty defines social work practice as a multi-level, client-centered, social justice oriented and goal-directed approach which involves engaging, assessing, planning, applying, and evaluating appropriate interventions. Our foundation-year curriculum is presented from a generalist perspective that is grounded in ecological systems theories and problem-solving models. Content related to social work values and ethics, diversity, social and economic justice, and populations-at-risk is integrated throughout the program and appears in every course as well as in the field practicum.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of the MSW curriculum is derived from the framework of the profession as a whole, i.e., the need to understand individuals both as separate entities and as elements of larger systems. This basic person in environment (Germain, 1981; Pardek, 1988) approach is consistent with the intellectual tradition, the philosophical orientation, and the value-based approach of the social work profession.

The key theoretical approach is systems theory. The core element of systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968) is that change in any element of a system leads to change in other elements of that system. It is this fundamental understanding that underlies and links all elements of social work practice and education. It is within this fundamental understanding that the faculty articulates specific elements of social work education and students come to appreciate the uniqueness and effectiveness of social work practice.

The faculty exposes students to a number of intellectual paradigms and theoretical approaches as methods of articulating the interconnectedness among elements of social systems. Exposure to these theories allows students to recognize that the social system is constituted not only by individuals, but also couples, families, informal groups, organizations,
communities and political structures. These theories lead to the explication and evaluation of specific social work interventions. They are all consistent with systems theory based on a basic person in environment approach and all reflect basic social work values. The following are descriptions of the major theoretical themes taught as part of the social work curriculum.

**Urban Professional:** Human-created urban blight has affected all areas of the social system. Political economy (Gummer, 1990) leads us in articulating the importance of resource control in the political process, the survival of cities, and the ability of citizens with them to provide the services that their residents expect. The East Bay has experienced urban decline that has led to increased social polarization, income inequality, and racial segregation. Given the multicultural and multiracial nature of our service area and great diversity in terms of political, gender and religious perspectives, we believe it is essential to prepare social work students for leadership in an increasingly complex and racially diverse society. Institutional (Scott, 1995) theories enhance understanding of the relationship between social service agencies and their environments. (Delgado, 1998/1999) suggests that communities can best be served through their own, already-established recreational, social, and cultural centers and suggests that social workers reach out in nontraditional ways to the communities they are trying to help.

Graduates from this MSW program are equipped to enter the field as advanced professionals focused on reversing urban problems; promoting access to the resources and services and creating the opportunities necessary for poor, vulnerable, underserved and oppressed populations. They are equipped with the strategies, skills, techniques and approaches for addressing and combating sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, ableism, and other egregious ills of our society.

**Culturally Competent Practice:** Influenced by the Council on Social Work Education’s (CSWE) EPAS 1.0 directing all institutions of education seeking accreditation to prepare social workers in culturally competent practices, the CSU East Bay MSW program is committed “to develop and apply practice in the context of diverse cultures” (CSWE, 2001, Educational Policy 1.0). Cultural values and beliefs are viewed from the strengths perspective (Saleeby, 1996; Fong & Lum, 2004), which has evolved as an alternative to the pathology orientation in the helping professions in theory building, assessments, and interventions. The cultural competence model (Lum, 1999, 2003, 2004) leads us to cultural awareness, knowledge acquisition, skill development, and inductive learning. The cultural competence model is used as a means for framing the issues for culturally sensitive practice and integrating cultural values in a manner that incorporates values and beliefs from cultures of origin of clients being served.

**Social Justice/Advocacy Orientation:** Multicultural empowerment is more than acknowledging cultural diversity and analyzing cultural stereotypes. It implies engaging, questioning, and transforming the diverse institutions that produce racism, gender and sexual orientation,discrimination, economic exploitation, cultural elitism, and other forms of oppression. The social justice perspective (Van Soest & Garcia, 2003) is premised on the concept of distributive justice, which emphasizes society’s accountability to the individual. The effective change of oppressive power relationships among elements of a social system requires the recognition and empowerment of the inherent strengths of system elements: individuals, families, agencies or communities. Empowerment (Pinderhughes, 1983) theory enhances the ability to choose among alternatives; to act, to intervene, and to change within social systems.
It involves an appropriate usage and sharing, and not the abnegation of power. Figure 2.1 depicts the relationship among the different parts.

Figure 2.1 CSUEB MSW Conceptual Framework

The MSW Curriculum Committee provides oversight to ensure coherence and integration in the MSW curriculum. In the MSW program, one lead faculty member, with feedback from colleagues, develops the “master” syllabus for each course and ensures that...
syllabi are consistent across sections and congruent with program objectives. Lead faculty members chair sequence and concentration committees and serve as liaisons for communication and information exchange between the curriculum committee and the relevant full and part time faculty.

The MSW curriculum infuses our commitment to serving a diverse, complex, urban population; to developing cultural competence; and to advocating for social justice in all of our courses. Our curriculum ensures that graduates will move beyond intervention to advocacy for social change and social justice. These elements are core to our practice, policy, research, and lifespan courses. Students are educated and prepared to articulate clearly, at the point of graduation, their commitment to social justice, advocacy, urban populations, and cultural competence through their culminating experience, the integrative capstone seminar.

The MSW program curriculum at CSU East Bay is coherent in that each course addresses several program objectives and each of the program’s objectives is emphasized in multiple classes. The same seven objectives are used for the foundation and advanced curriculum ensuring integration and coherence both in the foundation and advanced curriculum. The advanced level of the objectives describes the knowledge, values, and skills needed for advanced practice in a concentration. The specific knowledge and skills vary with the concentration, but are grounded in the same seven objectives.

**MSW Curriculum: Overall Structure, Integration, and Consistency With Goals And Objectives**

Applying a cultural competence framework to guide inquiry and analysis, students are equipped with skills and values necessary for effective advanced practice. The self-study process has allowed us to revisit our mission and goals and to reexamine all foundation and concentration content. Over a two-year period, 2008 to 2009, the faculty reviewed and refined both the conceptualization of its generalist foundation and Children, Youth and Family and Community Mental Health concentrations.

The MSW curriculum has been designed to (a) achieve the mission, goals, and objectives of the program; (b) be consistent with the purposes of social work education and all aspects of the CSWE Educational Policy Accreditation and Accreditation Standards; (c) build on a liberal arts foundation; and (d) prepare students with the knowledge, skills and values that are vital for advanced practice from either a Children, Youth and Family or a Community Mental Health multi-systems perspective.

**Unit Requirements.** The program requires 88 units of course work and grants the Master of Social Work degree to the Children, Youth and Families and the Community Mental Health concentration in advanced practice. The academic year and year round programs are sequential. The MSW program is offered at both the Hayward (academic year) campus and Concord (year-round) campus. Students enrolled at the Hayward campus attend classes and field internships during the fall, winter and spring quarters for a total of six quarters. Students enrolled at the Concord campus attend classes and field internships fall, winter, spring, and summer quarters for a total of eight quarters.

Students enrolled at the Concord (year-round) campus attend classes in the evenings and complete field studies over two (2) summer quarters for 13 weeks (each summer) of
intensive training and study. The requirements, admissions policies, expected student outcomes, and assessment procedures are the same for academic year and year-round students.

Students complete a 44 unit foundation curriculum, which is comprised of three courses in Practice and Field Practicum; two courses in HBSE, and one course in Race, Gender and Inequality and Research. The Practice, Field Practicum and HBSE courses are designed as Foundation year sequence courses.

The overall curriculum design and the sequencing of courses as they are taken by students in the academic year, two-year MSW program are illustrated below in Table 2.1. The overall curriculum design and the sequencing of courses for the Concord campus based, year round program is illustrated below in Table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1: Course Sequence in the Hayward Campus MSW Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Quarter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior in the Social Environment I: Infancy-Adolescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Gender, and Inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist Practice I: Micro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Practicum I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.2 MSW Curriculum Design (Model for the Year-Round Concord Program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Quarter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Gender, and Inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall Quarter** | **Winter Quarter** | **Spring Quarter** | **Summer Quarter** |
| Qualitative and Quantitative Research: CYF/CMH | Program Evaluation: CYF/CMH | Integrative Seminar: CYF/CMH | Advanced Micro Practice |
| Elective Option | Advanced Social Policy | Elective Option | Advanced Mezzo Practice |
The Liberal Arts Perspective

The MSW program is committed to training professionals who are especially skilled at serving low income communities. We train professionals to engage in multi-level practice strategies that demonstrate competence and sensitivity to broad areas of human diversity, including class, gender, race, age, religion, disability and sexual orientation. Thus, our students must be grounded in such basic liberal arts knowledge as human biology, arts and language, sociology, psychology, anthropology, ethnic studies, history, political science, and economics. Therefore, incoming students are expected to bring such knowledge to enrich their understanding of present social problems and to enrich their responses to the great diversity that they will experience at all levels of practice. We require a liberal arts bachelor’s degree from an accredited college or university, and prerequisites in statistics and in human biology, physiology, or anatomy. (See application requirements in appendix.)

MSW courses lead students to apply the generalized knowledge of an undergraduate education to specific social theory and problems through applied social work practice.

- Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE) courses teach students to apply theoretical content from psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, and women’s and ethnic studies to specific arenas of social work practice.
- The Race, Gender, and Inequality course builds on foundational thought in race, gender, and inequality from sociology, and ethnic and women’s studies undergraduate courses to ensure students’ advanced understanding of crucial theoretical concepts.
- Practice courses draw insights from sociology, psychology, and political science and from organizational and management business theory to help students apply theory to practice situations.
- Policy courses require knowledge of political science, economics, and history to enable students’ understanding of the history and development of social policy and the welfare state.
- Research courses build greater communication and critical thinking from undergraduate courses to enhance students’ understanding of the epistemological debates underlying the ways in which the social sciences accumulate and disseminate knowledge.

Accreditation Standard 4: Foundation Curriculum Content: All social work programs provide foundation content in the area specified below. Content areas may be combined and delivered with a variety of instructional technologies. Content is relevant to the mission, goals, and objectives of the program and to the purposes, values, and ethics of the social work profession.

Foundation Curriculum Content

With the liberal arts perspective as a base, during the first year of the MSW program, students gain a solid foundation in generalist oriented social work practice (courses) with the
goal of effective performance under the guidance and supervision of a professional social worker (field practice). The primary skills and competencies taught consist of the ability to assess, plan, implement, and evaluate practice with systems of varying size from a systems, ecological, and strengths perspectives.

First Quarter: In the first foundation quarter, students are introduced to the fundamentals of culturally competent and social justice oriented practice from a generalist perspective. During the first quarter, students receive extensive exposure to the theoretical underpinnings of social work interventions, learn about social work values and ethics, and have opportunities to explore and reflect on personal attitudes that bear upon their understanding of diversity and the structural aspects of social and economic justice. In the first HBSE course, students are provided with theoretical frameworks for understanding human development from conception through adolescence and the reciprocal relationships between the individual and the environment. They are also introduced to ecological and systems theory. In SW 6010, Race, Gender, and Inequality, students develop a comprehensive understanding of the oppression and exclusion of populations of color, women, and those singled out for differential and unequal treatment. Additional areas include: religion, age, sexual orientation, disability, white privilege, and socio-economic status. Students learn about the immigration and assimilation experiences of marginalized groups, people historically disadvantaged, the urban disenfranchised, and underserved populations.

By the third week of the quarter, students are assigned field placements. They shadow their field instructor and develop a learning agreement predicated on the seven program objectives (communication, diversity, professional use of self, values and ethics, applying theory to practice, and critical thinking). Students are introduced to these objectives in all of their courses, and all assignments are predicated on some aspect of these objectives. Within the practice and field practicum sequences, students develop an understanding of generalist practice and apply this approach to practice with clients and client systems. HBSE, practice, and field in the first quarter emphasize work with individual clients and client systems.

Second Quarter: During the second quarter in SW 6030, the History and Philosophy of Social Work, students are able to learn about social work history and impact on value, politics, and economics of the development of social welfare systems. There is emphasis on the impact of policy on the marginalization of disenfranchised groups such as populations of color, women, the aged, etc. In the second Human Behavior and the Social Environment course, students are provided with theoretical frameworks for understanding human development from young to older adulthood and the reciprocal relationships between individual and environment. Within the practice and field practicum sequences, students develop an understanding of generalist practice and apply this approach to practice with clients and client systems. Practice and field in the second quarter emphasize work with family and small group systems.

Third quarter: During the third quarter, students are introduced to research methods and design course, where they develop an understanding of scientific approaches to problem solving and develop core skills in information literacy and critical thinking. During the third quarter, students continue through the practice and field practicum sequence to develop an understanding of generalist practice and apply this approach to clients and client systems. Practice and field in the third quarter emphasize work with communities, organizations, and governmental entities. These foci, micro (first quarter), mezzo (2nd quarter), macro (3rd
Knowledge from the first quarter is the cornerstone of the second foundation quarter, which then builds on the third, thus assuring the vertical integration of knowledge, skills, and values. In the second foundation quarter, emphasis is placed on theory and practice with family and groups, while the third foundation quarter focuses on organizations and communities in the practice, field practicum, and HBSE courses. In the field, students continue to build on their skills in working with individual clients and client systems, and they are exposed to approaches to working with groups and families (second quarter) and communities and organizations (third quarter) in their field placements.

Foundation courses in practice, HBSE, and the field practicum provide the foundation for advanced practice in the concentration year (described in 2.0.1). The policy course gives attention to the development of both the social welfare state and social policy in the U.S. and prepares students to engage in policy analysis and practice during the concentration year. The research methods course provides students with analysis skills that they will employ in their advanced years research courses, Qualitative and Quantitative research and Program Evaluation as well as their capstone research project in the concentration year. All the courses and the field practicum prepare social workers to work effectively with diverse clients and client systems.

During the foundation year:

- The Race, Gender, and Inequality course and the Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE) course introduce students to the variations attributed to urban environments and to issues related to power, oppression, social standing, and cultural variation.
- HBSE and Practice courses explore key points of knowledge about the construct of culture and require students to practice skills in how to seek out information about various cultural communities.
- Practice courses and the Field Practicum expose students to approaches to working competently with diverse, urban populations and exploring how social group membership impacts perceptions of problems and interventions, allowing students opportunities to practice self-reflection skills.
- The Policy course provides opportunities to understand and identify strategies to remedy inequalities in terms of power and privilege.
- Research and Practice courses promote the principles of respectful partnership and the importance of approaching social work direct practice, macro practice, and research with respect/understanding for both best practices and scientific bias and a willingness to learn from and honor the lived experiences of different individuals, groups, and communities.

The courses are designed to work as a coherent, integrated whole. Each objective in the course syllabi in both the foundation and concentration year of the MSW program is linked to specific program level objectives. All of the EPAS’ content areas for the Master’s foundation
year are included and integrated through the selected conceptual frameworks. Table 2.3 identifies the relationship between course objectives and program objectives in the foundation year. Each objective in course syllabi is linked to specific program level objectives. The progression of content in each of the five program areas in the foundation year, their vertical integration with the concentration year, and the relationship of concentration year course objectives are described in greater detail in section 2.0.

**Table 2.3: Relationship of Course Objectives to Program Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Year</th>
<th>Values and Ethics</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Professional Use of Self</th>
<th>Advocacy</th>
<th>Applying Theory to Practice</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 6000</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6001</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6011</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6012</td>
<td>3, 14</td>
<td>8, 10, 14</td>
<td>5, 11</td>
<td>3, 10, 13</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 12</td>
<td>4, 6, 7, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td>2, 7, 8, 9</td>
<td>2, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td>2, 8, 9</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6, 7, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6030</td>
<td>2, 3, 6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6032</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 4, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>Values and Ethics</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Social and Economic Justice</th>
<th>Population s-at-Risk</th>
<th>HBSE</th>
<th>SWPS</th>
<th>Social Work Practice</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Field Practicum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 6000</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6001</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6010</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6011</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6012</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6013</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6020-22</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6030</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Working across systems, students in these courses formulate strategies for intervention based on situational assessments of problems, goals, and the size of systems. Students apply research findings and critical thinking to the assessment, intervention, and evaluation of their practice. Students emerge from the first year grounded in a generalist perspective and are proficient in beginning assessment-planning-intervention skills.

They should also be able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge and ability for multiculturally competent professional use of self in practice, including appropriate use of supervision and consultation, ability to function in the context of social service systems and organizations, and ability to seek necessary organizational change (Professional Use of Self).

2. Demonstrate oral, written, and interpersonal skills to communicate effectively and appropriately at individual, group, and community levels (Communication).

3. Analyze and apply knowledge of the bio-psycho-social framework, strengths perspective and theories that explain human development and behavior across the lifespan as well as social systems development and interactions (Applying Theory to Practice).

4. Demonstrate knowledge of issues related to power, oppression, and institutional discrimination; understanding of the history and structure of the social work profession; and the ability to advocate effectively for social and economic justice (Advocacy).

5. Demonstrate ability to understand, articulate, and integrate principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into practice (Values and Ethics).

6. Develop awareness of specific practice and competency skills in working with diverse populations, including addressing issues of age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation (Diversity).

7. Apply critical thinking skills in professional context and use research to inform and evaluate their practice (Critical Thinking).

Table 2.5 depicts the foundation year curriculum year for first year MSW students on the Hayward campus. Table 2.6 depicts the foundation year curriculum for first year Concord students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
<th>Winter Quarter</th>
<th>Spring Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior in the Social Environment</td>
<td>Human Behavior in the Social Environment</td>
<td>Elective Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infancy-Adolescence (SW 6000)</td>
<td>Adulthood (SW 6001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Gender, and Inequality (SW 6010)</td>
<td>Social Policy (SW 6030)</td>
<td>Introduction to Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist Practice I (micro)</td>
<td>Generalist Practice II (mezzo)</td>
<td>Generalist Practice III (macro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Practicum I</td>
<td>Field Practicum II</td>
<td>Field Practicum III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concord**

Table 2.6 MSW Curriculum Design (Model for the Year Round Concord Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
<th>Winter Quarter</th>
<th>Spring Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior in the Social Environment</td>
<td>Human Behavior in the Social Environment</td>
<td>Generalist Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infancy-Adolescence (SW 6000)</td>
<td>Young Adulthood- Old Age (SW 6001)</td>
<td>Field Practicum I, II, III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Gender, and Inequality (SW 6010)</td>
<td>Social Policy (SW 6030)</td>
<td>Introduction to Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Policy 4.0 Values and Ethics**

Social work education programs integrate content about values and principles of ethical decision making as presented in the *National Association of Social Workers’ Code of Ethics*. The educational experience provides students with the opportunity to be aware of personal values; develop, demonstrate, and promote the values of the profession; and analyze ethical dilemmas and the ways in which these affect practice, services, and clients.

**Foundation Curriculum: Social Work Values and Ethics**

The values of the profession—especially as they are codified in the *NASW Code of Ethics*—are explored in SW 6011 (Generalist Practice 1-micro practice), SW 6012 (Generalist Practice II-mezzo practice), and SW 6013 (Generalist Practice III-macro practice). Special emphasis is placed on how these issues influence professional decision-making in services to systems of all sizes. Content on values and their implications for ethical practice with
individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities are incorporated throughout the respective courses and are evident in discussions, readings and assignments.

Some of the values that are infused throughout the foundation practice curriculum are:

- Regard for individual worth and dignity
- Mutual participation of client system and worker
- Clients' strengths
- Confidentiality, and
- Respect of client systems

Additionally, an emphasis is placed on providing students with the knowledge and skills to apply the strengths perspective in working with diverse populations. Students are provided with opportunities to examine how their personal values impact their practice with diverse client populations. Furthermore, students are expected to be able to identify, examine, and clarify ethics and values as they relate to social work practice.

**Foundation Research: Social Work Values and Ethics**

Social work values and ethics are addressed throughout the research curriculum in readings, class discussions, and assignments. Ethical issues in social work research are discussed. Research and evaluation are essential tools in social work, and they are key elements in enhancing program delivery, maintaining programmatic relevancies and maintaining social work standards. Ethics are discussed with special emphasis on the profession’s responsibility for quality services, ethical ways to collect and utilize data, and how to contribute to social work knowledge. Value dilemmas in social work research, e.g., use of control groups, are addressed across all methodological areas. Students learn the importance of client rights, such as informed consent, confidentiality, and client decision-making.

**Foundation HBSE: Social Work Values and Ethics**

Social work values and ethics, particularly an understanding and respect for differences, represent central features of all courses. Developing an understanding of how human diversity impacts social work values and ethical practice is a critical component of student learning. This theme is reflected throughout course content, video presentations, readings, and assignments. Additionally, classroom exercises provide students with brief experiences in which they are encouraged to identify and clarify personal values, ethical dilemmas, and sources of value conflict.

Social work values and ethics are included in the discussions of diversity and research. Students are encouraged to become aware of their own personal values and beliefs, especially as they may influence their ability to work across cultures and to critically analyze and effectively use theoretical ideas.

**Foundation Policy: Social Work Values and Ethics**

Social work values and ethics are addressed throughout the history of social work and social welfare with a focus on demonstrating how social work values are used to guide policy practice skills including policy advocacy and social justice. Social work pioneers worked to breakdown social taboos and traditional barriers (such as a gendered society, racism,
homophobia, and social segregation) to promote social and economic justice. Their efforts shaped social policy in various periods. Ethical issues are reviewed and examined with particular attention to barriers to services for underserved and oppressed populations.

Throughout the social work policy sequence there is a focus on understanding, articulating and integrating principles, values and ethics of the social work profession in policy practice. By reading Jane Addam’s *Twenty Years at Hull House*, and discussing its implications for the development of social welfare state and programs, students learn the importance of advocacy and of macro practice. In the historical research paper, students are required to demonstrate the ability to articulate the historical context in which a selected policy exists, identify key issues of a selected policy as well as to identify the values and social context that influence the development of the policy.

**Diversity Foundation RGI: Social Work Values and Ethics**

The values of the profession—especially as these are codified in the *NASW Code of Ethics*—are explored in SW 6010 - *Race, Gender, and Inequality*. Special emphasis is placed on how these issues influence professional decision-making in services to systems of all sizes. Content on values and their implications for ethical practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities are incorporated throughout the respective courses, and are evident in discussions, readings, and assignments. Some of the values infused throughout the foundation practice curriculum include regard for individual worth and dignity, mutual participation of client system and worker, confidentiality, and respect of client systems. An emphasis is placed on providing students with the knowledge and skills to apply the strengths perspective which focuses on assets over deficits whenever possible. Students are assisted in developing an awareness of their personal values and clarifying conflicting values and ethical dilemmas in regard to practice with different systems.

**Foundation Field Instruction: Social Work Values and Ethics**

The values of the profession—especially as these are codified in the *NASW Code of Ethics*—are explored and applied in SW 6020, 6021 and 6022. Special emphasis is placed on how these issues influence professional decision-making in micro, mezzo, and macro practice situations. Content on social work values and their implications for ethical practice are incorporated throughout readings, discussions, and assignments. Likewise, field instructors are asked to explore values and ethical issues in supervision. Students are encouraged to share these topics in seminar(s).

Values such as regard for individual worth and dignity, mutual participation of client system and worker, confidentiality, respect, self-determination, integrity, and professional competence are infused into the curriculum throughout the seminar. Students are assisted in their personal values clarification, and supported in exploring ethical dilemmas that potentially arise in the field. They are introduced to the ethical responsibilities surrounding such issues as professional behavior, dual relationships, consultation, termination, and documentation.
Foundation Curriculum: Diversity and Populations-at-risk

Educational Policy 4.1: Diversity

Social work programs integrate content that promotes understanding, affirmation, and respect for people from diverse backgrounds. The content emphasizes the interlocking and complex nature of culture and personal identity. It ensures that social services meet the needs of groups served and are culturally relevant. Programs educate students to recognize diversity within and between groups that may influence assessment, planning, intervention, and research. Students learn how to define, design, and implement strategies for effective practice with persons from diverse backgrounds.

Educational Policy 4.2: Populations-at-Risk and Social and Economic Justice

Social work education programs integrate content on populations-at-risk examining the factors that contribute to and constitute being at-risk. Programs educate students to identify how group membership influences access to resources, and present content on the dynamics of such risk factors and responsive and productive strategies to redress them.

Programs integrate social and economic justice content grounded in an understanding of distributive justice, human and civil rights, and the global interconnections of oppression. Programs provide content related to implementing strategies to combat discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation and to promote social and economic justice. Programs prepare students to advocate for nondiscriminatory social and economic systems.

The MSW program is infused with the cultural competence perspective and a focus on diversity and populations-at-risk. The practice, HBSE, research, policy and field sequences also integrate diversity and the cultural competence perspective. The focus on diversity and multicultural issues in social work practice emphasizes evidence-based practice and developing knowledge and understanding that will produce culturally competent social work practitioners.

The foundation curriculum anchors students with a broad knowledge base, sensitivity to and an understanding of issues about race, gender, and inequality. Furthermore, the foundation curriculum assists students in developing a range of strategies for addressing barriers to full participation for oppressed populations.

**SW 6010 Race, Gender and Inequality** reflects the Department’s focus on urban populations-at-risk, cultural competence, and social justice advocacy. Students are required to take this course in the first quarter of the foundation year. The course uses the generalist perspective and focuses on barriers to full participation by oppressed, at-risk populations. It
exposes students to historical background, theoretical frameworks, policy and research implications, and interactive experiences focused on diversity and designed to prepare them for culturally competent social work practice. Using a systems perspective, students learn (a) how micro-, mezzo-, and macro-content learned in other foundation courses are linked together at the community level; (b) how to use oneself professionally as an agent of change at the community and organizational levels; and (c) the key role played by advocates and policy practitioners to address racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of oppression. SW 6010 acts as the base from which students explore, question, and increase sensitivity and develop a comfort level in dealing with the difficult dialogs and behaviors associated with issues of race, gender, and inequality.

**Signature Assignment**

The signature assignment of this diversity and at-risk-populations course is a three (3)-part paper in which you will:

- **Paper I:** Select either an African-American or Latino group to write about as an out group. If the student is an African-American, that student will select the Latino group. If the student is neither African-American nor Latino, the student may select either group.
- **Paper II:** Select a different group that is oppressed such as gay, lesbian, trans-gendered or another minority group such as Native Americans.
- **Paper III:** Use your critical thinking skills and conduct an analytical synthesis of the two groups that were researched in paper I and II and discuss the common themes, similarities, and differences of experiences as it relates to oppression. Interview someone from one of the groups studied and ask three (3) critically conscious questions about this person’s experiences as they may or may not relate to the findings of the completed research.

This three (3) part assignment provides students with an opportunity to develop understanding and sensitivity to the impact of inequality and oppression on disenfranchised populations. Additionally, it enhances the student’s awareness of diversity, the differential impact of social policy by asking them to apply research and critical thinking skills to complex populations, and the socio/political/cultural issues that impact them. Social Work 6010, Race, Gender and Inequality is a pivotal component of California State University East Bay MSW program’s commitment to diversity and preparing its graduates to become culturally competent urban social work practitioners.

**Foundation Practice and Diversity**

The foundation practice curriculum emphasizes the understanding and honoring of human diversity. The three practice courses, SW 6011 (Generalist Practice I), SW 6012 (Generalist Practice II), and SW 6012 (Generalist Practice III), utilize principles and tenets of cultural competence as a way of enhancing students’ understanding of differences and similarities in the experiences, needs, and beliefs of people. In particular, discussions, readings,
and assignments address the diversity of minorities, urban underserved, and immigrant communities in the Bay Area. The intersections of ethnicity/culture with other variables such as gender, age, social class, and sexual orientation, are also examined with regard to practice. All courses include content that explores differential assessment and intervention skills that will enable social workers to serve diverse populations. For example, in SW 6011, two written assignments require students to demonstrate cultural competence by applying theory to practice vignettes. In part of the assignment, the objective is to show how cultural variables influence the assessment of problems/issues and the selection of intervention approaches.

**Foundation Practice and Populations At-Risk**

The content of the foundation practice courses explores the influence of factors such as ethnicity, gender, age, social class, and sexual orientation on individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities, and examines implications for practice. There is specific content on people of color, women, and gay and lesbian persons. Furthermore, in line with the program mission, particular attention is paid to content on urban underserved populations including immigrants and refugees. Such content emphasizes the impact of discrimination and oppression on these populations-at-risk, and provides strategies for intervention. Throughout the foundation courses, students are asked to examine the intersection of race, class, and ethnicity on social problems.

Foundation practice courses highlight the importance of social and economic justice through practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. The courses broadly explore the dynamics and consequences of human oppression and discrimination, and provide students with the knowledge and skills to promote individual and collective social and economic justice. For example, all foundation courses include examples of empowerment practice with oppressed and underserved populations such as minorities, urban underserved populations, immigrants and refugees, women, gays and lesbians, and the elderly, and provide models and strategies that are responsive to the universal and unique needs of such groups.

**Foundation Research and Diversity**

The research foundation course, SW 6032 (Introduction to Research) focuses on sensitizing students to the conduct of research with diverse populations. Given the diverse population in the Bay Area, it is particularly important to ensure that students will not use research methods blindly or unethically, but will apply methods with sensitivity. Accordingly, topics related to sensitivity to diversity are addressed throughout the research curriculum. Such topics include design and measurement problems in the conduct of research involving minority populations, alternative ways to frame research questions, and the examination of underlying assumptions within any particular research study.

**Foundation Research and Populations-at-Risk**
Topics related to oppression and discrimination—particularly with regard to populations-at-risk in the Bay Area including people of color, immigrants and refugees, women, and gays and lesbians—are a focus of the research curriculum. Such topics include the misuse of findings or research methods that can contribute to oppression, ethical violations that can contribute to oppression, and the appropriate use of research to identify and help overcome oppression and its consequences.

SW 6032 (Introduction to Research) provides examples and discussion on how research can be used to promote social and economic justice. Examples also are provided about how some studies have been used by policy-makers to hamper social and economic justice. Whenever possible, the research of faculty in the MSW program will be used to highlight examples of how social workers can contribute to the social work research process.

Foundation HBSE and Diversity

The HBSE sequence which includes SW 6000 and SW 6001 focuses on understanding, affirming, and respecting people from diverse backgrounds. For example, in addition to exposure to traditional theories of development (e.g., theories of cognitive, moral, attachment, and psycho-social development) students learn about theories that examine race, ethnic, and gender identity development. Recognition of diversity within and between groups is integrated throughout the courses. Students are required to integrate consideration of diverse populations and cultural context in their term papers and presentations for both HBSE courses.

Foundation HBSE and Populations-at-Risk

HBSE courses (SW 6000 and 6001) explore the manifestations and impact of racism, ageism, sexism, and heterosexism as they apply to the experiences of diverse populations. Issues related to social and economic justice and strategies to combat discrimination, oppression, and economic deprivation are highlighted at each level of the lifespan. Students are taught to understand oppression at both a theoretical and practical level and are given assignments that focus on advocacy, social change, and the promotion of social justice. Students learn about the factors that impact risk and resiliency among individuals and families, including ways that individuals, families, and communities are affected by social, economic, and political factors. Through their ethnographic observations, students understand how social group membership and social construction interact with risk. Several course assignments (annotated bibliographies, interviews, presentations) ensure that students understand the impact of multiple risks on individual development as well as the accumulation of disadvantage for immigrant families, poor families, and lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender youth, and other populations at risk.

Foundation Policy and Diversity

The foundation policy course emphasizes the understanding and honoring of human diversity. The focus is on understanding and respecting people from diverse backgrounds, cultures including the aged, disabled, gay/lesbian/transgendered populations, and other
marginalized groups. Furthermore, students learn that there is diversity both within and between groups and how this impacts policy and practice. The overall intent of diversity in foundation policy is to assist students in understanding the impact of social welfare policies on diverse populations.

The policy foundation sequence emphasizes how racism, sexism, ageism, classism, ableism, and other discriminatory practices place people at risk. It shows students how the intersection of ethnicity/culture and other variables such as gender, age, social class, and sexual orientation magnify the risk; thus students learn for example that the lived reality of an African American transgendered male differs from that of a white transgendered male. Overall, there is an emphasis on helping students acquire specific policy practice skills and knowledge, such as advocacy, empowerment, and the strengths perspective. Students master strategies to effectively combat discrimination, oppression and economic deprivation.

**Foundation Field Instruction and Populations-at-Risk, and Social and Economic Justice**

In keeping with the MSW program’s mission, students are placed in non-profit field settings, which offer the opportunity to serve at-risk urban populations in the Bay Area. The seminar milieu, readings, and assignments promote the exploration of the field experiences in terms of social justice issues, such as poverty, equal access to healthcare and education, oppression, overt and institutionalized racism, violence, trauma, unemployment, substance abuse, incarceration/crime, and housing. While field tasks frequently require the student to work from a micro perspective, the foundation seminar challenges the student to examine the problem at hand from mezzo and macro lenses, thus encouraging the exploration of social and economic issues. Tensions between the applied reality of classifying individuals and groups as “at-risk” versus the program’s strength-based orientation are also addressed.

**Foundation Policy and Populations-at-Risk, and Social and Economic Justice**

The core focus of the foundation social policy course is to provide students with an understanding of how social policies either promote or detract from social and economic justice. In this course, students examine policy examples to capture the expected and unexpected policy outcomes that may or may not promote social or economic justice for specific populations. Special attention is paid to populations of color, women, gays and lesbians, urban disenfranchised and underserved populations by examining these populations as “out-groups.”
Foundation HBSE

The HBSE courses (SW 6000 and 6001) assist students in understanding the reciprocal relationship between individuals, families, and groups within the context of their community and the broader society. In this sequence, students learn about human development and socialization across the lifespan. They identify how their personal and cultural biases affect social work practice and are introduced to social systems and the ecological theory. Substantive areas covered in HBSE include the effects of human diversity and oppression; interpersonal behaviors and worldviews; life events and transitions; life cycle and human development processes, and critical factors that influence both healthy and problematic developmental outcomes.

Special emphasis is placed on the consideration of cultural context and awareness of factors connected to the social justice perspective that impact the interaction between individuals and the environment from macro (e.g., dynamics of power, privilege and oppression, and how social systems may both facilitate or impede the health and well being of diverse populations) to micro levels (e.g., the impact of social group membership and social position on individual perceptions).

By completing field observations and self-assessments, students gain insight into their personal and cultural biases. Students in classroom discussion of biological, sociological, cultural, psychological, and spiritual theories are encouraged to think critically about the applicability of theories to diverse populations. They increase their knowledge through case studies and role-playing. Through role-plays, they demonstrate their proficiency in applying theory to practice. Case studies give them specific examples of how the intersection of variables such as race, age, gender, and environmental factors result in different development outcomes. In their self-assessment, they explain the range of social systems in which they have functioned across their lifespan. They produce annotated bibliographies, interviews, and research papers that demonstrate their understanding of how social systems promote or deter people in their efforts to maintain or achieve health and well-being.

The fall quarter course (SW 6000-HBSE I) focuses on the individual and family (from pregnancy and infancy through adolescence), studied from the social systems and ecological perspective to provide an understanding of the reciprocal relationships between human behavior and social environments. Some theories examined include ecological, systems,
psychodynamic, behavioral, social learning, strengths, identity development, cultural identity development and cognitive behavioral development.

- Students search the empirical literature to identify ethical issues, best practices, and practice with oppressed and disenfranchised population in an annotated bibliography.
- Student groups present on the prevalence, incidence, etiology, diagnostic criteria, and treatment of a common childhood mental health disorder(s).
- Student term papers apply theory to an adolescent case study.

As with SW 6000, HBSE II theories and knowledge of biological, sociological, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development across young, middle, and older adulthood as well as reciprocal relationships between human behavior and social environments are covered. This course focuses on empirical theories and knowledge about normative and abnormal and mental health development across the lifespan. Students also develop an understanding of the ways in which social systems promote or deter mental health and wellbeing. Thus, problems of stigma, diagnosis, homelessness, discrimination, lack of adequate care, post-traumatic stress, psychopharmacology, and family stress are very carefully examined.
- Students search the empirical literature to identify ethical issues, best practices and practice with adults with behavioral disorders in an annotated bibliography.
- Student groups present on the prevalence, incidence, etiology, diagnostic criteria and treatment of a common childhood mental health disorder.
- Student term papers apply theory to an older adult case study.

**Human Behavior and the Social Environment and EPAS Content Areas**

**HBSE and Foundation Year Sequence**

The HBSE courses are connected to each other through systems and ecological theories. The relationship between Foundation Sequence courses and the HBSE sequence is described in Table 2.7.

**Table 2.7: Relation between HBSE and Other Foundation Sequences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Foundation HBSE Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy      | • Understanding social and economic justice issues and how they are and can be infused into policy development.  
|             | • Examining individuals in the context of their communities and how social milieu influences behavior. |
| Practice    | • Overlapping theoretical frameworks, particularly  
|             | o Behavioral  
|             | o Humanistic, and  
|             | o Social Learning  
|             | • Methods and skills taught in practice courses, but practice applications emphasized in HBSE, particularly with regard to assessment.  
|             | • HBSE courses offer a life span development understanding of individuals and highlights their interactions in the family and group context. |
Field Instruction

- HBSE/lifespan development and social community process are applied by students in the field.
- Theories studied in HBSE serve as an explanation for phenomena observed and processed in the field.

Research

- Emphasizes empirical knowledge about human development.

Foundation HBSE Instructional Methods and Evaluation of Learning

Faculty uses a common syllabus to ensure consistency in exposure to essential lifespan content. Using readings, lectures, and class discussions these courses provide foundational knowledge. Diverse instructional methods include guest speakers, prepared participation, lectures, small and large group interactive discussions, role-plays, and videos. All courses engage students and make them responsible for their own learning. Term papers and readings provide students with opportunities to demonstrate the depth and breadth of their understanding of HBSE knowledge. Evaluation of student learning occurs via research assignments, literature reviews, group presentations, midterms, final exams, final papers, journal assignments, group presentations, and homework assignments. The HBSE faculty meets regularly to review and plan for curricular changes.

Signature Assignments

**SW 6000- HBSE I**

*Observation and reflection of life span*

1. **Choose a segment of life span from infancy to adolescence that interests you.**
   - Infancy (birth through about 18 months), Toddlers (18 months to 3 years), Early childhood (4 years through about 6 years), or Middle Childhood (7 years through about 12 years).

2. **Create an opportunity for yourself to observe and interact with a group of people who are in the age phase you chose.** Arrange to spend 2-3 hours interacting with and observing this group (in research we call this participant observation).

3. **After your participant observation type two double spaced (12 point font) pages that:**
   - Describe the group you observed and interacted with in terms of ages, ethnicities, sexual orientations, social classes, and sex.
   - Describe your experiences of being with this group and one new thing you learned from this experience.
   - Describe your impressions of this age group in terms of what they do and say and how they express themselves.

**SW 6001- HBSE II**

*Assignment: Interview with an Older Adult*

Interview an older adult – 65 years or older (3 degrees of separation- race, ethnicity, language, place of birth, gender, religion). This person must be of another race/ethnicity and of a different
gender as well as another variable than your own, such as language, religious orientation, place or country of birth, etc.).

Questions:
• What are the most significant accomplishments of your life? Describe several in depth that refer to different aspects of your life.
• What have been the most significant challenges in your past life development? How did you meet these challenges? What coping skills did you use?
• Today, what are the most important issues that you face as an older adult? To what extent do you feel that you are in control of your life?
• How are you preparing for your anticipated future needs (physical, emotional, mental, spiritual, and financial)?
• How have race, gender, class or ability played a role in your life?
• If you were to review your life as a whole, how would you describe the most important meanings you have discovered?
• What wisdom do you want to share with others?
• How would you like to be remembered?

Educational Policy 4.4: Social Welfare Policy and Services

Programs provide content about the history of social work, the history and current structures of social welfare services, and the role of policy in service delivery, social work practice, and attainment of individual and social wellbeing. Course content provides students with knowledge and skills to understand major policies that form the foundation of social welfare; analyze organizational, local, state, national, and international issues in social welfare policy and social service delivery; analyze and apply the results of policy research relevant to social service delivery; understand and demonstrate policy practice skills in regard to economic, political, and organizational systems, and use them to influence, formulate, and advocate for policy consistent with social work values; and identify financial, organizational, administrative, and planning processes required to deliver social services.

Foundation Policy

Social Welfare History and Philosophy (SW 6032) provides foundation year students the necessary historical background and social work philosophy to better understand both the development of the U.S. social welfare state and necessary skills and knowledge to interpret current policies and to anticipate future developments and trends. This foundation course is vertically integrated with the Concentration Policy curriculum: SW 6520- Advanced Children, Youth, and Family Policy Practice and SW 6525- Advanced Community Mental Health Policy
Practice. This vertical integration will be discussed in more detail in the concentration year section.

The Policy content area consists of one course, SW 6030- Social Welfare Policy: History and Philosophy which is offered during the second quarter of foundation year. The SW 6030 policy course offers an historical overview along with a policy analysis framework for critically examining the basic dimensions of social policy and its historical origins. The course enables students to develop an understanding of the historical, philosophical, social, political, and economic context of social policy and the historical and current day structures of social welfare services. The introduction of the history of the social work profession is also included. Another component of this course is a chronological understanding of the impact of historical social policies on out-groups and current implications for social work policy practice.

Woven throughout this course is the importance of understanding oppression as it impacts populations of color, gay-lesbian-transgender groups and other out-groups. Culturally competent analysis and understanding are central to understanding the historical and current day impact of social policy. Therefore, it is expected that students will understand how and why policy impacts certain populations differentially. In weekly class discussions, reflections, readings and assignments, students are expected to use multicultural lenses to question, explore and analyze social welfare policy, programs and delivery systems.

The foundation year policy course is directly related to the mission, goals, and objectives of the MSW program in that students understand the connections among social welfare, social policy, social service delivery, and the profession of social work; the historical impact of racism, sexism, homophobia, white privilege and other forms of oppression in the historical development of social welfare policy and the social work profession. They also develop knowledge and skills to analyze organizational, local, state, national and international issues in social welfare policy and social service delivery; and they come to understand and demonstrate policy practice skills in regard to economic, political, religious, and organization systems. Finally, they are able to identify policy practice skills that influence, formulate, and advocate for policy consistent with social work values and financial, organizational, administrative and planning process to deliver social services.

Students learn to use a historically comparative view to elucidate the development of urban disenfranchised and underserved communities’ responses to individual and societal needs through social welfare and the social work profession. Upon completion of the course, they are able to identify and discuss the value premises, political and economic determinants embedded in major American social welfare programs, policies, and legislative initiatives. The final paper assigned in this course requires students to examine and access the impact of current policies on ethnic minorities, women, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, and other populations-at-risk; formulate social change and advocacy strategies appropriate for improving the well-being of service recipients and communities. The outline for this paper is listed below.

Signature Assignments

**SW 6030- Social Welfare Policy**

**Historical Social Welfare Policy Position paper.** Write a position paper (5-6 pages) in support of,
or in opposition (rebuttal) to past legislation. Identify a social welfare policy on a relevant issue related to social work such as the Social Security Act of 1935, the Indian Removal Act 1836, OASDI Insurance, Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, Unemployment Insurance, or the Asian Exclusion Act of 1882. The paper MUST include a minimum of five scholarly citations (which exclude sources such as dictionary.com and Wikipedia), and demonstrate an integration of both texts into the paper.

Particular emphasis is placed on understanding the historical role of social workers as critical thinkers and advocates for social and economic justice and social change in the development of social welfare policies and programs. Students learn how to use policy practice skills to influence, formulate, and advocate for policy consistent with social work values. Recognizing that the practice of social policy is regarded as a tool to understanding and influence the policy making process, the course examines policy practice in both historical and current day contexts.

The course content demonstrates its commitment to policy matters and social service delivery in three ways by discussing: (1) poverty, racism, sexism, homophobia, disability, and oppression; (2) the evolution of American social policies; and (3) the relationship to advocacy and policy practice.

An historical perspective is the basic underpinning for understanding the development of social policy. Students are exposed to the intricacies of policy formulating and development through different time periods in the United States and are asked to critically examine these practices in relation to current day policy formulation. Additionally, the course focuses on urbanization, religion, and philosophy on the development and implementation of social policy. Students are introduced to both conflict and functionalist theories to provide an understanding of historical and current day barriers to social welfare development, expansion, and refinement.

The notion of welfare as an instrument of social control as discussed by Cloward and Piven (1971) provides a platform for students’ understanding of alternative justification for social welfare institutions. Additionally, there is emphasis on understanding social welfare history and its development as the result of synergistic influences of values, religion, politics, and the economy. In the historical issues research assignment, students are expected to demonstrate their understanding of this synergistic impact and provide examples of it in policy development.

Social Policy and EPAS Content Areas

Foundation Policy and Foundation Sequence

The knowledge, values, and skills students learned in the social policy course inform and support all other courses at the foundation level. The course content expands beyond the social policy courses and links to the practice course(s) and research course(s) which begin with a module in policy practice and legislative advocacy. Table 2.8 summarizes the relation of foundation practice courses to the foundation sequence.
Table 2.8: Foundation Policy and Its Relation to Foundation Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Foundation Policy Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE) | • Understanding theories and knowledge about social systems in which individuals, families, groups, and communities participate.  
  • Capturing the dynamics and nature of emerging policy issues in the societal environment.  
  • Providing insights of the impact of social systems on populations at-risk.                                      |
| Diversity                         | • Exploring the diversity of human life and cultures.  
  • Dealing with the complexity of interactions among individuals, families, groups, communities, and organizations from diverse background.  
  • Encountering stereotypes, prejudices, and injustice and their impact on social work clientele. |
| Practice                          | • Informing and understanding the type of social work intervention most appropriate to current and emerging policy and societal issues.  
  • Providing a knowledge base regarding the role and effect of social policy in promoting social and economic justice that further supports the policy and practice connection. |
| Practicum                         | • Applying knowledge, skills, and values related to social policies and social welfare programs at field agencies.  
  • Understanding the policy impact on field agencies.  
  • Developing strategies for policy or agency policy changes.                                                      |
| Research                          | • Using research findings and census data to understand the empirical impact on service recipients and communities.  
  • Using available literature and WWW sources to research a policy issue in order to develop research-informed advocacy in the policy domain. |

Foundation Policy Instructional Methods and Evaluation of Learning

The policy course utilizes class lectures, small group classroom activities and assessment techniques, videos, Internet sources, discussion, and assigned readings to reach its educational objectives. Students conduct an analysis of policies that respond to a social problem or issue of importance to populations-at-risk. Then, as if they were presenting to policy makers, they do an oral presentation of their policy analysis and offer final recommendations to the class. Student learning is evaluated formatively and summatively through written assignments, class presentations, group projects, and case studies.

The signature assignment for the foundation policy course, SW 6030: The History and Philosophy of Social Welfare, is a group written assignment in which students are expected to identify an historical social issue/problem and discuss a policy that was instituted to address it. Included in this assignment are the expectations that students will examine the impact of historical values, provide an analysis of the policy, discuss how the identified policy has negatively impacted an out-group and thereby, enhanced its marginalization as well as how the students might advocate for policy modifications or a new policy.

Please note that the foundation policy content on social work values and ethics; diversity; and populations at risk & social justice is described earlier in their respective sections. Please note that text box may be overlapping some content below.
Educational Policy 4.5: Social Work Practice

Social work practice content is anchored in the purposes of the social work profession and focuses on strengths, capacities, and resources of client systems in relation to their broader environments. Students learn practice content that encompasses knowledge and skills to work with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. This content includes engaging clients in an appropriate working relationship, identifying issues, problems, needs, resources, and assets; collecting and assessing information; and planning for service delivery. It includes using communication skills, supervision, and consultation. Practice content also includes identifying, analyzing, and implementing empirically based interventions designed to achieve client goals; applying empirical knowledge and technological advances; evaluating program outcomes and practice effectiveness; developing, analyzing, advocating, and providing leadership for policies and services; and promoting social and economic justice.

Foundation Practice

The purpose of the foundation practice sequence is to provide students with the knowledge, values, and skills to enhance the well-being of people and to help ameliorate the environmental conditions that affect people adversely. Specifically, this curriculum prepares students to apply a strengths-based, generalist perspective to social work practice with systems of all sizes. The three courses- SW 6011 (Generalist Practice I -micro), SW 6012, (Generalist Practice II -mezzo), and SW 6013 (Generalist Practice III -macro) are organized around a problem-solving method that highlights assessment, planning, intervention, evaluation, and termination. The course content and the assigned readings focus on values, ethics, and philosophies of social work practice, including the examination of the strengths, capacities, and resources of client systems.

The foundation practice sequence courses are directly related to the mission, goals, and objectives of the CSU East Bay program in that students learn to apply the social work generalist-ecological perspective to practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Students understand and apply the generalist perspective in practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities; they are able to identify, understand, and critically apply major theories, approaches, and skills that guide best practice across different system sizes; they understand and demonstrate competencies in assessment, planning, intervention, evaluation, and termination of services, with systems of all sizes and are able to demonstrate an understanding of the professional use of self as it pertains to practice across different system sizes. Students are able to understand and integrate the values and ethics of the social work profession as they apply to practice. They recognize the significance of diversity in all levels of social work practice, and demonstrate respect and competence in working with diverse populations. Ultimately, students understand and utilize research-based knowledge to support practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels; and they are able to demonstrate the strengths perspective in practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels.
SW 6011 Generalist Practice I - taken 1st quarter Hayward campus and 3rd quarter Concord campus. This course uses the systems and ecological perspectives to understand culturally sensitive, non-judgmental approaches to social work intervention with individuals in the context of an urban environment. The course begins with an overview of generalist practice and the purposes of the social work professions. Additionally, this practice course introduces students to the specific realities of working with an urban population and the notion of becoming an urban practitioner/advocate. Specifically, the course content includes theories related to person-centered, psychodynamic, behavioral, cognitive and crisis intervention; and how to appropriately apply traditional treatment modalities in an urban setting. Students learn assessment and communication skills. They are taught the importance of eclectic practice and application of these theories. In this course, the students write a bio-psycho-social assessment on a client that they are working with in their placement and learn to use ecomaps and genograms. The purpose of this assignment is to help the student implement empirically based interventions with an identified client.

Signature assignment

Self-Assessment. The purpose of the self-assessment assignment is to help you gain greater self awareness regarding your values and ethics and how your ethics and values can impact clients. Also, this assignment is an opportunity for you to examine whether the client’s values are congruent with social work values and the NASW.

Please answer the following questions:
1. What are three of your values that define your professional work life? Discuss how each value is operationalized in your work behavior.
2. Compare these three values to values found in the NASW Code of Ethics regarding similarities, differences, and ways your values may strengthen/complement the social work values or ways your values may cause value conflicts with social work values.
3. Are the values that you identified in #1 the same as in your personal life? How do you deal with any differences in style in your professional and personal lives, and how you capitalize on similarities?
4. Describe three skills that you bring to the social work profession from your personal life and work experience. What five skills do you anticipate learning within this first year of study, and describe why you think each is important?
5. Discuss briefly what support you would like from this class to strengthen your values and develop new skills.

SW 6012 Generalist Practice II. This course extends learning of the ecological perspective as it applies to families and small groups. Diverse theories and approaches relevant to family and group-focused practice are introduced. Specifically, experiential, structural, strategic, and cognitive-behavioral theories and approaches are examined. Conceptual frameworks relative to group work practice are also taught, including the problem-solving and decision-making model, self-help and educational group approaches, and methods of working with therapy groups. In addition, the course makes use of small group theory, which covers
such ideas as group cohesion and group leadership. Students learn group facilitation skills working with clients in formal groups, and with families. This includes an understanding of the various stages of group development, strategies to foster group cohesion, and the development of mutual aid. In-class activities, such as role play and decision-making exercises, highlight such skills. In this course, the students view a movie of a dysfunctional family, for example, *What's Eating Gilbert Grape*, and write an extensive bio-psycho-social assessment on the family identifying the needs and strengths of this family from an ecological perspective. The purpose of this assignment is to teach the student to identify issues, problems, needs, resources, and assets with regard to this family.

**Signature assignment**

*Theory role-play.* Form groups of four or five to work on completing a theory role-play assignment. Identify a clinical problem (such as an eating disorder), create a 30 minute role play about that issue, and use an evidence-based practice approach to address that issue. Finally, write a 15 page group research paper, discussing best practices for working with that particular issue and the social work implications involved.

SW 6013 Generalist Practice III. This is the third and final course in the foundation level content in the area generalist practice. Students are presented a basis for understanding macro practice in communities and organizations from an ecological and systems perspective including biological, social, economic, cultural, and spiritual factors. A broad range of macro theorists and theories of practice are covered to help the student understand and identify macro issues and how macro problems can adversely impact a group, family, or community. Social work organizations are discussed, including developing, analyzing, advocating, and providing leadership for polices and services. Also, the student gains an understanding in methods of advocacy for urban populations. Variables such as race, gender, class, and ability as they promote health and wellbeing or contribute to difficulties in community and organizational life are emphasized. Unique situations of communities and organizations such as ethnic minorities, children, women, the poor, gays, lesbians, trans-gendered, and other oppressed groups will be examined in the context of the social systems with which they interact.

**Signature assignment**

*Community Needs Assessment.* This assignment is an experiential learning assignment in which you are expected to participate in a windshield tour of a selected urban community, with the approval of the instructor. Visit the community at least twice, at different times of the day to help increase your understanding of that community. In your paper, document who and what you see in the community and why you see what you see (i.e. an objective community profile using available data) in that community. Use a strengths-based perspective in the analysis of the community. Additionally, you should communicate with members of the community to learn about community needs. You will be asked to present your findings to the class.
As this is a culminating assignment of the first year used for departmental assessment of student performance, the abbreviated grading rubrics, Table 2.9, are included for this assignment.

**Table 2.9: Abbreviated Grading Rubrics**

### Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Selection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Survey</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References &amp; Appendices</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level Writing, APA Format, Presentation Format</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of MSW Foundation Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources &amp; Culture</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References &amp; Appendices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level Writing, APA Format, Presentation Format</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of MSW Foundation Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Strengths &amp; Challenges</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Identification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution Efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Design</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Implementation: Community Partners &amp; Constituency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gathering Implementation Support</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary &amp; Conclusion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References &amp; Appendices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Level Writing, APA Format, Presentation Format</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of MSW Foundation Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assignment is the signature assignment for the foundation year. The assessment outcomes are reported in Chapter 8.

**Foundation Practice and Liberal Arts Perspective**
The relationship between foundation practice and the liberal arts perspective is described in Accreditation Standard 2.0 (see page 23). The broad knowledge base of the ecological perspective and human behavior are vital components of the Generalist Practice sequence.

**Foundation Practice and Foundation Sequence**

The intent of three foundation practice courses is to provide a generalist and ecological perspective, while laying the groundwork for competent and effective social work practice with client systems of all sizes. Other foundation components incorporate content that strengthen students’ knowledge and skills in practice. The accumulated knowledge of all foundation components supports a coherent framework from which to conceptualize and deliver services to individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities. Table 2.10 summarizes the relationship of foundation practice courses to the foundation sequence.

**Table 2.10: Foundation Practice and Its Relation to Foundation Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Foundation Practice Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE) | • Essential to practice assessment and intervention are theories and knowledge of human bio psychosocial development and the social systems in which individuals participate (e.g., families, groups, organizations, communities).  
  • HBSE content about the interactions and impact of social, cultural and economic forces on individuals and systems is critical to understanding practice principles and strategies. |
| Policy                                | • Knowledge about roles and effects of social policy in promoting social and economic justice supports the practice curriculum.  
  • Understanding and analyzing policy in the context of historical and contemporary factors provides students with background for decision-making in practice.  
  • SW 6010 integrates a portion of the policy curriculum, into the teaching of macro practice and advocacy skills. |
| Research                              | • The understanding and use of a scientific, analytic approach is integral to the foundation practice curriculum.  
  • An empirical base for social work practice is emphasized in students’ use of the research in assessment, intervention, and understanding the importance of service delivery evaluation. |
| Field Instruction                     | • Students apply the accumulated knowledge, skills, and values from foundation practice courses.  
  • Under the supervision of advanced practitioners, students test out newly acquired practice concepts and skills. |

**Instructional Methods and Evaluation of Learning**

Multiple instructional methods are used in the foundation practice courses, including lectures, audio-visual media, class discussions, readings, and experiential exercises (e.g. role-play, group simulations). All methods utilized in these courses emphasize the integration of theory and practice in that students learn through reading, discussing, observing, and practicing. For example, in SW 6012, students are divided into groups (of five to seven) to participate in discussion of particular practice issues.
Common strategies used to evaluate learning include examinations, written assignments, and individual or group projects. Students learn ways to use effective communication skills, and how to enhance those skills in supervision and consultation with supervisors and peers. Instructor actions, videos, and role play exercises are used to model communication skills with clients. The signature assignment for SW 6013 General Practice III is the primary assessment (midpoint or touchstone) for end of first year. Assessment outcomes are documented in Chapter 8 of the Self-Study.

Please note that the foundation practice content on social work values and ethics, diversity and populations at-risk and social justice is described earlier in their respective sections.

Educational Policy 4.6: Research

Foundation Research

Qualitative and quantitative research content provides understanding of scientific, analytic, and ethical approaches to building knowledge for practice. The content prepares students to develop, use, and effectively communicate empirically based knowledge, including evidence-based interventions. Students use research knowledge to provide high-quality services; to initiate change; to improve practice, policy, and social service delivery; and to evaluate their own practice.

Research is integrated throughout the entire curriculum. To develop practice competence, students are required to learn how to think critically, understand and analyze research literature to help inform practice, apply appropriate research-based knowledge, and use research methods to monitor and evaluate outcomes. The foundation research curriculum is focused on developing these areas of knowledge and skills, and the attitudes necessary to support continuing education and professional development after graduation.

Accordingly, the foundation research curriculum introduces students to basic scientific thinking and methods, including the role of research in social work practice, skills in critical thinking, scientific logic, spirit of inquiry, and knowledge building. These approaches enable students to function as critical consumers of social work research; and to develop a beginning level of methodological expertise to be able to conduct empirical research and the evaluation of practice and to evaluate practice through class discussions.

All MSW students are required to complete SW 6032, Social Work Research in the foundation year to advance to concentration-based research courses in the advanced-year (SW 6932 Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis, 6935 Program Evaluation, and 6959 Integrative Seminar or 6909 Departmental Thesis).

The foundation research course is directly related to the mission, goals, and objectives of the CSU East Bay program. The foundation research curriculum contributes to the generalist knowledge and skills base. It develops the students’ ability to critically analyze this knowledge base and to understand, discuss, and participate in research and evaluation applicable at the micro, mezzo and macro levels. The ability to select the best knowledge for practice and the
ability to evaluate service delivery at various system levels are enhanced through course work in the foundation research curriculum.

**SW 6032 Social Work Research.** In this course introduces the student to social and behavioral research methodology. Included is an examination of the major steps in an empirical investigation: the statement of a problem; the derivation of a hypothesis; the operation of variables; the design of the study; the collection and analysis of data; and the generalization of findings. Upon completion of the course, the student will be able to utilize most of the research reported in the social and behavioral science literature. The student will also have a fundamental knowledge of research methodology which will prepare him/her for more advanced research topics.

This course focuses largely on learning skills, values and professional behavior necessary to be a critical consumer of research. The basic assumption underlying this course is that social workers need to be research-informed practitioners in order to enhance intervention effectiveness. Accordingly, this course provides an introduction to principles of scientific thinking and introductory overviews of forms of research. This course prepares students to develop, use, and communicate empirically-based knowledge, including evidence-based interventions. The course includes lecture, discussion, student class presentations, and in-class exercises.

This foundation research course introduces MSW students to social and behavioral research methodologies. It provides a close examination of the major steps in empirical investigations. Theories of measurement, design, and statistical analysis form the foundation of the research course which prepares students for advanced research methods.

**Signature Assignment**

*Literature Review.* Write a 13-15 page paper answering the following questions after you conduct a review of the literature in a topic of your choice. If there is extensive literature, focus on the most recent findings of the last 20 years.

- What is the important background information on this topic?
- Who are the main researchers (experts) on this topic? What are some “classic” studies on the topic? That is, what are some studies that anyone learning about the topic has to know?
- What are the theories used by researchers to study this topic? Why?
- What research has been done previously? What is currently done?
- Are there consistent findings or do studies disagree? In other words, what are the controversies about the topic?
- What is currently known about this topic?
- Are there flaws in the body of existing research that you feel you can remedy? How?
- What are the researchers saying about gaps in knowledge about the topic? What is your opinion on what the gaps are?
- What are implications for research for social work practice?

**Foundation Research and Foundation Sequence**
All other foundation areas include research-based content in their curriculum. The development of research skills in the research courses helps students examine and contribute to foundation knowledge scientifically. Table 2.11 summarizes the relationships of foundation practice courses to the foundation sequence.

**Table 2.11: Foundation Research and Its Relation to Foundation Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Foundation Research Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE)</td>
<td>• Foundation HBSE courses examine the logic of research upon which theoretical and empirical content is based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>• Policy courses illustrate ways information derived from research can be used to inform and enhance policy decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>• Courses teach students how to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o evaluate all levels of practice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o select appropriate practice models and empirically validated intervention strategies, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o conduct empirical research relevant to practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Integrates content from the community organization course content on program planning with program evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Instruction</td>
<td>• Practicum courses teach students how to evaluate cases from their foundation practicum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students are encouraged to examine opportunities available for research projects in their practicum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Foundation Research, Instructional Methods, and Evaluation of Learning**

All sections of SW 6032 Social Work Research rely on lecturing, discussion, student participation, and assigned readings. All students enrolled in SW 6032 have to write one or more critiques on published research. Student learning is evaluated via exams, papers, homework assignments and, when appropriate, individual or group projects. The foundation research course also promotes research knowledge to provided high-quality services, to initiate change, to improve practice, policy, and social service delivery, and practice through class discussions, assigned reading, bibliography, exercises, and the development of a literature review.

**4.7 Field Education**

**Foundation Field**

Field education is an integral component of social work education. It is anchored in the mission, goals, and educational level of the program. It occurs in settings that reinforce students’ identification with the purposes, values, and ethics of the
profession; fosters the integration of empirical and practice-based knowledge; and promotes the development of professional competence. Field education is systematically designed, supervised, coordinated, and evaluated on the basis of criteria by which students demonstrate the achievement of program objectives.

The purpose of the MSW foundation year practicum (SW 6020, SW 6021, and SW 6022) is for students to build a generalist foundation for social work practice by providing experiences in a continuum of social work modalities and to develop generalist practice knowledge and skills within a framework of urban practice, cultural competence and social justice advocacy practice.

Foundation field work consists of direct and indirect interventions, including services to individuals, families, groups, and communities from a variety of racial, ethnic groups including persons of diverse abilities, classes, religions, genders and sexual orientations. Shaped by learning objectives and expectations, the foundation-year field instruction provides selected and organized experiences within agency settings that apply to the generalist knowledge and practice skills taught in the department’s curriculum.

The foundation-year placement’s primary objective is to help students build a generalist foundation through a breadth of learning experiences and the development of skills common to basic social work practice. Students are exposed to a continuum of modalities, a diversity of client populations and treatment issues, and a range of theoretical models. The foundation practicum provides the opportunity for students to practice skills that they will need in future work, regardless of setting, client need, or population group.

The field instruction content area consists of three courses during the foundation year: SW 6020 Field Instruction I, SW 6021 Field Instruction II, and SW 6022 Field Instruction III. Students are exposed to a variety of foundation year experiences, tasks, and activities spanning a range of complexity during the 480 hour fieldwork period. Students also attend a weekly two-hour field seminar that supports the field experience.

The foundation year field sequence courses are directly connected to the Department’s mission, goals, and objectives. The foundation field curriculum supports all seven of the core program objectives by addressing and integrating: 1) social work values and ethics, 2) the professional use of self, 3) critical thinking skills, 4) application of theory to practice, 5) advocacy for disenfranchised and oppressed clients, 6) work with diverse groups, and 7) professional communication. Seminar instructors, field liaisons, and field instructors all nurture the growth of these essential skills. In addition, the learning agreement and evaluation tools are organized around and promote the attainment of these objectives.

During the first quarter, students become oriented to their placements, shadow their supervisors and agency social workers, and begin receiving case assignments. Following their initial experience in SW 6020 and under field supervision, during second quarter students increase their micro and mezzo involvement with clients. The number and types of client assignments are augmented during the second quarter, often to include group intervention. The final quarter continues micro and mezzo client work, with an emphasis on advocacy and preparation for client termination. The student is integrally involved with both their faculty field liaison and the agency field instructor in order to develop effective practice skills.

- **SW 6020 Field Instruction I.** This is the laboratory in which students demonstrate their ability to apply social work knowledge, skills, and values. By the end of the Foundation
Field Instruction sequence (SW 6020, 6021, and 6022), students are expected to
demonstrate, satisfactorily, a mastery of information concerning their agency and to
engage with clients at the micro and mezzo levels. Initially, students must demonstrate
the ability to work under supervision, and the willingness to accept responsibility for their
role as professional helpers. They must also demonstrate the ability to establish and
maintain effective working relationships with individuals from diverse backgrounds and
with at-risk populations. SW6020, the first part of the field instruction sequence, offers
students information concerning diversity, risk, abuse, sexual harassment, child abuse,
ethics, and elder abuse, which is then integrated for use throughout the field experience.

Signature Assignment
Goal-Setting paper. In 1-2 pages, analyze your strengths and challenges as you begin this
placement, in terms of self-awareness, communication skills, comfort with generalist
interventions, your use of supervision, understanding of the roles of agency policy, and your
goals for using the seminar group. How well do the agency opportunities and your supervisor’s
style match your own learning goals and style? Be prepared to discuss issues that you are
comfortable sharing.

- SW 6021 Field Instruction II. In this second component of the field instruction curriculum,
  students become more knowledgeable about applying strength-based, ecological and
  person-in-environment theories to practice. The use of these frameworks in analyzing a
  field issue provides students with the foundation to function effectively within service
delivery organizations. Over the quarter, students increase their ability to apply
knowledge concerning the impact of social issues on client systems, agencies, and
networks. Seminar content also expands into the mezzo realm, where students engage
in more group experiences.

Signature Assignment
Case Presentation. Do a brief case presentation (15 minutes total) on an individual client,
family or group from your placement. A one-two page summary should be prepared for the
seminar meeting and copies made for all seminar participants. Please organize the
presentation around the following:
- Identifying information (NO REAL NAMES): family members: age, sex, grade (if a child),
  marital status, ethnicity, culture, SES, area of residence, living arrangements, court or county
  status, (if relevant sexual orientation and/or spiritual identification) etc.
- Presenting problem and reason for referral including relevant events leading up to the
  referral
- Brief history of relevant social, family, educational, medical, mental health, substance
  abuse issues or criminal; traumatic events, abuse/violence, separations, losses, relocations,
  immigrations /migrations; previous social service or law enforcement involvement
- Short narrative of your contacts with the client
- Summary of Intervention Plan and Goals
• Any relevant counter-transference or supervisory issues you are comfortable sharing, particularly in relation to your growth in cultural competence. What effect does the client have on you?
• One question that you would like the group to address

• **SW 6022 Instruction III.** This course introduces content related to applied macro practice, and the role of social workers in advancing and redirecting agency services. Students explore the concept of advocacy in placement and demonstrate increased professional communication skills through a case presentation. Students demonstrate and apply critical thinking through assignments that require an analysis of field issues and options, as well as an understanding of the role of social workers in problem assessment and change. Students continue their micro and mezzo work in placement and prepare for termination and their advanced year placement.

**Signature Assignment**

*Reflection Paper.* In a minimum of two pages, reflect on your field experience and seminar this first year. This is an assignment of introspection and thought. Before writing, review your journal assignments, process recordings, and critical analysis papers to observe your intellectual and emotional changes over the year. Contrast yourself at the beginning of the first quarter with how you see yourself now. How do you account for any changes? Consider areas of growth, stress and future development. Reflect on the seminar process. How did you contribute to the growth of the group? Discuss your maturation as a graduate student and as a social worker, including your development of a professional social work identity. How have you grown in the use of yourself as a social work tool, in your understanding of ethics, in your sense of cultural competence, and in your commitment to social justice? In light of these changes, what vision do you have for your second year placement?

**Theoretical Orientation:**

Using the ecological perspective for understanding individuals and groups in the context of the environment, this SW sequence introduces the application of various practice theories to experiences raised in field instruction. Broadly, these theories stem from the psychodynamic, existential-humanistic, cognitive-behavioral, psychosocial, systems and developmental schools of thought. Best practice interventions are discussed in terms of specific models such as person-centered, psychodynamic, behavioral, cognitive, and crisis theories. Students are taught the importance of an eclectic approach to practice, applied from an over-arching strength-based perspective.

In keeping with the MSW program’s mission, students are placed in public and non-profit field settings and are given the opportunity to serve at-risk urban populations in the Bay Area. The seminar milieu, readings, and assignments promote the exploration of the field experiences in terms of social justice issues, such as poverty, equal access to healthcare and education, oppression, overt and institutionalized racism, violence, trauma, unemployment, substance abuse, incarceration/crime, and housing. While field tasks frequently require that the student works from a micro perspective, the foundation seminar challenges the student to examine the problem at hand from both mezzo and macro lenses, thus encouraging the exploration of social
and economic issues. Students confront the tensions between the applied reality of classifying individuals and groups as “at-risk” versus the program’s strength-based orientation.

**Foundation Field Instruction and Foundation Sequence**

The knowledge, values, and skills students learned in the field instruction sequence are supported and informed by all other foundation-year courses. This link to the generalist practice, diversity, HBSE, policy and research represents the strength of field education. Theory, method and practice components, in addition to the field experience and seminars, form the core of field education.

The relationship of foundation field instruction courses to the foundation sequence is summarized in Table 2.12.

**Table 2.12: Foundation Field Instruction and Its Relation to Foundation Sequence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Foundation Field Instruction Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Human Behavior in the Social Environment (HBSE) | • Solid grounding in theories of human development,  
• Respect for diversity abilities and paths in the developmental process.  
• Understanding theories and knowledge of social systems that affect clients and human development,  
• Recognizing the impact of social systems on at-risk populations.  
• Awareness of the nature of current emerging social issues.  
• Appreciating the profound influences of multicultural diversity on human growth, development, and definition of norms. |
| Practice                                      | • Informs and teaches the type of social work intervention needed in the field, particularly from an evidence-based perspective.  
• Introduces the social work skills, such as engaging, assessment and planning, to be applied in the field.  
• Provides a knowledge base regarding the role of practice in promoting social and economic justice, and  
• Develops the theoretical grounding required for beginning applied practice. |
| Policy                                        | • Supplies a basis for critical thinking regarding the impact of social policies on the micro, mezzo, and macro influences that impinge upon clients, and  
• Provides the opportunity to consider alternative policies that would be preventative, strength-based and health-building for clients and systems. |
| Research                                      | • Links decisions about field strategies, research questions, assessment, and program evaluation through the use of a |
scientific, analytic approach (surveys, single-subject design research).
• Equips students with tools to understand the meaning of evidence-based practice and the ability to critically evaluate evidence and professional literature, in the service of achieving best-practice standards.

Foundation Field Instruction Methods and Evaluation of Learning

The field instruction curriculum utilizes class lectures, small group classroom activities and assessment techniques, videos, discussion, and assigned readings to reach its educational objectives. Students present a case-study and conduct an analysis of agency objectives and program demographics. They learn in a monitored setting by formative and summative evaluations through papers, journals, class presentations, group projects, case studies, and a variety of classroom assessment techniques. Finally, the course is evaluated by anonymous, confidential questionnaires at the end of the quarter.

Foundation-Year Fieldwork Expectations. Foundation-year fieldwork placements provide students with the opportunity to develop a skills base common to social work practice. These basic skills include the continuum of practice modalities, a range of treatment and ethical issues, theoretical models, and a focus on understanding diversity and the multicultural perspective as they relate to field practice. While fieldwork experiences should include both direct and indirect service opportunities, the primary focus is on direct practice. The following is a list of expectations that correspond with foundation-year courses and coursework assignments (they are considered minimum expectations):

• Within the first month (of the fall quarter), the student should receive a comprehensive orientation to an agency including organizational structure, mission, boundaries, funding auspices, staffing patterns, relationship to surrounding community, and the role and fit of student interns into the agency’s operation, as well as an orientation to the specific program or service area where the student is completing field-work placement hours;
• Throughout the placement period, students should be exposed to indirect service activities such as participation in agency and interagency meetings, outreach programs, community advocacy, and visits to community resources;
• Throughout the placement period, the student is exposed to a variety of experiences along the social work practice continuum, including information and referral, case management, community linkage, advocacy, collaboration, assessment, treatment planning, crisis intervention, short and long-term intervention;
• Students will be exposed to a diverse group of cases during their field placement period, depending on the type of agency and caseload activity. Wherever possible, students are given the opportunity to work with diverse client populations. This diversity may reflect dimensions such as ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic class, religion, age, sexual orientation, lifestyle, age, ability/disability status, health status, language, and gender.
• Except in rare cases, students will receive initial caseload and/or task assignments no later than the third week of placement. If caseload assignments cannot be made
according to this timetable, the Field Instructor should contact the Field Liaison to
discuss the circumstances and plan for case assignments.

During the course of the field placement, the student will be involved in the following
assignments/activities:

- A majority of fieldwork hours must be spent in direct practice, including individuals,
couples, family and group assignments;
- Completion of comprehensive psychosocial assessments;
- Assignment of at least two ongoing, long-term cases to be seen throughout the fieldwork
placement period, where possible;
- Participation in case conferences;
- Collaborative experiences with other members of an interdisciplinary or treatment team
in the agency; and
- Participation in a group experience is highly recommended. If a group experience is not
available in the agency, the Field Instructor may wish to consult with the Faculty Liaison
about the possibilities of developing a group experience at a related facility within the
local community. These could then be integrated into the total fieldwork placement
experience. Group experiences might include an educationally-focused group, such as a
parenting class, a therapeutically-focused group, a socialization group, or a discussion
group. Students should have active roles in the group rather than act as observers.
- Please note that the foundation field content on social work values and ethics; diversity;
and populations at risk & social justice is described earlier in their respective sections.

Accreditation Standard 2, MO20.0.1 Educational Policy 5 Advanced Curriculum

The master’s curriculum prepares graduates for advanced social work practice in an
area of concentration. Using a conceptual framework to identify advanced knowledge
and skills, the program builds an advanced curriculum from the foundation content. In
the advanced curriculum, the foundation content areas (Sections 4, 4.0-4.7 are
addressed in greater depth, breadth, and specificity and support of the program’s
conception of advanced practice.

Advanced Year Curriculum Overview

Preparing students for advanced social work practice in a concentration, the advanced
curriculum (1) is organized around concentrations in fields of practice and other advanced
courses supportive of the concentration and (2) builds on the knowledge, values, and skills
taught in the foundation courses by developing, strengthening, and deepening students’
advanced practice skills and understanding in a specific concentration. Upon completion of the
foundation courses, all students are required to select a concentration in CYF or CMH. Students
take two concentration-specific practice courses, one policy practice course, two research
courses, a capstone course, and three quarters of practicum focusing on either concentration. In
addition, students are required to take at least one elective course that supports their concentration.

Students in Children, Youth, and Family (CYF) and Community Mental Health (CMH) complete courses that provide them with advanced practice, research and policy practice skills and knowledge that specifically focus on their concentration. This content is more comprehensive in scope within each concentration compared to that in the foundation curriculum, and can be applied to practice situations of greater complexity. Included in each concentration is content on existing and potential service strategies from prevention to treatment, diversity, values and ethics, populations-at-risk, social and economic justice, relevant social policy and legislation, and key practice theories, methods, and research.

The CYF and CMH concentration are established as institutional responses to community needs in the Alameda and Contra Costa counties, the two largest communities of the CSUEB service area. Both concentrations emphasize practice within the public sector and private non-profit sectors. There is an emphasis on agency-based service to under-represented, underserved and inappropriately served populations. Particular emphasis is placed on economically disadvantaged populations, ethnic minorities, individuals, groups, families and communities who otherwise lack power and opportunity. Throughout the advanced-year curriculum, emphasis is placed on applying critical thinking skills to case vignettes, course assignments and situations prevalent to field discussions in classroom settings.

Objectives for the Advanced Year

The MSW program has a common set of objectives for the advanced year. These are the seven abilities (the program objectives) at the advanced level. They specify the sets of knowledge, values, and skills all students acquire by the time of graduation, whatever their concentration. All required courses at the advanced year, both those specific to each concentration and those supporting the concentrations, specify student learning outcomes that are tied to these advanced year objectives. By providing learning opportunities for and assessing achievement of the course objectives, the department ensures that at completion of classroom and field education, graduating MSW students are able to demonstrate competence in the following areas.

1. **Values and Ethics.** Understand, articulate, and integrate the principles, values, and ethics of the social work profession into their practice.
   - Understand legal regulations and standards related to social work in the San Francisco Bay Area and their application in professional practice;
   - Employ ethical problem solving in their social work practice;
   - Analyze ethical dilemmas and develop, implement, and assess an action plan in line with their analysis.

2. **Professional Use of Self.** Demonstrate achievement of professional use of self in practice.
   - Understand their own personal values and biases and show understanding of and be able to describe how these impact work with clients;
Participate in and assume responsibility for ongoing development of professional knowledge and skills;
Identify and modify personal and professional barriers to effective practice and use self effectively in practice in an area of concentration.

3. **Critical Thinking.** Apply critical-thinking skills in the professional contexts.
   - Examine evidence, synthesize disparate information, see patterns, determine relevance of evidence, develop and defend a theoretically-based, empirically-grounded rationale in analyzing a problem and developing a strategy;
   - Modify their practice as a result of weighing feedback from supervisor, clients, instructors, self, and other data;
   - Use research as a basis for practice, accurately interpret evidence, evaluate and select among alternative approaches, and determine and increase the extent to which clients benefit from their practice.

4. **Applying Theory to Practice.** Analyze and apply knowledge to assessment and intervention in social work practice of bio psychosocial variables and theoretical frameworks that explain individual and social systems development.
   - Synthesize and apply a broad range of theory and knowledge with respect to assessment and intervention in an area of concentration;
   - Engage in learning activities and apply new theory and knowledge relevant to their area of concentration;
   - Select and apply theory-grounded assessment tools and practices appropriate to their area of concentration.

5. **Advocacy.** Advocate effectively for social and economic justice.
   - Understand and critically analyze specific social welfare policies and programs pertinent to their area of concentration;
   - Engage in social change in the quest for social and economic justice;
   - Demonstrate skills for influencing change through advocacy, empowerment, and other strategies.

6. **Diversity.** Achieve competency in working with diverse populations.
   - Understand and analyze the forms and mechanisms of discrimination and oppression, and the strategies and skills that advance social and economic justice for all populations-at-risk, with special attention to urban disenfranchised and underserved populations;
   - Actively evaluate and improve their own ability in valuing diversity and challenging oppression;
   - Demonstrate competency in the areas of diversity relevant to their concentration.

7. **Communication.** Demonstrate the oral, written, and related skills that will enable them to communicate effectively and appropriately in relation to their setting and audience.
   - Understand the specific forms of written and oral communication relevant to their area of concentration;
- Communicate appropriately and respectfully with different groups and client systems;
- Demonstrate a professional level of oral and written communication skills in the context of a specialized area of practice, including the ability to vary the use of those skills with different client populations, colleagues, and members of the community.

**Conceptualization and Design**

In each field of practice concentration, the principal focus is on advanced practice with individuals and families within the context of the community and the larger society. Specifically, content is organized around: (1) advanced human behavior knowledge; (2) advanced practice knowledge and skills; (3) assessment; (4) intervention planning; intervention methods, and intervention skills; (5) services strategies from prevention to treatment; (6) policy practice; and (7) practice evaluation methods.

The content in the concentration courses is specifically focused on CYF or CMH. The content is more specialized and of greater complexity than the foundation-year curriculum. Each of the concentration courses offers more specialized assessment methods, interventions, and problem-solving strategies. The concentration courses in the fields of CFY and CMH are integrated in a common advanced practice framework. This practice framework includes content on requisite knowledge and skills on assessment, intervention planning, case management, evaluation of interventions and client advocacy. The knowledge and skills pertain to prevention as well as to problems already present that are specific to the field of practice.

The practice framework for the advanced-year and concentration-based curriculum has three distinguishing characteristics:

1. It is based on the ecological model and incorporates ideas from the strengths perspective and empowerment theory in casework with individuals and families with special needs (such as learning adequate parenting skills and getting services for mental disability, etc.);

2. It is empirically based on evaluating the effects of interventions and on using the results for research-informed practice and policy advocacy;

3. It is dedicated to promoting social and economic justice. Special attention is paid to addressing issues of racism, sexism, and homophobia confronting the urban, underserved disenfranchised individuals, families and communities that historically have been negatively impacted by disparities in social, economic, educational, and other factors that compromise their overall mental health and well-being.

In the CMH concentration, students are prepared for careers in areas such as community outreach and prevention, clinical social work, case management, pediatric mental health treatment, and the treatment of co-occurring disorders. In the CYF concentration, students are prepared for leadership and practice roles in programs serving disadvantaged children, adolescents, and families, primarily through governmental and nonprofit agencies and
allied settings. In both concentrations, students move from the acquisition of foundational knowledge and skills to the application of specialized knowledge, skills, and values in concentration-specific field settings.

The structure of the curriculum enables students to move past a focus on either the micro, the mezzo, or the macro level to a multi-systems focus that allows them to deepen the knowledge acquired in the foundation year and to develop into a practitioner/advocate who, through an ability to intervene at multiple levels, can respond to the needs of individuals, families, groups, communities, and organizations, and who is able to move from case to cause as needed.

Children Youth and Family (CYF) Concentration

The sections that follow present the CYF concentration:

1. Overview
2. Integration with foundation sequence and program objectives
3. Course content and assignments
4. Advanced human behavior knowledge, theories, and practice
5. Social work values and ethics
6. Diversity
7. Populations at-risk and social and economic justice
8. Liberal arts perspective
9. Instructional methods and evaluation of learning
10. Recent progress and future directions

1. CYF Overview

Consistent with the mission of the Department of Social Work, the Children, Youth, and Family concentration prepares students for culturally competent practice with disenfranchised and marginalized urban populations that include racial/ethnic populations, LGBT populations, the elderly, disabled, immigrant/refugee, and religious minorities. The overall goal of the concentration is to prepare advanced practitioners for a range of challenges found in public and private non-profit child and family services.

Students take nine CYF-specific courses in their second year. These include two practice courses, one advanced policy course, two research courses, three field practicum courses (described in the field section), and the culminating experience, the Integrative Seminar. In addition, students must take at least one CMH-related elective (see the last row in Table X for an example list). These advanced practice, policy, research, elective, and integrative courses provide students with the essentials for informed social work practice with diverse urban underserved populations at micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

The nine CYF concentration courses focus on the theory, knowledge, and practice of child- and family-based social work within a strengths-based, risk and resilience framework. Within this major focus, there are five major themes, which are linked to the seven program objectives (shown in parentheses after each theme):
Within this concentration, students focus on learning that ties to our overall objectives:

1. Recognizing and supporting clients’ strengths and individual competence through empowerment and collaboration (communication and advocacy);
2. Developing skills needed for CYF practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels, including assessment, diagnosis, intervention, research, and evaluation (communication, critical thinking, and theory to practice);
3. Advocating for the improvement of CYF services through client and community partnership as well as through research (advocacy, communication, and value and ethics);
4. Promoting social justice in services to Children, Youth, and Family with urban underserved populations-at-risk (diversity and advocacy);
5. Recognizing cultural factors that support health and wellness (diversity and theory to practice);
6. Assuming responsibility for professional and personal growth, and understanding its reciprocal impact on both clients and workers (professional use of self).

In the CYF concentration year of the MSW Program, the primary model is the risk and resilience model, which identifies factors such as poverty, premature birth, divorce, neglect, maltreatment, neighborhood violence, poor schools and/or education systems, mental or physical disability of family members that threaten the integrity and well-being of children, youth, families and communities. This model focuses on identifying better tools that help clients cope with diverse, stressful settings. It recognizes the impact of micro, mezzo, and macro settings in diverse practice situations; mitigates against a "blame the victim" approach; and moves students more firmly into the practitioner/advocate role that emerges in the 2nd year of MSW education. Students learn to connect contextual and organizational issues to micro issues that are unique to a client without pathologizing the client. Students develop an awareness of transactions among social-structural, organizational, and human behavior systems; they understand at a deeper and broader level, the forces within the child, youth, and family, and they come to understand how individual forces interact with forces in the social environment (Anthony, 1987; Cohler, 1987; Vayda & Bogo, 1991; Begun, 1993).

Working with children and families who are experiencing neglect or abuse, poverty, violence, substance abuse, difficulties with law enforcement, schools and the educational system, or who are encountering difficulty navigating the environments in which they exist, students develop strategies and skills to remove barriers to service, to practice advocacy, to develop a social justice perspective, and to work toward empowerment of clients and communities.

Building on the foundation year, the CYF concentration is grounded in the understanding that the client is a dynamic part of an environment in which he/she acts and is acted upon. This ecological/person in the environment perspective guides the student in understanding that we are all in the environment, but not in the same way and that the nature of one’s “inness” impacts the thoughts, actions, and behaviors of both the client and the social service providers. Students focus on removing barriers to service, mitigating risks to clients and client resiliency and strengths. They learn practice skills appropriate to working with children, youth and families at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels including advocacy and policy strategies for intervention with local and state policy makers.
In field practice, students gain specialized experience in public and private social welfare agencies, including schools, community based agencies, and juvenile justice agencies where they handle challenging experiences under the supervision of a field supervisor. Through the capstone experience, Social Work 6959, Integrative Seminar, students demonstrate their mastery of the core program objectives: critical thinking, values and ethics, diversity, advocacy, theory to practice, communication, and professional use of self.

The curriculum centers on urban populations, cultural competence, and advocacy. Special attention is given to children and families whose daily lives are challenged by the effects of poverty, racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of injustice, and who rely on publicly funded agencies and services. Applying a social justice advocacy focus is a primary commitment.

- **Cultural competence.** Each of the advanced level courses is infused with learning materials (readings, videos, vignettes) that focus on the needs of diverse populations. Students are required to reach further to understand themselves and then to understand the different populations around them (including religion, gender, class, sexual preference, physical and mental ability, and age, to name a few).
- **Urban populations.** Faculty supports the study of issues closely (but not exclusively) related to the urban environment. We use our relationship with county and community based agency to maximize the “veracity” of our curriculum. For example, our field placements are primarily in urban, often lower socio-economic environments.
- **Advocacy.** Advanced CYF emphasizes the model of “case to cause to case.” Students are taught to advocate at the micro level, but to be willing to take that advocacy to a much higher level; to focus on policy practice and community organizing as needed, for the sake of our most vulnerable populations.

A sample course load for second year CYF student is as follows:

**Fall quarter**
- SW 6500: Advanced Micro Practice:
- SW 6932: Quantitative and Qualitative Research:
- SW 6030: Field Practicum IV

**Winter quarter**
- SW 6510: Advanced Mezzo Practice: CYF
- SW 6935: Program Evaluation: CYF
- SW 6031: Field Practicum V

**Spring quarter**
- SW 6525: Advanced Social Policy: CYF
- SW 6959: Integrative Experience
- SW 6032: Field Practicum VI
In addition to the course referenced above, all CSU East Bay MSW students are required to take at least one elective course in their second year.

2. Integration with Foundation Sequence and Program Objectives

Both concentration curricula build on knowledge, values, and skills that students acquire in the foundation year of the program. *SW 6011 & SW 6012: General Practice I&II* and *SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality* are pivotal courses in the foundation year. In these foundation courses, students address core issues of inequality including racism, sexism, aging, and homophobia assessment, intervention planning, implementation, and evaluation. These are core issues in working with individuals, families, groups, communities, and organizations from urban underserved populations. The *SW 6000 & 6001: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I & II* content prepares students to utilize existing theories and empirically-based knowledge about human development, human interaction, and social systems in aiding consumers to achieve or maintain well-being within context of their cultures. *SW 6030: Social Welfare Policy: History and Philosophy* provides concentration students with the foundation to understand and analyze social policies, the organization and delivery of social services, and the need to engage in effective advocacy for the improvement of systems of care for Children, Youth, and Family. The content and experiences of the foundation year enable students to address the CYF concentration with greater depth, breadth, and specificity.

Table 2.13 on the following page summarizes the CYF core and elective courses, their relationship to the foundation-year sequence, and their relationship to the seven Department of Social Work Program Objectives. As shown in the table, all courses address the seven program objectives. The remaining sections of this chapter provide further narrative description of the content in Table 2.13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Brief Description and Relation to Foundation-Year Sequence</th>
<th>Relation to Program Objectives and CSWE EPAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 6500: Advanced Micro Practice: CYF</strong></td>
<td>Advanced micro practice with Children, Youth, and Family with specific emphasis on multicultural populations. Builds on individual-level practice skills taught in <em>SW 6011: General Practice I</em>, as well as on theories and knowledge acquired in <em>SW 6000 &amp; 6001: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I &amp; II</em> and <em>SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality</em>. Builds vertically on skills learned in <em>SW 6020, Practicum I</em>.</td>
<td>P   S   S   P   P   S   P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 6510: Advanced Mezzo Practice: CYF</strong></td>
<td>Advanced CYF practice with families and groups in the context of communities. Builds on family and group-level practice skills taught in <em>SW 6012: General Practice II</em>, as well as theories and knowledge learned in <em>SW 6000 &amp; 6001: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I &amp; II</em> and <em>SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality</em>. Builds vertically on skills learned in <em>SW 6021, Practicum II</em>.</td>
<td>S   S   S   P   P   P   P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 6520: Advocacy and Macro Policy: CYF</strong></td>
<td>Skills and knowledge needed for advanced policy practice, including knowledge of child welfare and family and aging policy, funding streams, delivery systems, policy analysis and advocacy. Builds on community practice skills taught in <em>SW 6013</em>:</td>
<td>S   S   S   P   P   P   P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6932</td>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative Research: CYF</td>
<td>Training in qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection, data analysis, and report writing. Builds on the general research skills and knowledge taught in SW 6032: Social Work Research. Research methods are applied to CYF contexts, including selection of data sets, empirical articles, and use of data in CYF, such as research for development of evidence-based practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6935</td>
<td>Program Planning and Evaluation: CYF</td>
<td>Training in evaluation for continuous quality improvement in CYF. Builds on the skills taught in SW 6032: Social Work Research &amp; SW 6933: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6030, SW 6031, &amp; SW 6032, Field Practicum IV, V, and VI</td>
<td>See field section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6959</td>
<td>Integrative Seminar: CYF</td>
<td>Develop, conduct, and evaluate an advocacy project in a CYF setting. Builds on knowledge, skills, and theories for all foundation and advanced courses taken prior to the final quarter in the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Course Content and Assignments

The nine required CYF concentration courses focus on the theory, knowledge, and practice of social work from a strengths-based, resilience, and advocacy perspective. Summaries are provided below for each of the nine core concentration courses in practice, policy, and research.

Advanced Practice

Students complete two practice courses that provide them with comprehensive, advanced skills and knowledge that focus on CYF. Content includes existing and potential service strategies from prevention to treatment, diversity, values and ethics, populations-at-risk, social and economic justice, relevant social policy and legislation, and key practice theories, methods, and research.

SW 6500: Advanced Micro Practice: CYF

The first course in the concentration, SW 6500, Children, Youth and Families Practice I, builds on the foundation curriculum (SW 6000, 6001, 6002, 6011, 6012, 6010, 6030, 6031). The course prepares students to describe, analyze, and understand children and families and the systems which impact them. Developmental theory and content in working with vulnerable children and families are also introduced. The special focus is on children and adolescents from urban underserved populations. Assessment issues focus on risk and safety assessment, and risk and protective factors with the child, family, and environment are also covered. Individual child and family assessments are covered specifying issues relevant to child abuse and neglect, substance abuse, and domestic violence.

There are four assignments: (1) Application of Intervention based on selected Theoretical Approach; (2) Theory and evidence-based intervention paper (group or individual); Assignment (3) Reading Response to The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down; 4) a Group/individual paper presentation.

Signature Assignment

Theory and evidence-based intervention paper. Select a clinical problem (or a problem in living) about which you would like to develop some expertise as a clinical social worker. This expertise should reflect itself in knowledge of the nature of the problem, characteristics of the problem, the impact of the problem (i.e., bio psychosocial factors) and ethical considerations that should be taken when treating clients with this problem. Then decide on a practice model that you will use in order to: 1) conceptualize the case; 2) complete an assessment; and 3) plan intervention strategies. You can use one of the models discussed in class or use an integrated model (i.e., combine 2 of the practice models discussed in class). However, if you do so, you must clearly state which models you are using and your rationale for combining these particular models for use with the identified clinical problem.
SW 6510: Advanced Mezzo Practice: CYF  Students build on content offered in SW 6500 through case write-ups and demonstrations of interventions. The course emphasizes application, with a focus on honing professional writing and critical-thinking skills through the development of case reports, service plans, and grant proposals. Students write concise, analytical case reports and service plans. In one assignment students present a case, demonstrate relevant case management or therapeutic intervention, and answer pertinent questions. In this way students acquire familiarity with a range of intervention approaches. There are two assignments: (1) a clinical research paper on group practice and (2) a group assignment on Human Services Organizations.

**Signature Assignment**

Clinical Research Paper on Group Practice. Choose a subject about a clinical practice with groups of interest to you regarding group work with Children, Youth, and Family. For example, you can choose stages in the group process; groups with urban populations; rural groups; differences between same-sex and mixed-sex groups; groups with people of color, different sexual orientation, or ages; the application of cutting edge theoretical perspectives with specific populations; etc. This paper should be 5–7 pages, and is expected to be of research quality, having the potential to be developed into an article which could be submitted to a professional journal.

**Advanced Policy**

Students complete one advanced policy course, SW 6520, which focuses on Children, Youth, and Family, with an emphasis on development of complex policy analysis skills. The course builds on the knowledge of historical, economic, political, society and welfare ideologies covered in the foundation policy course—SW6030: Social Welfare Policy: History and Philosophy. The knowledge developed in this course (SW6520) vertically links to the foundation-year courses in the Human Behavior in the Social Environment sequences (HBSE I & II), as social policies develop and affect human behavior at various levels of systems. It also intersects with the General Practice sequence (GP I, II & III) in that it provides students with skills for examining the environment of social problems, social policy gaps, and failed social policies. Skills learned in the course—Social Work Research (SW6032) provide a foundation for policy analysis and research. The understanding and application of the process of policy development and evaluation is central to the knowledge base of students in the Children, Youth, and Family concentration. Additionally, the knowledge gained in this course allows students to engage in social work practice with a greater understanding of how policy relates to their practice with children and families. There are four assignments: (1) a student led seminar discussion and reading presentations; (2) a legislative bill and position paper; (3) a Policy Presentation; (4) a policy Research Paper

**Signature Assignment**

Policy research paper. Please select a problematic policy issue that affects the delivery of services for low-income families, substance-abusing families, or children with special needs. The policy issue can be a specific policy formulated at the federal or state level (e.g., Indian Child Welfare Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), or can be an issue which has
been created by a number of interesting policies (e.g., concurrent planning, inter-racial or inter-countryside adoption). The selected policy issue should be of sufficient magnitude that its genesis and impact can be traced through scholarly literature, documents, and first-hand personal accounts, incorporating concepts and data from course readings and outside research. Also, the research paper must demonstrate a clear link between race, gender, and inequality.

Advanced Research
The two advanced year research courses are designed for students to build on the foundation year research course, and they will continue to gain in-depth knowledge of research methodologies in their concentrations.

**SW 6932: Qualitative and Quantitative Research: CYF.** This is the second course in research methodology, building upon SW6032 Social Work Research. This course focuses on social work practice research paradigms, models, and methods. Particular attention is given to qualitative and quantitative methods used in social work practice evaluation. Needs assessment, practice evaluation, and their role in social work practice will be covered. This course gives the student a deeper exploration of gender and ethnic minority research issues and computer-assisted, descriptive and exploratory data analysis. There are three assignments in this course: (1) an ethnographic observation/oral history (or using one of the five approaches; (2) a critique of an Empirical Research Paper; (3) a group paper in which students present the results of their student survey.

Signature Assignment
**Ethnographic observation.** Conduct an ethnographic observation of the social world of individuals and/or groups in a particular setting. The goal of this exercise is to do a 90-minute observation in a selected setting and to document your observations using field notes. In ethnographic research, field notes serve as the central source of data and are used to capture in detail your observations while in the setting. More specifically, notes from the field should contain complete narratives and should provide a “thick description” of the setting so that anyone who reads your field notes will understand and experience the social setting without actually being there. In order to complete this project, you need to submit your field notes, type-written, along with a typed report (maximum 5 pages, APA format) including an analysis of your observations (e.g., details such as rituals of social interaction, the use of social space, body language), conclusions based on your observations, and potential relevance to Children, Youth, and Family practice.

**SW 6935: Program Planning and Evaluation: CYF.** The purpose of this course is to prepare students to plan to implement and evaluate a human services program. Each student must demonstrate an ability to apply the knowledge, values, and skills of a social worker in (1) the identification of issues in human services administration and planning, (2) the application of theoretical and empirical literature, (3) the design of human services evaluation, and (4) the preparation and presentation of a professional-quality comprehensive program and evaluation plan reflecting the promotion of diversity and economic justice in either the Children, Youth, and Family or Community Mental Health concentration. This course has one assignment broken into
four parts: (1) a Draft Proposal- part 1: describing: A) Statement of Need; B) Proposed Evidence-Based Service/Practice, and C) Proposed Implementation Approach. (2) Draft Proposal: Part II- students prepare a 10 page paper describing: D) Organizational Experience, and E) Evaluation Plan (Performance Assessment and Data). (3) A presentation of the proposal program and evaluation plan. (4) A consolidation of all of the above into a final 20-25 page paper.

Signature Assignment:
*Program evaluation and plan.* Complete an in-depth program evaluation paper based on your field placement agency. Describe the history, setting, mission, funding, services, and staffing of the agency. Then discuss your ideas for new and/or stronger program evaluation and devise an implementation plan for that evaluation, including an evaluation budget.

Capstone Course
*SW 6959: Integrative Seminar: CYF* provides a culminating experience in the last quarter of the MSW program. Students examine a Child/Family/community related issue, synthesize the research on the issue, apply this synthesis to an actual CYF agency or program, and integrate the seven program objectives (values and ethics, professional use of self, critical thinking, apply theory to practice, advocacy, diversity, and communication) into the analysis. All aspects of CYF training such as practice, field, policy, research, and diversity are incorporated when students analyze the chosen issue. Their final papers address racism, sexism, ageism, and other forms of discrimination such as those applying to religious beliefs or sexual orientation.

Signature Assignment
*Integrative paper.* Write an integrative paper (20-30 pages) that represents a culmination of your academic and practicum learning, by synthesizing content across the MSW curriculum in relation to your selected topic and applying this synthesis to an actual agency or program. You should select a Children, Youth, and Family focused problem and write an in-depth analysis and action plan that advocates for the resolution of that issue. This paper should also address the issue from the perspectives of HBSE, Practice, Policy, Research, RGISWP and Field. Finally, integrate the seven core program objectives into your analysis. Please see the back of this syllabus for more detailed instructions on how to write this paper.

As this paper is part of the Department of Social Work assessment plan, an abbreviated grading rubric is provided here (Table 2.14), as it was for the signature assignment of the foundation year, the General Practice III paper.

Table 2.14: Abbreviated grading rubric: Integrative paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page, table of contents, abstract</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and statement of topic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum integration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Field practicum
SW6030, SW 6031, & SW 6032, Field Practicum IV, V, and VI. Please see the separate section on field, beginning on pg.

4. Advanced Human Behavior Knowledge, Theories, and Practice

The CYF concentration covers practice knowledge and skills, social policy organizational structures, and community collaborations and grant writing. Assessment and intervention skills such as case management, crisis intervention with children and adolescents are covered in the fourth quarter course SW 6500. The fifth quarter course SW 6510 emphasizes assessment and intervention strategies with families and groups. Knowledge of culturally competent assessments, intervention, and issues relating to racism, sexism, and oppression will also be emphasized. Critical policies such as the 1997 Adoption and Safe Families Act, which impacted adoptions and the foster care system, will be addressed in SW 6520. In addition, the course reviews grant writing, develops students’ skills as grant writers through the process of writing a grant proposal. Students also present cases and demonstrate interventions, with written case reports as well as intervention and evaluation papers.

The ecological approach, strengths perspective, and resilience practice model focus on the multiple interactions which contribute to healthy and unhealthy functioning at various system levels. This approach is valuable in preparing culturally competent urban practitioners. Practice in the CYF concentration is ecologically-based and builds on the liberal arts and the foundation practice content. Students are taught practice skills from smaller to larger system levels. Most MSW graduates will focus at the micro level in their initial practice, and therefore, there is a greater emphasis in the concentration on direct work with individuals and families. Ecological theories and developmental theories are taught as well as crisis intervention and solution-focused therapy. The focus on children is less on intensive work with a child (e.g., play therapy) as opposed to child welfare issues and the development of public and private service systems, which will support child development, strengths and wellness, and prevention. The focus on the family in the concentration is represented in "family-centered practice" rather than "family therapy" as the method of intervention. Nonetheless, a number of approaches to family therapy are presented in readings, exercises, and videos in order to prepare graduates to comfortably intervene with total family systems when relevant.

The study of CYF is based on knowledge of life cycle development including the family life cycle. However, this knowledge has to be taught and understood in the context of the ecological framework, strengths perspective, and the relevance to different ethnic and/or cultural groups. Life cycle knowledge also has to take into account gender, sexual orientation, religion, disabilities, etc. Diversity issues consider the strengths of the various components affecting life
cycle knowledge and application. For example, family life cycle knowledge needs to include single parenting because divorced and blended families are dominant in social work caseloads. Substance-abusing single parents may require more extensive and intensive intervention strategies related to parenting than those offered to a family who recently adopted an infant from China. Parental and child behaviors of families with children in the foster care or juvenile justice system need to be understood in order that appropriate assessments and interventions can occur.

Students concentrating on CYF must have practice knowledge in macro level issues affecting families. Families affected by social and economic injustices may, in turn, engage in substance abuse, domestic violence, child abuse (physical, sexual, and emotional) and neglect as inappropriate coping strategies. Students working with public child welfare families must have practice knowledge in these areas as well as other prevalent issues plaguing families in the Bay Area. Divorce, HIV/AIDS, ADHD, Oppositional Defiant Disorder, and Fetal Alcohol Syndrome are all areas where social workers need knowledge and skills to help the multi-problem families and society at large.

Students must be able to learn and apply assessment and intervention strategies such as crisis intervention and case management skills appropriate to these problem areas. It is also critical that students learn to communicate and write effective case reports and service plans. Critical thinking needs to be applied to assessment and intervention practice skills based on knowledge received about the problem areas. In addition to examining ethical issues and value conflicts, students must acquire skills to promote social and economic justice.

These skills and knowledge are transmitted in the concentration through the two advanced practice concentration classes, electives, and field instruction. Classroom readings and assignments reflect a “theory and practice” approach to teaching. Critiques to practice theories and refined writing skills are emphasized in class through writing assignments, role plays, case presentations, case vignettes, videotapes, speakers, and/or agency visits. Specifically, students will be able to be proficient in the following areas.

**Child and Adolescent Assessment/Family Assessment.** Assessments on child and adolescent functioning are taught with the understanding that contextual reference is necessary to understand cultural, diversity, and environmental factors. Children and adolescents will be assessed in the context of families who live in communities affected by macro level issues. Bio psychosocial assessments are taught using additional tools such as Tripartite Assessment Forms, Genograms, Ecomaps, and Social Network Maps. Family assessments are taught using a risk resilience model, strengths perspective and are supplemented by additional assessments depending on the nature of the problems affecting the family. For work with families in the public child welfare system, specific assessment forms, such as the Safe Family Home Guidelines, will be addressed as part of the curriculum with a major emphasis on writing skills.

**Intervention Planning, Intervention Methods, and Intervention Skills.** Based upon comprehensive and culturally competent assessments, students acquire skills to identify and prioritize problems and determine the appropriate intervention(s) that will be
congruent with the client systems’ ethnic makeup, gender, sexual orientation, and family issues.

Service Strategies from Prevention to Treatment. Child and family interventions include primary, secondary, and tertiary interventions. Content for these service strategies is covered in both concentration courses. Barriers to implementation of interventions are discussed, with a focus on oppression and social and economic injustices. Course curriculum includes home-based and family preservation interventions, especially for children and families in at-risk situations.

Evaluation Methods and Skills. CYF social workers need to understand and apply a multivariate approach to evaluation of practice. All students are encouraged to evaluate their own practice. The goal of the concentration is to help students learn and use a variety of methods so that they will be comfortable with varying strategies for evaluation in their practice. In the second quarter class, case presentations enable students to acquire skills to evaluate individual practice, goal setting, and intervention selection and implementation. Outcome measurements are stressed in the intervention planning and implementation phase of practice.

5. Social Work Values and Ethics
The social worker and MSW student intern will encounter many ethical dilemmas when working with minors and families, thereby requiring them to make many difficult decisions. Frequently child abuse and neglect within families require out of home placements. Social workers need to determine the parameters for defining a “safe home” and what would best serve the child in permanency planning. Ethical dilemmas may occur when the social worker’s values system is in conflict with that of ethnic communities when it comes to determining what is a “safe home.” CYF students are able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the nature of ethical dilemmas that arise in working with Children, Youth, and Family;

2. Understand the proactive steps necessary to avoid unethical behavior and malpractice; and

3. Demonstrate knowledge of social work values in relation to social work ethics in practice with Children, Youth, and Family.

6. Diversity
Because of the great cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity in the San Francisco Bay Area, it is important to address cultural competence issues in assessing and planning interventions for clients. Content related to cultural theory and to the specific cultural issues are presented in lectures, class presentations, and assignments. Readings are assigned which focus on culture and culturally competent practice, as well as issues relating to racism, sexism, and other forms of oppression. Students also search for information of greatest relevance to their practicum work. The identification of cultural factors is a part of the case presentation in the final course in
the concentration. Since all students encounter varied populations in practicum, cultural information is an integral part of field learning. CYF students demonstrate:

1. A basic understanding of the nature of cultural differences in families; and,

2. Awareness of how cultural differences impact work with diverse Children, Youth, and Family.

7. CYF in Relation to Populations At-Risk and Social and Economic Justice

Women and children in poverty, substance abusers, victims of child abuse and neglect, and survivors of domestic violence are examples of the populations-at-risk that social workers need to serve. Segments of the state of California have greater numbers of families who are at risk, and social services need to be provided for those families. A large percentage of families that receive public assistance also have substance abuse problems. Substance abuse, child abuse and neglect, as well as domestic violence are so intertwined that their relationship must be considered if service planning is to be successful.

There are many forms of oppression that affect minors and families in California specifically and in the United States generally. The objectives of the CYF concentration are to help students become sensitive to overt and covert forms of oppression and to consider levels of service that may positively impact Children, Youth, and Family. Students will read about populations whose needs for social services stems directly or indirectly from levels of societal oppression: for example, single parents, those in gay and lesbian households, and the poor. Moreover, they will learn strategies for successful intervention with the oppressed to overcome barriers and empower these families. One class session in the final course focuses on the problems of women who experience substance abuse. Readings, lectures, discussion and a video all contribute to the exploration of this social problem and the ways in which it especially impacts on women and children in poverty. CYF students are able to:

1. Examine how vulnerable populations such as women, children, racial/ethnic minorities, and LGBT individuals are at risk for experiencing problems in living;

2. Understand the many ways in which high risk populations have difficulty accessing services; and

3. Develop service plans/assessments that advocate for the Children, Youth, and Family from diverse urban populations.

8. Liberal Arts Perspective

Many aspects of the liberal arts perspective are integral to the advanced practice curriculum in the Children, Youth, and Family concentration. Chief among these are communication, logical reasoning, familiarity or orientation to the social and behavioral sciences, human biology, culture, and humanities in general. The social, behavioral and biological sciences are fundamental to understanding theory and practice with Children, Youth, and Family (for example, the potential impact of medications on a seriously mentally ill family
member, when that illness is understood as having biochemical origins). The CSU East Bay MSW program relies heavily on the contributions of the humanities to provide an underlying source of information and wisdom for the SW foundation in preparing culturally competent urban social workers.

Written and oral communications are required in all courses and in practice throughout the concentration. Feedback is ongoing, from comments on student papers, to peer feedback in response to class presentations, and to practicum evaluations. Systematic and critical thinking is required of students as they develop research and analyze data, and as they evaluate their own practice and the research literature related to Children, Youth, and Family.

10. Instructional Methods and Evaluation of Learning

The methods of instruction in the Children, Youth, and Family concentration are varied according to the learning needs of students and the curricular objectives sought. Because the first concentration course builds on the foundation curriculum for its relevance to issues in the concentration, there are more lectures, assigned readings and follow-up discussions, media presentations of models of intervention, or issues of relevance to children and families. Additionally, student group presentations will utilize information and practice approaches with various populations (e.g. urban disenfranchised and underserved groups). Student learning is evaluated based on student papers, class presentations, and contributions to class discussion.

In the second concentration, course evaluation is done on one’s own practice through group work and an overall evaluation of the service plan designed in the group project. Each course has course evaluations of the instructor, course content, and learning conditions. In addition, further evaluation takes place through the annual alumni surveys, which solicit the opinions of recent graduates about their experiences while in the MSW program. Since respondents are asked to specify their concentration, it is possible to have a more global evaluation of the concentration.

Practicum learning objectives are developed in coordination with the objectives for the two concentration courses. Students’ achievements in these objectives are monitored in field education.

Throughout the concentration year, students are encouraged to meet separately with faculty for review of progress or for further clarification of course assignments and evaluation. Evaluation is a reciprocal process. Anonymous mid-term and final course and instructor evaluations are conducted.

Community Mental Health (CMH) Concentration

The sections that follow present the CMH concentration:

1. Overview
2. Integration with foundation sequence and program objectives
3. Course content and assignments
4. Advanced human behavior knowledge, theories, and practice
5. Social work values and ethics
1. CMH Overview

Consistent with the mission of the Department of Social Work, students in the CMH concentration prepare for culturally-competent practice in the field of mental health as advanced practitioner-advocates working with urban underserved populations, emphasizing consumer empowerment, wellness, recovery, and evidence-based practice. Students acquire advanced knowledge and skills in assessment, intervention planning, service delivery, consumer advocacy, evaluation of services, and policy development for working with individuals, groups, and families.

Students take nine CMH-specific courses in their second year. These include two practice courses, one advanced policy course, two research courses, three field practicum courses (described in the field section), and the culminating experience, the Integrative Seminar. In addition, students must take at least one CMH-related elective (see the last row in Table X for an example list). These advanced practice, policy, research, elective, and integrative courses provide students with the essentials for informed social work practice with diverse urban underserved populations at micro, mezzo, and macro levels.

The nine CMH concentration courses focus on the theory, knowledge, and practice of clinical social work from a client-centered, empowerment, recovery, and wellness perspective. Within this major focus, there are five major themes, which are linked to the seven program objectives (shown in parentheses after each theme):

1) Recognizing and supporting consumer strengths and individual competence through empowerment and collaboration with family and across disciplines (values and ethics; theory to practice);
2) Developing skills needed for community mental health practice at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels, including assessment, diagnosis, intervention, research, and evaluation (critical thinking; theory to practice);
3) Advocating for the improvement of community mental health services through consumer collaboration and research (advocacy; communication);
4) Promoting social justice in mental health with urban underserved populations-at-risk, recognizing cultural factors that mediate mental health and illness (advocacy; diversity);
5) Assuming responsibility for professional and personal growth, and understanding its reciprocal impact on both clients and workers (professional use of self).

As in the foundation year, the CMH concentration builds on the students’ liberal arts background by identifying and assessing socioeconomic, cultural, and lifestyle factors affecting mental health functioning. As an interdisciplinary study area, the CMH concentration draws from the knowledge base offered in anthropology, biological sciences, education, ethnic studies, law, political science, psychology, sociology, and other related disciplines. In order to understand mental health policies, in class discussions about political and legislative structures, which
directly affect policymaking and policy implementation, are grounded in knowledge from liberal arts perspectives such as political science and economics.

Given the complexity of issues many consumers confront, such as multi-system involvement, homelessness, victimization, disability, and criminalization, the CMH concentration also emphasizes the development of a rich knowledge base necessary to understand and intervene with diverse consumers across the lifespan and across agency boundaries. The concentration further recognizes the interconnectedness of physical and psychological well-being for individuals and communities, the need for better integration of health and mental health service systems, as well as the importance of addressing barriers to accessing services frequently imposed by social service systems. The CMH concentration places emphasis on understanding cultural differences in the support and maintenance of emotional and mental well-being and understanding mental health delivery systems as well as valuing traditional or cultural treatment/healing practices.

Since the Department of Social Work curriculum is centered on the themes of cultural competence, urban practice, and advocacy, the advanced year curriculum in community mental health integrates material on these issues in greater depth and sophistication:

- **Cultural competence.** Each of the mental health courses is infused with content that applies the skills and theories for practice to specific multicultural communities. For example, when studying psychopharmacology, students also learn about indigenous and alternative healing practices that consumers in diverse populations may prefer.

- **Urban practice.** Faculty uses the rich learning opportunities available in our urban setting, as the laboratory for developing skills as culturally competent mental health social workers. For example, when studying epidemiology of mental disorders, students compare data drawn from San Francisco Bay Area County Mental Health organizations with national data, and discuss the similarities and differences in rates of mental disorder by age, sex, race, and socioeconomic status.

- **Advocacy.** The advanced community mental health curriculum emphasizes advocacy on micro, mezzo, and macro levels. For example, students in the micro practice course must include a discussion of case advocacy in their comprehensive assessment and treatment plan final papers.

Students in the CMH concentration critically examine the etiology of mental illness through a range of theories from the western biomedical perspective, the psychodynamic or psychosocial perspective, and the socio-cultural perspective. A major assumption that guides the concentration is that the effectiveness and appropriateness of treatment interventions are affected by the client’s understanding and perception of his/her mental state. Therefore, the concentration reviews various western as well as culturally-based perspectives and interventions for mental illness. These include, but are not limited to medical diagnostic systems and psychopharmacology, case management which involves the strengths perspective, empowerment, interdisciplinary teamwork to provide services, cognitive and behavioral approaches, psychosocial rehabilitation, traditional cultural methods, and brief therapy.

The use of empirical research is emphasized throughout the concentration. Through the departmental Curriculum Committee, both concentration courses are updated annually to
include current research regarding the etiology of mental illness, effective assessment, evidence-based interventions, and emerging promising practices. Students utilize empirically based best practices in developing intervention plans, and evaluate their own practice utilizing a systematic performance measurement such as the logic model evaluation approach.

Mental health policy-making and program development are examined from the perspective of historical, contemporary, and future models of the mental health service provision in the U.S. and California. Students maximize consumer self-help, mutual aid, and natural helping systems in order to advocate effectively for social and economic justice, and equitable mental health policies.

A sample course load for second-year students in community mental health is as follows:

**Fall quarter**
- SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: CMH
- SW 6932: Quantitative and Qualitative Research: CMH
- SW 6030: Field Practicum IV

**Winter quarter**
- SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: CMH
- SW 6935: Program Evaluation: CMH
- SW 6031: Field Practicum V

**Spring quarter**
- SW 6525: Advanced Social Policy: CMH
- SW 6959: Integrative Experience
- SW 6032: Field Practicum VI

In addition to the above courses, students take at least one elective course in their second year.

2. CMH Integration with the Program Objectives and Foundation Courses

The CMH concentration curriculum builds on the knowledge, values, and skills that students acquire in the foundation year of the program. For example, SW 6011 & SW 6012: General Practice I&II and SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality are pivotal courses in the foundation year; students address core issues in assessment, intervention planning, implementation, and evaluation in working with individuals, families, groups, communities, and organizations from urban underserved populations. These basic skills are revisited and refined in the advanced year practice courses. Similarly, the SW 6000 & 6001: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I & II curriculum prepares students to utilize existing theories and empirically-based knowledge about human development, human interaction, and social systems in aiding consumers to achieve or maintain well-being within context of their cultures. The theories and knowledge learned in foundation year HBSE courses thus prepare students to understand and apply evidence-based practice frameworks used in mental health settings. SW
6030: Social Welfare Policy: History and Philosophy provides concentration students with a broad knowledge base of social work policy, so they can understand and analyze mental health policies, the organization and delivery of mental health services, the manner in which social policy has been used to marginalize populations of color and other disenfranchised populations, and the need to engage in effective advocacy for the improvement of mental health systems of care. Through the content and experiences of the foundation year, students are able to address the mental health concentration with greater depth, breadth, and specificity.

Table 2.15 on the following page summarizes the CMH core and elective courses, their relationship to the foundation-year sequence, and their relationship to the seven Department of Social Work Program Objectives. As shown in the table, all courses address the seven program objectives, but each course emphasizes some objectives over others, thus the denotation of “primary” and “secondary” in the table. The remaining sections of this chapter provide further narrative description of the content in Table 2.15.
Table 2.15: Community Mental Health Courses, and Relations to Foundation Sequences, Program Objectives, and CSWE EPAS (P=Primary; S=Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Brief Description and Relation to Foundation-Year Sequence</th>
<th>Relation to Program Objectives and CSWE EPAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values &amp; Ethics EP 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Use of Self EP 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication EP 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Thinking EP 4.4 &amp; 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory to Practice EP 4.3 &amp; 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy EP 4.2 &amp; 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity EP 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: CMH</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on advanced community mental health practice with individuals in the context of their families and communities. Builds on individual-level practice skills taught in SW 6011: General Practice I, as well as theories and knowledge acquired in SW 6000 &amp; 6001: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I &amp; II and SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality. Also builds vertically on skills learned in SW 6020, Practicum I.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: CMH</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on advanced community mental health practice with families and groups in the context of communities. Builds on family and group-level practice skills taught in SW 6012: General Practice II, as well as theories and knowledge learned in SW 6000 &amp; 6001: Human Behavior and the Social Environment I &amp; II and SW 6010: Race, Gender, and</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6525</td>
<td>Advocacy and Macro Policy: CMH</td>
<td>Focuses on skills and knowledge needed for advanced policy practice, including knowledge of mental health policies, funding streams, delivery systems, policy analysis, and advocacy. Builds on community practice skills taught in SW 6013: General Practice III and on knowledge and theories learned in SW 6030: Social Welfare Policy: History and Philosophy and SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality. Also builds vertically on skills learned in SW 6022, Practicum III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6932</td>
<td>Qualitative and Quantitative Research: CMH</td>
<td>Provides students with training in qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection, data analysis, and report writing. Builds on the general research skills and knowledge taught in SW 6032: Social Work Research. Throughout the course, research methods are applied to mental health contexts, including selection of data sets, empirical articles, and use of data in community mental health, such as research for development of evidence-based practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6935</td>
<td>Program Planning and Evaluation: CMH</td>
<td>Provides students with training in evaluation for continuous quality improvement in community mental health. Builds on the skills taught in SW 6032: Social Work Research &amp; SW 6933: Qualitative and Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SW6030, SW 6031, &amp; SW 6032, Field Practicum IV, V, and VI</th>
<th>See field section.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SW 6959: Integrative Seminar: CMH**

Gives students an opportunity to develop, conduct, and evaluate an advocacy project in a community mental health setting. Builds on knowledge, skills, and theories for **all** foundation and advanced courses taken prior to the final quarter in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
In addition to meeting all Department of Social Work educational objectives, students in the CMH concentration learn the mental health curricular objectives set by the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) Mental Health Initiative Committee. Schools of social work in California are part of the emerging transformation of the public mental health system in California, as advanced through the passage of the 2004 Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). The MHSA allocates resources to workforce development, supporting efforts to strengthen the social work mental health service delivery system. Subsequently, a number of curricular competencies were written through a statewide collaborative process involving mental health consumers, social work educators, and agency-based staff. These competencies can be accessed at http://calswec.berkeley.edu/MHInitiative_Competencies.html. Thus, a highlight in the ongoing development of the CMH concentration has been the integration of these curricular competencies that ensure our graduates are learning advanced knowledge and skills representative of the shared vision for community mental health services in California. Furthermore, the CMH concentration represents the very best in responding to community needs through the collaboration of CSU East Bay faculty, consumers, mental health organizations, and the California State Department of Mental Health. Each course syllabus in the CMH concentration includes a note about the CalSWEC curricular competencies that students will master in the course.

3. CMH Course Content and Assignments

Brief summaries are provided below for each of the nine core concentration courses in practice, policy, and research.

Advanced Practice

Students complete two practice courses that provide them with advanced skills and knowledge that focus on community mental health. This content is more comprehensive in scope compared to that in the foundation curriculum, and can be applied to practice situations of greater depth and complexity. Content includes existing and potential service strategies from prevention to treatment, diversity, values and ethics, populations-at-risk, social and economic justice, relevant social policy and legislation, and key practice theories, methods, and research.

SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: Community Mental Health.
This is the first course in the community mental health concentration, and it focuses on providing mental health services to individuals, particularly to urban underserved populations. This course combines advanced practice knowledge about mental illness with experiential skill-building activities. Advanced practice knowledge includes special populations, mental illness across the lifespan, and perspectives on mental health such as consumer empowerment, anti-stigma, wellness, recovery, and strengths. Experiential skill-building activities focus on individual assessment, treatment planning, clinical case management, crisis intervention, and evidenced-based practices such as cognitive-behavioral therapy and multi-systemic treatment.
This course has three assignments: (1) Weekly discussion questions; (2) An evidence-based practice paper; (3) A comprehensive assessment and evidence-based treatment and advocacy plan - micro level:

Signature Assignment:
Individual psychosocial assessment and treatment plan. Social workers are expected to know how to conduct & write a strong psychosocial assessment. For this assignment, you will identify a client of your own or one about whom you have access to detailed case information. Then write an assessment/intervention plan using the required headings (see handout). Each heading must be used. If you do not have information on the topic, write “Information not available,” or “information pending.” The last part asks for 2 challenges/problems for intervention, as well as one advocacy action. Ideally, the advocacy action should be something you could do in collaboration with the client to increase client access to resources, or decrease stigma, discrimination or some other barrier to health or services. Answer the ancillary questions at the end, justifying the evidence-based choice of intervention and explaining the evaluation plan. In addition, address ethical/legal, cultural competence, and transference/counter transference issues.

SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: Community Mental Health. This is the second advanced practice course required in the CMH concentration. Here, students use the practice knowledge obtained in the foundation year and advanced micro practice (SW 6505) and further refine their skills in working with families and groups. Emphasis is placed on early and advanced intervention with families who are affected by mental illness, as well as on building advanced group work skills. Special attention is paid to urban underserved and disenfranchised groups. Experiential skill-building activities focus on family and group assessment, treatment planning, crisis intervention, and evidence-based practices, such as cognitive behavioral therapy and multi-systemic treatment.

This course has three assignments: 1) weekly discussion questions; (2) An evidence-based practice paper; (3) A comprehensive assessment and evidence-based treatment and advocacy plan - mezzo level.

Signature assignment:
Family psychosocial assessment and treatment plan. In this paper (7-10 pages) you will be given a comprehensive family vignette. Based on the vignette, you will outline a three-month treatment plan for the family, including the goals you will work towards, the evidence-based intervention you will use to achieve these goals, rationale for choosing that intervention, and the methods you will use to evaluate the intervention. You will also identify at least one case or cause advocacy action that you could do (ideally in collaboration with the client) to increase the family’s access to resources, and/or address stigma or discrimination the client encounters. See handout.

Advanced Policy
The advanced policy course builds on the student’s knowledge from the foundation policy course by teaching content specifically focused on mental health with an emphasis on development of complex policy analysis skills.

SW 6525: Advanced Policy Practice: Community Mental Health. Students learn the history of mental health policy in the United States and California and develop advanced skills in policy analysis, development, and advocacy. Macro practice is discussed using the principles of economic and social justice, multiculturalism, anti-oppression practice, and human behavior knowledge about groups, organizations, and communities. These principles and theoretical perspectives support social workers’ development as critical thinkers and reflective practitioners capable of facilitating an action-oriented model that reflects social work’s core values in community mental health settings.

This course has four assignments: (1) Weekly Discussion Questions; (2) A Community meeting; (3) A Small Group Contribution to a Class Wiki; (4) APolicy Analysis Paper:

Signature Assignment:
Policy analysis paper. For this (7-10 page) paper, you will conduct a policy analysis of a mental health policy problem of interest to you. First, choose a problem. (See me if you need help finding a topic.) Then, follow Bardach’s (2008) “eightfold path” in analyzing the problem and considering the policy alternatives. In each step, challenge yourself to think about how the problem, evidence, and proposed policies will affect multiple stakeholder groups, and in particular, how members of disadvantaged communities are or could be affected.

Advanced Research

The two advanced year research courses are designed for students to build on the foundation year research course and gain more in-depth knowledge of research methodologies in their concentrations.

SW 6932: Qualitative and Quantitative Research: Community Mental Health. This is the second course in research methodology, building upon SW 6032: Social Work Research. This course focuses on social work practice research paradigms, models, and methods in community mental health. Particular attention is given to qualitative and quantitative methods used in community mental health evaluation. The course covers needs assessments, practice evaluations, and their role in social work practice. Students conduct a deeper exploration of gender and ethnic minority research issues and computer-assisted, descriptive and exploratory data analysis.

There are three assignments in this course: (1) an ethnographic observation; (2) a critique of an Empirical Research Paper; and (3) a group paper in which students present the results of their student survey.

Signature Assignment
Ethnographic observation. Conduct an ethnographic observation of the social world of individuals and/or groups in a particular setting. The goal of this exercise is to do a 90-minute
observation in a selected setting and to document your observations using field notes. In ethnographic research, field notes serve as the central source of data and are used to capture, in detail, your observations while in the setting. More specifically, notes from the field should contain complete narratives and should provide a “thick description” of the setting so that anyone who reads your field notes will understand and experience the social setting without actually being there. In order to complete this project, you need to submit your field notes typed, along with a typed report (maximum 5 pages, APA format) including an analysis of your observations (e.g., details such as rituals of social interaction, the use of social space, body language), conclusions based on your observations, and potential relevance to community mental health practice.

SW 6935: Program Planning and Evaluation: Community Mental Health. The purpose of this course is to prepare students to plan, design, and implement a community mental health program evaluation. Each student must demonstrate an ability to apply the knowledge, values, and skills of a social worker in: 1) the identification of issues in mental health administration and planning; 2) the application of theoretical and empirical literature; 3) the design of a mental health program evaluation; and 4) the preparation and presentation of a professional-quality comprehensive evaluation plan reflecting diversity and economic justice.

This course has one assignment divided into four parts:
(1) A Draft Proposal- part 1: describing: A) Statement of Need; B) Proposed Evidence-Based Service/Practice, and C) Proposed Implementation Approach.
(2) Draft Proposal: Part II- students prepare a 10 page paper describing: D) Organizational Experience, and E) Evaluation Plan (Performance Assessment and Data). (3) A presentation of the proposal program and evaluation plan. (4) A consolidation of all of the above into a final 20-25 page paper.

Signature Assignment:
Program evaluation and plan. Complete an in-depth program evaluation paper based on your field placement agency. Describe the history, setting, mission, funding, services, and staffing of the agency. Then discuss your ideas for a new and/or stronger program evaluation and devise an implementation plan for that evaluation, including an evaluation budget.

Culminating Course

SW 6959: Integrative Seminar: Community Mental Health. This seminar provides an opportunity for students to select an issue in community mental health and demonstrate their mastery of program objectives and curricular integration of practice, policy, research, and HBSE content. This community experience allows students to take a holistic approach to their learning and apply it to a community mental health agency or practice. Students examine a mental health related issue, perform a synthesis of the related knowledge on the issue, apply this synthesis to an actual community mental health agency or program, and integrate the seven program objectives (values and ethics, professional use of self, critical thinking, applying theory to practice, advocacy, diversity, and communication) into the analysis. All aspects of community mental health training such as practice, field, policy, research and diversity are incorporated.
when analyzing the chosen issue. Issues relating to racism, sexism, ageism, and other forms of discrimination such as religion and sexual orientation are also incorporated into the final paper.

**Signature Assignment**

*Write an integrative paper (20-30 pages) that represents a culmination of your academic and practicum learning, by synthesizing content across the MSW curriculum in relation to your selected topic and applying this synthesis to an actual agency or program. You should select a community mental health focused problem and write an in-depth analysis and action plan that advocates for the resolution of that issue. This paper should also address the issue from the perspectives of HBSE, Practice, Policy, Research, RGISWP and Field. Finally, integrate the seven core program objectives into your analysis. Please see the back of this syllabus for more detailed instructions on how to write this paper.*

As this paper is part of the Department of Social Work assessment plan, an abbreviated grading rubric is provided here (Table 2.16), as it was for the signature assignment of the foundation year, the General Practice III paper.

**Table 2.16: Abbreviated grading rubric: Integrative paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title Page, table of contents, abstract</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and statement of topic</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum integration</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied recommendations</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate level writing, APA format, references, appendices, &amp; presentation format</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Field practicum**

*SW6030, SW 6031, & SW 6032, Field Practicum IV, V, and VI.* Please see the separate section on field.

**4. CMH Advanced Human Behavior Knowledge, Theories, and Practice**

Students in the CMH concentration develop a sophisticated knowledge and theory base, building on foundation HBSE, which supports effective, culturally competent mental health practice.

The study of mental health and mental illness is based on the knowledge of life cycle development including the family life cycle and genetic, environmental and constitutional variables that lead to various levels of function and dysfunction. Mental health and mental
disorders must be understood in the context of variables such as sex, sexual orientation, religion, disability, and other elements of human diversity. Diversity in the context of these CMH practice courses also includes a discussion of how race may impact mental health service delivery (Segal, 2001), and how cultural differences in access to care (Snowden, 2005) and access to affordable housing and employment create barriers to service.

Students working in the public mental health area must also have practice knowledge in other issues such as divorce, single parenthood, poverty, substance abuse, and discrimination. These are all areas where mental health social workers need knowledge and skills to help the consumer, their families, and the larger group of consumers as a whole. Students in the CMH concentration critically examine the etiology of mental illness through a range of theories from the western biomedical perspective, the psychodynamic or psychosocial perspective, and the socio-cultural perspective. A major assumption that guides the concentration is that the effectiveness and appropriateness of treatment interventions are affected by the client’s understanding and perception of his/her mental state. Therefore, the concentration reviews various western as well as other culturally-based perspectives and interventions for mental illness. These include but are not limited to: medical diagnostic systems and psychopharmacology; case management which involves the strengths perspective; empowerment model and interdisciplinary teamwork to provide services; cognitive and behavioral approaches for psychosocial rehabilitation; traditional cultural methods; brief therapy; and psychoeducation.

The ecological approach, anti-stigma, and strengths perspectives, and consumer-centered practice with individuals involved in the mental health service delivery system focus on the multiple interactions which contribute to both healthy and unhealthy functioning at various system levels. Understanding how to engage consumers in a non-hierarchical relationship that supports their best functioning in their environment requires an understanding of not only diagnosis, but treatment approaches, societal supports, and impediments to successful living for those dealing with mental illness. Various empirical supports to practice approaches are presented in assigned readings.

In keeping with the social justice and advocacy focus of our program, students in the CMH concentration develop advanced practice knowledge at the macro level in addition to the micro and mezzo levels. Thus students embrace a population-based approach to treatment which balances an understanding of a consumer’s particular strengths and needs with macro-level contributors to mental health/mental illness. For example, students learn how financing and service delivery systems impact consumers’ access to timely and appropriate mental health treatment, and discuss disparities in access to treatment that exacerbate mental health problems.

Assessment and intervention skills such as clinical case management, cognitive behavioral therapy, and crisis intervention with mental health consumers are covered in SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: Community Mental Health. SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: Community Mental Health emphasizes assessment and intervention strategies with families of mental health consumers, their families, and groups. Knowledge of culturally competent assessments, interventions, and issues relating to racism, sexism, and oppression are also emphasized. Both SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: Community Mental Health and
SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: Community Mental Health are based in the ecological approach, anti-stigma and strengths perspectives, and consumer-centered practice.

Throughout all CMH concentration courses, advanced human behavior knowledge and theories are paired with advanced practice knowledge. This allows students to practice with greater sophistication. For example, in the fifth week of SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: Community Mental Health, the advanced knowledge topic is child and adolescent mental health issues, the advanced skill topic is multi-systemic therapy, and one of the readings (Pottick, Kirk, Hsieh, & Tian, 2007) is a research article describing clinicians’ differing perspectives on a case example of an adolescent with conduct problems based on professional discipline, race of the clinician, or race of the client described in the case. In this way, students are not only exposed to an evidence-based practice (multi-systemic therapy), but they are also challenged to think about issues of identity and diversity, as well as current research, as they plan and carry out assessment, treatment planning, and intervention. Another example is in SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: Community Mental Health, where advanced knowledge and skills are paired in the sixth week through discussion of trauma and family transitions, practical application of crisis intervention skills, and reading of a book chapter about crisis intervention with a Mexican American family experiencing acculturation conflicts (Congress, 2004).

Skills and knowledge are transmitted in the practice courses through classroom readings and assignments which reflect a “theory and practice” approach to teaching. The student’s skills are developed and demonstrated through writing assignments, computer lab exercises, role plays, case presentations, case vignettes, videotapes, speakers, and agency visits, as appropriate to a particular course. By the completion of their second year in the CMH concentration, students demonstrate competency in:

1. **Comprehensive Biopsychosocial Assessment.** Consumer assessments are taught with the understanding that contextual reference is necessary to understand cultural, diversity, and environmental factors. Clients are assessed with an orientation towards strengths and past successes in functioning. Students also learn to complete mental status exams. A clear understanding of DSM IV-TR diagnostic criteria, the effects of stigma and oppression, and access to community resources demand a thorough and comprehensive evaluation that goes beyond standard psychosocial parameters.

2. **Treatment Planning, Intervention Methods, and Intervention Skills.** Following completion of comprehensive and culturally competent assessments, students collaborate with consumers to identify and prioritize problems and determine the appropriate intervention(s). Students practice intervention skills on the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. Intervention methods include such evidence-based practices as multi-systemic therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, and motivational interviewing.

3. **Service Strategies from Prevention to Treatment.** Community mental health services include primary, secondary, and tertiary interventions. Barriers to implementation of interventions are discussed, with a focus on oppression and social and economic injustices. In keeping with emerging scientific evidence regarding the importance of preventing mental illnesses in those at-risk (Institute of Medicine, 2009), students
develop an understanding of mental health and mental illness as they exist on a continuum throughout the lifespan.

**Evaluation Methods and Skills.** Mental health social workers need to be familiar with a range of methods that are appropriate to evaluation of practice. All students are encouraged to evaluate their own practice, and many will have the responsibility for furthering their professional development in identified need areas. The goal of the mental health concentration is to help students learn to use a variety of methods so that they will be comfortable with varying methods of evaluation in their own practice.

5. **CMH and Social Work Values and Ethics**

The content throughout the nine CMH-concentration courses is built upon the values and principles of ethical decision making that are integral to social work practice. Students examine with greater depth and specificity ethical dilemmas and value conflicts that arise when working with individuals with mental illness. The focus areas include the problems mental health professionals encounter around client self-determination, the duty to warn, and maintaining confidentiality. Discussion of values and ethics are infused throughout the courses, but a specific example of how values and ethics are incorporated is in the reading and discussion of Gumpert & Black’s (2006) article on ethical issues in group work in the final week of *SW 6515: Advanced Mezzo Practice: Community Mental Health*. Through this and similar activities, upon successful completion of the courses, students are able to:

1. Demonstrate knowledge of the nature of ethical dilemmas that arise in mental health;
2. Understand the proactive steps that need to be taken to avoid unethical behavior and malpractice; and
3. Demonstrate knowledge of social work values in relation to social work ethics in mental health practice.

6. **CMH and Diversity**

Students have numerous opportunities to analyze, critically, the appropriateness and effectiveness of western modes of assessment (e.g., *DSM IV-TR*) and treatment when applied to non-mainstream, ethnic minority populations. Various cultural conceptualizations of health/mental health/spiritual health are examined along with traditional forms of healing. For example, in the second week of *SW 6505: Advanced Micro Practice: Community Mental Health*, the focus is on urban multicultural mental health practice, and the three readings include an overview of ethnically and culturally sensitive practice (Helms & Cook, 1999), an article on working with transgender individuals (Nuttbrock et al., 2002), and an article on bias in mental health assessment (Snowden, 2003). Through this and similar activities, students in the concentration are able to demonstrate:
1. A basic understanding of the nature of cultural differences in the social construction of mental illness and mental health; and
2. Awareness of cultural differences in healing or treatment of mental illness.

7. CMH in Relation to Populations-at-Risk and Social and Economic Justice

Vulnerable groups such as women, children, people of color, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals, older adults, individuals with disabilities, and others are at risk for stress-related mental health and health problems are examined. The CMH concentration examines factors that contribute to mental illness in high-risk populations. Emphasis is placed on developing proactive interventions such as psycho-education, agency change, and a strong commitment to consumer empowerment and advocacy. For example, in SW 6525: Advanced Policy Practice: Community Mental Health, one of the major projects in the course is student contributions to an online collaborative encyclopedia (wiki), which can be accessed at http://sites.google.com/site/sfbayareacmhwiki/. Students work in small groups to select a vulnerable population as the subject for a web page. The page must cover such issues as the unique strengths, challenges, and mental health needs of the population, difficulties the population has in accessing mental health resources, and policies that have been passed or proposed to address the needs of this population. Through this and similar activities, students are able to:

1. Examine how vulnerable populations such as women, children, racial/ethnic minorities, and LGBT individuals are at risk for stress related mental health problems;
2. Understand the many ways in which high risk populations have difficulty accessing services; and
3. Develop service plans/assessments that advocate for the unique needs of mental health clients.

The concentration examines the importance of social and economic justice for individuals with mental illness across sex, class, race, sexual orientation, and cultural boundaries. Without various forms of support that are sensitive to their particular needs, individuals with mental illness are unable to maintain optimal levels of functioning, and they often find themselves the subjects of discrimination. Utilizing an ecological perspective, students examine how existing policies within various systems may oppress and thereby prevent individuals with mental illness from obtaining needed services and achieving recovery. Strategies to initiate change toward the goal of social justice in systems are developed during the interactive class process. For example, students in SW 6959: Integrative Seminar, must research, plan, and implement an activity in the community intended to increase access to or otherwise improve services for individuals with mental illnesses. Through this and similar activities, students are able to:

1. Understand the nature of racism, sexism and other forms of oppression in mental health;
2. Advocate for, increase access to, and improve services for individuals in need of mental health care;
3. Aid in developing policies that remove barriers to service provision for individuals with mental illness; and

8. CMH and Liberal Arts Perspective

The CMH concentration builds on the liberal arts background by identifying and assessing socioeconomic, cultural, and lifestyle factors affecting mental health functioning. As an interdisciplinary study area, the CMH concentration draws from the knowledge base offered in anthropology, biological sciences, education, ethnic studies, law, political science, psychology, sociology, and many others. In order to understand mental health policies, discussions about political and legislative structures, which directly affect policymaking and policy implementation, are grounded in knowledge from liberal arts perspectives such as political science and economics.

9. CMH Instructional Methods and Evaluation of Learning

Instructional methods focus on the development of critical thinking skills as a basis for acquiring knowledge and skills necessary for community mental health practice with urban underserved populations. Teaching methods include lectures, small group discussions, focused class exercises (role plays, fish bowl discussions, case consultations, and topic-focused brief written assignments), student presentations, and class discussions based on reading assignments. These methods are tailored to the educational objectives of a particular session. Additionally, mental health providers, policymakers, and consumers in the community are invited to present their perspectives, including current issues and relevant information that will be useful to social workers in mental health practice. Skills and knowledge relevant to the student’s needs are also transmitted in the practice courses through classroom readings and assignments, which reflect a “theory and practice” approach to teaching. Students demonstrate skills’ acquisition through writing assignments, computer lab exercises, role plays, case presentations, case vignettes, videotapes, speakers, and agency visits.

Methods used to evaluate student learning include: brief written assignments or examinations, case presentations and analysis, development of biopsychosocial assessments and treatment plans, critique and application of current literature on evidence-based practices, policy analysis papers, and research projects. As shown in the brief course descriptions presented earlier in the chapter, there are usually three major assignments in each course, and examples would include the following: 1) submission of weekly reflection questions to encourage thoughtful student completion of reading assignments and to facilitate richer in-class discussions; 2) review and critique of journal articles on evidence-based interventions; 3) in-depth case assessment and treatment plan or in-depth policy analysis or research paper.

10. Recent Progress and Future Directions

The CMH concentration faculty and the Advisory Board recognize the critical need for well-trained social workers to serve children, youth, adults, and special populations in need of
mental health services. To that end, current plans to strengthen the CMH concentration include the following:

- Continue to strengthen links between consumers, community mental health social workers, interdisciplinary professionals and the Department of Social Work;
- Continue to strengthen classroom linkage with practicum sites;
- Continue to strengthen links between the CMH and CYF concentrations; the latest effort in this area included a member of our faculty attending a recent symposium on the collaboration between child welfare and mental health;
- Continue to explore use of teaching methodologies that deepen and facilitate learning, such as through the use of critical thinking skills and problem-based learning; a recent effort in this area included a pilot project to have students contribute to an online collaborative encyclopedia (wiki) about mental health issues for specific urban underserved populations. This wiki can be accessed at http://sites.google.com/site/sfbayareacmhwiki/;
- Continue to develop additional courses in mental health and related issues, such as a course that focuses on social work and developmental disabilities, or social work with vulnerable young adults, or social work with older adults. A recent successful effort to develop a new course included a special revision of our Advanced Assessment elective (SW 6561) to focus specifically on child and adolescent mental illnesses.

Advanced Year Field Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Standard 2.1: Advanced Year Field Education Reflects Program Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The sections that follow present the advanced year field instruction sequence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integration with foundation sequence and program objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course content and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Advanced human behavior knowledge, theories, and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social work values and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Populations at-risk and social and economic justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Liberal arts perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Instructional methods and evaluation of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recent progress and future directions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Overview

Consistent with the mission of the Department of Social Work, the Field Practicum sequence (in both foundation and concentration years) prepares students for culturally-competent practice as advanced practitioner-advocates, working with urban underserved populations. Field instruction provides for selected and organized experiences within agency settings that apply to the generalist knowledge and practice skills in the foundation year and advanced knowledge and practice skills commensurate with their area of concentration.

During the advanced year of the MSW field practicum, students’ professional competence is facilitated through the development of the knowledge and skills needed for
culturally competent urban social work practice and advocacy. Students select from two specific areas of concentrations: Children, Youth and Families or Community Mental Health. Selection of concentration is based on the student’s area of interest and consultation with their graduate advisor. Students are placed in concentration specific field practicum, thus enabling them to have greater exposure to specialized knowledge, issues, and practice relevant to their concentration. Faculty liaisons with specialized knowledge and advanced practice skills in either concentration lead the concentration practicum.

In the second year, students take three sequential field practicum courses designed to offer advanced knowledge and practice in their chosen area of concentration. Students spend a minimum of twenty hours a week in field placement, enabling them to integrate theoretical frameworks and specialized knowledge of their course work while continuing to build on the foundation skill sets and working towards increasingly sophisticated evidence-based, culturally competent urban social work advocacy. Students choose from two different concentrations Children, Youth, and Family or Community Mental Health. Students are placed in concentration specific field practicum, which allow them to have greater exposure to specialized knowledge, issues, and practice relevant to their concentration. Faculty liaisons lead the different concentration practicum based on their own area of expertise, specialized knowledge, and advance practice skills in either Children, Youth, and Family or Community Mental Health. The field seminar is divided into two parts--the first hour is spent on a directive check-in process where the students discuss specific issues or problems in their placement and receive feedback from their peers. The second hour of the field practicum is focused on skills building, special topics, or assignments designed to improve practice.

Over the course of the three field practicum courses, students develop a cohesive group where they learn the strengths and weakness of each other’s practice. This dynamic enables the students to provide pertinent and insightful feedback in a supportive environment. Ultimately, this practice will foster deeper professional development, knowledge, and understanding of social work issues. This process also helps students to refine their skills in the use of supervision, reflection, self-evaluation, and incorporation of critical feedback to inform their practice. Students are thus better prepared to enter a specialized area of practice. They acquire the ability to utilize a variety of intervention techniques informed by evidence-based practice, emerging research, and new paradigms for use in diverse urban settings and populations.

In the advance year practicum, the micro level includes practice focusing on the individual alone or as part of a family or a small group and engages in more sophisticated and comprehensive assessment and treatment or service delivery. The mezzo level includes practice primarily with families and small groups that have a greater complexity of problems and which necessitate additional and/or alternative communication skills and techniques. Macro level practice is directed toward bringing about improvements and changes in the larger society. Students obtain a more profound understanding of the issues and challenges pertinent to the clientele in their area of concentration.

Advanced year field work builds on the skills developed in the foundation year and focuses on moving students beyond foundation year experiences to more refined practice skills with an emphasis on a greater level of autonomy and competence. Advanced year learning
opportunities afford students greater depth, breadth, and specificity across micro, mezzo, and macro practice areas.

Students practice with increasingly complex client systems so that they can refine their knowledge and skills from the foundation year. The advanced year field practicum promotes skills related to professional competence including self-responsibility, self-observation, and self-correcting practice, and leadership skills.

In the advanced year students work with their field instructor to create a concentration specific learning agreement. The goals and objects of the advanced learning agreement foster the development of practice skills at the micro, mezzo and macro levels; maintaining self-awareness within a variety of practice situations; greater understanding of one’s strengths and the process of one’s own learning; and utilizing values and ethics of the profession. Students are poised to engage with client systems in a more significant way than during the first year of field practicum. The specialized focus of the advanced year field practicum, combined with the knowledge and skills obtained in the foundation year, provide students with the opportunity to obtain greater professional competence and independence in delivering a variety of services.

Students attend the Field Placement Fair during Winter Quarter of their foundation year and select agencies based on their area of concentration. Although the choice of field placement is a self-directed process, agencies must meet a minimum standard of educational opportunities for the students, and this requirement is also monitored by the field liaison on an ongoing basis.

The advanced year seminar is divided into two parts. The first hour is spent on a directive check-in process where students discuss issues or problem in their placement and receive feedback from their peers. The second hour focuses on building skills building and topics or assignment designed to improve practice. The students gain familiarity with the group dynamic process, the utilization and incorporation of feedback by peers, and the self-reflective process. Working with students from the same concentration allows students to focus on issues relevant to their practice area. Since students share a common ground of interests, skills, and techniques relevant to their practice, they understand practice at a more sophisticated level.

The Field Education Office, which implements the field education program, consists of the Field Director, three full time field liaisons, five part-time field liaisons and approximately 200 field instructions. The field Director and the full time field liaisons meet monthly to coordinate program activities, monitor program objectives, and address challenges associated with the administration and implementation of the field experience. The Field Director holds monthly meetings with the Children, Youth, and Family Co-Chair and the Community Mental Health Chair and the Department Chair to address ongoing curriculum and field education issues. The Field Director also participates in the Department’s Advisory Board which meets on an as-needed basis.

In advanced year field instruction, the students link to the advanced course sequences in their area of concentration in micro and mezzo practice, policy, and research. Theory, method, and practice components, in addition to the field experience and seminars, form the core of field education.

The relationship of advanced field instruction courses to the advanced sequence concentration is summarized in Table 2.17 below:
Table 2.17: Advanced Year Instruction and Its Relation to the Children, Youth, and Family Concentration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Advanced Year Field Instruction Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Micro</strong>&lt;br&gt;6500 Advanced Micro Practice: Children, Youth, and Family</td>
<td>• Provides specific intervention skills and techniques utilized in field;&lt;br&gt; • Guidelines for conceptualization and operationalizing of case plans and service plans;&lt;br&gt; • Informs and teaches evidence-based practices relevant to individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Mezzo</strong>&lt;br&gt;6510 Advanced Mezzo Practice: Children, Youth, and Family</td>
<td>• Informs and teaches evidence-based practices relevant to families and communities;&lt;br&gt; • Provides specific intervention skills and techniques used for intervention with families; and&lt;br&gt; • Provides skills set and framework for specialized group interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy</strong>&lt;br&gt;6520 Advocacy and Macro Practice: Children, Youth, Family&lt;br&gt;6935 Program Evaluation</td>
<td>• Facilitates the introduction and practice of relevant paradigms and the implementation process;&lt;br&gt; • Facilitates critical thinking regarding policies and service delivery systems;&lt;br&gt; • Provides specific information for assessment of concentration and need for creation of policies on a macro level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong>&lt;br&gt;6932 Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis</td>
<td>• Critical evaluation of research methods to determine validity of evidence-based practices;&lt;br&gt; • Critical assessment of information utilized to discern relevant treatment and intervention strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capstones</strong>&lt;br&gt;6909 or Capstone: Departmental Thesis&lt;br&gt;6959 Capstone Seminar</td>
<td>• Critical assessment and evaluation of information, systems, or special issues relevant to area of concentration;&lt;br&gt; • Research study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electives:</strong>&lt;br&gt;6405 Community Mental Health Seminar&lt;br&gt;6550 Social Work Psychosocial Rehabilitation&lt;br&gt;6557 Sex Roles and Gender Discrimination: Women’s Issues in Social Work&lt;br&gt;6552 Legal Issues in Social Work Practice&lt;br&gt;6558 Supervision and Staff Development&lt;br&gt;6553 Assessment and Treatment of Substance Abuse&lt;br&gt;6554 Occupational Social Work&lt;br&gt;6555 School Social Work&lt;br&gt;6556 Human Sexuality and Social Work</td>
<td>• Understanding of special topics relevant to social work practice on a micro, mezzo, and macro levels.&lt;br&gt; • In-depth analysis and application of special topics as they relate to field practice;&lt;br&gt; • Greater understanding of vulnerable populations; and&lt;br&gt; • Specialized knowledge relevant to advocacy on behalf of vulnerable populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.18: Advanced Year Instruction and Its Relation to Community Mental Health Concentration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>How Advanced Year Field Instruction Relates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Micro</td>
<td>• Operationalizes specific assessment frameworks like <em>DMS IV-TR</em> for diagnosis;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6505 <strong>Advanced Micro Practice:</strong></td>
<td>• Provides specific intervention skills and techniques utilized in field;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>• Guidelines for conceptualization and operationalizing of treatment planning; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informs and teaches evidence-based practices relevant to individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Mezzo</td>
<td>• Informs and teaches evidence-based practices relevant to families and communities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6515 <strong>Advanced Mezzo Practice:</strong></td>
<td>• Provides specific intervention skills and techniques used for intervention with families;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>• Facilitates the introduction and practice of paradigms relevant to specific concentrations; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides skills set and framework for specialized group interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>• Facilitates critical thinking regarding policies relevant to mental illness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6525 <strong>Advocacy and Macro Practice:</strong></td>
<td>• Provides greater understanding of the public and private insurance issues and barriers impeding service delivery;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>• Provides relevant information for assessment of concentration and need for creation of policies on a macro level; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6935 <strong>Program Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>• Facilitates students’ understanding of services, systemic issues, and identification of underserved populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>• Critical evaluation of research methods to determine the relevance and validity of evidence-based practices; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6932 <strong>Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis</strong></td>
<td>• Critical assessment of information utilized to discern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relevant treatment and intervention strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstones</th>
<th>Electives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6909 or Capstone: Departmental Thesis 6959 Capstone Seminar</td>
<td>• Critical assessment and evaluation of Information, systems, or special issues relevant to area of concentration; and • Research study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives:</td>
<td>• Understanding of special topics relevant to social work practice on a micro, mezzo and macro level; • In-depth analysis and application of special topics as they relate to field practice; • Greater understanding of vulnerable populations; and • Specialized knowledge relevant to advocacy on behalf of vulnerable populations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Integration with foundation sequence and program objectives**

The goals and objectives of the advanced year practicum build on foundation field and align with the Department’s program, especially those related to preparing social workers for effective practice from a culturally competent perspective with individuals across the lifespan, and with families, groups, organizations and communities in urban settings. At the completion of the advanced year sequence, students are expected to fulfill the following in field placement specific to their advance area of concentration:

1) **Values and Ethics.** Demonstrate a firm understanding of and a commitment to uphold the core values, ethical principles, and ethical standards of the social work profession as codified in the *NASW Code of Ethics*;

2) **Professional Use of Self.** Conduct oneself with increased autonomy in the professional social work role in the placement setting. This includes understanding personal values and biases and knowing their impact on clients, a commitment to the ongoing development of professional knowledge and skills, and the use of self effectively in the chosen area of concentration;
3) **Critical Thinking.** Demonstrate the ability to use critical thinking skills in the field setting through successful analysis and synthesis of information, application of evidence-based practice, and a willingness to modify plans of intervention accordingly;

4). **Applying Theory to Practice.** Demonstrate an ability to integrate relevant theoretical material into field experiences in the student’s area of concentration. This includes the ability to articulate such theories with field instructors, field staff, and/or intervention teams;

5) **Advocacy.** Demonstrate a commitment to and the ability to advocate for clients, groups, and/or communities in increasingly complex situations, specific to the student’s area of concentration;

6) **Diversity.** Demonstrate self-awareness and increased knowledge of diverse populations, with the commitment to provide culturally competent service and advocacy; and

7) **Communication.** Demonstrate a professional level of written and oral communication skills relevant to the concentration and the ability to communicate across diverse client systems.

Although the educational objectives are the same for the Children, Youth, and Family Concentration and the Community Mental Health Concentration, the context and the application of theory to practice differs significantly. Students working with different populations may need a self-reflective, guided process different from that of their peers as well as the use of specific engagement and therapeutic techniques endemic to their specific concentrations. Students will be dealing with ethical dilemmas in different ways and are being held to different standards of content and rigor based on the placements.

### 3. Course Content and Assignments

The field instruction content area consists of three courses during the advanced year: SW 6530 Field Instruction IV, SW 6531 Field Instruction V, and SW 6532 Field Instruction VI. Students attend a two-hour per week field seminar that supports the field experience. During the first class, students are oriented to the placement, they shadow their supervisors and agency social workers, and they begin receiving case assignments. Under supervision, students increase their micro and mezzo involvement with individual clients, families, and groups. The final class continues micro and mezzo client work with an emphasis on advocacy, evaluation, and policy analysis. Additionally, students prepare for transition into the workforce through a series of sessions which focus on professional development, including licensure and job seeking skills.

---

¹ In advanced year, Hayward students complete 600 hours, Concord students complete 520 hours.
**SW 6530 Field Instruction IV:** In the first component of the field instruction curriculum for advanced year, students demonstrate their ability to apply social work knowledge, skills, and values. Students develop and solidify effective supervisory collaboration while working more autonomously. Students further develop their communication skills including documentation to secure services successfully to meet the client’s needs. They demonstrate increasingly culturally competent skills in engagement, assessment, and treatment with individuals from diverse backgrounds and with at-risk populations. This course builds on foundation year information concerning diversity, risk, abuse against children and adult/elder(s), ethics and confidentiality which are then integrated for use throughout the field experience. Practice skills are demonstrated through assignments such as learning logs, process recordings, case presentation, and class discussions.

**Signature Assignment**

**Learning Log (journal of field experience).** The Learning Log is an opportunity to reflect on the day’s events in your field placement. 

*Type* an entry every other week that includes the following headings:

1. **Content:** Select one or more events and write a short narrative. Describe the family or people involved, including what happened, what you did, and your role in the event. (Who is the client/family? Include all relevant demographic information/children’s ages, grades, living situation etc. Why were they referred? What are the concerns? What are the strengths? What interventions are you using? Remember to write this section in narrative form from a social worker perspective. Please check grammar and spelling!
2. **Thoughts:** Describe your thoughts about what happened and what you did as you addressed your responsibilities.
3. **Feelings:** Describe the feelings you experienced related to your thoughts about what happened and what you did. How do you feel?
4. **Social Work Principles Involved:** Using the (7) seven program objectives, explain why you did what you did in terms of the social work principles you used. Based on your interaction in this situation, which of the objectives apply? (In many cases there could be more than one.) Do the NASW Code of Ethics standards/principles apply?

**SW 6531 Field Instruction V:** In the second component of the field instruction curriculum for advanced year, students apply strength-based, ecological, and person-in-environment theories to practice while building on the skills and concepts from the SW 6530 course. Students identify and utilize appropriate intervention based on evidence-based practices or paradigms in their area of concentration. The increasingly advanced study of the impact of social issues on client systems, agencies, and networks allows for more effective service delivery. Seminar content also expands into the mezzo realm, encouraging the students’ skills in family and group work. Practice skills are demonstrated through the use of learning logs, process recordings, case presentation, and class discussions.

**Signature Assignment**

**Case Presentation.** Each student will do a brief case presentation on an individual client, family, or group during the second year field sequence. Dates for each presentation will be
determined at the first class meeting. A 1-2 page summary should be prepared for the seminar meeting, and copies made for all seminar participants. Please organize the presentation around the following:

- Presenting problem
- Relevant history and information
- Context of intern’s initial contact with the client
- Intern’s observations of the client & the situation
- Intervention Results to date
- Personal reflections relating to any of the following: ethical/value issues, intern's professional use of self, applying theory to the case, evidence
- Evidence-based practice questions, cultural competence, advocacy, access and resources
- Consultation Question

CYF Students are required to complete an advanced assessment of the client’s risk and protective factors. CMH Students are required to complete a DSM IV-TR Differential Diagnosis and a Case Formulation which supports the diagnosis.

**SW 6532 Field Instruction VI:** In the third component of the field instruction curriculum for advanced year, students integrate the skills and concepts learned in SW 6530 and SW 6531. Students work with individuals and families utilizing advanced intervention skills. Students will also solidify critical thinking, advocacy skills, and reflective practice. Practice skills are demonstrated through the use of learning logs, process recordings, case presentation, class discussions, a reflection paper, and agency policy analysis. Students will be able to apply the knowledge and skills obtained in the classroom and the field placement to the work setting.

**Signature Assignment**

**Reflection Paper:** In a minimum of three pages, use two pages to reflect on your field experience and seminar this year and one page to analyze the strengths and limitations of an agency policy. This is an assignment of introspection and thought. Before writing, review your learning logs, process recordings, and assignments to observe your intellectual and emotional changes over the year. Contrast yourself at the beginning of the first quarter with how you see yourself now. Contrast yourself at the beginning of graduate school with yourself now. You may find it interesting to re-read your personal statement written for the MSW admission process. How do you account for any changes? Consider areas of growth, stress, and future development. Reflect on the seminar process. How did you contribute to the growth of the group? How would you like it to have been different? Discuss your maturation as a graduate student and as a social worker, including your development of a professional social work identity. How have you grown in the use of yourself as a social work tool, in your understanding of ethics, in your sense of cultural competence, and in your commitment to social justice? In light of these changes, what vision do you have for your future social work role? The analysis of policy could be reflected in the mission statement, specific policies and services relevant to serving urban at-risk populations, responding to diverse communities, pursuing social and economic justice, and applying social work values. Consider what aspects of the policy you would like to change to make it more responsive to the clients’ needs.
4. Advanced human behavior knowledge, theories, and practice

Using the ecological perspective for understanding individuals and groups in the context of the environment, this sequence requires implementation of various practice theories in the field instruction. Students draw from theoretical frameworks learned in foundation year. They demonstrate their ability to apply theoretical perspectives to practice through learning logs, course assignments, and weekly field seminar discussions and check-ins. Students are exposed to specialized knowledge and interventions through their advanced electives to gain experience in the operation of these skills in the field practice. Students analyze the efficacy of their practice in the group process. In the Learning Agreement for advanced students, specific objectives related to diversity include facilitating culturally appropriate assessment and intervention on multiple system levels (i.e., individual, family, group, organization, and community).

Children, Youth, and Family Concentration:
Students use over-arching principles of the strength-based and the person-in-environment perspectives. Students apply practice interventions in the field of child welfare, school-based social work settings, and case management through specialized programs serving the community, innovative assessment approaches such as interventions, alternative service delivery model, incorporation of new paradigm shifts in the concentration designed to improve the lives in Children, Youth, and Family.

Community Mental Health Concentration:
Students use over-arching principles of the strength-based and the person-in-environment perspectives. Students apply the consumer-based social rehabilitation model which necessitates a different and innovative relationship toward working with in community mental health. Students apply this framework in different community mental health setting including clinics, school based mental health, juvenile hall, and psychiatric hospitals. Examples of evidence-based practice models include cognitive behavioral therapy, multi-systemic therapy, and specialized assessment tools.

In Advanced Year Field Practicum students demonstrate competency in practice by completing the following activities as part of their field placement:

Children, Youth, and Family

- Effectively differentiate and appropriately manage a crisis by determining the level of intervention needed;
- Conduct risk assessment to determine appropriate intervention technique(s) and service delivery plan;
- Completion of multiple comprehensive psychosocial assessments.
- Completion of case plans;
- Appropriate, identify, and utilize evidence-based practices or emerging paradigms to engage and deliver service within the clientele;
• Assignment of at least two ongoing, long-term cases to be seen throughout the fieldwork placement period, where possible;
• Participation in case conferences, multidisciplinary team conferences in the agency, and within the community;
• Participation in a group experience which might include an educationally-focused group, such as a parenting class, a therapeutically-focused group, a socialization group, or a discussion group; and
• Continue to foster self-care in the context of professional development.

Community Mental Health
• Effectively differentiate and appropriately manage a crisis by determining the level of intervention needed;
• Conduct risk assessment to determine appropriate intervention technique(s) and service delivery plan;
• Completion of multiple comprehensive psychosocial assessments, intake assessments, and differential diagnosis;
• Completion of treatment plans that articulate how the clinical interventions will ameliorate the presenting problem or symptoms based on the creation of goals and objectives created by the clinician and the client, or as indicated by the agency;
• Appropriate, identify, and utilize evidence-based practices or emerging paradigms to deliver service with the clientele;
• Assignment of at least two ongoing, long-term cases to be seen throughout the fieldwork placement period, where possible;
• Participation in case conferences, and case presentations;
• Collaborative experiences with members of the interdisciplinary or treatment team in the agency;
• Participation in a group experience which might include an educationally-focused group, such as a parenting class, a therapeutically-focused group, a socialization group, or a discussion group. and
• Continue to foster self-care in the context of professional development.

5. Social Work Values and Ethics

In the advanced year, students are expected to be familiar with the NASW Code of Ethics and apply its standards when ethical dilemmas arise. Through directed supervision, students discuss ethical dilemmas, develop strategies to address these dilemmas, and apply these strategies to a particular practice situation. Students use self-reflection in practice situations with clients to adjust professional approaches when needed. Process recordings and case discussions offer students the opportunities to demonstrate professional values such as self-determination and respect for cultural diversity. When developing an assessment and treatment plan, students reflect on their own values and ethics in order to promote appropriate and effective service delivery. In the Learning Agreement for advanced students, specific objectives related to diversity include facilitating culturally appropriate assessment and
intervention on multiple system levels (i.e., individual, family, group, organization, and community).

**Children, Youth, and Family Concentration**

Students develop skills for maintaining confidentiality with minors and parents and remaining actively engaged with the client to maintain their therapeutic rapport. In child welfare, students reflect on their own definitions of abusive parenting while maintaining an objective, open approach to dealing with children and families in these arenas. Students in hospital settings deal with ethical dilemmas stemming from beliefs systems around palliative care, right to self-determination for themselves, their agencies values, and those of the clients. Through active participation in a seminar, students confront similar dilemmas to facilitate a more profound discussion of these issues.

**Community Mental Health Concentration**

Students learn the navigation and utilization of the mental health system and the requirements of clinical practice. The strength-based approach is frequently at odds with operating models of pathology and treatment which are part of the culture of mental health. Shifting from expert to driven to client centered service delivery is also problematic. Students may struggle with issues of confidentiality and safety while maintaining therapeutic rapport. Students will discuss these conflicting values and dilemmas in a group setting with peers in similar situations.

6. **Diversity**

In conjunction with the reading materials and lectures from the practice courses and field integrative seminars, students become proficient at defining, designing, and implementing practice strategies with persons from diverse backgrounds in the context of their chosen field of practice. In the advanced year, students work with clients from a variety of racial/ethnic backgrounds including Latinos, African Americans, Asian and Pacific Islanders, and Native-Americans, many of whom face socioeconomic and cultural contexts that affect service delivery. Students gain awareness of the importance of diversity in social work practice, but they also become proficient in adapting practice skills to meet the unique needs of diverse client groups. In the Learning Agreement for advanced students, specific objectives related to diversity include facilitating culturally appropriate assessment and intervention on multiple system levels (i.e., individual, family, group, organization, and community).

**Children, Youth, and Family Concentration**

Students seek a more sophisticated and detailed understanding of the cultural norms and values of the clients that they are actively involved with. This understanding facilitates the student’s ability to assess the needs of the clients and create culturally relevant and appropriate interventions. This point becomes more pertinent when students engage clients in understanding beliefs and values around abuse, power and control, family values, acculturation, and assimilation issues at an individual and family level. In the practicum, students are able to reflect on and share their experiences, receiving input from peers who face similar issues and
dilemmas. At a mezzo and macro level, this exposure to and greater understanding of practice with diverse populations will operationalize itself as students begin to focus on assessment of greater communal needs to direct advocacy.

**Community Mental Health Concentration**

Students in this concentration seek a greater understanding of the individual's culture and the norms and values surrounding mental illness. Questions regarding the nature of pathology versus normative behavior become more culturally defined. Students understand how different cultures conceptualize mental illness and the coping strategies and mechanisms utilized by the individual, the family, and the culture in seeking optimal functioning. Students learn to embrace the cultural norms and to facilitate healing for the individuals and families. This understanding also guides advocacy on a mezzo and macro level. Students must frequently intervene in the larger community to assist the individual and families in having their needs met.

**7. Populations-at-Risk, Social and Economic Justice**

Students in the advanced field practicum understand the role of oppression as a risk factor for a variety of individual and social problems. They address such issues in weekly supervision with their field instructor. Students understand populations-at-risk and social justice through the development of a community project that focuses on identifying a particular population at-risk and the social justice issues affecting this population. Students analyze this community and develop an intervention to meet its needs. In addition, the Learning Agreement for advanced students describes ways in which the field site and field instruction facilitate cultural competence with an emphasis on populations-at-risk.

**Children, Youth, and Family Concentration**

Students discuss special topics relating to populations at risk in their practicum. This includes victims of child abuse, domestic violence, substance abuse, and other forms of disabilities. The practicum focuses on helping students develop more advanced interventions skills in this area through the use of exercises and vignettes. Some of these interventions include specialized case management and risk assessment. Students address these issues throughout the year in their practicum, as their scope of practice begins to incorporate mezzo and macro level interventions. At the end of the practicum, students have a greater understanding of the vulnerability of individuals and the social and economic justice issues that directly impact individuals in their concentration.

**Community Mental Health Concentration**

Students discuss populations at risk within the scope of community mental health. Special attention is paid to children, the elderly, and other underserved individuals. Students focus on advanced engagement, advanced intervention skills, and relevant risk factors that impede service delivery and optimal health. Issues of funding and payment for treatment with populations at risk require special attention and creative solutions. Students continue to utilize their practicum to develop strategies to overcome some of the economic injustices that they are
facing in the field. As they advance through the year, they expand their focus to mezzo and macro levels for more directive advocacy.

8. Liberal Arts Perspective

Advanced year foundation builds on the liberal arts perspective to facilitate understanding of the major theoretical, political, historical, and scientific developments that have shaped the social work practice. The practicum courses allow students to better comprehend rationales for interventions at multiple levels and to obtain a deeper appreciation of how the evidence base of social work is constructed and advanced. Critical thinking and information literacy skills are integrated in process recordings, learning logs, case presentation, and class discussions. Advanced year is rooted in both the liberal arts perspective and the generalist perspective.

Children, Youth, and Family Concentration

Students draw from their liberal arts background to understand how politics and economics directly impact practice with Children, Youth, and Family. They learn how the formation and shaping of the legal system and its relationship to child welfare and domestic violence are impacted by political mandates. Students apprehend the impact of such mandates, their origins, and effects and become more effective in questioning some of these practices. This understanding and the ability to discuss these issues in the group process facilitates a more rigorous examination of ethics, social work values, and their impact on direct practice.

Community Mental Health Concentration

Students in this concentration study new scientific developments in the treatment of mental illness utilizing pharmacology, imaging scans, and evidence-based practices. Their foundation in science and theory can assist them in the understanding of these valuable new technologies. Their liberal arts foundation in history and politics can also help them to understand, more judiciously, the trends and application of these technologies, as well as the impact on the clientele and service delivery models.

9. Instructional Methods and Evaluation of Learning

Students in both the Children, Youth, and Family and Community Mental Health Concentration benefit from the same instructional methods and evaluation of learning. The field seminar experience encompasses both classroom instruction and field placement experiences. The field instruction curriculum utilizes class lectures, small group classroom activities and assessment techniques, discussion, and assigned readings to reach its educational objectives. Students complete learning logs, case presentation, process recordings, reflections, and policy analysis. Differences in their field practicum emerge as the students engage in the group dynamic with other students in their cohort. Students acquire more advanced knowledge and skills sets and are able to provide informed and productive feedback to peers dealing with similar issues. This dynamic process is mediated by the field liaison who has additional expertise in the area on concentration and can increase the sophistication and complexity of assignments to meet the student’s needs.
The field seminar and the field placement experience are interconnected. The field placement provides activities that progress in complexity throughout the field experience. The students go into field placements and are involved in working with clients with similar issues and challenges. Students are integrating curriculum experiences, the feedback from the group dynamic, and intervening with increasingly complex and sophisticated approaches. Students receive feedback regarding their progress from their field liaison’s comments and their field instructor’s progress reports. The students’ field course is evaluated by formative and summative anonymous, confidential questionnaires at the end of the quarter.

See table for schematic representation of the student’s advanced year learning experience. In the group dynamic process, the field liaison leads the students in ongoing discussion involving assessment, increased professional communication, and evaluation of social work values leading to culturally competent urban social work practitioners.

The advanced year field curriculum supports all seven of the core program objectives by addressing and integrating them throughout the field practicum. Seminar instructors, field liaisons, and field instructors all help students to nurture the student’s growth of these essential skills. In addition, the learning agreement and evaluation tools are organized around and promote the attainment of these objectives.

1) **Values and Ethics**: The students engage in advanced self-reflexive and critical evaluation of their own values and how these values directly impact their practice in the concentration. This becomes more challenging as the students are exposed to increasingly complex situations where they are required to work more independently. Examples of the difficulty of negotiating these issues are very clear when students have to negotiate communication and confidentiality between parents, children, and themselves; moreover, they may have to keep in confidence issues which are problematic. Students engage in discussions of ethics relevant to their practice area.

2) **Professional use of self**: Through the seminar’s dynamic group process of check-in and feedback, students are provided with a safe environment in which to work that is moderated by the field liaison so that constructive and critical feedback can be received and incorporated into practice.

3) **Critical thinking**: Students are encouraged to deconstruct situations, cases, and issues in their field placement as they arise. Often through the group process, students improve their critical thinking skills by listening to their peers’ struggles and practice issues.

4) **Applying theory to practice**: Students gain greater exposure to theory in their course work and in the field placement. The practicum offers a place where the students can receive objective feedback from peers regarding their capacity to apply theory to practice and perhaps the identification of the “blind spots” in their own practice.

5) **Advocacy**: Students are able to use the knowledge that they have gathered from the field and other course work to learn about pertinent advocacy practices. Exposure in their area of concentration provides additional guidance and direction for them to focus on advocacy efforts.
Students use the group process to receive feedback and problem solving advocacy strategies to become more successful at various levels of practice: micro, mezzo and macro.

6) **Diversity**: Students gain continued exposure to diverse populations throughout their practicum. Through the group process, they gain further exposure to the practices of their peers, which increase their knowledge base and skills set to serve more diverse groups.

7) **Communication**: Students work towards improving their oral and written communication skills at a variety of levels. This can occur through group exercises, assignments, and learning logs.

### 10. Recent Progress and Future Directions

The Field Instruction Practicum faculty and the Advisory Board recognize the critical need for well-trained social workers to serve children, youth, adults, and special populations as a culturally competent social work advocate. To that end, current plans to strengthen the Field Practicum are as follows:

**Recent Progress:**

- Commitment to transition students to the work force via the Preparation for Workforce Seminars as in Syllabus SW 6532, Spring 2009.

- Commitment to the continued education and development of our field instructors by providing educational experiences and CEU’s to eligible Field Instructors such as attendance to community forums and specialized trainings.

- Commitment to hosting an annual field fair widely attended by community agencies and students which provide a forum for placement procurement as well as an opportunity for community agencies to meet, network, and share resources.

To that end, current plans to strengthen the Field Practicum experience are as follows:

- Continue to foster and develop partnerships with community agencies to create field placements and expand current placement opportunities.

- Continue to recruit and retain a wide spectrum of placement opportunities that will offer a broad scope of opportunities.

- Continue to strengthen linkage with practicum sites.

- Continue to explore use of teaching methodologies that deepen and facilitate learning.
Field Instruction Policies and Procedures

**Accreditation Standard 2.1.1** Provides for a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and 900 hours for master’s programs.

MSW field education at CSUEB requires that students complete 1,080 placement hours before graduation. This reflects 480 hours in the foundation year and 600 hours in the advanced year. There are two full-time models of fieldwork. Hayward Academic Year Program (Hayward Campus) requires 16 hours per week, three quarters for the foundation-year students and 20 hours per week, three quarters for advanced year students. Concord Year-round Program (Concord Campus) is a two-summer block field placement that requires a 13-week summer block of 40 hours per week for each summer placement: 520 for foundation year and 520 for advanced year.

Students have to meet the program’s specified criteria for field education. Students attend the mandatory orientation, meet with field faculty, become eligible to work at a community agency (no prior felony charges or convictions), complete pre-placement interviews, secure acceptance at a field agency, and have a valid driver’s license and access to a car. Written criteria for selecting field placements are included in the field manual.

**Accreditation Standard 2.1.2** Admits only those students who have met the program’s specified criteria for field education.

Admission to the MSW program is prerequisite to participation in field education. Before students are eligible for field, they complete an Application for Fieldwork. This document gathers details on contact information, special needs, work history, unique skills, personal vehicle availability, and student field interests. It also inquires into possible criminal history, to determine eligibility for the departmental malpractice insurance policy of $1,000,000-3,000,000 per student. Students may not be placed in field without this application and malpractice insurance. Beginning in the fall of 2006, students who enter the MSW program will be required to provide their own malpractice insurance. Students are informed that some agencies, particularly those dealing with minors, will require fingerprint clearance and a Department of Motor Vehicle printout. Students are permitted to interview at three different placements prior to the start of their foundation year. Students not placed by the fourth week of their first quarter may be dismissed from the program.

*Foundation Year-Hayward Academic Year Program:*

Students are given the opportunity to interview at three different places that have been pre-selected by the Field Department, based on a careful review of the students experience and area of interest. Students not placed by the fourth week of their first quarter may be dismissed from the program.

*Foundation Year-Concord Year-round Program:*

Due to the nature of the Concord Year-round Program block placement, students in foundation year undergo a different process to secure their foundation year internship than Hayward campus MSW students. Concord Year-round Program students are required to attend the field fair. Students are also encouraged to look in their community for potential placement opportunities that are of interest to them.
If the student identifies an agency that has the possibility of working with the school, this is pursued by the Field Department in order to ensure that all criteria for appropriate placements are met. Students are required to complete three interviews prior to the selection of a field placement. Some Concord students elect to have their current employment serve as their first year placement. Authorization for such a placement must meet the rigorous requirements set by the Field Department and authorized by the Field Director. Students are required to complete three interviews prior to accepting their advanced year placement. During this process students are also meeting with their field liaisons to ensure that field placement issues are addressed appropriately. Once a student has selected an agency, the field director reviews all the information and authorizes the placement.

Field Department Field Fair

The Field Fair is an annual event which takes place in the Winter Quarter. Agencies who have contracts with the Department or are interested in having students placed and are in the process of completing the application process are invited to the fair to recruit potential interns. The Field Department reviews agency information and discusses the appropriateness of placements and concentrations prior to the fair. At the fair, students and agencies are able to exchange important information about the internships, educational opportunities, agency services, etc. Agencies present provide information regarding the opportunities appropriate to students in either concentration or inform students of which concentration they are more likely to take. Frequently, agencies and students schedule interviews at this time.

Advanced Year Placement Hayward Academic Year Program:

Students that have successfully completed course work, field placement, and are in good academic standing are eligible to begin their advanced year placement. Students need to make sure that they have an updated field application, a copy of their current resume, and malpractice insurance. Students are required to attend the annual field placement fair and to complete three interviews prior to accepting their advance year placement. During this process students are also meeting with their field liaisons to ensure that field placement issues are addressed appropriately. Once a student has selected an agency, the field director reviews all the information and authorizes the placement.

Advanced Year Concord Year-round Program:

Students that have successfully completed course work, field placement, and are in good academic standing are eligible to begin their advanced year placement. Students need to make sure that they have an updated field application, a copy of their current resume and malpractice insurance. Students are required to attend the annual field placement fair and to complete three interviews prior to accepting their advanced year placement. During this process students are also meeting with their field liaisons to ensure that field placement issues are addressed appropriately. Once a student has selected an agency, the field director reviews all the information and authorizes the placement.
Selecting Fieldwork Agencies

To determine the suitability of an agency for field placement, the Social Work Department, via the Field Director, assesses the agency’s interest in and potential for a long-term commitment to social work practice education. Preference is given to agencies that are focused on supervising social work students as well as having a wide range of opportunities for a variety of student learning experiences. The department looks for agencies and programs that offer services to individuals, families, groups and communities, and a commitment to serving diverse client populations. Agencies are expected to provide students with diverse, multicultural practice experiences, as well as experiences with populations at risk, and individual or groups impacted by social or economic injustices. Agencies are also expected to assist and provide the student with opportunities for advocacy at multiple levels. Agencies are expected to subscribe to the educational objectives of the Department of Social Work, and to treat the students as learners while, at the same time, according them the resources necessary to complete their assignments. Agencies selected for field placement include those with private, nonprofit or public sources of funding.

Agencies selected for foundation-year placements are those that can offer an opportunity for students to employ intervention skills at all system levels. Agencies are also expected to provide the close supervision, support, and guidance most foundation-year students need. The advanced-year placement settings must offer the students opportunities for increased independence and responsibility within the context of providing services to one of the concentration populations.

The criteria used in evaluating agencies to determine their suitability for use as fieldwork settings includes the following:

- The ability to provide students with exposure to diverse client populations with a particular emphasis on cultural, ethnic, and racial diversity, as well as working with those in poverty and oppressed groups;
- The ability to provide a comprehensive range of learning experiences for students;
- The ability to provide students with adequate and appropriate work-space, work-related equipment such as a computer, support staff, and an adequate number of clients;
- The availability of a qualified fieldwork instructor who is an employee of the agency--as opposed to a consultant who is only there a limited number of hours during the month--and who is available during the hours in which the student is in field;
- A commitment to the achievement of the educational objectives of an educationally based fieldwork learning experience;
- A philosophy and standards that are acceptable and respected in the practice community and by the University;
• Adequate practice opportunities in order to accommodate the student intern’s area of concentration;
• Adequate staffing so that the agency can perform and maintain its service delivery goals without inappropriate reliance on students;
• Policies, procedures, and practices that demonstrate non-discrimination towards clients, staff, and students;
• A working and learning environment free from sexual harassment of students, clients, and employees;
• Philosophy and practices which are consistent with the NASW Code of Ethics.
• Adequate resources that are essential to a successful field teaching environment; and
• A willingness to sign a California State University East Bay’s Social Work Field Placement Agreement

Procedurally, agencies that express field instruction interest first complete an Agency Fact Sheet and sign the Agency Agreement. A field faculty member then makes a site visit to determine the appropriateness of the placement and to discuss department and agency needs. The agency is given the Field Manual and field instructors are requested to attend department training. If for some reason, usually one of timing, the field instructor cannot attend training, it is required that the field faculty completes a one-on-one orientation for the instructor. Agency participation is then evaluated via ongoing contact, as well as end-of-year evaluation by the assigned student and field liaison.

Selecting Field Instructors

To ensure that placement sites and fieldwork instructors meet accreditation standards, interested agencies and potential fieldwork instructors provide information describing the agency’s services. The potential fieldwork instructor also provides information describing his or her work experience and academic training. Agencies are required to submit the resumes of all potential field instructors available. The Field Faculty will interview the Agency Intern Coordinator or Field Instructors while conducting initial or administrative site visits. The MSW Program requires the following qualifications when selecting fieldwork instructors:

• The instructor must possess an MSW from an accredited school of social work;
• The instructor must have at least two years of post-MSW direct and indirect practice experience;
• The instructor must commit to be available to supervise the student intern for a complete academic year;
• The instructor has demonstrated the necessary knowledge and practice competence related to social work practice from an ecological systems perspective;
• The instructor must demonstrate expertise in the student’s chosen concentration, i.e., CYF or CMH;
• The instructor is willing and available to participate in Field Education Department activities such as fall quarter orientation for fieldwork instructors, and training sessions for new fieldwork instructors;
• The instructor will be available within the agency during the hours in which the student intern(s) will be in fieldwork;
• The instructor must possess the willingness and ability to adjust his or her workload to allow for weekly supervision of the student intern(s); and
• Whenever possible, it is highly desirable that fieldwork instructors have prior experience supervising graduate-level social work interns.

Placing and Monitoring Students
Each student has two fieldwork placements in two different agencies during the course of study. Additionally, every effort is made to ensure each student has experience working with diverse populations and working under the supervision of ethnically diverse fieldwork instructors.

Foundation Year Hayward Academic Year Program: The Department of Social Work exercises full responsibility for the placement of all foundation year students. Students are required to submit a field placement application and their resume. The Field Director, in consultation with Field Faculty, reviews each student’s application, relevant experience and selects an appropriate foundation year placement for that student. Placement decisions are communicated to the field instructors, agencies, and students as soon as possible during the summer months. Students are instructed to schedule a pre-placement interview with their assigned agencies prior to the actual start of the practicum. The purpose of the visit is to begin the introduction and orientation process. Agencies then submit an Interview Response Form, in order to provide feedback to the field liaison and the student. This form allows the interviewer and the interviewee to comment and to indicate acceptance or rejection of the placement or student. If questions regarding the match are identified during this first contact, the student’s field faculty liaison or the Field Director is consulted immediately.

Foundation Year Concord Year-round Program: The Concord students are assigned Field Advisor in their foundation year. During the course of their first year, they prepare their resumes, identify areas of interest, and complete the field placement application. Students are required to attend the field placement fair and complete at three interviews prior to selecting a placement. Some students who are currently employed in social services agencies request to have an employer placement; other students identify agencies in the community with which CSU East Bay does not have a relationship with. In both of these cases, the student works with their field advisor and the Field Director to explore the possibility and appropriateness of the placement.

Placement decisions are guided by the following considerations:
• The generalist goals of foundation year field instruction;
• The expressed interest and career goals of the particular student;
• The expressed needs and interests of the agency;
• The prior work and life experience that the student brings;
• Geographic location;
• The special needs of the student;
• The special characteristics of the student;
• The special characteristics of the field instructor; and
• Stipend requirements, if any.
Advanced Year Hayward Academic Year Program

Students declare their concentration at the start of the MSW program. For advanced year, students are directed to agencies that will provide field opportunities commensurate with their concentration area. Students prepare resumes in SW 6021, discuss potential field placement, and attend the field placement fair. Students discuss placement choices with their field liaisons and their academic advisors. Following the Internship Fair, students select three agencies with which they would like to interview. A student and field liaison meet to discuss the placement and if appropriate, interviews are arranged. Agencies generally begin interviewing in March. Title IV-E interview start-times are coordinated between the Bay Area MSW programs and the county agencies.

Advanced Year Concord Year-Round Program

Students declare their concentration at the start of the MSW program. For advanced year, students are directed to agencies that will provide field opportunities commensurate with their concentration area. Students are assigned Field Advisors to discuss potential summer placements and to review their resumes. Students are required to attend the Internship Fair. Following the Fair, students identify three agencies with which they would like to set up interviews and schedule them. Student in the Title IV-E program are assigned to work in their county agency.

The Field faculty and Field Director finalize the placements and notify the students. In Hayward Academic Year Program advanced year, student are notified by the middle of the Spring Quarter. Concord Year-round Program Advanced year students are notified by the beginning of June. Students who are not accepted or placed in their first round of interviews are required to meet with their Field Advisor or Field Director. Students can complete a maximum of six interviews after which time the Field Director and Department Chair will determine if it is appropriate for the student to remain in the program for the academic term or return at a later point.

Maintaining Field Liaison Contact with Agencies

Each field instructor is given a graduate Field Manual that contains information regarding the organization, content, and sequencing of the curriculum. The manual also includes a master calendar for the academic year, sample case recordings, a sample learning contract, outlines for different types of written case recordings, and evaluation forms. The graduate Field Manual is especially helpful to new as well as experienced field instructors.

The Field Director or Field Faculty staff visit the agencies for pre-placement screening. They talk with the agency director and field instructor about field education and the agency’s needs. Students’ duties, responsibilities and learning opportunities are discussed in detail. This visit often affords the opportunity for the agency and field staff to continue to develop and improve the field placement experience, and to make a determination as to which concentration applies to the internship experience. Field Instructors also interface with the program through:

- The initial orientation training,
- Quarterly community forums,
• Quarterly department newsletter.

Hayward Academic Year Program

Once a student is placed, the assigned liaison makes a quarterly site visit. During the first quarter, the student’s learning agreement is reviewed in detail. In subsequent visits, the liaison discusses progression towards completion of learning goals, additional learning opportunities, areas of growth and problem areas with the student intern. In addition, this is an opportunity to review current issues and changes in the Department of Social Work. New agencies are visited early. Any field instructor, agency, or student experiencing difficulty will be visited as often as needed by the field liaison. Field faculty members are also available by phone and email for ongoing support. To facilitate this process and improve accessibility, the Department invested in a cell phone for each field liaison.

Concord Year-Round Program

Once a student is placed, the assigned field liaison completes two site visits during the summer block program. Field liaisons are required to complete their initial site visits within the first two weeks and their last visit in the last two weeks of the term. This enables the Field Liaison, Field Instructor and student to review the learning agreement early to ensure a good learning experience. The Field Instructor will discuss the student’s Progression towards completion of learning goals, additional learning opportunities, areas of growth and problem areas that may occur in the field placement. In addition, this is an opportunity to review current issues and changes in the Department of Social Work. Field Liaisons are available to meet with Field Instructors during the summer term in the event that additional issues arise. A final visit is completed towards the end of the summer quarter to review the student’s progress towards completion of his/her learning agreement and final evaluation.

Evaluating Student Learning and Agency Effectiveness in Providing Field Instruction

Field Instruction evaluation occurs on an ongoing basis over the course of the academic year in the Hayward Academic Year Program and during the Summer Block in Concord Year-round Program. It is a joint process between the Field Instructor and the student where the Field Instructor utilizes standardized instruments and the instructor’s narrative provides feedback to the student based on the seven core objectives and specified learning tasks. The student also provides feedback regarding his/her learning experiences areas of growth and challenges. The Field Instructor and student often review specific examples of the student’s work.

The Field Instructor and the student discuss the evaluation in a specially scheduled evaluation conference. The Field Instructor clarifies the purpose and the structure of the evaluation in advance. Both parties individually prepare for the conference by reviewing their teaching-learning experiences to date, the learning agreement, the evaluation instrument, education recordings, conferences, notes, and any other relevant materials.

To support individualized student evaluation, the student/agency Learning Agreement provides a backdrop for the student assessment process. Student field performance expectations are organized into seven core areas:
1. Values and Ethics;
2. Professional Use of Self;
3. Critical Thinking;
4. Applying Theory to Practice;
5. Advocacy;
6. Diversity; and
7. Communication.

Each core area contains particular objectives and behavioral measures that are used to structure the field experience and to evaluate the student’s performance. The student must demonstrate adequate performance and skill in all seven areas in order to pass the field. A student who fails field placement is not eligible to continue in the MSW program.

In addition to the Learning Agreement, the Field Instructors and students complete additional documents which include:

- First Quarter Progress Report,
- Mid-year Winter Progress Report,
- Final Evaluation,
- Student Evaluation of Field Placement,
- Student Evaluation of Faculty Liaison,
- Field Instructor Feedback, and
- Faculty Evaluation of Field Placement.

**Learning Agreement**

Students work with Field Instructors to develop the “Learning Agreement.” During the first weeks of placement, the document is flexible and can be modified throughout the year by the field instructor and the student. The learning agreement must include goals and objective directed towards the completion of program objectives. While it is the student’s responsibility to complete the written document, the content should represent mutually agreed upon objectives between the Field Instructor and the student. Students and Field Instructors are responsible for signing the learning agreements on the dates specified in the Field Education Master Calendar. The learning agreement provides a structure for the placement experience and delineates expectations. Students assigned to the Title IV-E program use learning agreements which additionally address the IV-E competencies, and they receive evaluation specifically designed to prepare them for work in public child welfare settings.

**Student Evaluations of the Field Program**

Throughout the academic year, students meet with their respective field liaisons and offer feedback regarding their assessment of the field placements. At the end of the academic year, students have the opportunity to evaluate their agency, field instructor, and the field liaison. The formal end-of-the-year student evaluations of placement are kept in a binder in the Field Director’s office and are available for student perusal.

**Field Instructor Evaluation of Program**
Field instructors are asked to evaluate their experiences with the field program and their respective field liaisons at the end of each year. These evaluations are reviewed by the field faculty. In addition, the Field Director and field liaisons maintain ongoing contact and receive ongoing informal feedback from instructors in the field.

**Accreditation Standard 2.1.4** Specifies that field instructors for baccalaureate students hold a CSWE-accredited baccalaureate or Master’s of Social Work degree. Field instructors for master’s students hold a CSWE-accredited Master’s Social Work degree. In programs where a field instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited baccalaureate or Master’s Social Work degree, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective.

Field instructors for the CSUEB MSW program must hold a CSWE-accredited MSW degree and have two-year post-MSW experience. In the event that there is a staffing change during a students’ placement the field liaison, Field Director and agency work collaboratively to identify an appropriate MSW to provide supervision. In the event that an appropriate MSW supervisor cannot be located, the agency and Field Department can generate an alternative supervisory plan which can include supervision from an MFT, PhD or an MSW that does not meet the two year post master experience with additional support from the field liaison to ensure an optimal learning experience for the student. Such a supervisory plan would be generated if it was determined that it would be most appropriate for the student to remain in the placement. The final decision to have the student remain in placement is at the discretion of the Field Director.

The Field Department reviews each agency placement at the end of each academic year. This is accomplished through a review of the students’ evaluations of the agency and the field liaisons’ evaluation of the agency. Based upon these evaluations, a recommendation is made to continue or discontinue the agency as a field placement site. These evaluations are reviewed by the field staff and are available in a binder in the Field Director’s office. A report of discontinued agencies are shared with the chair and faculty at the end of the academic year and reviewed prior to the commencement of placements at the Fall term for Hayward Academic Year Program and Winter Quarter in preparation for the Field Fair. Agencies that have been discontinued are not invited to the field fair. This review supports the department’s ongoing evaluation of an agency’s effectiveness as a field instruction partner.

**Accreditation Standard 2.1.5** Provides orientation, field instruction training, and continuing dialog with agencies and field instructors.

**Field Instructor Orientation and Training**

Field Instructors attend a three-hour training which is offered in June and September. Field Instructors are oriented to the program’s mission and objectives and then provided an overview of the *Field Manual*. If a Field Instructor cannot attend the training, the field staff provides individual orientation. In addition to the program-focused orientation, Field Instructors are invited to attend the quarterly community training forums. The department provides continuing education units for Field Instructors who attend these forums.

**Continuing Dialog with Agencies and Field Instructors**
The MSW program maintains open communication with collaborating agencies through initial site visits, Field Instructor orientation, community forums, routine and crisis-based phone and email contact, mailings, the quarterly newsletter, the cultural competence e-resource, and routine student-monitoring site visits. Clear and frequent communication between all parties is essential. The most consistent and intensive form of contact revolves around the day-to-day facilitation of the student placement partnership. Minimally, field liaisons make three student-focused site visits to placement agencies participating in the Hayward program and two visits to the summer-block agencies.

The first agency visit clarifies the students learning objectives during the field placement, his/her adjustment to the placement, and completing the learning agreement, the first evaluation, and a general review of the student’s progress. The first visit is made during the first ten weeks of the fall quarter. A second visit is made in the second quarter. The third visit will address the final evaluation, and an overall critique of the student’s field experience.

Additional agency visits will be scheduled to address problems or concerns that need more timely attention. The student has ongoing contact with the Field Instructor through supervision and the Field Liaison through the seminar class. Individual meetings with students will be arranged with the Field Liaison as needed. Significant changes in the agency that directly impact the student may require additional visits from the Field Director or field faculty, and it may be necessary to evaluate the ongoing placement of students in the agency.

The Field Department staff also conducts administrative site visits for all agencies. The intent of this visit is to continue to foster an ongoing partnership with the agency and re-assess the educational opportunities available to students. During these site visits, the Field staff re-assesses the appropriate concentration focus given the educational opportunities, discuss the number of placements that the agency can accommodate, address changes in the MSW supervision or general administrative changes that might impact student placement.

2.1.6 Develops policies regarding field placements in an agency where the student is also employed. Student assignments and field education supervision differ from those associated with the student’s employment.

Students who are employed in social work agencies may request that their agency be evaluated for suitability as a field placement site. Students are encouraged to meet with the Field Director or Field Faculty to review the policy regarding employer placement to determine the appropriateness of the request. In considering an employer placement, it is important for the student to be able to obtain an educational experience that significantly differs from their current employment.

In order to assure the educational focus of the practicum experience, the following criteria outlined in the field manual must be met:

- The agency must be able to provide a practicum site for the intern during fieldwork hours that is in a different physical location, and the learning assignments must be significantly different from normal work activities and duties;
• Assigned hours for practicum must be completed in a different program area or unit of the agency, allowing for an actual physical separation of employment and practicum activities;
• The intern must have practicum assignments with a different client population and program area or service area during the fieldwork hours;
• A qualified Field Instructor (with an MSW degree and two years post graduate experience) must be available who is different from the line supervisor of the student. The Field Instructor must be available to the intern during the hours when the intern is in his or her practicum. There can be no possibility of a dual relationship;
• The proposed practicum assignments must be educationally focused and address the Department of Social Work’s educational objectives;
• The agency must submit a written proposal describing the differentiation between employment activities and practicum activities. The proposal must be signed by the intern, proposed Field Instructor, work supervisor, and agency representative;
• The proposal must provide a schedule that adheres to the practicum calendar: specific hours and/or blocks of time must be designated as practicum hours. Typically, an intern is required to spend 16-20 hours per week in practicum—depending on whether the intern is a first or advanced-year student. Practicum hours must be scheduled at a minimum of four hours at a time; eight-hour blocks are preferred, and the schedule should provide the best educational experience. Interns are not permitted to accelerate the accumulation of hours or to count any employment hours towards the required hours; and
• The identified Field Instructor must complete the three-hour Field Instructor training (Introduction to Field Instruction) prior to the implementation of the placement; the agency must take steps to ensure that agency staff is informed of the requirements and expectations of the practicum;

In general, it is the position of the department to discourage employer-based placements whenever possible. The intent of the generalist practice program is to provide the student with a breadth of experience. Advantages inherently exist in the student’s exposure to an unfamiliar agency and client group. For these reasons, students may only have one employer-based placement with the same agency in completing their field instruction at CSUEB.

Recent Progress and Future Directions
The Field Department recognizes the critical need for well-trained social workers to serve children, youth, adults, and special populations. To that end, current plans to strengthen the practicum experience include the following:

• Continue to strengthen links between community agencies and the school;
• Continue to strengthen classroom linkage with practicum sites;
• Continue to seek out placement opportunities that are in line with the program objectives of the school;
- Create a Field Liaison position in for the Concord Year-round Program whose specific focus will be to address the needs of the students in that program and to recruit agencies in the Contra Costa County area;
- Create additional training opportunities for Field Instructors.
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 3: PROGRAM GOVERNANCE, ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE, AND RESOURCES
Accreditation Standard 3.0: The social work program has the necessary autonomy and administrative structure to achieve its goals and objectives.

Administrative Organization of the School

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work has the necessary autonomy and administrative structure to achieve its goals and objectives. The Department of Social Work was granted departmental status in 2003 in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS). The Department of Social Work’s organizational and administrative structure is analogous to other CLASS Departments.

The Department of Social Work is administered by a Departmental (Program) Chair, and a full-time social work faculty. The Chair is elected for a three-year term and reports to the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences. The Chair is responsible for financial and administrative oversight of the Department of Social Work. The faculty shares in the governance of the department, and utilizes a participatory decision-making process, described in the next section. As shown in figure 3.1, tenure-track/tenured faculty, lecturers, the field director, IV-E and Mental Health stipend program coordinators, and department secretary all report directly to the chair of the department. The field faculty reports to the field director, and the administrative assistants associated with the IV-E and mental health stipend grant programs report to the coordinators of those grants. This administrative structure allows for communication and coordination within the department and ensures that all staff members have adequate access to supervision and assistance when needed.

Regularly scheduled meetings of the faculty ensure that communication occurs frequently. All full-time faculty members, including tenure-track/tenured faculty and full-time lecturers, meet monthly. The Chair, Field Director, and coordinators of the IV-E and mental health stipend programs also meet monthly to coordinate such activities as community forums, advisory board meetings, and other special events for students, such as mock interviews. Other committees described later in this document, such as the admissions committee, student performance committee, and curriculum committee, also meet monthly.

The remainder of this section describes the administrative structure of the Department of Social Work in further detail.
The responsibilities of the Chair are outlined by University policy as follows:
Under the direction of the School Dean, the Department Chair serves as the primary administrator of the academic department. Areas of responsibility include faculty relations, student relations, curriculum development, budget and resources, relations with community and alumni, and professional development. In these responsibilities, the Department Chair consults with the departmental faculty. More specifically these areas of consideration include the following:

1. Recruitment, retention, and promotion recommendations for faculty and staff. Works to assure equal opportunity employment compliance.
2. Recruitment, retention, and advising of students.
3. Supervision and evaluation of faculty and staff.
4. Consultation with faculty on department, school, and university objectives, policies, and procedures.
5. Facilitation of internal communication among faculty and staff.
7. Preparation of department budget requests and administration of budgetary allocations.
8. Preparation of class schedules and catalog copy.
9. Certification of payroll documents.
10. Encouragement of faculty growth and high performance in teaching, research, and other professional activities.
11. Maintenance of departmental records.
12. Representation of the University and department to external agencies.
13. Preparation of department correspondence and reports.
14. Other duties as assigned; see: http://www.csueastbay.edu/OAA/chairs.pdf

The Director of Field Education is a full-time position, which reports to the Chair and administers the field education program. Duties include evaluating and certifying agencies as field placements, supervising and evaluating field education faculty, assigning faculty to field practicum classes, organizing training for field liaisons, and advising faculty, students, and field liaisons with regard to field placement issues. The Director of Field Education works with the Chair of the Department to ensure that the integration of theory to practice, i.e., praxis, is achieved through the field internships and field practicum classes. The Director of Field Education does this through the development of curriculum in conjunction with all other sequence and concentration chairs: by providing in-service training to both field instructors and field liaisons, and by working closely with the Title IV-E and CalSWEC-II coordinators to ensure that these competencies are integrated into field education coursework.

The Graduate Coordinator is an assigned faculty position. The responsibilities are as follows:
1. Admissions advising and admissions.
2. Support of student transition into program.
3. Advising enrolled students on transfer units, problems with credit for repeatable courses, failure to complete pre-requisites, leaves, writing skills issues and problems with enrollment, courses taken over the five year limit.
4. Assignment of graduate advisors.
5. MSW major checks.

School Governance and Decision-Making

The School has in place well conceived administrative, governance, and decision making structures that enable administration and faculty to attend to fundamental programmatic matters, such as setting goals and objectives, long and short-term strategic planning, evaluation and assessment, academic and curricular matters, and student affairs. In general, the School’s primary governance and decision making occurs through standing committees chaired by full-time faculty members.

The Program Chair and the social work faculty define program curriculum, establish fieldwork policies, establish program criteria, and implement policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel. The faculty governance process requires that faculty participate in the development of curriculum, the hiring and promotion of faculty, and in the overall maintenance of academic programs and the academic process.

The Constitution and Bylaws of the University Faculty (http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/06-07/06-07constitution.bylaws.pdf)
The governing document for CSU East Bay faculty, establishes strong faculty governance representation on issues related to the curriculum, instruction, planning, research and other key
issues. The Chair, in consultation with the faculty, establishes budget priorities, develops the budget and manages all fiscal matters of the department.

The faculty has authority and responsibility for establishing the mission, goals, objectives, and curriculum of the MSW Program. In collaboration with the Department faculty, the Chair assesses program needs and makes recommendations on recruitment, promotion and tenure of faculty. Through standing committees, the faculty has established mechanisms for evaluating curriculum and teaching, and policies related to student life and development. Regular faculty meetings and scheduled colloquia provide forums for faculty discussions and evaluation of mission, goals, objectives, and curriculum of the program.

The Department Chair, all tenured and tenure-track faculty, and full-time lecturers are eligible to serve on committees. By University policy, the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Committee and Search Committee are filled by tenured and tenure-track faculty only. Part-time faculty members are invited to attend faculty meetings and to participate on committees. Full-time adjunct faculty routinely participates in faculty governance through committee membership. Student representatives are appointed by SWGA (Social Work Graduate Association) for participation in the Faculty and Curriculum committees. Discussion of the Department's committees and decision making processes related to Retention, Promotion, and Tenure are presented under AS 3.0.2.

The following paragraphs describe the Department’s standing committees. Please note that Committees related to curriculum and to the promotion, retention, and tenure process are described respectively in 3.0.1 and 3.0.2 subsections.

**General Faculty Meeting**

The general faculty assembly (GFA) is the *de facto* governing body for of the Department. The faculty members in the Department of Social Work include full and part-time members who hold academic appointments: Tenure-track/tenured faculty has full voting rights in departmental meetings per The Constitution and Bylaws of the University Faculty ([http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/06-07/06-07constitution.bylaws.pdf](http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/06-07/06-07constitution.bylaws.pdf)). The Departmental faculty has the overall responsibility of reviewing and approving all policies submitted by standing committees in the Department. The Constitution [Articles II.2-II.4 (Department) Voting Rights is followed when matters require vote by the GFA (see [http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/06-07/06-07constitution.bylaws.pdf](http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/06-07/06-07constitution.bylaws.pdf)].

The Faculty responsibilities are outlined to accomplish the following:

1. Establish the rules to govern its procedures, provide for its committees, and make recommendations to the Department Chair;
2. Formulate educational policy for the MSW program consistent with the policies of California State University, East Bay, and the appropriate accrediting bodies of its various programs and departments;
3. Develop, implement, and evaluate the curricula for the department;
4. Establish, maintain, and monitor standards to enhance academic excellence, including the admission policies and degree requirements of its department;
5. Create a learning environment which encourages each individual member of the Faculty, staff, and student body to actualize his/her potential in professional and academic development.
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The following committee structure exists in the Department of Social Work:

**Assessment Committee.** The Department Chair appoints faculty members to the Assessment Committee for two year terms, and the Committee elects a chairperson. The committee designs measurement instruments for assessing the Department’s achievement of programmatic goals and objectives, and collects and analyzes data for Department reports and communication purposes.

**Student Performance Committee.** Members of this committee are the Graduate Coordinator, the Title IV-E and CalSWEC-II Coordinators, and the Director of Field Education. The Committee develops, reviews, and oversees the School’s student academic conduct and performance standards, and carries out all Department, College, and University policies and procedures concerning student academic performance and grievances. The committee convenes as needed.

**MSW Admissions Committee.** This committee includes the Graduate Coordinator, the Director of Field Education, the Title IV-E Coordinator, the CalSWEC-II Coordinator and fulltime lecturers. It is chaired by the MSW Graduate Coordinator. The Chair is an Ex-Officio member of this committee. The Committee recommends admission standards and procedure for selecting and admitting students for approval by the Chair and Tenure-track/tenured faculty. The key tasks of the Committee are to develop and recommend MSW program admission policies to the faculty as a whole and to assist and advise the Admissions Coordinator on issues concerning the governance and administration of the admissions process.

Department committees report on their activities and actions at the monthly meetings of the GFA for additional review and appropriate action. The committee system promotes a high level of faculty participation in School governance and decision making. The committee system continues to evolve to meet the needs of the Department. As the Department continues to develop, it will regularly and systematically review its committee structure to ensure its optimal functioning.

**Accreditation Standard 3.0.1: The social work faculty defines program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies.**

Faculty in the Department of Social Work defines the curriculum. They are responsible for the integrity of the curriculum and for ensuring that MSW program curricula are consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the university’s policies. Tenured, Tenure-track, and adjunct (full and part-time lecturers) faculty members design, plan, implement, modify, and evaluate the curriculum and the educational policies. These responsibilities serve to support the Department’s curricular goals and objectives. The responsibility for defining, approving, and monitoring educational policy relating to the admission, advising, retention and graduation of students rests with the faculty.

A Curriculum Committee has been established within the Department of Social Work consisting of all tenured and tenure-track faculty, the Director of Field Education, Grant Program Coordinators, and the Program Chair. Chaired by a tenure track faculty member, this committee is responsible for the development of curriculum, curriculum change proposals, and overall maintenance and refinement of the curriculum.
This committee has numerous sub-committees that are responsible for the overview, content, book selection, and course modification recommendations for the departmental sequences:

- **Human Behavior in the Social Environment (SW 6000, SW 6001)**
  - Chair of sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence
- **Race, Gender, and Inequality/Social Policy (SW 6010, SW 6032)**
  - Chair of sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence
- **Foundation Year Practice (SW 6011, SW 6012, SW 6013)**
  - Chair of sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence
- **Research (SW 6032, SW 6932, SW 6935)**
  - Chair of sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence
- **Field Practicum (SW 6020, SW 6021, SW 6022)**
  - Chair of sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence as well as the departmental sequences:
- **Children, Youth, and Family (Concentration group)**
  - Chair of Sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence
- **Community Mental Health (Concentration group)**
  - Chair of Sequence
  - All faculty teaching in sequence

Review of course content takes place at the smaller unit level, i.e., the above sequence and concentration sub-committees. The chairs of these sequence and concentration groups comprise the participants of the Department Curriculum Committee.

Through the MSW Curriculum Committee and sub-committees, the faculty is routinely involved in curricular development and assessment to prepare students for changing practice needs, to ensure the integration of courses, and to assess program outcomes.

After approval of curriculum proposals at the departmental level, proposals are forwarded to the CLASS Committee on Instruction. Approval at the school level moves the proposal on to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and onto the Academic Senate for final approval.
Accreditation Standard 3.0.2: The administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel.

The Social Work faculty participates in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel within the guidelines established by University Policy (http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/08-09/Eval%20of%20Temp%20Faculty.08-09%20rev.clean%20copy.pdf). The Search Committee formed each academic year identifies potential tenure-track faculty. The social work faculty is responsible for the recruitment, interviewing, and recommendations of hiring for tenure-track faculty. Once position requests have been approved by the Dean and by the University Provost, the Search Committee is responsible for developing and implementing procedures for the recruitment of qualified faculty.

The Committee develops advertising and recruiting strategies, reviews and screens faculty applications, interviews selected faculty and makes recommendations regarding appointment to the Dean of CLASS. While the Dean has been delegated to make the final offer to the candidates, he/she relies heavily on the input and recommendations of the Social Work Departmental Search Committee and the Program Chair. The Provost makes the final decision on the offer, but the Provost relies heavily on the input from the Dean and the Program Chair. During the last five years, the Department has hired four tenure track faculty.

The Department’s Promotion, Tenure, and Retention (PTR) Committee works within the guidelines established both by the CSU and the CSU East Bay Academic Senate. The PTR Committee evaluates applications for the retention of tenure-track assistant professors, applications for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, applications for promotion to full professor, and post-tenure reviews of tenured associate and full professors. A minimum of three tenured professors elected by tenured and tenure track faculty on an annual basis sit on these committees. The committees must be comprised of faculty who are senior or equal to the rank of the faculty member being evaluated. The PTR process is a transparent one in which candidates are given feedback from committees at each level. The Department Chair informs faculty members who are to be reviewed on the nature of the materials required by PTR committees and ensures that the evidence necessary for a full and fair evaluation is contained in the faculty dossier. The University provides detailed guidelines on the criteria for retention, promotion and tenure for tenure/tenure-track faculty (http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/PTR%20doc%20as%20amended%20by%2005-06%20FAC%204.EB.pdf). During the past academic year, one associate professor received tenure and two assistant professors were retained at the second and fourth year of participation in the academic community.

Part-time faculty members are recommended for hire by the Department Chair with input from sequence chairs and other full-time faculty. The MSW Advisory Board also actively participates in making recommendations and in the recruitment of MSW part-time faculty and other personnel.
The Department Chair, Dr. Dianne Rush Woods, has an M.S.W. degree from the University of California, Los Angeles and a doctorate in Social Welfare from the University of California, Berkeley. She is a Board Member of the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), where she actively participates with other Chairs of Social Work programs in California to improve the quality and availability of social work education. She is also a member of the California Association of Social Work Dean and Directors. She is a current member of both the Council on Social Work Education and the National Association of Social Workers.

Dr. Woods has more than ten years of University level teaching experience at California State University, East Bay and the University of California, Berkeley. The majority of Dr. Woods' teaching experience has been in the Department of Social Work (since 2003). From 2000-2003, she taught in the Department of Sociology and Social Services where she taught in the Social Services option. For two (2) years Dr. Woods has served as the Chair of the Social Work department; prior to this she also served, for two years, as the Field Director. When she taught in the Department of Sociology and Social Services, she also served as the Coordinator the Field Program for the Social Services option. During her tenure at California State University, East Bay she taught Human Behavior in the Social Environment (I, II, and III), Generalist Practice (I, II, and II), Social Policy, Advanced Social Work Practice (I, II, and II) and a number of electives, such as Crisis Intervention, Family Violence across the Lifespan, and Brief Treatment Interventions.

Dr. Woods has served as a member and Chair of the Curriculum, Admissions, and Student Performance Committees. She has served on numerous search committees and several other departmental committees. She has served as an academic advisor to students on both the Hayward and the Concord campuses. Dr. Woods has been vigorously involved in all aspects of the development of the program, including the curriculum design, recruiting Advisory Board members, and preparing for the CSWE accreditation process.

As an active board member of the California Social Work Education Center, Dr. Woods actively participates in policy discussions and the development of strategies to improve the training of MSW level social workers in California. Her areas of interest are particularly focused on developing strategies to identify the “best-practice” social work education model for those currently working in the social services system.

The above activities, coupled with her active participation in community development activities in the City of Emeryville, her participation in University governance through participation on the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, and her efforts to develop community programs that address the needs of non-traditional students and the unmet needs of urban school districts, demonstrate the Dr. Woods’ leadership abilities.
Accreditation Standard 3.0.4: The chief administrator of the social work program has a full-time appointment to the program and sufficient assigned time (at least 25% for baccalaureate programs and 50% for master's programs) to provide educational and administrative leadership. Combined programs designate a social work faculty member and assign this person sufficient time to administer the baccalaureate social work program.

The Chair of the Department of Social Work has a full-time appointment and sufficient assigned time to perform her duties. Currently, the Chair, Dr. Dianne Rush Woods, is a tenured faculty member and has a full-time appointment in the Department of Social Work. Beginning July 1, 2003, the Department Chair has a twelve (12) month appointment in which 50% of the time base is to administer the Department of Social Work. The remainder of her time is allocated to teaching and advising duties in the Department of Social Work. The 50% time base for administrative duties is adequate for carrying out her administrative/executive responsibilities. In the 2008 Social Work Department Five Year Report, the Department identified a future goal of establishing a coordinator for the full-time Concord campus (preferably a full-time annual lecturer or tenure track line). Hired after a national search, Dr. Woods was appointed to the faculty at CSU East Bay in 2001. She was elected Chair of the Social Work Department in 2007 and serves at the pleasure of the Provost in this capacity.

Accreditation Standard 3.0.5: The field education director has a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and at least two years post–baccalaureate or post–master’s social work degree practice experience.

The Field Education Director, Rachael Cresci has an M.S.W. degree from San Jose State University (1995). She has been a Licensed Clinical Social Worker since March 2005. Ms. Cresci has over five years of combined experience in case management in the following agencies: Aspira Foster Family Agency, Napa County Health and Human Services, and Contra Costa County Department of Social Services. She has three years of experience as a clinical social worker, and five years of experience as the Behavioral Emergency Response Team Coordinator at Children’s Hospital in Oakland. Ms. Cresci has also served as the On-Call Social Services Supervisor at Children’s Hospital for the last five years. In her work at Children’s Hospital, Ms. Cresci served as a field supervisor for many CSU East Bay Department of Social Work students, and has an excellent understanding of the relationship between the Department of Social Work and the field placement agencies. She brings a unique combination of managerial, clinical, and field training experience to the department.

Accreditation Standard 3.0.6: The field education director has a full-time appointment to the program and sufficient assigned time (at least 25% for baccalaureate programs and 50% for master’s programs) to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education.

Ms. Cresci has had a full-time appointment with the Department of Social Work since January 2009. As the director of field, .50 of her appointment is dedicated to the administration of the fieldwork program, which includes evaluating and certifying agencies as field placements, supervising and evaluating field education faculty, assigning faculty to field seminar courses, organizing training for field liaisons, and advising faculty, students, and field liaisons with regard to field placement issues. The
remaining .50 of her time is dedicated to teaching field education seminar courses, serving on appropriate departmental committees, evaluating field faculty, and coordinating internship fairs.

**Resources of the Department of Social Work**

**Accreditation Standard 3.1: The social work program has sufficient resources to achieve program goals and objectives.**

As a result of the support of the University's administration and the administration of the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences, the Department of Social Work has adequate resources to achieve its educational goals and objectives, and to support its ongoing program operations. Evidence of the adequacy and sufficiency of its resources is presented in the sections that follow.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.1: The program has sufficient support staff, other personnel, and technological resources to support program functioning.**

The Department of Social Work has sufficient staff, personnel, and technological resources to support the program. CSU East Bay is committed to providing sufficient resources to achieve departmental goals and objectives. The University has committed funds to support seven tenure/tenure track faculty positions. Currently there are seven tenure-track faculty, 6.4 (full-time equivalent) annual lecturers and 13 part-time lecturers committed to the Department of Social Work.

*Administrative Support Staff.* The Department of Social Work has one full-time staff assigned to Department function and 1.5 staff assigned to managing grant related activities and supporting grant related functions within the department.

Ms. Lyn Harton is the administrative coordinator assigned to the department. Her main responsibilities include departmental duties, such as contracts, catalogue updates, purchasing, room scheduling, the admissions paperwork process (from mailing of applications to input of students into the system), book orders, and co-management of the department budget. Ms. Harton is also responsible for assisting full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty members as well as all students on the Concord campus. In addition, she also has the following responsibilities:

1. Aiding the department head with class scheduling for various quarters and inputting course requests for the department;
2. Aiding students during class registration periods;
3. Working with the chair to assign faculty offices; and
4. Supervising student workers assigned to the department.

The additional grant-funded support staff positions provide administrative support to the administration and faculty at both campuses. In response to feedback from the students in the Concord year-round program, the five year plan for the department includes a request for one additional full-time position to provide dedicated support to the Concord campus office, which is currently covered one day per week by an administrative grant employee. Departmental staff is also supported by two (2) dedicated work-study students who provide 20 hours of support services per week.
Technological Resources. The Department, with substantial assistance from the University and the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, has been able to make substantial investments in technology to support its academic, professional programs, administrative processes and functions, and the work of its faculty and professional staff.

Faculty members have personal computers with the software that they need to support their teaching, research, and service responsibilities. The faculty also has personal printers, e-mail and internet access, and other electronic resources. All of the telephones in the school are equipped with voice mail, and have voice mail forwarding capabilities that enhance communications with students and other constituents. The field staff members have been assigned cell phones to facilitate contact with students, faculty, and agency field instructors. The department has a copying machine, a document scanner, and a fax machine. In addition to the myriad of technological resources in the department, the College of Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences has a special information technology laboratory that is available for students to use. The University provides an online website for the Department.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.2: The program has sufficient and stable financial supports that permit program planning and achievement of program goals and objectives. These include a budgetary allocation and procedures for budget development and administration.**

The program has sufficient and stable financial supports that permit program planning and achievement of program goals and objectives. The Department of Social Work is a well funded program in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. We receive sufficient university funding to meet our needs and are an autonomous budgetary unit responsible for planning and developing a yearly budget, consistent with the University and Department goals. The Department Chair, Dr. Woods, serves as the budget unit head, and develops the proposed budget in conjunction with the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences. The Department has clear responsibility for managing the budget and any subsequent reports, which may be requested by the University. This budget includes personnel, travel, operating services, supplies, and equipment.

The budget for 2008-2009 is $1,800,000, primarily funding personnel. The Departmental services and supply budget is $2,800 per year. The funding through Title IV-E allows for additional supply and equipment acquisition as associated with specialized grant program. The university allocation has grown for the last eight years indicating strong support.

The Department of Social Work receives additional funding for faculty positions and student stipends through two externally funded grant programs, the IV-E Child Welfare program and the Mental Health Stipend Program. Both of these grants are made available through our partnership with California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC). The Title IV-E grant supports students who are committed to working in public child welfare. It allows for the funding of 50 stipends or registration fees for MSW students and a coordinator who guides the program and teaches advanced Children, Youth, and Family courses. The present contract extends through 2010 in the amount of $1,350,000. The Mental Health Stipend Program provides for 15 stipends for 2nd year MSW students and a coordinator who guides the program and teaches advanced Community Mental Health courses. This grant brings in $388,000. Although we benefit greatly from these external funding sources, the program is not dependent on grant funding for its financial survival. The grants have allowed an expansion into specialized content areas and much needed financial support for students, but the university provides the department with the necessary funds and resources to sustain the program. The university administrative support permits
department planning and implementation by faculty and administration. Our allocation, coupled with external funding, has provided travel support to the department’s faculty to attend professional conferences each year. We have sufficient faculty, instructional materials, equipment, supplies, library purchases, departmental videotape purchases, and other operating expenses.

The program has comprehensive library holdings and electronic access, as well as other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving the program’s goals and objectives.

The CSU East Bay Libraries are state of the art academic libraries, which fully support the Department of Social Work at both the Hayward and Concord campuses. They do so through a strong collection of print, audio-visual, and online resources and a wide range of information services available to the students, staff, and faculty in the program.

The Libraries provide in-person reference assistance to MSW students at a centralized reference desk, via telephone and e-mail, and via the 24/7 QuestionPoint online chat reference service. Associate Librarian Dana Edwards works closely with the MSW faculty in the selection of materials and in information literacy classroom instruction sessions. He also provides in-person and online assistance to MSW students on an individual basis.

The Libraries’ extensive online resources are available via remote access on a 24/7 basis for the entire campus community. The Libraries’ budget for electronic subscriptions in 2008-09 is $465,000. The Libraries subscribe to over 90 online databases, including the core databases in social work, sociology and psychology. The Libraries provide full-text online access to over 47,000 periodical titles and over 45,000 electronic books. Patrons can submit interlibrary loan requests online in the LINK+ consortial catalog and via the ILLIAD interlibrary loan system. The Hayward main campus library provides wireless Internet access, features a large Learning Commons computer lab with over 100 workstations, and a laptop computer loan service. The Concord campus library also provides wireless Internet access, and is located next door to the campus computer lab. Students on the Concord Campus of CSU East Bay have access to all the resources from the Hayward Campus library and beyond.

The Libraries’ collection for social work is substantive, focused especially on community mental health and on Children, Youth, and Family. The Libraries have purchased numerous audio-visual titles in support of the program. The Libraries’ print and online resources and the rapid interlibrary borrowing capabilities provide a vast array of materials available to the students in the program.

In addition to providing a diverse and accessible collection of journal and books, the CSU East Bay library offers substantial support for students and faculty. Library staff provides research-oriented assistance through in-person and online access to reference librarians. The library offers access to subject specialists and liaisons to academic departments on campus as well as access to reference librarians who are available in person or who can respond to online reference questions. The library also provides access to instructional reserves, special library class sessions, support for web-based teaching, student guides to resources by subject, access to loaner laptops, all of which serve to foster student success.

**Accreditation Standard 3.1.4: The program has sufficient office and classroom space, computer-mediated access, or both to achieve the program’s goals and objectives.**

The Department of Social Work has sufficient office and classroom space to achieve our goals and objectives. The Department has eleven contiguous, clearly identified offices on the Hayward
Campus on the fourth floor in Meiklejohn Hall. All tenured/tenure-track and full-time annual faculty members have a designated office space. Office space is also designated for all part-time faculty members. The Department of Social Work Chair’s office is adjacent to the faculty offices. In addition, the department also has access to one conference room on the third floor, and one conference room on the fourth floor of Meiklejohn Hall.

On the Concord campus, the Department of Social Work has two administrative offices designated for the social work administrative assistant and coordinator, and four offices designated for social work faculty. These offices are all located on the second floor of the Library Building. Classes meet on the Concord campus on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, so office space is sufficient for faculty.

Classrooms are assigned centrally through the University by the Academic Scheduling office. Each quarter the department submits the course schedule to the CLASS Office for approval. Once the schedule is set, the Academic Scheduling office assigns classrooms to the courses. These rooms are generally suitable, and most often located within Meiklejohn Hall. There are a number of “smart” classrooms located within the building, and computer carts with LCD projectors are available from Classroom Services upon request.

All faculty members have computers, printers, and access to the department copy machine to meet their needs. Students have access to the computer laboratories at CSU East Bay which are open until 10:00 p.m. each evening during the week. Students may also take advantage of the loaner laptop program available through the library.

Accreditation Standard 3.1.5: The program has access to assistive technology, including materials in alternative formats (such as Braille, large print, books on tape, assistive learning systems).

The Department of Social Work has access to assistive technology, including materials in alternative formats to support individuals with disabilities. The Department of Social Work faculty works closely with the Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC) at CSU East Bay, which is one of the leaders in the State in providing services to students with learning issues and disabilities. In order to ensure that all students are notified of this valuable resource, faculty includes a statement about the SDRC within all course syllabi. The SDRC offers accommodations to address the individual needs of students with documented permanent or temporary disabilities. Students served include those with mobility limitations, learning disabilities, hearing and visual impairments, attention deficit disorders, psychological disabilities, and other types of disabilities such as acquired brain injuries, chronic or intermittent health problems, seizure disorders, cardiac disorders, multiple sclerosis, pulmonary disorders, and carpal tunnel syndrome.

Accommodations are designed to integrate students into the general campus programs and activities. Students eligible for these accommodations need to plan ahead and follow the pertinent Guidelines for the Use of Accommodations. The SDRC also serves students attending classes at the Concord campus with similar services and accommodations.

Admission Support. Applicants with disabilities who are seeking special admissions consideration should contact the SDRC and speak with a counselor regarding their circumstances.

Assistive Technology. Assistive software and hardware are available in the Warren Hall Lab, Library, the SDRC, and the Concord Campus to assist students with disabilities. In order to utilize the equipment, students must first register with SDRC and Student Technology Service Center. Brailers,
recorders, visual enlargers, talking calculators, and other assistive devices are also available for short-term loan from the SDRC.

**Alternative Testing.** Students deemed eligible for this service typically receive extra time for tests along with the specific accommodations determined by the SDRC. The student must submit a *Request for Alternative Testing Form* to the instructor for completion and return it to SDRC one week before quizzes and midterms and two weeks before the beginning of Finals week. Students who do not meet this deadline are scheduled based on room and proctor availability.

*Books in Alternate Format.* Students with verified print disabilities may be eligible for books in alternate format (audiotape or e-text). The SDRC makes its Tape Library available to students eligible for books in alternate format. To check on the availability of a book, students are able to go to the Tape Library Database. Students are also able to research availability of their books with Recordings for the Blind & Dyslexic, California State University Talking Books, and Bookshare.org prior to requesting the books from SDRC. The complete *Books in Alternative Format Policy* is included in this site.

**Disability Management Counseling.** Disability management counseling is available to students who are registered with the SDRC. These meetings are confidential, and focus on assisting and supporting students in dealing with disability-related issues as they impact their role as students at CSU East Bay. SDRC counselors help students identify and consider strategies for addressing their concerns.

**Interpreter and Transcribing Services.** Students may be approved for interpreter and transcription services by submitting an *Accommodations Request* form, available online, to the SDRC. Students determined to be eligible for this service are then assigned interpreters or transcribers by the coordinator and are expected to follow the *Guidelines for Use of Interpreter/Transcriber Services*.

**Learning Disability Resource Counseling.** Students diagnosed with a learning disability are eligible for learning disability support services. Prior to the first meeting, students submit to the Student Disability Resource Center current documentation of their learning disability. The learning disability Resource Counselor then reviews the documentation and schedules an intake appointment to discuss support services and accommodations. Students diagnosed with a verified learning disability are eligible for the following support services: individual counseling, instruction in learning strategies and techniques, awareness training in self-advocacy and the understanding of the student's learning disability. Counselors are available to assist students in reviewing their LD assessment reports and to help them understand and identify learning styles appropriate for enhancing their chances for academic success.

**Mobility Orientation.** An SDRC staff member conducts an orientation for students with mobility limitations. Best routes to the classrooms are explored along with accessible campus facilities.

**Note-taking.** Accommodations for note-taking are provided to eligible students who have a documented disability that impairs lecture access. A needs assessment is made during an intake appointment to determine if the student is eligible for this accommodation. With the aid of a classroom note-taker, the student has access to lecture information that will assist him/her in learning the material and completion of the course. Students eligible for this accommodation recruit their own note-takers from each class.

**Parking Fee Waiver.** A CSU East Bay student with a verified mobility disability may be eligible for a waiver of parking fees. To qualify, the student must have documentation of mobility disability verified by the Student Disability Resource Center; possess a distinguishing license plate or placard issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles; demonstrate financial need according to the needs analysis procedures for campus-based financial aid; attend CSU East Bay either full or part-time and not receive any other
assistance for parking fees from the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation or other financial aid sources.

SDRC Counselors also make referrals to on-campus offices and departments as well as to community resources and agencies. Referrals and resources may be accessed at the Resources and Referrals section of the CSU East Bay website.

*Temporary Disabled Parking Permit.* CSU East Bay students, staff or faculty with temporary mobility impairments may request a temporary disabled parking permit through the SDRC. These permits are valid for two weeks to three months, depending upon the medical verification provided by the student.
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 4: FACULTY
Faculty Qualifications and Biographies

The Department of Social Work has full- and part-time faculty with the qualifications, competence, and range of expertise in social work education and practice to achieve its goals and objectives. The program has a sufficient full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio (usually 1:25 for baccalaureate programs and 1:12 for master’s programs) to carry out ongoing functions of the program. In Spring 2009, our faculty-to-student ratio was 1:14.5. Though this is slightly above the ratio recommended by CSWE, two of our full-time tenured faculty members were on leave in academic year 2008-2009, and as indicated in our five-year plan, we will be recruiting for an additional tenure track position in 2009-2010. At the same time, we are slowly decreasing the number of students admitted to keep our faculty-to-student ratio at or below 1:12.

In the 2008-2009 academic year, the Department of Social Work had 7 full-time tenured/tenure track faculty members. The full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty includes one full professor, three associate professors, and three assistant professors. We have recently recruited for and successfully filled two additional full-time faculty/lecturer members; the Director of Field Education and a full-time Lecturer/Field Liaison. In addition, we have hired a .70 FTE CalSWEC-II Grant Coordinator/Lecturer, who coordinates the mental health stipend program. As noted in the previous chapter, this program is funded with ongoing support from the California Department of Mental Health, and the purpose is to recruit and retain diverse, committed social workers into community mental health.

The tenure/tenure-track faculty members compose the Department’s core teaching staff. Our full-time Field Liaison/Lecturers teach the majority of the field placement courses and visit placement sites quarterly. Each full-time faculty member is expected to teach nine 4-unit (i.e., 3.5 hours per week) courses each academic year, unless they have been granted assigned time for research, administrative duties, or other special projects.

Faculty members bring rich and diverse professional experience and research interests to the Department. All full-time faculty members are veteran teachers and all practice faculty has at least two-years of post-masters practice experience. Full-time faculty has diverse scholarly and teaching interests that reflect our multicultural, social justice, urban focus and our fields of specialization. In total, the full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty provides the expertise to achieve the Department’s mission, goals, and objectives. Some of these strengths are highlighted in the brief biographies here. More complete descriptions of the faculty’s scholarship are provided in Section 7 of this self-study.

Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty:

- **Dr. Terry Jones, Professor.** Dr. Jones, a tenured full Professor in the Department of Social Work, earned his PhD in Social Welfare from the University of California, Berkeley in 1974. He...
has an MSW from the University of California, Berkeley in Social Policy and Community Organization. His research interests are in race, the juvenile justice system, affirmative action, community development, and workforce education. Dr. Jones has published in a variety of journals including *The Journal of Social Work*, *the Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, *Thought in Action*, and *Academe*. He is co-author of two books, and has chapters in several edited books. Dr. Jones is past chair of the Civil Rights Committee of the National Education Association and of the North Richmond Task Force for Community Development. For the past two years Dr. Jones has been chair of the Diversity and Equity Committee, and Affirmative Action Liaison Officer, at California State University, East Bay. In this capacity, he has been responsible for monitoring faculty tenure-track hires, providing training for search committees in best practices for identifying, recruiting and hiring underrepresented faculty. Furthermore, as chair of the Diversity and Equity Committee, he has coordinated the effort to produce a diversity plan for the University. Dr. Jones, in cooperation with Alameda County Social Services Department, has developed both a housing and a counseling program for youth aging out of the foster care system. For the past two years, California State University, East Bay has housed youth aging out of the system in student housing, and MSW students have been hired as counselors to assist with transitioning them into permanent housing, employment, and education programs.

Additionally, Dr. Jones consults locally on issues of diversity and multiculturalism and speaks locally and nationally on issues of race, diversity, and multiculturalism.

- **Dr. Mayling Maria Chu, Associate Professor.** Before joining the social work faculty at California State University, East Bay, Dr. Chu taught in the Master of Social Work Department at California State University, Stanislaus, and in the B.S.W. program at Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. She earned her Ph.D. degree in Social Work from Arizona State University in 1995. She has an M.S.W. degree from the National Taiwan University in Taipei, Taiwan. Dr. Chu started her social work career as a front-line B.S.W.-level social worker in the public sector. Dr. Chu’s research interests include juvenile delinquency, criminal justice and corrections, rural/urban differences, social welfare and policy analysis, social services for low-income families, minority experience, health disparity, community services, and international social work. In recent years, Dr. Chu has been involved in developing and teaching medical social work courses. She has articles published in the *Journal of Social Work Research and Evaluation: An International Publication*, *The British Journal of Criminology* and has also written several book chapters. Dr. Chu is actively serving on editorial boards for professional journals, including *Social Work* (the official journal of the National Association of Social Workers).

- **Dr. Evaon Wong-Kim, Associate Professor.** She received her MSW and MPH from the University of California Berkeley in 1990 and her PhD in Social Work in 1999 also from the University of California Berkeley, School of Social Welfare. Before joining California State University, East Bay, Dr. Wong-Kim taught at the University of Hawaii and San José State University. Dr. Wong-Kim’s major research interest is on cancer survivorship and quality of life issues confronting cancer patients. She has presented papers at national and international conferences relating to cancer and behavioral issues. She has conducted numerous training on cultural diversity issues relating to cancer and the underserved population. Dr. Wong-Kim was the PI for the “Talking Cancer, Saving Lives” breast cancer training in Hong Kong in July 2005 funded by the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation. She is also the Co-Investigator for Chinese Breast Cancer Patients and Quality of Life Issues. The project is funded by the NCI SPN
grant to gather pilot data in order to better understand quality of life issues confronting the Chinese immigrant women when diagnosed with breast cancer. Dr. Wong-Kim has been an advocate for minority and low-income cancer patients, especially the Asian immigrant and Pacific Islander populations. She is the Past Chair of the Asian and Pacific Islander Breast Cancer Advisory Council for the Susan G. Komen for the Cure and Immediate Past President of the San Francisco Affiliate of the Susan G. Komen for the Cure. She has been a member of the Intercultural Cancer Council since 1995, a national advocacy organization for improving the cancer mortality rate of the underserved populations. She was also a member of the Minority Women’s Health Panel of Experts, Office of Women’s Health, DHHS from 2001 until 2007. She was named Community Director of the Asian American Network for Cancer Awareness, Research and Training project in Hawaii from October 2002 to May 2004.

- **Dr. Dianne Rush Woods, Associate Professor and Chair of the Department of Social Work.** Dr. Woods is a founding member of the Department of Social Work at California State University, East Bay. She received her MSW from the University of California Los Angeles in 1976, her LCSW in 1978 and her PhD in Social Work in 2001 from the University of California Berkeley in the School of Social Welfare. She received her Master’s in Public Health in spring of 2002 from the University of California Berkeley. She teaches a broad range of including Human Behavior in Social Environment (of which she is the sequenced chair), Field Seminar (Two years as director of field), Social Policy, Brief Treatment/Crisis Intervention, Race, Gender and Inequality and Social Work Practice (micro, mezzo and macro). In addition, she served as a visiting lecturer at U.C. Berkeley in practice and social policy for five years. Her research areas include non-traditional student populations, issues (diversity and financial) related to developing new social work programs, work with student spouses and community development models. Dr. Woods is co-author of a book, *The Managed Care Answer Book for Mental Health Professionals* and is finalizing a text, *Social Welfare History and People of Color: Invisible Histories*. Dr. Woods has presented at nationally and internationally levels on managed mental health care as well as nontraditional student populations. She has reviewed books for the *Journal of Sociology and Social Services* and is currently publishing and presenting in the area of Nontraditional Student Populations (Chinese, Korean, and Middle Eastern), women of color in social work education and Social Welfare History in relationship to populations of color.

- **Dr. Kilolo Brodie, Assistant Professor.** Dr. Brodie received her Ph.D. from Howard University School of Social Work in 2008; she obtained her MSW from California State University, Stanislaus in 1998; and her bachelor’s degree from Clark Atlanta University in 1994. Her research interests include interagency collaboration, public child welfare, Family Group Conferencing, and developmental disabilities. Dr. Brodie has worked for a public child protective services agency as a county child welfare worker, and for community collaboratives in Washington D.C., as a family group conference coordinator and facilitator. She was the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project Coordinator at California State University, East Bay in the Social Work Department from 2004 – 2008 . Current MSW Departmental duties include the following: Admissions & Outreach Committee (chair), Student Performance Review Committee (chair), Advanced-year Children, Youth & Family concentration (chair), Assessment Committee (member), and Curriculum Committee (member). Her teaching experience includes Generalist Practice II, Field Practicum I – VI, Title IV-E Integrative Seminar, Race, Gender & Inequality, Capstone, Program Evaluation, and Quantitative/Qualitative Analysis. She is a current member of CSWE and NASW.
• **Dr. Phu Phan, Assistant Professor.** He teaches social work practice, research, and social policy. He has published in the area of health and mental health adjustments of immigrants and refugees, especially the elderly. He has also published in the area of the inclusion of race in the social work curriculum. He worked for several years as a senior social worker at a community mental health center, as a chemical dependency assessor, and internationally with the U.S. State Department’s Refugee Program.

• **Dr. Paul Wright, Assistant Professor.** Dr. Wright earned his Doctorate in Education with an emphasis in International and Multicultural Education from the University of San Francisco in 2004. He has an MSW from San Jose State University, with a specialization in school social work. Mr. Wright has over 20 years experience in the human services field. This experience includes counseling, working with culturally diverse, at risk populations and training interns. He has been a liaison with field agencies and court officials and has worked in monitoring child placements. His research interests are in race, social work practice, child welfare, and pedagogy. He serves on the Las Positas Community College Advisory Board, a school from which many CSU East Bay students transfer.

This compliment of tenure-track/tenured faculty is supplemented by full-time annual lecturers:

- **Ms. Rachael Cresci, Field Director.** Ms. Cresci is a licensed clinical social worker. She graduated in 1995 with a Master’s in Social Work from San Jose State University, and was a Title IV-E recipient. She is currently employed as the Coordinator of the Behavioral Emergency Response Team, responsible for the development of policy and procedures, training and supervision of staff from Department of Psychiatry and Social Services Department who are responsible for conducting emergency psychiatric assessments at Children’s Hospital & Research Center at Oakland. In addition, she provides clinical supervision and training to the Social Services Department staff responding to medical social work needs throughout the Children’s Hospital & Research Center at Oakland. Ms. Cresci has worked as a child welfare worker in three Bay Area counties working in emergency response, dependency investigation, and continuing services for six years.

- **Ms. Christa Countee, Title IV-E Project Coordinator/Lecturer.** Christa Countee received her MSW from the University of California, Berkeley in 2000 and was the first recipient of the Deans Leadership Award. She was also a recipient of a Title IV-E stipend and worked for five years as a child welfare worker for the Alameda County Social Services Agency. Ms. Countee is an Oakland native and worked for Alameda County for 14 years before leaving in 2004 to accept a position as the Foster Youth Program Coordinator for the Oakland Unified School District. Her work spans issues of child welfare and protection, domestic violence specializing in the treatment of batterers, parenting education, case management, and emancipation services for foster youth. She joined the Masters of Social Work Program at California State University, East Bay as a full-time liaison in 2005, has served as the field director, and is the current Title IV-E Project Coordinator.

- **Dr. Sarah Taylor, CalSWEC-II Grant Project Coordinator/Lecturer (.70 FTE).** Dr. Taylor earned her M.S.W. in 2002 and her Ph.D. in 2007 from the University of California, Berkeley. Her research interests include transition-age youth, mental health, substance abuse prevention, and workforce development. Prior to joining the Department of Social Work, Dr. Taylor was a National Institute of Health post-doctoral fellow at Prevention Research Center in Berkeley. Her work has
been presented at numerous national and statewide conferences, including the *Society for Social Work and Research, Council on Social Work Education, Research and Training Center for Children’s Mental Health,* and *Beyond the Bench.* She has published in a variety of academic journals, including *Children and Youth Services Review, The Journal of Human Behavior and the Social Environment, The Journal of Public Child Welfare,* and *Qualitative Social Work.* She also has significant teaching experience and earned the Graduate Student Instructor Award in 2007 at the University of California, Berkeley.

- **Ms. Maria Herdeliza L. Ciriaco, Full-time Annual Lecturer/Field Liaison.** Ms. Ciriaco earned a Master’s of Social Work degree and Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC), focusing on school social work in the public schools, from San Jose State University in 2001. She graduated from California State University, Hayward (now CSU East Bay) in 1996 with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology, with a concentration in social services. In the past, she has been employed in educational settings, local government agencies, and non-profit organizations. Ms. Ciriaco has experience working with diverse populations and has provided supportive services to underserved children, youth, and families, adults with special needs, and older adults and seniors. Ms. Ciriaco is a member of the California School Social Work Association (CASSWA) and participates in a monthly mentoring support group of current and post graduate MSW students. Ms. Ciriaco also consults and volunteers in the community and in the public schools.

- **Ms. Lizelle Cline, Full-Time Annual Lecturer/Field Liaison.** Ms. Cline is a licensed clinical social worker. She was raised and educated in England, completing high school at United World College of the Atlantic, undergraduate at Lancaster University, and MSW at Leicester University, England. She has worked in various social work positions since 1991; as the equivalent of a CPS for 7 years at Derbyshire County Council, and Sheffield City Council, before being appointed as a Guardian ad Litem and Reporting Officer for South Yorkshire for 5 years. She was also an Independent Reviewing Office for Sheffield City Council, assisting the city in providing comprehensive services for Looked after Children. Since 2002, Ms. Cline has lived in the East Bay and worked for Aldea in the Treatment Foster Care Program, where she created and managed the Intensive Treatment Foster Care program for several years. Ms. Cline is interested in applying an international perspective in social work practice and the processes by which children and families heal from trauma. She has worked as a Field Liaison/Lecturer since May 2008 but retains links with Aldea, volunteering, providing training and consultation.

- **Ms. Vinita Lee, Full-Time Annual Lecturer/Field Liaison.** Ms. Lee is an Accredited Clinical Social Worker and earned her Master’s degree in Social Welfare from the University of California, Berkeley in 2000, with a Pupil Personnel Services Credential (PPSC). Previously, she worked for 7 years at an Oakland-based community mental health agency, providing counseling and case management services to underserved Asian immigrant and refugee individuals and families. During this time, she worked in several public elementary, middle, and high schools in the Oakland Unified School District, serving diverse children, youth, and their families and working closely with school faculty and administrators. In addition, Ms. Lee worked in San Francisco at a senior center which provided medical and social services to low-income and isolated elders of the Tenderloin community. Ms. Lee’s interests include intergenerational differences in ethnic minority families, school social work, and transition-age youth.
Part-Time Faculty

Accreditation Standard 4.1. The program demonstrates how the use of part-time faculty assists in the achievement of the program’s goals and objectives.

In keeping with our focus on culturally competent practice with urban underserved populations, the Department of Social Work employs part-time lecturers from urban community-based agencies to supplement and expand the expertise of full-time faculty. The special expertise of community practitioners adds depth and breadth to the program. Many of our part-time faculty have been teaching in our department since its inception; the average number of years part-time faculty have actively taught in the Department is three (3), which is notable given the Department’s inception in 2004. The part-time faculty brings a wealth of expertise to their teaching, and assists us in maintaining strong ties to the community. Part-time faculty members are recommended by our Community Advisory Board and are also recruited by advertising available positions throughout the region and state.

New part-time faculty receive individual orientation meetings with the Department Chair, who provides master syllabi for the assigned courses, a copy of the MSW handbook, and other materials. The Department Chair discusses the vision, mission, and goals of the program to ensure that part-time faculty participates fully in assisting the Department of Social Work to realize its mission. On the first day of class, the Department Chair or another designated faculty member assists new part-time faculty in locating their classrooms and with other logistics.

Part-time faculty are invited, but not required to attend, meetings of the full faculty. We welcome their ideas and suggestions for course development. Part-time faculty members are encouraged to participate in the committees for the curricular sequences in which they teach.

All but two of our part-time faculty members have MSWs from CSWE-accredited institutions, and many have additional educational or professional certifications, such as clinical licenses, credentials, and degrees. One part-time faculty member without an MSW (Jose Martin) has a Master’s Degree in Counseling and is a Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist; the other (Isabel Perez-Yanez) has a Master’s of Public Health degree. Table 4.1 summarizes the educational and practice backgrounds of the part-time faculty, as well as the number of years they have taught in the Department of Social Work. Table 4.1 is followed by brief biographical information for each of our part-time faculty.

Table 4.1: Part-time Faculty: Educational Background, Years Practice Experience, and Years Teaching in the Department of Social Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART TIME FACULTY</th>
<th>DEGREE/LICENSE</th>
<th>YEARS PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>YEARS TEACHING IN SW Dept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chavez, Peggy</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, Andrea</td>
<td>MSW, LCSW</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, Thana</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clancy, Thomas</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Rick</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlquist, Betty</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal-Weber, Michele</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief Biographies of Part-time Faculty

- **Ms. Peggy Chavez** earned her Bachelor of Arts degree in Clinical Psychology and her Master’s degree in Social Work from San Francisco State University. She completed her MSW internship at the San Francisco Veterans Administration Hospital in the Post Traumatic Stress Unit and received a one year fellowship appointment at Cowell Student Health Center at Stanford University. For approximately 2 years, Ms. Chavez worked with the Marin Aids Project to educate and advocate for immigrant farm workers in the area of AIDS prevention. For nine years, Ms. Chavez worked in the field of Pediatric Oncology at Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital (LPCH) at Stanford as a Clinical Social Worker. At LPCH, in addition to her regular duties, she trained medical students on the emotional impact of working with chronically ill children and their families. For the past 7 years, Ms. Chavez has taught for The Center for Excellence University of California at Davis in the areas of Child Development, Substance Abuse and Clinical Interventions with Difficult Patients/Clients. She also teaches for the College of San Mateo in the area of Alcohol and Drug Abuse. Ms. Chavez currently works as a Clinical Social Worker with Wellbound Dialysis providing education and support to peritoneal dialysis patients and staff.

- **Ms. Andrea Christian** is a licensed clinical social worker. She received her undergraduate degree in Social Welfare from the University of California, Berkeley, and MSW from the University of Chicago. Ms. Christian has worked for 20 years in the areas of Pediatric Oncology as a Clinical Social Worker. During that period, she has provided field placement supervision to Social Work students and instruction to Medical students around the psychosocial effects of children and their families at Stanford Medical Center. Ms. Christian has also provided clinical supervision to Social Workers working toward their licenses in clinical Social Work. For the past 8 years, Ms. Christian has been an instructor at UC Davis in the area of Child and Adult Welfare, Developmental Theory and Practice.

- **Ms. Thana Christian** earned her MSW from the University of Denver in June 1977 with an emphasis in Advanced Clinical Practice. She has been practicing in the mental health services field since 1974 and has been a child welfare worker II with Alameda County since February, 2000. Prior to this, she was self-employed as a psychotherapist; a clinical social worker for Alta Bates Inpatient Drug/Alcohol program, and the director of the social work department at Kaiser Permanente. She has been a lecturer at CSU East Bay since 2006.

- **Mr. Thomas Clancy** has an MSW from the School of Social Welfare at the University of California, Berkeley. He has been teaching research methods and macro practice courses in the MSW program at California State University of the East Bay since its inception. He works at the Alameda County Social Services Agency as a senior analyst in the Program Evaluation and Research unit. He has
pursued the question of effectiveness throughout his social work career with an ongoing interest in whether policies, programs, and services make a difference in the lives of families and children.

- **Mr. William “Rick” Collins** received his MSW in 1972 from Bryn Mawr College. Mr. Collins was a medical social work officer with the United States Army from 1971 to 1999. He then became a social worker IV for Santa Clara County from 1975 to 1983; moving on to the United States Navy in 1983 as the family advocacy regional program manager. He held that position until 2002. From 1996-2205, Mr. Collins was the medical social services director for the Contra Costa Regional Medical Center. He currently is the team leader/supervisory social worker for the Oakland Vet Center. He has been lecturing at CSU East Bay since 2008.

- **Ms. Betty Dahlquist** received her MSW from the University of Michigan majoring in clinical social work. She has been Executive Director of the California Association of Social Rehabilitation Agencies since 1982. Prior to that, she worked in Yolo County’s Suicide Prevention Unit as a Mobile Crisis Worker. She has several books in press on the subject of psychiatric rehabilitation.

- **Mr. Stuart Hanson** teaches research methods. He received his MSW in research and planning from the State University of New York at Stony Brook and was advanced to candidacy at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Social Welfare. He has also taught at University of California, Berkeley, San Jose State University, and the University of San Francisco. He is Research Manager at the Center for Applied Local Research and has more than twenty years experience as a program evaluator and policy researcher.

- **Mr. Michael Lisman** has been a lecturer at CSU East Bay since 2006. He received his MSW from CSU Sacramento and has been the director of the adult community support center for Alameda County's Behavioral Health Care unit since 2000.

- **Mr. Jose Martin** has been a licensed MFT since 1981. He received his master’s in integral counseling and psychotherapy from the California Institute of Integral Studies in 1975. He has been employed at Contra Costa County Health Services as a mental health program manager since 1985. He has been lecturing at CSU East Bay since 2008.

- **Ms. Isabel Perez-Yanez** received her B.A. degree in Social Work from the University of California in 1980. She has a Master of Public Health degree from the University of California Berkeley. She is a certified health specialist as well as a certified addiction specialist. She has previously taught at Alameda, Contra Costa, Merritt, Solano and San Mateo Community colleges. Currently, she is employed as a lecturer at California State University, East Bay. She conducts statewide trainings for Social Workers, for the University of California Davis, Probation Officers for State Corrections, and Substance Abuse service providers for the California Hispanic Commission.

- **Mr. Felix Rivera** obtained his Ph.D. in 1974 from UC Berkeley, majoring in social welfare. He received his MSW at the same institution in 1970. He briefly taught at San Jose State University for a year before moving on to San Francisco State University where he was a professor from 1972 to 2006. After a 3 year hiatus, he returned to teaching, starting at CSU East Bay in January 2009.

- **Ms. Jenell Thompson** earned her MSW from the University of California Berkeley in 2001 with specializations in Title IV-E and Social Work. She also earned a certificate in Early Childhood Special Education from San Francisco State University in 1996 and completed a Master of Education and Child Life degree from Mills College in 1994. She earned her Bachelor of Science in Human Development degree from the University of California Davis in 1992. She is currently working as an emergency response child welfare worker for San Mateo County Human Services agency and as a
lecturer for the graduate social work program at California State University East Bay. For over ten years, Ms. Thompson has worked to support families in the care and development of their children, in a wide variety of settings, ranging from hospitals to schools. She has served as a guest lecturer at San Francisco State University for the Title IV-E Training Project for graduate students in social work. In the past, she has been a guest lecturer at the University of Georgia for the National Child Development Associate Credential Program and for the Department of Early Childhood Special Education at San Francisco State University.

- **Ms. Donna Thoreson** graduated from California State University, Chico. Ms. Thoreson received her MSW at the University of California Berkeley. In her early life she moved frequently with her family as her parents and siblings migrated with other poor farm worker families to work in the fields, picking cotton, green beans, potatoes, peaches and other fruits and vegetables. This moving meant that she changed schools, homes, and friends on a constant basis until she was 14 years old. Ms. Thoreson became interested in doing public service work in elementary school and was the first in her family to graduate from college. She has worked serving the poor and disenfranchised for the past 30 years. She was an Employment and Training Specialist in Butte County for five years and also worked as a CPS Social Worker and in the GAIN program in Butte County. Ms. Thoreson moved to Contra Costa County in 1989 and has worked for Contra Costa County Children and Family Services for the past 19 years. She has been a Social Work Supervisor for the past 11 years. Ms. Thoreson is a graduate student of the Title IV-E CalSWEC program. In 2001, she began supervising the Contra Costa County CFS new Title IV-E graduate student internship program. Since that time, she has been the Field Instructor/Supervisor for more than 80 MSW IV-E interns. She has been a lecturer for Cal State East Bay Social Work Department since the program began in 2004, teaching classes and working with the Field program.

- **Dr. Holly Vugia** is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Social Services at CSU East Bay. She lectures in the Department of Social Work during the summer breaks. She has been employed at CSU East Bay since 2004. Dr. Vugia received her undergraduate degree from Millersville State University in 1978 and an MSW from University of California, Los Angeles, in 1985. She earned her Ph.D. in 1991 from the University of California, Berkeley and a PPSC from San Jose State University in 2002.

**Accreditation Standard 4.2.1:** The master’s social work program has a minimum of six full-time faculty with master’s social work degrees 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.

### Faculty Size and Educational Background

There are seven full-time tenured/tenure-track faculty members with 100% of their appointments in the MSW program. In addition to this tenured/tenure-track faculty, the Department employs Seven (7) faculty with annual appointments. As table 4.2 demonstrates, the CSU East Bay Department of Social Work faculty is highly qualified with regard to educational background. Six of the tenured/tenure-track faculty members have (6) MSW and Ph.D. degrees from CSWE-accredited programs, and one (1) has an MSW from a CSWE-accredited program and an Ed.D. All annual lecturer faculty members have an
MSW from a CSWE-accredited social work program, and one has a PhD. The educational backgrounds of the full-time faculty and annual lecturers are summarized in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Educational Background of Tenured/Tenure-Track and Annual Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEGREE/LICENSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Terry</td>
<td>MSW, PhD</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu, Mayling</td>
<td>MSW, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong-Kim, Evaon</td>
<td>MSW, MPH, LCSW, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Woods, Dianne</td>
<td>MSW, MPH, LCSW, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor and Department Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodie, Kilolo</td>
<td>MSW, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phan, Phu</td>
<td>MSW, PhD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Paul</td>
<td>MSW, EdD</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciriaco, Maria</td>
<td>MSW, PPSC</td>
<td>Full Time Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline, Lizelle</td>
<td>MSW, LCSW</td>
<td>Full Time Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countee, Christa</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>Title IV-E Project Coordinator/ Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cresci, Rachael</td>
<td>MSW, LCSW</td>
<td>Field Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Vinita</td>
<td>MSW, ASW</td>
<td>Full Time Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale, Jamila</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Sarah</td>
<td>MSW, PhD</td>
<td>CalSWEC-II Grant Project Coordinator/ Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accreditation Standard 4.2: Faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; class size; number of students; and the faculty’s teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities.

The Department of Social Work faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field. The Department has worked to build a faculty adequate to meet its teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities. We have a sufficient number of faculty, full and part-time, to cover our curricular needs. Class size remains manageable, with all classes have fewer than 30 students and most do not exceed 25. For some courses, capacity is significantly less because of special needs or courses content requirement. For example, faculty field liaisons who supervise students in the field practicum are assigned no more than 12 students per course section. Similarly, SW 6959: The Integrative Seminar is limited to 15 students per section because students are engaged in individual integrative projects that require considerable consultation time.

With few exceptions, all courses meet weekly for 3 hour and 30 minutes. Most faculty members teach and meet with students two or three days a week, leaving one to two days for their research and scholarly work and community service. In addition, faculty are encouraged to seek outside funding for their scholarly activity and may be granted assigned time to pursue these interests. Given the expertise and breadth of our part-time faculty, we are able to maintain all our essential courses when full-time faculty are provided assigned time for research activities and special projects.

4.3: Faculty who teach required practice courses have a master’s of social work degree from a CSWE-accredited program and at least two years post–baccalaureate or post–master’s social work degree practice experience.
All MSW required practice courses (SW 6011, 6012, and 6013) and all MSW advance practice methods courses (SW 6500, 6505, 6510 and 6515) and fields of practice-specific required practice courses are taught by faculty meeting CSWE degree and experience requirements. The following table identifies practice courses for the Department of Social Work, faculty who taught these courses in the academic year 2008-2009, and the years of post-MSW practice experience for each faculty member.

**MSW- Foundation Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 6011</td>
<td>Generalist Practice I (micro)</td>
<td>Wong-Kim (20)</td>
<td>Phan (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wright (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thoreson (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cline (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6012</td>
<td>Generalist Practice II (mezzo)</td>
<td>Wright (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chavez (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phan (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woods (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sullivan (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christian, T. (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6013</td>
<td>Generalist Practice III (macro)</td>
<td>Phan (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Countee (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wright (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chavez (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MSW- Concentration Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW 6500</td>
<td>Advanced Micro Practice</td>
<td>Phan (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children, Youth, and Family</td>
<td>Wong-Kim (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weber (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Countee (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6505</td>
<td>Advanced Micro Practice</td>
<td>Christian, A. (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cresci (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chavez (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vugia (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6510</td>
<td>Advanced Mezzo Practice</td>
<td>Christian, A. (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children, Youth, and Family</td>
<td>Clancy (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wong-Kim (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW 6515</td>
<td>Advanced Mezzo Practice</td>
<td>Chavez (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>Christian, A. (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Workload

**Accreditation Standard 4.4:** The program has a faculty workload policy that supports the achievement of institutional priorities and the program’s goals and objectives.

The Department of Social Work has a faculty workload policy that supports achievement of institutional priorities as well as our goals and objectives. The Department adheres to the workload policy as established by a memorandum of understanding between the California State University system and the California Faculty Association, the bargaining agent for the faculty. In part, the agreement states:

*The instructional assignments of individual faculty members in the classroom, laboratory, or studio will be determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department chair or designee and/or the individual faculty member. The department or other appropriate unit’s overall instructional or course assignments shall be consistent with department and student needs. Members of the bargaining unit shall not be required to teach an excessive number of contact hours, assume an excessive student load, or be assigned an unreasonable workload schedule. Normally, the faculty workload is a fifteen (15) unit load per quarter for three (3) quarters with three (3) of those fifteen (15) units allotted to advising each quarter for a total of 9 units.*

*In addition to the memorandum of understanding, the Promotion, Tenure and Retention documents clearly spell out expectations in terms of academic performance, research, and scholarly activities.*

In general, there are two types of faculty evaluations. Performance evaluations of faculty members are conducted for retention, tenure, and promotion. Periodic evaluations are made for purposes such as merit salary adjustments, evaluation of probationary faculty, and peer review of faculty (including tenured faculty) who have not been evaluated during the past five years. Evaluations are based on teaching performance and/or other professional performance, professional growth and achievement, service to the University and community, and student evaluations.

The promotion, tenure, and retention process is a peer review process. The probationary and tenured faculty of the department elects a committee of tenured full-time faculty for the purpose of evaluating and recommending individuals for retention, promotion, and tenure actions. Departmental committee evaluation reports and recommendations are approved by a simple majority of the committee; minority views must be incorporated within a single letter. All reports are presented in writing and accompany the Program Director’s written recommendation to the Dean.

An elected college committee of faculty then reviews each faculty file and makes recommendations to the Dean. A simple majority vote is needed for approval. On favorable recommendation of the Dean, the faculty file is forwarded to the University Committee for review and a favorable recommendation at this level moves the file on to the President for action. At CSU East Bay, tenure is granted by the President on the recommendation of the faculty. Faculty recommendations on the candidate are based on criteria and expectations applied to the Working Personal File.
SUMMARY AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In summary, one of the strengths of the Department of Social work is our outstanding full-time and part-time faculty. Our full-time faculty members possess a range of expertise and are eminently qualified to achieve the goals of MSW programs. Our part-time faculty members are drawn from a rich pool of social work practitioners and researchers in the region. We are fortunate to have a core group of excellent part-time faculty for both classroom instructors and as faculty field liaisons. Many of these part-time faculty members have been with us since the inception of the program and fully understand the mission, goals, and objectives of our program. They have participated in all the processes involved in the development and assessment of the program. The workload at CSU East Bay is demanding but manageable, and we have sufficient full and part-time faculty to achieve the program goals and objectives. In addition to our seven full-time tenure/tenure track faculty, we are recruiting for one additional interdisciplinary position to start in the 20010/2011 year.

The Department of Social Work plans to maintain our current efforts to provide support the success of our full- and part-time faculty. Future directions include:

1. Continued Department of Social Work orientation and coaching of part-time staff through our sequence and committee structure.
2. Continued Department of Social Work participation in campus workshops and special initiatives to support excellence and innovation in teaching.
3. Identification of priorities and submission of request to the University for recruitment of new full-time tenure track faculty. Specifically, a request for a position to replace one of our faculty members who has chosen to retire effective June 2009.
4. Continue participation in dialogues with the CSU East Bay administration, California Faculty Association, and other stakeholders in the CSU system about addressing workload issues.
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 5: STUDENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Admission to the Department of Social Work

The Department of Social Work has admissions criteria and procedures that reflect our program’s goals and objectives. The faculty of the Department, subject to the policies of the University, determines MSW admissions policy. Consistent with our mission to train social workers in the areas of Children, Youth, and Family, and community mental health, we seek diverse, dedicated, qualified, and talented people who will make a positive impact in our society through commitment to advocacy, social change, and social justice. The Department of Social Work specifies several admissions requirements, which are clearly detailed in all admissions materials. The goals and objectives of the California state University East Bay Department of Social Work are articulated in the CSU East Bay catalog (http://www.csueastbay.edu/ecat/current/g-sw.html#) as well as on the departmental website (http://class.csueastbay.edu/socialwork/#). The Department of Social Work’s admissions policies are consistent with the University’s requirements for graduate admission.

A brief summary of our admission procedures is provided here. A more detailed description is provided in the next section. The Department’s Admissions Coordinator administers the admissions process. Applicant files are reviewed for completeness by Department staff and, when complete, are distributed by the Admissions Coordinator to the members of the MSW Admissions Committee and to individual faculty for review. Each applicant is rated using an admissions scoring form, created by the Admissions Committee and approved by the faculty. Based on faculty ratings and the Coordinator of Admission’s review, applicants are selected for admission. Once the admissions goal has been met, other qualified students are placed on a waiting list. Wait listed students may be admitted if previously admitted students declined.

CSU East Bay Graduate Admissions Requirements

Admission to graduate standing in all CSU East Bay departments is under the purview of the University’s Office of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, which establishes admissions policies and minimum criteria for admission. These policies reflect the main purpose of CSU East Bay: “To provide an academically rich, multicultural learning experience that prepares all its students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful lifework, and to be socially responsible contributors to their communities, locally and globally.”

The minimum requirements for admission to graduate and post-baccalaureate studies at California State University, East Bay are in accordance with California State University regulations as well as Title 5, chapter 1, subchapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations. Specifically, a student shall at the time of enrollment:

1. Have completed a four-year college course of study and hold an acceptable baccalaureate degree from an institution accredited by a regional accrediting association, or 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 earned a GPA of at least 2.5 ("A" = 4.0) in the last 90 quarter (60 semester) units attempted; and
4. Satisfactorily meet the professional, personal, scholastic, and other standards for graduate study (including qualifying examinations) established by the admitting department.

These requirements are quoted from the 2007-2008 University catalog: http://www.csueastbay.edu/ecat/20092010/g-010gradst.html#section3.

In addition to these general requirements, graduate programs at CSU East Bay often establish additional criteria. To assure that the Department of Social Work trains future social workers who will make a significant positive contribution to the Department and to the field of social work, we require several additional requirements beyond those of the University.

These additional requirements are as follows:

- A bachelor's degree, from a recognized institution, with an achieved GPA of at least 2.8 (on a 4-point scale) during the last 60 units of undergraduate study or in 14 or more credits of graduate study.

- An undergraduate major or concentration in the Social Sciences or in Social Work is preferred but not required for admission to the Department of Social Work;

- Evidence of personal qualities considered important for social work practice, e.g., volunteer or paid experience in social work related agencies, strong writing skills, and/or commitment to social work as evidenced in personal statement;

- Completion of an undergraduate course in statistics or research methods with documented statistics content is required prior to enrollment. Students who have not completed this requirement prior to enrollment may be admitted on the condition that this requirement is met prior to the start of classes in the year admitted. In rare cases, exceptions are considered.

- Prior academic work reflecting a liberal arts perspective, as demonstrated through an undergraduate major in the humanities or social sciences, in fields such social work, sociology, psychology, anthropology, history, philosophy, literature, or languages.

- Successful completion of a college-level course in human biology, human physiology, or human anatomy. Students who have not completed a course in human biology, physiology, or anatomy must take the prerequisite course offered by the department in the summer prior to the start of their first quarter. In rare cases, exception will be considered, and provisional admission granted.

- TOEFL for international applicants: A composite score of 580 or more and no sub-score below 55 to be considered for regular (non-provisional) admission on the paper examination and 237 with no sub-score below 21 in listening, structure/writing and reading on the computer-based examination; and

- A personal statement and resume.
Additional Details on the Department of Social Work Criteria for Admission

**Academic Achievement.** Academic achievement is measured by grades in courses undertaken after the first two years of undergraduate study. Students must have a minimum 2.8 GPA (on a 4.0 scale) achieved in their last 60 undergraduate units to be eligible for admission. Because of our commitment to training social workers who represent diverse urban communities, occasionally applicants below this standard can be considered for “Special Action” and conditional admission. For example, some of our applicants are returning students with many years of social service experience. These applicants sometimes note in a memorandum included with their applications that they experienced significant hardships which compromised their undergraduate educations, yet their commitment to social work is evident through their years of successful employment in social services and recommendations from supervisors attesting to their professionalism. In these cases and others, faculty reviewers may recommend “Special Action.” This “Special Action” includes an evaluation by the admissions committee that may include an interview with the applicant. If, after careful review, applicants are perceived to have the ability to do MSW level work and to succeed in the profession, they can be admitted with conditions, such as achieving a 3.0 GPA in the first MSW quarter.

**Social Work Related Experience.** Applicants with significant volunteer, internship, or paid work experience with oppressed and disenfranchised groups such as Latinos, African Americans, Asian and Pacific Islanders, Native Americans, Gay, Lesbian, Transgendered, and other marginalized, oppressed, or disadvantaged groups are encouraged to apply. Although there is no minimum experience requirement, applicants with more than 2 years of human services volunteer or work experience have a greater chance of being accepted.

**Overall Assessment of Suitability.** In assessing suitability, consideration is given to personal and professional qualities relevant to social work such as knowledge of the field of social welfare, with diverse populations, an ability to work cooperatively and effectively with others, success in overcoming hardships, and strong verbal and writing skills.

**Selection Process**

Applicants demonstrate that they meet the specific Department of Social Work admissions requirements through:

- Two applications: (1) one for the Graduate School of CSU East Bay and (2) another specific to the Department of Social Work.
- A personal statement and resume.
- Three letters of reference from professors, supervisors, or others who have known the applicant in a professional context.
- Transcripts of all undergraduate and post-baccalaureate work.

**Application review procedure**

1. The students will either hand in or mail their applications to the front office to the department administrator
2. The applicant’s materials are date-stamped, logged in, and put in the admissions data base by the department administrator.

3. The applicant’s file is created within 48 hours of receipt.

4. If the application’s file is incomplete, a notification of missing materials post card is sent to the student.

5. If the applicant’s file remains incomplete after 45 days a second post card is sent to the student as a reminder. If the applicant does not respond within 45 days, then the file is closed. The file is retained for three years and then shred.

6. Once the applicants’ file is complete, the file is put in the mailbox of the Chair of the Admissions and Outreach Committee and a notification of receipt post card is mailed to the applicant.

7. The Chair of the Admissions/Outreach Committee will distribute files to faculty. Faculty (Tenure, Tenure-track, and annual lecturers). Faculty is expected to review the files within a two week period of time and return them to the committee chair.

8. The Chair of the Admissions and Outreach Committee will review files and return them to the Chair of the Department of Social Work.

9. If rejected, the applicant receives a rejection letter from the Program Director.

10. If accepted, the applicant is notified via letter by the Chair of the Department of Social Work and is asked to inform the Social Work Department of their intention to accept or reject the admissions offer. This notification can be done either by fax or mail.

11. If the applicant accepts the offer, then his/her student information is added to the CSU East Bay Internship Placement Tracking system. If the applicant declines the offer, the application is kept on file for three years, and then shredded.

In recent years, we have continued to strengthen our outreach efforts by increasing the number of informational meetings available for potential applicants from an average of eight (8) per year to twenty (20). These informal informational meetings take place several times a year at CSU East Bay on the Hayward and Concord campuses, where interested undergraduate students and other community members, can attend. Informational meetings are also held in Contra Costa, San Mateo, San Francisco, and Alameda county social service agency offices so that employees who are considering graduate education can attend. In 2009-2010, 239 prospective students attended an information session. The Department of Social Work application is distributed in hard copy, by mail, and on the Department website.

**Accreditation Standard 5.1: Only candidates who have earned a Bachelor’s Degree are admitted to the Master’s in Social Work degree program**
As noted above, an essential admissions criterion is completion of a Bachelor’s degree, preferably in the social sciences, with a GPA of at least 2.8 in the past 60 units of study. Interested applicants without a Bachelor’s degree must complete their degree work prior to being admitted to the social work program.

**Policies on Course Credit, Waiver of Courses, and Transfer of Units**

**Accreditation Standard 5.2: The program has a written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience.**

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work has a written statement indicating that the social work program does not grant credit for life experience or previous work experience. The statement is also included in the application packet, field manual, student handbook, and the department Web site. This statement reads as follows: *Credit for Life Experience: No unit credit is allowed toward the MSW degree for practical life experience.*

**Accreditation Standard 5.3: In those foundation curriculum areas where students demonstrate required knowledge and skills, the program describes how it ensures that students do not repeat that content.**

The Department of Social Work strives to create a learning environment that provides a consistent social work education for all students, while allowing for some individual variation based on prior educational experiences and knowledge. Students may avoid repeating foundation content through two means. Students who have completed graduate level coursework at a CSWE accredited MSW program are allowed to transfer units. BSW students who have completed coursework in HBSE, Policy, or research are allowed to waive this coursework through examination and take additional electives in lieu of the waived courses. Waivers are discussed here. Transfer of credit is described in the next section, 5.3.1.

The following foundation-year courses in the Department of Social Work may be challenged upon a written request from students:

- HBSE I
- HBSE II
- Policy (including social work history)
- Research I

MSW students who completed an undergraduate HBSE, diversity, policy, or research course with a grade of B- or better in each course may request an opportunity to challenge required courses in the foundation-year curriculum by passing a comprehensive written test in each course. Students who earned credits for post-baccalaureate or graduate course work (with a grade B- or better) in non-CSWE accredited social work programs may request to take comprehensive examinations for possible course waivers.

Interested students must submit a written request, course syllabi, and grade report to the Department Chair at least **four weeks before the first day of fall classes**. Students are informed of the dates when
comprehensive examinations will take place. This policy is stated at:
http://www.csueastbay.edu/ecat/20092010/g-sw.html#section2

In compliance with CSU East Bay Graduate Studies requirements, all courses waived must be substituted with approved electives so that the total of 88 or 89 quarter units is completed for the MSW degree. The academic advisor will work with the student to identify appropriate electives within the Department of Social Work or in related disciplines on campus. This policy is stated at:
http://www.csueastbay.edu/ecat/20092010/g-sw.html#section2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accreditation Standard 5.3.1: The program has written policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| As noted in the previous section, our written policies concerning transfer of credit are intended to be responsive to individual student learning needs, while ensuring that all Department of Social Work students receive a consistent, high quality education. MSW students are subject to the university’s policies for Graduate Programs (please refer to Graduate Degree Information in the university catalog at www.csueastbay.edu/ecat). When the department's policies are more restrictive than the Graduate Programs, the department’s policies prevail. Thus the policy for transfer of credits is as follows:
| 1. The course must be accepted by the CSU East Bay Department of Social Work;  
2. The courses must be taken within five calendar years immediately preceding the receipt of a bachelor degree;  
3. The course should be of graduate or upper division levels; and no more than 13 quarter units may be applied to the MSW degree.  
4. Credits for Field instruction and Generalist Practice courses are not transferrable. |

The applicable policy is stated in the CSU East Bay catalog:

If you have special expertise that is covered in a required course, you may ask to receive credit for the course through examination. To receive credit in the course, you must pass the examination with a grade of B- or better. Please note that units taken credit-by-examination are considered non-resident units and only a maximum of 13 non-resident units are allowed in a graduate degree. Other examples of non-resident units are those earned while at other schools, while an undergraduate with permission to take graduate courses, while pursuing an additional baccalaureate degree in "Unclassified Post-baccalaureate" status, while enrolled in another graduate degree program, or while enrolled in Extension courses—including Open University courses.

Courses from Other MSW Programs

Students with MSW-level course work in other CSWE-accredited programs are advised to submit a written request for transfer of credits and meet with the Graduate Advisor prior to the beginning of the first day of fall classes to determine if any foundation-year courses of CSU East Bay Department of Social Work are equivalent to their MSW-level education at previous institutions. Students are required to provide copies of course syllabi and other relevant materials.

Each course taken at another CSWE-accredited Department of Social Work will be reviewed by the Department’s Graduate Advisor to determine its acceptability to the CSU East Bay Department of
Social Work. Only comparable courses to the CSU East Bay MSW foundation-year curriculum will be granted for transfer of credits toward the MSW degree.

The student will receive a verification letter from the Graduate Advisor. A copy of this letter will be placed in the student's file in the social work office and another copy will be forwarded to the student's academic advisor.

All requirements for the MSW degree (including transfer of credits and completion of the Department of Social Work courses with a total of 88 quarter units) have to be satisfied within the required time limit (seven years). Transfer of credits will not be granted until the student has satisfactorily completed one full-time quarter of course work. Grades earned in MSW courses elsewhere for which transfer of credits is granted are included in the grade point average.

Accreditation Standard 5.3.2: Advanced standing status is only awarded to graduates of baccalaureate social work programs accredited by CSWE.

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work does not provide advanced standing status. Graduates of accredited baccalaureate programs in social work and other liberal arts disciplines who enroll at CSU East Bay are expected to complete the regular graduate course of study. Students who have mastered relevant content may, as described, waive certain foundation courses through examination, replacing the units with electives.

Advising

Accreditation Standard 5.4: The program has academic and professional advising policies and procedures that are consistent with the program’s goals and objectives. Professional advising is provided by social work program faculty, staff, or both.

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work has developed academic as well as field/professional advising policies and procedures that are consistent with our goals and objectives. These policies are distributed to students at the orientation meeting in August of each year. Advising is conducted by MSW faculty only. New faculty members are provided with student and field handbooks, as well as information about the student advising process as part of the new faculty orientation. Any updates to the student and field handbooks are distributed to all faculty advisors to facilitate the advising process. The sections below describe the academic, field/professional, and special stipend program advising that we offer to students.

Academic Advising

All graduate students in the program are assigned an individual faculty advisor (also called the Academic Advisor) to provide necessary support as the students pursue their educational and professional objectives in the Master of Social Work Program. Foundation-year students will have their academic advisors assigned in the fall quarter of their admission year. Changing Academic Advisors is allowed only following consultation with and approval by the Department Chair. The specific objectives of student advising include the following:

- To support students in their academic progress.
- To provide periodic monitoring of students’ academic performance.
To provide suggestions, alternatives, and means whereby a student can move into another major or career choice as easily as possible when a change is indicated.

- To refer students to appropriate academic services if they have difficulty with writing or research.

**Routine Advising Contacts.** Students begin meeting with their faculty advisors in the first quarter, and once each quarter thereafter, or more frequently if needed.

Course Instructors refer students who are having academic difficulties to their Academic Advisors. Students are instructed to see their Academic Advisors, and the Academic Advisors are informed of the student’s issues, problems, and concerns. This procedure is intended to ensure that problems are not left unattended, that all possible assistance and support are made available to the student, and that all necessary actions are taken. The Department Chair makes a list of students receiving a letter grade of C- or lower or an “Incomplete” at the end of each quarter, and notifies the students’ Academic Advisors, who then schedule special meetings and/or provide additional support(s) or referrals as needed. Referrals may include the campus counseling service, individual tutoring or writing support, the disability student resource center, and other resources available to students on campus or in the community.

Academic Advisors document contacts with students in the students’ academic files on a standardized academic advising form. The form items include the date and time of the contact, content of discussion, referrals made or offered, plan of action, and follow-up needed.

A student experiencing difficulty in academic courses or in the field is encouraged to engage the Instructor/Professor/Field Supervisor immediately and attempt to ameliorate the problem. If the problem cannot be resolved, the student is instructed to contact his/her Academic Advisor immediately.

A student receiving a grade of D+ or lower may not be allowed to move forward with advanced level courses until the course is satisfactorily completed. A student may remain on probation for a maximum of two quarters. Termination from the Department of Social Work is described in section 5.7; it involves a process of interaction between the student, his/her Instructors, Academic Advisors, the Student Performance Committee and the Department Chair.

**Field/Professional Advising**

Incoming students and first-year students are assigned a temporary Field Advisor, who, in consultation with the Field Director, collaborates with the student to secure an appropriate field placement that will meet the students’ learning objectives. Once the field placement begins, the Instructor for the student’s field practicum course becomes his or her Faculty Field Liaison. In that role, the Faculty Field Liaison meets with the student at least once each quarter, at the student’s field placement. At that time, the Faculty Field Liaison also meets with the agency-based Field Instructor to determine how well the student is meeting his or her learning objectives, and to identify any areas designated as needing improvement.

Field advising also takes place in the weekly field practicum course, where students “check in” at the beginning of each class meeting. This check-in is often an informal opportunity for the student to exchange ideas and problem solve with the Faculty Field Liaison and fellow students. During the check-in, if a student mentions a concern that the Faculty Field Liaison believes requires further attention, the Faculty Field Liaison promptly schedules an individual meeting with the student to provide timely support and resolution.
As students enter their final quarter in the program, field advising also includes review of student resumes, mock interview sessions, and sharing of job announcements verbally and via emails sent to all students. The field practicum sessions in this final quarter also shift to include content relevant to students’ imminent transition to professional social work, and topics such as financial planning, registering with the California Board of Behavioral Sciences, and self-care are incorporated into the curriculum.

In addition to these individual and small group professional advising efforts, the Department of Social Work also provides opportunities for professional growth and development for the whole student body. These opportunities include the annual internship fair and community forums on topics such as working with ethnic-specific underserved populations and differential diagnosis.

**Special Stipend Program Advising**

Students who participate in our two stipend programs (the IV-E Child Welfare and CalSWEC-II Mental Health Initiative) work closely with the Coordinators of those programs who provide field and professional advising to help students meet their professional goals and the grant objectives. The Coordinators are especially active in helping students select appropriate field placements, and in assuring that they find employment that will allow them to complete their post-graduation employment payback requirements. The coordinators also arrange special activities for the stipend recipients, such as mock interviews and guest lectures by community partners who can discuss their professional experiences with students.

**Student Rights and Responsibilities**

Accreditation Standard 5.5: The program has policies and procedures specifying students’ rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs. It provides opportunities and encourages students to organize in their interests.

The Department of Social Work has policies and procedures specifying students’ rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs. We provide opportunities and encourage students to organize in their interests. The remainder of this section provides further details about our policies and procedures for protecting students’ rights, ensuring they fulfill their responsibilities, and supporting students in engaging in departmental and social activities that meet their needs and enrich the program.

Students have explicit rights related to nondiscrimination, financial assistance, disability, sexual harassment, ombudsman assistance, employment, and privacy of their educational records. The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work faculty has developed an *MSW Student Handbook* that specifies these and other student rights and responsibilities. Students are given the handbook at the new student orientation, and key elements are reviewed at that time. In addition, University-wide student rights and responsibilities are online:

http://www20.csueastbay.edu/sa/sdja/right-response.html
Students with documented disabilities have a right to academic accommodations and to assistance in the case of emergencies. The CSU East Bay Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC) provides auxiliary aides and services (academic accommodations) to qualified students with disabilities. More information about the SDRC is available at: http://www20.csueastbay.edu/sa/sdrc/index.html

Student Conduct: Rights and Responsibilities. Students have the responsibility to collaborate in making CSU East Bay a healthy and safe learning community. Students are thus expected to conduct themselves as mature citizens of the campus community. Examples of inappropriate conduct include activities that would endanger the health and safety of others, use of illegal drugs, and academic dishonesty. The University student code of conduct is available at: http://www20.csueastbay.edu/sa/sdj/student-conduct.html. All students at CSU East Bay agree to comply with these and other policies and regulations intended to maintain a safe campus. Inappropriate conduct by students or applicants for admission is subject to discipline as noted in Sections 41301-41304 or Title 5, California Code of Regulations. Copies of the CSU East Bay Student Disciplinary Procedures, which govern enforcement of these regulations, are available from the Office of Vice President of Student Affairs, Warren Hall Room 959 or on the web at: http://www20.csueastbay.edu/sa/sdj/executive-order.html

Student Grievances. Grievances are formal complaints by students arising out of alleged actions of the University, its faculty, administrators, or officers. When such actions are alleged by students to be unauthorized or unjustified and to adversely affect students’ status, rights, or privileges, students may file grievances. These grievances include actions based on race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, handicap, or veteran status.

An official Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities enumerates the rights guaranteed to, and the responsibilities of, all CSU East Bay students. It contains the procedures for the redress of grievances. Copies of this document are available at the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Warren Hall Room 945 or on the web at http://www20.csueastbay.edu/sa/sdj/right-response.html.

Adequate safeguards have been instituted to protect the rights of students and the University and to ensure that grievances are handled fairly. The grievance procedure is but one channel for solving problems and should not take the place of attempting to resolve disputes through meeting between the parties involved in the alleged dispute.

Support for Student Organizations

The Department encourages student participation primarily through the Social Work Graduate Student Association (SWGA) and ethnic student caucuses on both the Hayward and Concord campuses. All graduate students automatically have membership in SWGA, which elects its own leadership and selects a faculty member as its advisor. SWGA is registered through the university and is therefore recognized as a viable student organization with all the benefits and responsibilities that it carries. SWGA has access to use of the university’s meeting rooms, access to financial support to attend conferences, or to engage in projects that would benefit other students, such as bringing speakers to the campus. The Department’s commitment to student involvement and participation is evidenced in the following ways.

The leaders of our Social Work Graduate Association (SWGA) meet on a regular basis with the Department Chair and with their faculty advisor. SWGA representatives are also invited to attend faculty meetings. Additionally, SWGA has promoted student attendance at professional presentations by tenure-
track faculty candidates and has had the opportunity to meet and question candidates. Students have also been encouraged to provide written feedback to the Search Committee on their perception of candidates. The SWGA has also been instrumental in assisting with and leading Department Town Hall Meetings. Additionally, Town Hall Meetings are held at least once per quarter where students help set the agenda and discuss issues and problem areas as they perceive them.

The Department provides a display bulletin board dedicated to SWGA and the ethnic caucuses, as well as student mailboxes in Hayward and Concord. What is needed, however, is space for a student lounge. The University is currently overcrowded, and we have not been able to secure this badly needed space. SWGA has taken the initiative to reserve a classroom at specific times so students have a gathering place.

Additionally, the Department has worked closely with SWGA on the following activities:
- Organizing and securing funds for the annual student graduation banquet;
- Organizing an annual Christmas Toy Drive;
- Raising funds for Tsunami relief victims; and
- Raising funds for Hurricane Katrina flood victims.

The students, through SWGA and the ethnic caucuses, have been an integral part of the development of the Department of Social Work. These organizations understand their pioneering role in the development and refinement of the department, and have been very generous with their time and commitment to the ongoing development of the Department of Social Work Program. Student organizations (SWGA and the caucuses, Latino Social Workers, Black Social Workers, Prism (LBGTQQI), Community Mental Health Social Workers, Asian Pacific Islander Social Workers) have also participated with us in developing community forums. Below is a listing of some of our recent community forums, developed in response to student input about topics they had an interest in exploring further.

Forums include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Date/Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Social Work Practice with American Indian Populations”, Tom Phillips, MSW</td>
<td>Saturday, 8/23/08- Concord Campus</td>
<td>9:00 am-4:00 pm</td>
<td>approximately 70 students (community was invited)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Psychopathology and the Role of the Social Worker” Stan Taubman, PhD &amp; Rachel Cresci, LCSW</td>
<td>Thursday, 4/24/08- Oakland Conference Center</td>
<td>8:30 am-4:00 pm</td>
<td>approximately 110 students/10 field instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Social Work with Latino Populations” Jose Martin, MFT Facilitator</td>
<td>Thursday, 1/23/09- CSU East Bay Hayward Campus</td>
<td>8:30 am – 4:00 pm</td>
<td>140 students/25 field instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Differential Diagnosis and Case Formulation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evaluation of Student Performance

**Accreditation Standard 5.6: The program informs students of its criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance.**

The Department of Social Work informs students of our criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance. The MSW Student Handbook and the University Catalog both clearly delineate policies for evaluating students’ academic and professional performance. Students are required to purchase the following texts: The MSW Student Handbook and the Student Field Manual. The policies in these manuals are reviewed both at the fall orientation and in the Field Practicum courses.

**Evaluation of Academic Performance**

Each course syllabus details requirements for evaluation of students’ academic performance. A syllabus is provided at the first meeting of every course offered in the school. The syllabus is the primary document of record for courses. It outlines course objectives, weekly course content and readings, assignments such as examinations, papers and presentations, grading criteria, and other course specifics. Additional policies for the evaluation of academic performance, including academic integrity, citation format, and norms of student conduct are included in all syllabi.

**Grading System.** The grading policy of the University provides that a letter grade (A, B, C, D, or F) shall be the basic grading system, except for those courses in which it is mandatory or permissible for Credit/No Credit grades to be used. Letter grades reflect the following performance levels, as noted in the CSU East Bay catalog: [http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/current/g010gradst.html#section15](http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/current/g010gradst.html#section15).

The grading symbols used for graduate courses are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Standard of Work Represented</th>
<th>Grade (Quality) Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>Substandard</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students have access to their course grades within three weeks after each term at the MyCSU East Bay website (https://my.csueastbay.edu/). Students may also view their cumulative GPA online. Students requiring formal academic transcripts may request them from the registrar’s office.

**Academic Standing and Probation.** A student who fails to maintain good academic standing (defined as a GPA of at least 3.0) in a given quarter will be placed on academic probation for the following quarter. The student, in consultation with the Academic Advisor, will be required to devise a plan to remove the probationary status. This plan will be filed in the student’s record. A student who fails to maintain good academic standing for two consecutive terms or after completing 16 units will be subject to academic discipline, which may include termination from the program, as discussed in section 5.7.

**Evaluation of Professional Performance**

Before beginning field placement, students are provided with a one-day orientation, which, among other topics, covers the expectations for student performance in the field. These expectations include professional goals and objectives, professional conduct, the number of internship hours required, and documentation of hours completed.

Field Instructors submit three written progress reports over the course of a students’ field placement, an initial, mid-year, and final report. Field Instructors are also encouraged to discuss performance issues with a student’s Faculty Field Liaison and to submit an “early concerns” form as soon as they suspect that there are problems. Copies of these forms are available at: http://class.csuhayward.edu/socialwork/Field_Instructors.php In addition to these reports, Faculty Field Liaisons visit field placements to meet with students and their Field Instructors at least once each quarter (Model B students completing field placements in the summer are visited twice during the 14 weeks of field placement). The purpose of these meetings is to ensure that students and Field Instructors are satisfied with the student’s progress and learning.

**Addressing Problems in Academic and/or Professional Performance**

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work is strongly committed to helping students maximize their learning opportunities in classes and educational fieldwork placements. Potential problems and demonstrated difficulties in class and in the field, both personal and educational, are identified and acted upon as soon as possible to allow resolution and/or corrective action as necessary. The student performance committee follows the procedures for judicial process and due process as stipulated by the University.

**Problems in Academic Performance.** When a student experiences academic difficulties in class, the Instructor collaborates with the student to identify remedial actions such as individual meetings with
the faculty member, or extensions to complete required assignments. If the above efforts fail to obtain the desired result, the instructor refers the student to his/her academic advisor. In this situation, the Academic Advisor may, in addition to discussion with the student, call a meeting of the student and instructor as needed to develop a plan for academic improvement. Should all these efforts fail to achieve any satisfactory outcome, an academic review, completed by a sub-committee of the Student Performance Committee, described below, is prescribed. Any student, faculty member, or advisor may request an academic review to discuss the student's academic performance or factors that seem to be impeding the student's academic progress. The purpose of an academic review is to assist a student in all appropriate ways, which can include extension of time for completing assignments, referral to tutoring, counseling, or disability services, recommending that the student repeat one or more courses, and recommending that the student take a leave of absence or withdraw from the program.

Problems in Professional/Field Internship Performance. Failure to adhere to the NASW Code of Ethics and/or engagement in irresponsible behavior will be documented by the field instructor who will then advise the student of the nature of the breach. The field liaison will be advised of the breach and a meeting of the student, Field Instructor, and Field Liaison may be arranged to determine the disposition of the case.

If the Field Liaison is concerned that the student may be engaged in irresponsible or unprofessional behavior, the Field Liaison will meet with the student and advise the student of the problem.

In both cases, the Director of Field Education will be notified re: unresolved concerns related to student behavior and a remediation plan will be developed in collaboration between the placement and the school.

Student Performance Committee. The Student Performance Committee is a standing committee of the Department of Social Work. Responsibilities of the Student Performance Committee include the following:

- Acts as the Department Grievance Committee for non-grade related issues;
- Reviews and approves leaves of absence, both at the time of request and at the point of potential reentry into the program.
- Makes recommendations to the Department Chair regarding termination or retention of students in all situations regarding student violations of the NASW Code of Ethics and any other professional and/or ethical standards that are not resolved using established procedures indicated below.
- Reviews all student complaints, issues, and concerns that are not resolved using Fairness committee or EEO/Discrimination protocols.

If the student requires intervention beyond the department’s Student Performance Committee, the student is referred to the University-wide Fairness Committee. Through the Fairness Committee, the student may file a formal grievance. The policies and procedures of the Fairness Committee are noted here: [http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/07-08/Fairness%20doc%20revision%2007-08.pdf](http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents/07-08/Fairness%20doc%20revision%2007-08.pdf).

Accreditation Standard 5.7: The program has policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance.

The Department of Social Work has policies and procedures for terminating a student’s enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance. The
Department of Social Work endeavors to train individuals who will serve as competent professionals and uphold the values and ethics of the profession. The educational program is structured in a manner to provide support for students so that termination is unlikely to occur. However, when prevention efforts have not been successful, students may be terminated from the program. In an effort to ensure that only competent professionals graduate from our program, there are clear policies and procedures for terminating students from the Department of Social Work who consistently demonstrate difficulty in meeting professional standards.

The policies and procedures regarding termination from the program are delineated in the *MSW Student Handbook* and in the *University Catalog*. The policies and procedures for termination are discussed extensively during student orientation sessions held in the fall quarter of each academic year. The following sections discuss these procedures; additional information regarding these policies is delineated in the *MSW Student Handbook* and in the University Catalog.

Reasons for which a student may be terminated from the Department of Social Work include the following:

- Having a grade point average which is less than 3.0 for more than one quarter;
- Receiving a failure or no credit in the practicum;
- Exhibiting behavior in class or field that is assessed by the faculty to indicate an inability to perform with the maturity, sensitivity, or wisdom required for satisfactory social work practice;
- Behaving unethically in a situation where the student knew or should have known that the behavior was unethical;
- The student has serious difficulties accepting supervision in fieldwork, thereby undermining his or her learning and also placing clients’ well-being in jeopardy;
- The student has unresolved emotional problems that make it difficult for him or her to develop and maintain effective working relationships with clients;
- The student wants to become a professional social worker, but isn’t capable of developing a viable helping relationship with clients due to extreme shyness, inappropriate prejudices, or negative predispositions towards clients;
- The student decides that a career in social work is not really what he or she wants and is not motivated to complete the requirements for fieldwork and/or the program.

**Termination from Fieldwork.** Termination from fieldwork with a grade of “No Credit” means termination from the Department of Social Work, since a passing grade in fieldwork is a requirement for continuation in the program. Students who receive a grade of No Credit are dismissed from the program immediately. A student who has received a grade of No Credit may reapply for admission to the MSW program after one year and is expected to demonstrate progress in the areas previously deemed unacceptable.

As in all instances of assignment of a final grade, students have the option of appealing that grade according to the policies and procedures outlined above. If a student has other personal issues that are impacting his/her ability to successfully meet the requirements of the Department of Social Work that become evident in the early weeks of the fieldwork placement, he/she may request an Educational Leave from the program, which would include a withdrawal from all classes in which he/she is enrolled at the time.

A student can be dismissed from the program for the following: In any situation where there is (a) imminent danger of harm to clients, other students, or other professionals in the agency, i.e., field
placement student is engaging in practice activities that could result in harm to the client, other students, other professionals, (b) a violation of the NASW Code of Ethics, i.e., areas outlined in the NASW Code including the social worker’s conduct and comportment as a social worker, the social worker’s ethical responsibility to clients, colleagues, the agency setting, the social work profession and society, (c) disregard or violation of agency policies and/or procedures, (d) a breach of confidentiality, i.e., violation of patient privacy, patient rights, and client confidentiality policies, violation of confidentiality policies regarding agency information or agency staff/personnel, (e) unexplained absences, i.e., failure to notify Field Instructor in the case of absence or extended absence with no notification or prior approval by Field Instructor and/or Faculty Field Liaison, or (f) other significant professional issues or ethical concerns, i.e., dual relationships with clients, lying, or false misrepresentation of facts.

On determination of any of the above, an administrative meeting is held to review the circumstances and make a determination of the student’s status in the program. This review meeting includes the Field Director, Faculty Field Liaison, and the student.

There are occasions where issues about student performance in the fieldwork agency arise which necessitate immediate intervention, thereby eliminating some of the identified procedures for handling these issues. A Field Instructor may request that a student not continue in the agency before the entire procedure for handling a performance issue has been implemented. In these instances, the field faculty liaison and Field Director will make a determination of the appropriate action steps to resolve the situation.

 Procedures for Implementing the Termination. The procedure for implementing the termination process for academic and/or nonacademic reasons includes advising the student in writing of his or her status, a decision by the Student Performance Committee of the Master of Social Work Program, and an opportunity for the student to appeal. Specific steps in the termination procedure include:

Any member of the faculty, the Field Instructor, the Field Director, or a student may initiate review by communicating his or her concerns to the student’s Academic Advisor, who will then confer with the student to inform him or her of concerns regarding performance; obtain the student’s perspective; clarify any information, and determine if the student might wish to withdraw. The faculty advisor prepares a written report that is presented to the student and the Department Chair.

The Department Chair, with faculty consultation, refers the matter to the Chair of the Student Performance Committee. The Chair of the Student Performance Committee consults with involved parties including, but not limited to, the student, the student’s academic advisor, faculty member, fieldwork instructor, or the Field Director with relevant information regarding the matter. The Student Performance Committee then makes a decision regarding termination, no termination, or remedial action. The Department Chair, following consultation with the Graduate Division Vice President, implements the Committee’s decision with written notice to the student. The student may appeal the decision to the Department Chair whose decision is final. In all cases measures are taken to protect confidentiality and to treat the student with dignity and respect.
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 6: NONDISCRIMINATION AND HUMAN DIVERSITY
Accreditation Standard 6.0: The program makes specific and continuous efforts to provide a learning context in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity (including age, class, color, disability, ethnicity, family structure, gender, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation) are practiced. Social work education builds upon professional purposes and values; therefore, the program provides a learning context that is nondiscriminatory and reflects the profession’s fundamental tenets. The program describes how its learning context and educational program (including faculty, staff, and student composition; selection of agencies and their clientele as field education settings; composition of program advisory or field committees; resource allocation; program leadership; speakers series, seminars, and special programs; research and other initiatives) and its curriculum model understanding of and respect for diversity.

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work makes specific and continuous efforts to provide a learning context in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity are practiced. As noted earlier, the Department of Social Work is designed to serve disenfranchised and underserved urban populations. The curriculum provides students with knowledge and skills necessary for culturally competent practice. Special attention is directed at preparing students to advance social justice through advocacy and other direct action strategies. We provide a learning context that is nondiscriminatory and reflects the profession’s fundamental tenets. Diversity is infused into all Department of Social Work activities: teaching, learning, scholarly activities, management, decision-making, and collegial interactions. The Department’s core vision of a diverse learning environment is demonstrated in numerous ways. Examples of the diversity focus in the Department of Social Work are evident throughout, including admissions criteria, field curriculum, field placements, selection of field supervisors, recruitment of faculty, staff, and students, course assignments, reading assignments, and course bibliographies. Thus the cornerstone of the Department of Social Work is the development of understanding and appreciation for the diversity and value of all people.

The department faculty takes particular pride in the leadership that it is providing the profession in how to infuse diversity in the curriculum. Through a gateway course, SW 6010: Race, Gender, and Inequality, faculty members provide students with a unique introduction to issues of racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of oppression. This course is then followed by an infusion of diversity issues throughout the rest of the curriculum.

What the faculty teaching this course has found is that the content of the course, i.e., a focus on issues of racism, sexism, homophobia, and inequality meets with a great deal of emotional resistance from students, especially European American students. In short, the emotional reactions, while expected, make the course challenging for both students and faculty alike.

Seeing an opportunity to improve the educational quality of the course, and, at the same time, provide support for faculty teaching the course, faculty began to hold regular meetings to share experiences, provide support for one another, and refine the course. Not long into this process, it was recognized that what we were experiencing and learning had value to the entire social work education community. Faculty collaborated on an article and presented it for publication to The Journal of Social Work Education. The article, “Teaching Note – A Social Work Program’s Experiences in Teaching about Race in the Curriculum,” was published in the Spring/Summer 2009 issue. It is anticipated that this article will generate a great deal of discussion about the importance of diversity and, most importantly, provide colleagues with valuable lessons learned in the teaching of this course at the Department of Social Work.
The faculty’s reflective teaching of this course, and publication of the article about it, is but one example of our core focus on integration of diversity throughout our work.

CSU East Bay NONDISCRIMINATION POLICY

The Department of Social Work has, at its core, a belief in non-discrimination and affirmative action in the removal of barriers to allow full participation for all groups and individuals in American society. The Department is governed and committed to the non-discrimination policies of the University and the State of California, which are congruent with the Department’s vision of a learning environment as described above. The Department of Social Work adheres to all University policies and procedures to guard against discrimination on the basis of race, color, gender, age, creed, ethnic or national origin, disability, political orientation, or sexual orientation. The Department’s commitment to non-discrimination is evident in all departmental communications, at faculty meetings, and in the orientation of students and field seminars. The Department of Social Work’s commitment to non-discrimination is supported by the University non-discrimination policy:

California State University, East Bay and its auxiliaries subscribe to the precept that all students and applicants for admission will be treated equally in its programs and employment, without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, gender, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, age, physical/mental disability, or medical condition. No person shall, on these bases, be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination in any of the University’s programs or activities. Equal educational opportunity is observed and promoted in the administration, housing, and education of students; and in policies governing programs and extracurricular activities. As to disability and medical condition, the University is committed to providing reasonable accommodations to individuals with disabilities, if doing so does not create an undue hardship for the University.

Furthermore, the University and its auxiliaries will not tolerate retaliation of any form against an individual who has or who is believed to have filed a discrimination complaint, which the individual reasonably and in good faith believes is discrimination, opposed a discriminatory act or participated in a discrimination investigation or proceeding. CSU East Bay’s adherence to equal opportunity policies and the development of relevant programs, communication strategies, training, and monitoring of efforts comply with State and Federal laws and support the University’s mission of “educational excellence for a diverse society.” (From: http://www.aba.csueastbay.edu/HR/deo/Non-DiscriminationPolicy.pdf)

The Department of Social Work adheres strictly to all university standards for nondiscrimination and harassment. Information regarding such policies and procedures are made readily available to all faculty - both full-time and temporary faculty - staff, and students on an ongoing basis. The California State University policy on harassment, as noted in Executive Order 927, effective January 6, 2005, is (http://www.calstate.edu/EO/EO-927.html):

The California State University (CSU) is committed to maintaining a work environment where every employee, applicant, and independent contractor is treated with dignity and respect. CSU will not tolerate unlawful harassment based on race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, veteran status (as defined by the Vietnam-Era
Veterans’ Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, as amended), physical disability, mental
disability, or medical condition.

Individuals covered within the scope of this executive order who believe they have been
subjected to harassment should promptly report it to the campus administrators designated to
receive harassment complaints.

CSU will respond to all harassment complaints brought to its attention in a timely and
appropriate manner. If the complaints have merit, CSU will promptly take actions to prevent
recurrence and remedy the effects of the harassment. Persons who engage in harassment may
be subject to discipline up to and including discharge. In determining whether the conduct at
issue violates this policy, the totality of the circumstances shall be considered.

To prevent harassment, it is critical that individuals not be deterred from reporting it. CSU East
Bay will not retaliate, nor will it tolerate retaliation.

Faculty and Staff

Faculty recruitment, appointment, tenure, and promotion review activities are all governed by
University approved policies and procedures on nondiscrimination. We explicitly express our
nondiscriminatory position on all position announcements:

As an Equal Opportunity Employer, CSU East Bay does not discriminate on the basis of any
protected categories: age, ancestry, citizenship, color, disability, gender, immigration status,
marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran’s status. The University
is committed to the principles of diversity in employment and to creating a stimulating learning
environment for its diverse student body.

Not just a passive follower of the rules in terms of valuing and respecting diversity, two of the faculty in
the Department of Social Work are active leaders in the move to increase, refine, and expand the
University’s commitment to diversity. These two faculty are members of the University Diversity and
Equity Committee, which is charged with developing the University Equity Plan and monitoring diversity
on campus. In fact, the Faculty Diversity and Equity Office for the University, the person responsible for
monitoring all new faculty hires, is a member of the Department of Social Work.

Students and members of the community are invited and encouraged to attend, and to participate
in campus-based interviews of candidates for faculty positions in order to ensure the department hires
faculty who reflect the diversity of the San Francisco Bay Area and expertise in social work practice with
diverse populations.

Efforts to maintain faculty salary equity are made at several levels. Salaries offered at entry are
based upon experience, expertise, previous levels of academic appointment, and program needs.
Appointment, tenure, and promotional patterns are monitored to ensure that the advancement of women
and minorities as a group is equal to that of other employees as a group. Efforts are also made on a
regular basis to reward faculty on the basis of merit, at all levels of review, via the Faculty Merit Increase
Program available through the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty
Association and the Board of Trustees of the California State University.

The Department of Social Work has been successful in hiring faculty members, lecturers, and
support staff that represent a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives. In fact, the faculty and staff of
the Department of Social Work are a majority of minorities (66% are members of minority groups; See
Figure 6.1. As such, the faculty and staff model the diversity that we teach about throughout the program. Detailed information about the racial and ethnic composition of faculty and staff is provided in Tables 6.1 & 6.2.

Table 6.1: Diversity of Tenured/Tenure-Track and Annual Lecturer Social Work Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TENURED</th>
<th>RANK/POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodie, Kilolo</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countee, Christa</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Title IV-E Coordinator/Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciriaco, Maria</td>
<td>Filipino-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Full Time Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline, Lizelle</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Full Time Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu, Mayling</td>
<td>Chinese-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cresci, Rachael</td>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Field Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Terry</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Vinita</td>
<td>Chinese-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Full Time Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale, Jamila</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lecturer/Field Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phan, Phu</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush Woods, Dianne</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Associate Professor and Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Sarah</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>CalSWEC-II Coordinator/Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2: Diversity of Part-time Faculty & Support Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART-TIME FACULTY</th>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrzejczyk, Cynthia</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez, Peggy</td>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, Andrea</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, Thana</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clancy, Thomas</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz-Santana, Dana</td>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlquist, Betty</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goma-Gakissa, Georges</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Stuart</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisman, Michael</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Jose</td>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Kenya</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Jenell</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoreson, Donna</td>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University Support Faculty**

| Redmond, Sonjia                | African-American | F   | VP Student Affairs/Professor |

**Office Support Staff**

| Harton, Lyn                    | European-American | F   | Department Secretary      |
| Anderson, Cindy                | European-American | F   | Title IV-E Grant Secretary |
| Susan Szeto                    | Chinese            | F   | .75 Grant Secretary       |

Faculty hired by the Department of Social Work for temporary, non-tenure track, and temporary and/or part-time positions also represent diverse backgrounds and areas of expertise within multi-cultural social work education, practice, human behavior, policy, and research. In addition to the diversity of the faculty and staff, faculty members regularly invite guest speakers from the professional community in order to enrich course content on diversity issues.

**Students**

The Department of Social Work’s success in attracting students from diverse backgrounds is made apparent by the gender and ethnic composition of the graduate students enrolled in the department. Since the Department of Social Work’s inception in 2004, more than 75% of our students have been members of racial and ethnic minority communities; the students’ very high degree of ethnic diversity is illustrated below in Table 6.3.
### Table 6.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN AGE</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN GPA</strong></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN UNIT LOAD</strong></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TERM FTES</strong></td>
<td>212</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOGRAPHIC ORIGIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other California Counties</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSIFICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Baccalaureate</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAL STATE EAST BAY</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ethnic backgrounds of the social work students reflect the socio-demographic characteristics of the urban communities surrounding the University. In terms of gender, a higher percentage of females than males choose to enter the Department of Social Work; however, this is reflective of state and national trends for graduate social work education. Though we do not have official estimates on other elements of human diversity in our student population, a number of students are active in LGBTQ, disability, and other minority community activities on and off campus.

The diversity in our student body is a highlight of our program, and we take full advantage of the richness it brings. A recent example was this past spring, when a number of the students in PRISM, the LGBTQ student organization in the Department of Social Work, chose to complete Capstone assignments that focused on LGBTQ content in social work education. With the cooperation of the
faculty, the PRISM members conducted a survey of student awareness of LGBTQ issues and prepared a bibliography of books, journal articles, and multimedia resources for inclusion in courses across the curriculum. This bibliography was distributed to all faculty in print and electronically. PRISM members also met with faculty to discuss their suggestions and ideas for our upcoming community forum on social work with LGBTQ populations, to be held in the 2009-2010 academic year.

Thus in addition to providing a learning context conducive to nondiscrimination, the Department of Social Work continuously strives to maintain an educational program that acknowledges diversity and nondiscrimination in terms of its program mission, goals, objectives, syllabi, reading assignments, and field program.

Community Advisory Board

The Department of Social Work’s Community Advisory Board contains a wide spectrum of colleagues that is diverse in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity. Members of the board are viewed as leaders and experts within the community. Additionally, advisory board members represent the great diversity of our service area. The membership of the community board consists of Directors of Humans Services Departments, Educators, Community Activist/Leaders, and representatives of community based programs. They understand the needs of diverse student populations and communities and advocate for theoretical and case management approaches that are a “good fit.”

Field Education

The MSW field education program is also diverse in terms of the composition of its campus-based field faculty, field work settings, agency based field work supervisors, the clients served by field settings, and the communities in which field settings are located. Field work instructors are recruited on the basis of their interest and ability as practitioner-teachers. Field work instructors reflect a wide and diverse range of backgrounds and areas of expertise. Since a significant number of the field agencies are located within ethnically diverse communities, many of the Department of Social Work’s field work instructors are people of color with many years of experience in multicultural, generalist social work practice. Seminars and workshops sponsored by the Department of Social Work’s field faculty place great emphasis on the importance of diversity in field education in relation our curriculum.

Social service agencies providing field work opportunities for our students embody the urban multicultural competent mission of the Department. Among these agencies are:

Alameda County Adult and Aging
Aids Project East Bay
Alameda County Asian Community Mental health
American Indian Child Resource Center
Asian & Pacific Islander Wellness Center
Asian Community Mental Health Services
Asian Pacific Psychological Services
Asian Perinatal Advocates
Black Adoption Placement & Research
BWOPA (Black Women’s Organization)
Circulo de Vida
Clinical de la Raza Mental Health
DRAIL (Disability Resource Agency for Independent Living
Familias Unidas
Family Service Agency of SF: Geriatric
Family Service Agency of SF: Adult Care
Hong Food Adult Day Health Care
Institute on Aging
Instituto Familiar de la Raza
Jewish Family & Children’s Services
La Clinica, Casa del Sol
La Familia Counseling Another Road to Safety
La Familia Counseling Services
La Familia Multicultural Psychotherapy
Lavender Seniors
Migrant Education Program Region 1
Native American Health Center
Oakland Vet Center
On Lok Senior Health Services
SF Aids Foundation
SF Senior Center
San Mateo County Aging & Adult Services
Tenderloin Aids Resources
VA Palo Alto

**Department Activities**

At the Departmental level, our mission statement and program objectives for producing culturally competent urban social work practitioners who are engaged and committed to advocacy and social justice establishes our commitment to diversity and cultural competence. Additionally, the Department has adopted a tripartite approach (urban populations, social justice/advocacy, and multicultural competence) which is reflected in our mission, goals, and objectives; in the types of articles that we choose for our courses; in the focus of our community forums; and in short throughout our department structure.

Our faculty includes Hispanic (Costa Rican, Mexican), African-American, Asian (Korean, Chinese, Vietnamese), and African faculty. We are also diverse with respect to sex. The composition of our faculty is a sign to students that diversity is our practice rather than a theoretical discussion and contributes to the applications from many cultures that we receive. (See Tables 6.1 & 6.2)

The diversity of our Department has increased intercultural contact and has pushed both faculty and students to deepen our understanding of a dynamic, intercultural community. The challenges and demands of supporting this type of community are sources of discussion in faculty and curriculum committee meetings. Students approach faculty and have requested specific community forums to address better understanding of the diversity that we embrace. Over the past three years, we have offered community forums on:
- Practice with LBGTQ populations
- Practice with Latino Populations
- Practice with Native American Populations

The Department’s Mental Health Stipend program is in its third year and supports the integration of consumers of mental health services into the MSW student population. This program provides stipends in the amount of $18,500 per year to a select group of students in their second year of graduate study to specialize in public mental health. Students are provided with a specialized curriculum and do their field placements working in public mental health settings with the chronically and persistently mentally ill population. Funded through the Mental Health Services Act, this program has as one of its goals to increase the number of culturally and linguistically prepared social workers to work with socially and economically disadvantaged persons with chronic mental illness. Of the 30 students in the Mental Health Stipend Program in academic years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, 53% are members of racial/ethnic minority communities.

Our faculty is actively engaged in community practice and scholarship related to diversity issues. Some highlights of our faculty’s activities in this area include:

- As noted earlier in the chapter, several of our faculty (Dr. Phan, Dr. Vugia, Dr. Wright, Dr. Woods, Dr. Chu, and Dr. Jones) co-authored a publication about our program’s experiences in teaching about race in social work education. This article was published in the Spring/Summer 2009 issue of the Journal of Social Work Education.
- The Department of Social Work sponsored one visiting faculty from China for a quarter in 2006. She worked in partnership with Dr. Chu, a full-time faculty member, on identifying differences between the social welfare state in the U.S. versus that in China.
- During the winter and spring quarters, Dr. Wong-Kim spent 24 weeks as a Wang Research Fellow at the University in China. She also developed a proposal on “Access and Barriers to Participate in Clinical Trials among Chinese Immigrant Populations (2006).” Dr. Wong Kim also sponsored four students in the Student Mentoring Program at the 10th and 11th Biennial Symposium on Minorities, the Medically Underserved in 2006 and 2007. In 2007, Dr. Wong-Kim published an article on the use of complementary and alternative medicine among Chinese women with breast cancer.
- In 2002, Dr. Chu was awarded the prestigious CSU system-wide Wang Family Scholarship Faculty Research Stipend for conducting research in China. This award provided opportunities for exchange of social work education and research. Dr. Chu has been invited to teach social work courses or offer training to Chinese social workers at universities in Beijing and Shanghai, China. In 2006, Dr. Chu published two book chapters on culture and deviance, respectively. She serves on the Council on Global Learning, Research, and Practice of CSWE (Council on Social Work Education). Dr. Chu is also a member of the editorial board of Social Thought: Spirituality and Religion in Social Work.
- Dr. Phan and Dr. Jones received $27,000 from the City of Richmond to provide academic and supportive services to under-performing students and families in the City’s elementary schools.
- Dr. Jones serves as the Diversity and Equity Officer for the University. He also serves as a founding member of the Faculty Development and Equity Council. Dr. Jones is one of the founding members of the National Association of Black Social Workers and has published numerous papers on diversity and intercultural competence.
• In 2006, Dr. Phan published an article on social work and Southeast Asians. Dr. Phan has also published and presented other research in the area of practice with refugee and immigrant populations.

• Dr. Wright is currently an active member of the Diversity and Equity Committee at CSU East Bay and the Advisory Board for the Renaissance Scholars Board, which serves former foster youth students at CSU East Bay. He also serves on the University-wide Faculty Development and Equity Council. In 2009, Dr. Wright was invited to train a multi-disciplinary staff for the City of Berkeley on issues of cultural Competence and Practice with African American Adults and Children. In 2007, he presented at the 17th Annual West Coast Child Welfare Trainer’s Conference, in Oakland, California on the need for cultural competence and intra-group cultural competence in the child welfare profession.

• Dr. Woods is the honorary chair of the 2009 African American Education Summit at CSU East Bay and is expected to chair the 2010 Summit. In addition to participating in Super Sunday (a University-wide outreach day for African American youth) through church presentations, she has developed an expertise with the Intercultural Development Inventory instrument. This instrument assesses the intercultural acceptance of others and will be instrumental in the measurement of attainment of cultural competence. In 2007, Dr. Rush Woods wrote a chapter titled, “Working From Can’t See to Can’t See” in Women of Color as Social Work Educators, edited by Vakalshi, H., Stronics, S., & Ortiz Hendricks, C., CSWE Press.

• Dr. Taylor is currently working on a paper about economic inequality as it relates to the experience of an “emerging adulthood” phase of life. As a doctoral student researcher in 2005, Dr. Taylor contributed to a workforce diversity study, Attracting and Recruiting Minority, Multi-Lingual and Culturally Competent Social Workers. In her role as the CalSWEC-II Coordinator, she continues her efforts in this area by working to recruit and support diverse students with a commitment to community mental health. Dr. Taylor is also the organizer of a group for parents of young children with disabilities and is collaborating with Dr. Brodie to develop an elective course on social work and disability.

Summary

In summary, the Department of Social Work is distinguishing itself as a leader in the profession in terms of teaching about issues of race, gender, and inequality. Though the Department of Social Work is relatively new, it has already developed a reputation for valuing diversity and preparing culturally competent social work practitioners. The University and the Department ensure nondiscrimination by continuously monitoring, implementing, and evaluating its nondiscrimination policies. The Department demonstrates its commitment to diversity by providing a learning context and educational program in which continuous efforts are made to ensure diversity by recruiting diverse student, faculty, and staff and by maintaining a central focus on advancing social justice and cultural competence with diverse, urban populations through teaching, leadership, and research. Furthermore, the Department faculty and administrative leadership are perceived on campus, and in the community, as experts and leaders in the development and maintenance of policies and programs that foster respect for diversity. The Department of Social Work will maintain its own commitment to creating a supportive learning environment for our students and to participate in University-wide activities designed to enhance respect for diversity.
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 7: PROGRAM RENEWAL
Community Collaboration

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work maintains ongoing exchanges with outside community-based agencies, advocacy groups, the academic community and the community at large. Specifically, the Department of Social Work was founded in response to dialogue between major social work and social services agencies in both Alameda and Contra Costa counties.

As part of its educational philosophy, the program believes in the importance of developing and maintaining strong community and school ties in order to support a strong and responsive professional curriculum. The program continues to collaborate with other social work programs in the Bay Area and throughout California. Additionally, the program has developed relationships with the State Department of Social Services, Contra Costa County Community Development Department, and the cities of Oakland, Richmond, Emeryville, and Albany as well as the South East Bay Neighborhood Collaborative. Additionally, the program has developed professional exchanges between faculty of other social work programs and members of area agencies. The goal is to establish partnerships in which research, training, and other collaborative social work ventures will occur.

The Department of Social Work continues its relationship with the National Association of Social Workers where a faculty member (Christa Countee) serves as treasurer and hosts the Region C chapter meetings on the University campus. Additionally, the local NASW chapter has been supportive of the program by providing funds for student activities and annually contributes a *Code of Ethics Handbook* for each new student. The program has also developed a relationship with the San Francisco/Bay Area chapter of the National Association of Black Social Workers.

Faculty in the Department of Social Work continuously visits local community-based social service organizations to recruit students and to network with these agencies. The Department Chair is an active participant in the Association of Bay Area Social Services Directors. Other faculty actively engages with numerous agencies in the University service area.

*Community Advisory Board (CAB).* As part of the Department of Social Work’s commitment to continue to build on its collaborative relationships with its external constituencies, an advisory board has been established. The advisory board, which consists of local social service providers and community leaders, meets at least annually. The CAB is the primary vehicle for receiving input from external constituencies. This board has been extremely helpful in recruiting students and part-time faculty and has been exceptionally helpful in opening doors in the social work community locally and at the state level.

The Advisory Board also provides consultation and support regarding curricular needs. Among its other roles, the Advisory Board identifies and recommends field placements, garners community-based support for program development, assists in the acquisition of resources, and provides the department with information regarding employment opportunities. The Advisory Board also assists in reviewing and
updating the field program, and participates in the planning of events and innovations with field education.

*Community Outreach.* Through the use of a tri-annual newsletter, distributed to the social work community in the University’s service area, the Department of Social Work shares departmental news and events with the social work community and solicits stories of interest from the social work community. Additionally, the Field Director has established on-going contacts with social work agencies.

Both the Department Chair and the Field Director regularly attend meetings of community-based organizations and soliciting input regarding the development of the program. The Department Chair attends quarterly meetings of the California Social Work Education Consortium and participates with other social work directors and heads of social work agencies in discussing social welfare policy, formulating educational plans, and in developing strategies to fund graduate students in schools of social work. The Field Director meets regularly with other field directors to consult, develop best practices in the delivery of the field work experience, and to share information about social work around the state. The Title IV-E Coordinator is regularly involved in community presentations and outreach to potential child welfare placement sites. Additionally, the Title IV-E Coordinator meets several times a year with other Title IV-E Coordinators throughout the State of California to develop curriculum and best practices in the field of child welfare. The CalSWEC-II Coordinator attends monthly meetings of the Bay Area Mental Health Education and Workforce Collaborative and meets several times a year with other mental health stipend coordinators throughout the state.

---

**Accreditation Standard 7.1: The program’s faculty engages in the development and dissemination of research, scholarship, or other creative activities relevant to the profession.**

---

**Faculty Scholarship**

The Department of Social Work faculty is actively engaged in scholarship and research related to the social work profession. In addition to publishing in social work journals, faculty members are involved with social work organizations and community groups within the University’s service area. Some highlights of our faculty’s scholarship in the past year include:

- In April 2009, Dr. Taylor, Dr. Wright, Dr. Phan, Dr. Brodie, and Dr. Woods collaborated to submit a roundtable proposal on *Advocacy in the Social Work Curriculum* to the Society for Social Work and Research Conference to be held in January 2010. As part of this proposal submission, they prepared a brief survey on student attitudes towards advocacy in the curriculum, which will be distributed to the students in fall 2010.
- In April 2009, Dr. Phan presented a paper on the effective use of role plays in social work education at the annual Southwestern Social Science Association in Denver, Colorado.
- Dr. Phan, Dr. Vugia, Dr. Wright, Dr. Woods, Dr. Chu, and Dr. Jones published an article on their experiences in teaching about race in the social work curriculum in the *Journal of Social Work Education*.
- Dr. Wong-Kim and colleagues have an article in-press on reducing disparities in hospice care experienced by racial and ethnic minorities. This article will be published in *Primary Psychiatry*. 
• Dr. Taylor has two articles in press. The first is on engaging and retaining vulnerable youth in a short-term longitudinal study, to be published in *Qualitative Social Work*. The other article is co-authored with a colleague and is a county case study of collaboration between staff of independent living programs for foster youth and their community partners. It will be published in the *Journal of Public Child Welfare*.

The list below provides further details about our faculty’s scholarly achievements.

**SELECTED FACULTY SCHOLARSHIP**  
(Faculty listed in alphabetical order)

**KILOLO BRODIE**

**Journal Articles**


**Presentations/Conference proceedings**


**Book chapters**


**MAYLING MARIA CHU**

**Journal articles**


permission from the *Journal of Gang Research.*


**Book Chapters**


**Presentations/Conference proceedings**


**Book Reviews**


**Reports and other scholarly work**


**MICHÈLE FATAL-WEBER**

**Journal articles**


**STUART HANSON**

**Journal articles**


**Reports and other scholarly work**


Temkin T., & Hanson, S. (2000). *Participatory action research in a study of exemplary collaborations between community-based independent living centers and publicly-funded vocational rehabilitation agencies,* InfoUse.

**TERRY JONES**

**Journal Articles**


**Books**


**Book Chapters**


Presentations


Multimedia


PHU TAI PHAN

Journal articles


Presentations/Conference proceedings


Reports and other scholarly work

**SARAH TAYLOR**

**Journal Articles**


**Book Chapters**

Clark, H.B., Taylor, S., and Deschenes, N. (in press). Transition to independence


Presentations/Conference proceedings


Taylor, S. (2008, March). Mental Health Service Act (MHSA), Prevention and Intervention Planning, Data Briefs for Yolo County, Woodside, CA. Invited to present local data to community stakeholders to inform the MHSA planning process. Presentation arranged through consulting agreement with the California Institute of Mental Health.


Taylor, S. (2007, October). A typology for supporting vulnerable youth in transition to

Oral paper presentation at the 3rd Conference on Emerging Adulthood.

challenges in an urban Independent Living Skills Program. Poster presentation at the annual
conference of the Council for Social Work Education, Chicago, IL.

discovery: Transition age youth conference, Long Beach, CA.

Schools of Law and Social Work. Invited to present at regional training events for legal and social
work professionals in ten California locations including Mendocino, Corte Madera, Belmont, Santa
Barbara, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Hayward, and Oakland. Presentations arranged through
consulting agreements with the Bay Area Academy, the California Administrative Office of the
Courts, Center for Families, Children and the Courts, and individual counties.

Book Reviews

frontier of adulthood: Theory, research, and public policy. [Review of the book]. Journal of
Sociology and Social Welfare.


maps for applying theoretical perspectives to practice. [Review of the book]. Research on Social
Work Practice, 18(4), 356.

Taylor, S. (2007). Mimi Abramovitz and Sandra Morgan. Taxes are a woman’s Issue: Reframing the

out of the foster care system? [Review of the book]. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare,
32(4), 183-185.

Reports and other scholarly work

Student Narratives on the Quest for Training in Qualitative Research. Unpublished manuscript
under review.


manuscript under review.


**EVAON WONG-KIM**

*Journal articles*


Wong-Kim, E. (2003). Evaluating a psychoeducational support group intervention in


Book chapters


Presentations/Conference proceedings


Book reviews


Reports and other scholarly work


**DIANNE RUSH WOODS**

**Journal articles**


**Books**


**Book chapters**


**Book reviews**


**Reports and other scholarly work**

Woods, D. Executive Summary of Needs Assessment Research presented to Albany
PAUL WRIGHT

Journal Articles


Book Reviews


**Accreditation Standard 7.2: The program seeks opportunities for innovation and provides leadership within the profession and the academic community.**

**Faculty Innovation and Leadership**

In keeping with the CSU East Bay Department of Social Work’s focus on advocacy, cultural competence, and urban underserved populations, the faculty actively seeks opportunities for innovation and provides leadership within the profession and the academic community. Our leadership efforts include participation in the academic and professional social work community, community-based service, and innovative scholarship. Not only does this participation present a model for students of engaged leadership, but we also make efforts to involve students in service and research that extends beyond CSU East Bay.

**Participation and Leadership in the CSU East Bay University Community**

- Dr. Woods is Vice Chair of the Academic Senate and also serves on the Executive Committee.
- Dr. Jones serves as the University Diversity and Equity Liaison Officer and is responsible for reviewing policy and procedure related to faculty hiring and retention.
- Mr. Hanson is the Chair of the Assessment Sub-committee of the University-wide Alcohol and Tobacco Advisory Council. Dr. Taylor is a member of the Council and the Assessment Sub-committee.

**Participation and Leadership in the Social Work Academic Community**

- Many of our faculty members serve as reviewers or editorial board members of social work journals, including *Social Work, The Journal of Sociology and Social Services*, and *The Journal of Adolescent Research*.
- In 2002, Dr. Chu was awarded the Frederick Milton Thrasher Award for “Outstanding Contributions to Scholarship, Service, and Innovations in Gang Research Issues” by the National Gang Crime Research Center in Peotone, Illinois.

**Participation in the Professional Social Work Community.**

- Dr. Woods is a Board Member of the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) and a member of the California Association of Dean and Directors.
- Many of our faculty are members of the National Association of Social Workers, and two attended Lobby Days in Sacramento this past year, along with many of our students.
- Ms. Countee is co-director for the Region C California Chapter of NASW.
- Dr. Taylor has been a member of the Transition-Age Youth sub-committee of the California Mental Health Director’s Association since 2004. She co-authored two chapters for the group’s *Transition Age Youth Resource Guide*.
- Ms. Ciriaco is a member of the California School Social Work Association (CASSWA).

**Community-Based Service.**

- Dr. Woods is a Co-Chair of Partners, a school-city-community organization in Emeryville, CA, where 80% of the high school students are from minority populations. Dr. Woods and others at Partners are working to build a community center. She also serves as Co-Secretary on the Executive Committee for the Emery Ed Fund, a school-community partnership to strengthen schools in Emeryville, California.
- Dr. Wright provides advising and consultation to Pivotal Point, a charter school in Oakland that works with foster children.
- Ms. Cline volunteers for World Affairs, an organization that encourages middle school and high school students to become involved in world affairs and engage in social action.
- Dr. Jones advises youth in North Richmond, an urban, low-income area. He is also involved with the Beyond Emancipation program at CSU East Bay, which places foster youth in dorms with students who help the youth to access jobs, housing, and educational opportunities. He also volunteers with a homeless organization in Berkeley.
- Dr. Wong-Kim has been an advocate for minority and low-income cancer patients, especially the Asian immigrant and Pacific Islander populations. She is the Past Chair of the Asian and Pacific Islander Breast Cancer Advisory Council for the Susan G. Komen for the Cure and Immediate Past President of the San Francisco Affiliate of the Susan G. Komen for the Cure. She has been a member of the Intercultural Cancer Council since 1995, a national advocacy organization for improving the cancer mortality rate of the underserved populations. She was also a member of the Minority Women’s Health Panel of Experts, Office of Women’s Health, DHHS from 2001 until 2007. She was named Community Director of the Asian American Network for Cancer Awareness, Research and Training project in Hawaii from October 2002 to May 2004.
- Ms. Countee has served as a volunteer and group facilitator for more than seven years at the Allen Temple Baptist Church, Heath & Social Services Ministry and as a volunteer and mandated reporting trainer for the Contra Costa County Child Abuse Prevention Council since 2008.
- Dr. Taylor is the founding member of East Bay Parents of Children with Special Needs and serves as the group’s organizer. The purpose of the group is to provide families of young children
with special needs opportunities to meet, socialize, and network in a casual atmosphere. Approximately 25 families have joined the group since September 2008.

**Innovative Scholarship**

- Dr. Wong-Kim is the Principal Investigator for the “Talking Cancer, Saving Lives” breast cancer training in Hong Kong in July 2005 funded by the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation. She is also the Co-Investigator for Chinese Breast Cancer Patients and Quality of Life Issues. The project is funded by the NCI SPN grant to gather pilot data in order to better understand quality of life issues confronting the Chinese immigrant women when diagnosed with breast cancer.

- In addition to his interest in curricular development in social work, Dr. Phan continues to explore pioneering work in the area of the adjustment and acculturation of Asian Americans with colleagues around the U.S. He is currently using Census data to examine gender differences in home ownership and other socioeconomic achievements of Vietnamese Americans. This research will reveal, for the first time, national data and information on this specific group of immigrants, and he is honored and excited to be a part of this collaboration.

- Dr. Taylor is working with a colleague at Arizona State University to develop an early intervention program for risky alcohol and other drug use among transition-age youth with serious mental illnesses. In fall 2008, they conducted a pilot study of community mental health workers in California and Arizona to explore opportunities and barriers for implementation of enhanced early intervention services. In January 2009, they presented a literature review on this topic in a roundtable session at the Society for Social Work and Research conference. They are currently preparing the literature review paper, describing the findings of the pilot studies, and a National Institute of Health grant proposal for submission in fall 2009.
ACCREDITATION STANDARD 8: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
Accreditation Standard 8.0: The program has an assessment plan and procedures for evaluating the outcome of each program objective. The plan specifies the measurement procedures and methods used to evaluate the outcome of each program objective.

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work has an assessment plan and procedures for evaluating the outcomes of each of our seven program objectives. Our plan specified the measurement procedures and methods used to evaluate student achievement of program objectives. The assessment plan in the Department of Social Work is a living, dynamic document that has been culminated from the input of everyone within the Department and the University. With the experiences of the initial accreditation process and being a part of the University-wide Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation process, the faculty in the Department of Social Work at CSU East Bay decided on an assessment plan that reflects the following guiding principles: 1) To produce useful data that would facilitate program renewal and fulfill the needs of CSWE and University (WASC) requirements, 2) To be feasible in implementation and analysis, and 3) To be sustainable over the long term, in view of staff availability, resources, and logistics.

With these principles in mind, the Master’s of Social Work program at California State University derives its seven core objectives from the program goals and mission. The seven objectives are:

- social work values and ethics;
- professional use of self;
- critical thinking;
- applying theory to practice;
- advocacy;
- diversity;
- and professional communication.

The seven objectives are conceptualized and operationalized for both the foundation year and the advanced year. In the foundation year, the indicators for these objectives are signified by wording such as “demonstrate a beginning understanding of” and the advanced year indicators are “the application of advanced skills.” These skills are measured through several instruments which are listed in Table 8.1, which outlines the relationship between the Department of Social Work’s seven core objectives and the direct and indirect measures. In this model, all objectives are assessed at every measurement point. The specific items on the measures that assess the objectives are noted parenthetically. Since many of these measures have been modified based on program feedback, instrument copies are attached at the end of this document. (Appendix A shows Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance, Appendix B the Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating, and Appendix C the Capstone Rating system.)

Measurement instruments and systems for implementing measures

To reflect the principles of usefulness, feasibility, and sustainability, the assessment plan aims to use measures that are strategically embedded in specific classes. These instruments combined direct and indirect measures which provide validity and reliability of these instruments. Furthermore, the information gained from these data helps improve the program in specific ways since they focus on student perception, field instructor ratings, and professors’ feedback of student performance. All five of the listed measures in Table 8.1 are designed to assess student outcomes on all seven objectives at the exit point. However, the Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance and Generalist Practice III Community Project Ratings are also used as gateway measures to capture student learning at the end of the foundation year. The program has two additional assessment components related to student performance, namely course assignments and an employer survey. As we are a relatively new social work department, the employer survey is still in development. All of the assessment measures are
Conducted annually. The alumnae/i survey is done both annually and every five years, so that information can be obtained about students’ long-term outcomes post-graduation. All of the measures are described below, noting the current stage of their development and contribution to the body of outcome information.

**Table 8.1: Program Objectives by Related Direct and Indirect Assessment Measures**

Instrument items designed to assess specific objectives are noted in parentheses. Copies of instruments can be found in Appendices A, B, & C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Direct Measures</th>
<th>Indirect Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (1)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (1,3,13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (I: 3)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-3,4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (2)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (11,12,15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (I: 8)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-5,6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (3)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (8,9,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (II: 3)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-7,8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Theory to Practice</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (4)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (2,7,10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (I: 4)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (5)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (4,5,18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (II: 4)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-9,10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (6)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (9,16,17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (III: 4)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-11,12; 28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Communication</td>
<td>Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance (7)</td>
<td>Pre-Post Survey (6,19,20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating* (III: 7)</td>
<td>Alumni Survey (27-13,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone Rating (Paper: 9 &amp; 10 poster)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Roman Numerals represent three distinct parts of the Generalist Practice III assignment. 
Table 8.1 highlights five primary outcome measures, including:

1) Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance,
2) Generalist Practice III Community Project Ratings,
3) Capstone Ratings,
4) Pre-Post Student Surveys, and
5) Alumni Surveys.

**Benchmarks for student achievement**

For each measure, we have established benchmarks, which are the scores above which we expect students to achieve. The benchmarks are set through discussion among the faculty about the appropriate level of student achievement in a given area of social work education. For example, for the field instructor ratings of student performance, we expect 90% of foundation year and 95% of advanced year students to obtain an overall score of 3 or better, which indicates that students demonstrate social work skills and knowledge consistently. For the capstone and community project assignments, the benchmark was developed to be consistent with the University standard of “B” level work being considered appropriate for graduate-level work. Thus the benchmark is that students will score 85% or better on each of these core assignments. The remaining sections describe our measures and benchmarks in greater detail.

**System for analysis and presentation of results**

The assessment committee develops and implements the assessment, analysis, and presentation plan. This plan is shared with all faculty members at the general faculty meeting. All faculty members are asked to contribute to the assessment measures based on the courses they are teaching. For example, at the end of the spring quarter, all Capstone instructors provide a summary score sheet to the assessment committee, so they may aggregate and analyze the results. These results are entered in MS Excel and presented to the faculty.

**Measures**

**Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance** instruments were revised since the original Self-Study. Now a four point Likert scale directly relates to each program objective. For each objective, the scale ratings read:

1 = Area of Future Growth
2 = Demonstrates Emerging Skill
3 = Demonstrates Skill Consistently
4 = Demonstrates Advanced Accomplishment

Field instructors rate students on objectives designed for foundation and advanced levels of practice. Very similar to the foundation and advanced indicators listed in table 1 for the program objectives, these field ratings are used for the outcome evaluation measure. For a copy of the foundation and advanced field objective, please see Appendix A.

This field measure represents feedback from field instructors regarding a student’s ability to earn credit for the field experience. The instrument also requests narrative comments related to each objective. Field instructors complete evaluations each quarter for students; however, for program assessment purposes, the final evaluation of the foundation and advanced years are used for the quantitative and qualitative analysis. Field Instructors review evaluations privately with students within the context of the supervisory relationship. Thus it is used for triple purposes of student evaluation;
student feedback and learning; and program assessment. This field measure is a well established portion of the MSW assessment plan. The instrument is available at the Department website in both MS Word and PDF formats to facilitate field instructor access. Because it is linked to student credit/non-credit evaluation, all students have this evaluation measure submitted before program completion. This is seen as a direct measure of student performance.

ESTABLISHED BENCHMARK = 90% of foundation students and 95% of advanced year students rated ≥ 3 (demonstrates skill consistently).

Generalist Practice III Community Project Ratings have only recently been developed at the suggestion of the University WASC committee, after seeing the positive results of the Capstone Project Evaluation. This measure was piloted in spring 2008 and is currently in use for spring 2009, with some revisions. The University’s enthusiasm about this form of direct-embedded course assessment translated into funding support to provide staff time to create the measure. Generalist Practice III is the final practice course taught in the foundation year. This course was selected as the point at which to identify a target assignment due to the integration and cumulative nature of the foundation year curriculum. Generalist Practice III, which adopts a macro focus, revolves around a community project assignment in three parts: 1) a community observation, 2) a community profile, and 3) a community problem analysis and intervention plan. An assessment rubric has been developed similar to the Capstone Rubric, guided by the program objectives. The experiences of piloting this measure in spring 2008 lead the faculty to further revise the rubric to make it more usable. The most current version of this rubric is attached for the Commission’s examination. It is intended to serve as a direct measure of student performance. In addition, the faculty decided that the original established benchmark of >92% was too high so it has re-set the benchmark to >85%, which is a solid B, according to program standards.

ESTABLISHED BENCHMARK = an aggregate calculation of percentage of possible points earned per program objective score will be ≥ 85%.

Capstone Ratings were designed and piloted in the spring of 2007. Originally, students selected from six capstone options, including the completion of: 1) a community project, 2) a program evaluation, 3) an integrative paper, 4) an advanced case study, 5) a single subject design, or 6) a secondary data analysis. All options must reflect the ability to integrate the MSW curriculum, address an oppressed population, be concentration-specific (that is, Community Mental Health or Children, Youth and Families), and have an applied component. Students write a Capstone Paper and present at a Capstone Poster Session that is open to the University and general community. Poster sessions are held on the Hayward Campus and on the Concord Campus. With the results and comments from students and faculty, the capstone was changed from students having to choose from six options to its present form, which requires students to pick a concentration-focused topic and then use the curricular knowledge they have learned in practice, policy, HBSE, research, and field as lenses through which to examine the issue. In addition, students are then asked to reflect on how the Department of Social Work objectives further impact the issue, and should be able to discuss these in the Integrative Paper and present at a poster session. The poster session is where the public is invited to come as potential social work consumers and critics of student’s culminating research projects. The instructor rating of the student’s work constitutes the direct measure of student learning of program objectives.

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work transitioned from a thesis requirement to a capstone project, based on feedback from students, faculty, and field instructors. Applying CSWE’s feedback model for continuous improvement, it seemed clear that several realities called for this change.
Faculty work-load amidst an expanding program, quarter system time limitations, and time restrictions of the students who elect to attend an evening-focused graduate program all spoke to the need for a more circumscribed culminating project. As described earlier, the need for a direct student performance assessment measure for the University’s WASC Accreditation process coincided with the rethinking of the capstone, and eventually led to the current Capstone Project Rubric. Having the experiences from several years’ worth of data, during fall 2008, the faculty met to discuss the matter and found that the original rubric was too time consuming and too complicated to implement. Hence, the faculty decided to revise the rubric to its present form. The Capstone Paper and poster session is assessed on ten categories, but the seven program objectives are strategically placed in the rubric that corresponds to a part of the capstone project. For each of these the relevant program objective is stated, to facilitate outcome evaluation and objective attainment analysis as a direct measure of student performance. The capstone rubric originally had a benchmark of $\leq 92\%$, and the faculty thought it was too high; therefore, it was re-set to $\leq 85\%$, a solid B, according to the Departmental standards.

**Established Benchmark** = an aggregate calculation of percentage of possible points earned per program objective score will be $\geq 85\%$.

**Pre-Post Student Surveys** are quite similar to those in the original *Self Study*. In addition to demographic information and open-ended questions, the survey presents 20 items that are self-report measures of skill attainment and preparedness. The attached version marks the targeted program objective beside each item (Appendix D). Each program objective is represented by three items that are used to calculate program outcomes and progress toward meeting the objectives. These are listed below in Table 8.2.

In addition to the program objectives, with the pre-post student surveys, we also take the opportunity to solicit student feedback about satisfaction with the program, subjective impressions of the learning experience, and other information that assists us in our continual efforts to strengthen the program.

**Table 8.2: Program Objectives by Relevant Pre-Post Student Survey Items**

A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Relevant Pre-Post Survey Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Theory to Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre- and post-surveys are now embedded in the Field Seminar Syllabi (SW 6020 Field Instruction I and SW 6532 Field Instruction VI). To facilitate administration, the surveys have been prepared for online completion using the Survey Monkey website, for use since the spring of 2008. Available data is presented in 8.1. This instrument is viewed as an indirect measure of student performance. Students choose a scaled response to the 20 skill attainment self-report items, based on a rating of strongly agree, moderately agree, neutral, moderately disagree, strongly disagree, or don’t
know. The benchmark is 80% of students will moderately or strongly agree at exit in all of the areas of the seven objectives.

ESTABLISHED BENCHMARK = 80% of students will moderately or strongly agree at exit (no benchmark is set for the pre-test).

Alumni Surveys have been shortened in 2008 to bolster data usefulness and increase ease of completion (Appendix E.a). These changes were based on informal feedback from alumni who completed the early versions of the survey and from the Assessment Committee’s investigation of the limited response rates. In addition, the Alumni Survey is now administered via email, using Survey Monkey, which allows maintenance of respondent anonymity and supports assessment sustainability. The Assessment Committee outlined a plan to complete the Alumni Survey at the 3-6 month post-graduation point at the end of December each year (Hayward students graduate in June, Concord students in September). This measure is well established in the Assessment Plan and serves as another indirect window into student performance and preparedness. It also collects demographic and employment information. Items 27 and 28 on the survey directly query about preparedness in relation to the seven MSW program objectives (as outlined in Table 8.2). There are three open-ended questions to assess most valuable and least valuable MSW education experiences and general comments. This Alumni Survey is sent only to graduates from the current year.

ESTABLISHED BENCHMARK = 80% will report being well or excellently prepared.

In March 2009, the Assessment Committee also sent a Comprehensive Alumni Survey (Appendix E.b) to all graduates upon the matriculation of the program’s fifth graduating class. By this time, alumni would have had sufficient time, if it has been their ambition, to seek state licensing (Licensed Clinical Social Worker) or other credentials (such as the School Social Work Credential). Questions to assess these accomplishments were added to the survey. This large scale Comprehensive Alumni Survey would then be conducted on five year cycles, the first of which was March 2009. The result from this survey is presented in 8.1.

Course Assignments have been improved since initial accreditation to improve connection to program objectives. Two assignments, the Generalist Practice III Community Project (Foundation Year) and the Capstone Project (Advanced Year), have been specifically outlined as direct measures of student performance toward program objectives. In addition, the Assessment Committee has reviewed all syllabi and created for each a matrix that illustrates each of the seven program objectives listed with the course assignments that support that objective. The matrix is listed in each syllabus. A sample is reproduced below from SW6030 Social Policy: History and Philosophy.

Sample Course Assignment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Video: The Orphan Train (including the Web). Discuss the concept of the “deserving poor” and its relation to social work values and ethics. Brainstorm approaches to serve social welfare clients in a reluctant welfare state. Learn social work values and ethics in different time periods and their impact on policy areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>Selection of out-group paper topic—identification of area of interest/passion. Develop understanding via readings &amp; discussions of relationship between own ethnic identity &amp; the historical reality of policy &amp; social welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Analysis and discussion of <em>The Orphan Train</em>. Understand the institutionalized factors in social welfare and the reluctant welfare state. Completion of “out-group” paper. Policy analysis project and completing synergistic analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Theory to Practice</td>
<td>Use of the historical framework to review policy issues in different time periods. Application of theories related to race, class, gender and poverty. Compare social welfare issues then and now. Analyze a selected policy or program by using the knowledge learned in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Understand and discuss the impact of policy on urban clients and communities. Brainstorm advocacy strategies for urban clients and communities in the policy arena. Send a letter related to a local advocacy issue to a newspaper or legislator. Participate in NASW Lobby Days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Weekly readings reflection. Understand how and why policy impacts certain populations (or out-groups). Analysis of the adequacy of diversity issues in policy fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Communication Skills</td>
<td>Student presentation and participation in class activities. Creative use of media (such as PowerPoint, board, music, role play, etc.) for presentations. Writing class assignments. Newspaper group assignment, Out-group paper, Policy analysis paper and presentation. Oral presentation of analysis paper and participation in Lobby Days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Assessment Committee reviewed all syllabi to examine the intersection of program objectives with major course assignments and assessments. This did not yield a student performance outcome, but rather a formative outcome that examines the program curriculum. Results from this review will be presented in 8.1, along with a discussion of its uses and implications.

**ESTABLISHED BENCHMARK = 100% of courses will address all program objectives.**

**Employer Surveys** is scheduled to be administered in 2010. The Assessment Committee has drafted surveys assessing employer views of alumni preparedness in relation to the seven core objectives. However, challenging questions regarding 1) how to determine which agencies to include while maintaining alumni confidentiality, and 2) whether respondents should be social work supervisors or human resource personnel, have arisen. The greatest concern is alumni confidentiality; in that, many agencies have employed only one program graduate, thus making the subject of the agency responses quite obvious. The Assessment Committee decided to research employer survey procedures in other institutions, to create a well planned instrument and process, before implementing this part of the Assessment Plan. The Committee views this as an indirect measure. If a feasible Employer Survey can be designed that protects alumni confidentiality, the Assessment Committee plans to implement this at 7 year intervals, staggering with the Comprehensive Alumni Survey.

**Procedures for Presenting Assessment Results.** The Assessment Committee routinely presents findings to the social work faculty at its monthly meetings and yearly retreats. Results are first reviewed by the Assessment Committee and discussed with the Chair and Field Director, if field related material.
The evolution of the Capstone Project offers a prime example of the feedback process and will be discussed in detail in 8.1, since the renewal process is one of the concerns of CSWE.

Following presentation to the general faculty, specific issues are referred to appropriate committees. For example, curriculum issues are sent to the Curriculum Committee and Sequence Committees when indicated. Needs for modification of the evaluation process are delegated to the Assessment Committee. Process and formative issues related to the Department functioning and the student body are reviewed by the Chair and relevant faculty staff, whether that be the Graduate Advisor, the Title IV-E Coordinator, and so on.

Accreditation Standard 8.1: The program implements its plan to evaluate the outcome of each program objective and shows evidence that the analysis is used continuously to affirm and improve the educational program.

General outcomes of assessment

Direct measures generally affirm that students are mastering the program objectives. For example, students in the field instructor ratings, here, students show strong achievement in the areas of social work values and ethics and advocacy. The post-test survey completed in spring 2008 shows that students rated themselves as knowledgeable and capable in each of the seven program objectives. In areas where students demonstrate difficulty in meeting the established benchmarks, efforts are being made to enhance their learning. Faculty members are actively addressing these areas for improvement, through ongoing discussion, adjustment of assignments where necessary, and exploring avenues for providing additional student support.

The following reports the findings of the evaluation outcome measures, in the order it was presented in previous sections.

Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance. In Table 8.3, Field Instructor Ratings of Student Performance are presented for foundation and advanced year students, based on final field evaluations from academic year 2007-2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Foundation Outcome* n=94</th>
<th>Advanced Outcome* n=62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entry Year 2007 Cohort</td>
<td>Entry Year 2006 Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Theory to Practice</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Communication</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Instrument rating scale: 1 = Area of Future Growth; 2 = Demonstrates Emerging Skill;
3 = Demonstrates Skill Consistently; 4 = Demonstrates Advanced Accomplishment

The established benchmark for this measure was 90% of foundation year and 95% of advanced year students would be rated ≥ 3 (demonstrates skill consistently). One should keep in mind that the foundation and advanced year criterion are designed on a scaffold, increasing the level of sophistication. Foundation year students met the benchmark in the objectives of values and ethics, professional use of self, critical thinking, and advocacy. The objectives diversity, professional communication, and applying theory to practice were almost achieved at 89 and 88%. This is good news for us when compared to the prior year’s results where advocacy was at 84.5%, application of theory to practice was 84.5%, professional use of self was 79.3%, and communication was 79.3%. Hence, curricular changes in field in these areas were effective.

Advanced year students scored at or well above the benchmark on all seven program objectives. Last year’s advanced outcome score(s) were also well above the established benchmark, so field continues to be a strong component of the MSW program. The findings have been presented to the faculty and curriculum committees. The advanced year results are particularly encouraging in relation to assessment of applied professional social work skills.

Generalist Practice III Community Project Ratings. The community project in SW6013 was piloted in spring 2008. Similar to the Capstone rating, it was intended as a direct measure of students learning in the seven core program objectives. Table 8.4 outlines student achievement of these program objectives during spring 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Community Project Items</th>
<th>% of students scored ≥92%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Items 1, 12, 13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>Items 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Theory to Practice</td>
<td>Items 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Items 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Items 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Communication</td>
<td>Items 1, 12, 13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the capstone ratings discussed below, the spring 2008 pilot of the community project ratings was not uniformly understood and followed by faculty teaching these sections. Hence, it was reflected in the low scores. There were several reasons for this. First, it was the first time that the ratings were used. Second, all faculty members teaching these sections were new faculty to these classes, including community faculty members who did not necessarily understand the intent of these rating forms, despite trainings on how to use the rating. Third, although they were trained on how to use the rating forms, much more could have been done to ensure uniformity of the assignments. Forth, the rating form itself was complicated with too many items for each measure that did not get at the heart of what was being measured. Hence, the faculty met during fall 2008 and simplified the rating rubric to make it more user-friendly and strategically placed the seven objectives into the community project assignment in addition to delineate more clearly what the seven objectives look like within the
assignment. Furthermore, because of the importance of this gateway measure, key faculty members are now assigned to teach these sections of this class and regularly meet to ensure uniformity. Another equally important change is the fact that the faculty realized that $\geq 92\%$ is a very high expectation and that since not every student is an A student, it was decided to lower the benchmark to $\geq 85\%$, which is a solid B, according to Departmental standards.

**Capstone Ratings.** This discussion of the piloted Capstone Project Ratings will serve as both a direct outcome measure and as an example of using programmatic feedback to improve the program. The description will be organized into six sections: 1) a brief historical summary, 2) target improvements, 3) changes implemented, 4) learning artifacts, 5) assessments methods, and 6) the impact on learning.

1) **Historical Summary. 2005.** The first CSU East Bay MSW graduating class (spring 2005) completed Departmental theses. Qualitatively, faculty reported disappointment in the thesis process and outcomes, largely due to limited time within one quarter (10 weeks) to provide adequate thesis supervision. Upon exploring culminating experience requirements of neighboring MSW programs and discussing program needs, faculty decided to replace the departmental thesis with a capstone project.

2006. To fulfill the capstone requirement, the second graduating class (spring 2006) was given the option to complete a literature review, case study, single subject design, secondary data analysis, program evaluation, or community project. Faculty continued to feel disappointment with the outcomes reporting that 1) many students elected to do a literature review and in retrospect, this did not seem representative of MSW level training; and 2) the results did not reflect the program commitment to advocacy and social change.

2007-present. Several revisions have been made to further improve the efficacy of the Capstone Rating. Please see below changes made and explanation of the current form of the Capstone Rating.

2) **Target Improvements.** From students, faculty wanted to see evidence of:
   a. concentration-based curriculum integration,
   b. mastery of the core seven objectives,
   c. commitment to social justice and change in relation to work with oppressed groups, and
   d. application of skills and findings to a case, agency, or community setting.

In addition, ancillary objectives included:
   a. the design of an assessment tool for the capstone projects to facilitate quantitative comparisons across years;
   b. the presentation of clear information to students to reduce the unnecessary anxiety and uncertainty about the capstone, as well as foster enthusiasm about the task; and
   c. increasing faculty consistency around implementation and assessment of the capstone.

3) **Changes Implemented.** The following changes were implemented for the spring 2007 and spring 2008 cohorts:
   a. **Capstone Integrative Project Guide.** The faculty developed a step-by-step guide that spells out the objectives, expectations and the six format options (Community Practice Project, Integrative Paper, Program Evaluation, Advanced Case Study, Single Subject Design, or Secondary Data Analysis). The Literature Review option was eliminated, and instead, each format required a literature review section. This guide was posted on the program website. The project requirements were expanded to include curriculum integration, an applied aspect, and a poster session.
   b. **Capstone Integrative Project Power Point.** The faculty created a power-point to introduce the students to the capstone project. This was shared and discussed with the students at their fall
2006 orientation. It was been included in the first year *Introduction to Social Work Research* class to reduce student anxiety about the second year expectations. The power point is posted on the program website.

c. *Integrative Seminar Capstone Syllabus.* Faculty designed a new capstone syllabus to specifically address the new requirements. This is also posted on the website.

d. *Poster Sessions.* Open poster sessions were held on both the Hayward and Concord campuses.

4) **Learning Artifacts.** The capstone paper/project and the poster sessions served as the direct artifacts of learning. Posters could either be physical, traditional style presentations, or electronic.

5) **Assessment Methods.**

a. *Expanded Capstone Paper Grading Rubric.* Faculty piloted a grading rubric at the Concord Campus program where the largest number of students worked with one faculty member. This rubric takes into consideration specific capstone requirements, core program objectives, the importance of curriculum integration, and the contribution to social work (advocacy and working with oppressed populations). These sheets are completed and given to the student.

b. *Expanded Capstone Poster Session Grading Rubric.* Since the poster session was an added component to the capstone experience, a separate rubric was created, appropriate to a presentation. Again this was piloted in Concord. The completed rubric is given to the student.

c. *Capstone Grading Summary Sheet.* A summary sheet was formatted so faculty could track their grade point breakdowns.

6) **Impact on Learning/ Outcomes.**

*Capstone Paper/Project.* We used the two years’ worth of data to assess the impact of learning in the capstone paper/project. The pilot of one cohort (Concord campus) in the spring 2007 resulted in that particular faculty member and students reported greater satisfaction with the capstone process and outcomes for that year. However, in the spring 2008 implementation of these changes, faculty and students were still dissatisfied with the process and product. Table 8.5 presents the data of these two cohorts. The following narrative will discuss implications and changes made to the capstone ratings and plans for improvement during spring 2009.

**Table 8.5: Capstone Project/Paper Ratings Outcomes by Program Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Capstone Project/Paper Items</th>
<th>Outcome/ % students &gt;92% Spring 2007 pilot Concord cohort (N=16)</th>
<th>Outcome/ % students &gt;92% Spring 2008 cohort (N=73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>Items 3, 4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>Items 3, 4, 5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Items 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Theory to Practice</td>
<td>Items 3, 8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Items 3, 8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Items 3, 9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Communication</td>
<td>Items 1, 6, 7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the reader can see in the above table, the student achievement of program objectives in the spring 2008 capstone were less than satisfactory, especially when compared to the Spring 2007 cohort. While the experiences of one faculty member in Concord in spring 2007 with 16 students were overwhelmingly positive (over 90% of students met the 92% benchmark), the experiences of the six faculty in six sections in spring 2008 was not as positive in regard to the achievement of these objectives. Across the seven program objectives, students’ achievement ranged from 43% (critical thinking; N=73) to 57% (professional communication). Subsequent examination of the capstone rating rubric revealed methodological deficiencies regarding unclear expectations on program objectives, coupled with the variance in grading styles, the complexities of the three-page rubric, and the strict requirement of adherence to the point system in the rubric’s design that made it difficult for the raters to use it uniformly. In addition, faculty and students expressed difficulty in managing a six-option capstone class in a 10-week quarter.

Hence, further changes to the capstone seminar and the capstone requirements as well as the rubric were required. While much of the description of the capstone seminar is the same, instead of having six options, students are now required to pick a concentration-focused topic/issue/program, do an extensive literature review on the topic, design an intervention using empirically-tested best practices, use these “solutions” to advocate for changes at a micro, mezzo, and/or macro level. In doing so, students are required to integrate curricular knowledge learned in the program and discuss how the seven core program objectives impact the issue/topic. The faculty also revised the rating rubric by more clearly delineating the seven objectives and strategically placed them into the assignment and eliminated repeated and confusing measures.

Furthermore, faculty is committed to explaining more clearly to students on how to integrate the seven objectives into a topical research/advocacy paper such as the Integrative Paper. A copy of the current rubric is in Appendix C. Hence, through the capstone, the faculty has learned several valuable lessons and continuously observed and instituted changes to improve the program. With the implementation of the revised rubric in spring 2009, the faculty knows that there will also be further lessons learned and improvements to be made. The faculty looks forward to these challenges.

**Pre-Post Student Surveys.** For the student cohort that graduated in 2008 (entered the program in 2006), the post-test resulted in scores ranging from 90%-100% in all objectives, meeting the benchmark of 80%.

**Table 8.6: Pre- and Post- Survey Results for 2006-2008 Student Cohort**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Pre-test Fall 2006 (%)</th>
<th>Post-test Spring 2008 (% Moderately/Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>Relevant Items on Spring 2008 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values and ethics</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1, 3, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional use of self</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>11, 12, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>8, 9, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying theory to practice</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>16, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shading indicates 80% benchmark met
Based on the 46 respondents, the benchmark of 80% was easily met on all objectives for the 2008 graduating cohort. The results of the pre-test of the same cohort are presented for comparison of their learning. The post-test is based on 46 responses out of 86 graduated students, representing a response rate of 53%. While an over 50% response rate is generally considered good, the Assessment Committee is committed to improving the response rate. The Committee also recognizes that this sample of respondents may also be skewed toward the Title IV-E Child Welfare Stipend recipients, because they are legally required to maintain contact with the IV-E Coordinator and thus tend to have current emails on file with the department.

The pre-test results for the students who entered the program in 2008 are listed in Table 8.7.

Table 8.7: Pre-Test Results for fall 2008 Student Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Fall 2008 Pre-Test (%Moderately or Strongly Agree)</th>
<th>Relevant Items on Fall 2008 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values and ethics</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1, 3, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional use of self</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11, 12, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8, 9, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying theory to practice</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>2, 7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most program objectives at student entry are well below the exit benchmark of 80%, most notably, that of applying theory to practice, which is good because that is why students come to a program such as CSU East Bay to learn these skills. However, professional use of self and social work values and ethics are rated rather high (78% and 63%, respectively) for beginning students, yet faculty knows a large learning curve exists during the foundation year on both of these items. One interpretation of this outcome reflects the possibility that incoming students do not really grasp the concept that they are being asked to rate, and thus cannot provide an accurate assessment. This pattern has been observed with previous cohorts as well; for example, in 2007, the students rated themselves at 83% in professional use of self and 75% in values and ethics. The Assessment Committee is looking this year to explore whether it would be more effective to eliminate the pre-test for this reason, and instead, include a retrospective self-skill level assessment at program exit, along with the current exit-skill level survey. This methodology would enable the student to self-reflect on skills, using terminology whose meaning has now been learned in the MSW curriculum. Potentially, this format may more accurately reflect changes in perceived skill attainment. This retrospective self-skill level assessment will be instituted during spring 2010.

Comprehensive Five Year Alumni Surveys. This section will present the results of the first Comprehensive Five Year Alumni Survey. This survey is part of our assessment plan and was launched March 2009 through Survey Monkey. Since we have reported regular alumni surveys to the Commission previously, we will focus this section only on this comprehensive survey. This survey was sent to all 283 graduates from our program since its inception in 2004-present. The result is based on 70 responses, representing 25% response rate.
• Ethnicity: 22% African American; 14% Asian; 9% Latino; 34% White; 12% mixed; 8% other
• Sexual Orientation: 97% heterosexual; 2% gay/lesbian; 1% other
• Language: 75% monolingual; 22% bilingual; 3% multilingual

Some of these outcomes were encouraging, including the fact that:

• 2% earn $100,000.00 or more whereas before, no one was making this amount;
• 4% earn between $80,000-99,000 whereas before, only 1% was making this amount;
• 44% earn $60,000-79,999 whereas before, only 8% made this amount;
• 6% went on to further education since the MSW degree
• 87% have full-time jobs; with only 8% unemployed
• 93% are employed in a social work position; 94% are in either public or private agency; (34% in child protective services, 4% community based family services, 17% in community mental health, 24% in medical social work, 21% in other social work agencies).
• 87% in direct service; 3% are in management and supervision; and 10% are classified as “other.”
• 84% plan on pursuing licensure and 3% have taken the exam. Of those who took the exam, 22% passed it the first time; 78% did not.

When asked if their education at CSU East Bay prepared them for their current job, 71% felt it did “strongly”, while 24% chose “somewhat.” Six percent reported that they did not get much from their MSW education.

Results from question 27, which asks alumni to rate preparedness on 14 items designed to assess the seven core program objectives are presented below. Two items were designed to be collapsed into a core objective measure. Collapsed data into the seven core objectives measures is in Table 8.8.

### Table 8.8: 2009 Comprehensive Five-Year Alumni Survey Outcomes by Program Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Objective</th>
<th>Outcome/ % reported well or excellently prepared</th>
<th>Outcome/ % reported adequately, well or excellently prepared</th>
<th>Alumni Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SW Values &amp; Ethics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Items 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Items 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Items 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Theory to Practice</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Items 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Items 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Items 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Items 13, 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The benchmark of 80% of respondents reporting being well or excellently prepared was met in relation to the diversity objective, but not in the other six areas. Three points must be kept in mind when examining these results.
First, the Likert Scale presented a choice of the following: unprepared, poorly prepared, adequately prepared, well prepared, and excellently prepared. The outcomes presented above do not include those alumni who viewed that the program adequately prepared them on the objectives. If these are included, the benchmark is met on all objectives as can be seen in Table 8.9 in the third column.

Second, since this is the comprehensive 5 year alumni survey, time has elapsed between the time they graduated and now. Their views on these objectives may have changed, so it may not be the most accurate measure on the program objectives. In addition, of 283 alumni, only 70 responded. Hence, this response rate is 25%, which could be much improved. The faculty recognizes that a more current and updated email system of all alumni must be kept so that the connection is stronger. The Assessment Committee has suggested that an exit contact information update form be integrated into all field seminars, to be completed prior to graduation. Students also need to be educated about the importance of participating in such data collection efforts.

Finally, it appears that more accurate information may be available from the individual items rather than the collapsed objective scores, indicating that the two items used for each score may be assessing two very divergent aspects of the objective. For this reason the item results are listed below in Table 8.9.

Table 8.9: 2009 Comprehensive Five Year Alumni Survey Outcomes for Question 27, Separate Items; n = 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Target Objective</th>
<th>Collapsed Objective Percentage</th>
<th>Outcome/ % reported well or excellently prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Integrate evidenced-based interventions across the practice</td>
<td>Application of theory to practice</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuum (micro to macro) level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Complete a strength-based biopsychosocial-spiritual assessment</td>
<td>Application of theory to practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Understand legal regulations &amp; standards of practice</td>
<td>SW values &amp; ethics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Apply social work values and ethics</td>
<td>SW values &amp; ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Effectively use self as a social work tool</td>
<td>Use of Self</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Identify &amp; modify personal &amp; professional barriers to effective</td>
<td>Use of Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Critically analyze challenges from an ecological perspective</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Analyze the impact of practice &amp; policies on individuals &amp;</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Advocate for social justice for disenfranchised populations</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Influence change through advocacy &amp; empowerment</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assignment</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Objective Diversity</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Understand mechanisms of discrimination &amp; oppression</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Work from a culturally competent perspective</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Communicate with SW professionals</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Write at a professional MSW level</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the objective diversity met the benchmark, professional use of self, critical thinking, and communication, and advocacy range from 70-78%. Two of the most concerning results are social work values and ethics (42%) and application of theory to practice (64%). If one examines the individual items that make-up the collapsed scores, there is wide variations between the two questions that composed the objective. In relation to values and ethics, alumni are asked how well the Department of Social Work prepared them for professional practice in the following areas:

- Understand legal regulations and standards of practice (41% said well or excellently)
- Apply social work values and ethics (85% said well or excellently).

It should be noted that the first part, “understand legal regulations and standards of practice” was identified by the faculty as a problem (from previous alumni survey) and a class on legal issues in social work practice was instituted as an elective in winter 2008. While many in the graduating class of might have benefited from that class, the other alums would not have had access to it. Hence, it is understandable that it is rated well-below the benchmark. Having said that, the faculty recognizes that more needs to be done to help students become more competent in issues regarding legal regulations and standards of practice. In fact, content related to child welfare competencies and community mental health are being identified and strategically inserted into foundation and concentration courses at this moment.

The second area that warrants concern is the application from theory to practice because there are also wide variations between the two measures. The first measure, “integrate evidence-based interventions across the practice continuum (micro to macro) level, is at 49%. The second, “complete a strengths-based biopsychosocial-spiritual assessment”, is at 76%. The faculty met and decided that more evidence-based information should be infused into the curriculum. This is being done by the Curriculum Committee as the faculty prepares for re-accreditation but also is continually assessing the syllabi, by bringing in the most recent research article(s) and information, as well as speakers and experts in the field. In addition, the reader will notice that in most of the syllabi, the assignments require students to research and integrate best-practices that are based on updated empirical research. A few examples of these practices are included in SW6011 Generalist Practice I and SW6012 Generalist Practice II.

It should be noted that while these scores are relatively low, the objective professional communication actually improved from 68% (2008) to 75% now. At any rate, these low scores are a reminder to the faculty that increased efforts are needed to ensure and assure that students are taught and maintain these important program objectives.

Course Assignments Review. The syllabi review that resulted in a matrix being included in all syllabi is not duplicated here due to the unwieldy nature. Informal feedback from faculty has indicated that it provides an efficient mechanism to double-check that all program objectives are targeted. When discussion raised the issue of possible redundancy of the matrix in the syllabi, and possible removal, the result was one of clear protest from faculty. Therefore, the matrix remains in the syllabi.
As described above, the Assessment Committee also created a series of charts intended to be a living document and Departmental tool, examining the intersection of program objectives with major course assignments and assessments. A major course assignment or assessment is defined as any task that receives points toward the course grade, other than participation/attendance. This document, titled *Intersection of Program Objectives with Major Course Assignments and Assessments*, depicts a table for every course, lists the major assignments/assessments, and lists the target objectives for each. A sample chart for SW 6000 Human Behavior and the Social Environment I is copied below. The complete document is attached in Appendix F.

**Sample Intersection of Program Objectives with Major Course Assignment Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation &amp; Reflection (Infancy to Adolescence)</td>
<td>A, CT, D, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Bibliography of Human Development Literature</td>
<td>C, CT, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking, Integrative Paper</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>AP, C, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>AP, C, CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A=Advocacy, AP=Application of Theory to Practice, C= Communication, CT= Critical Thinking, D=Diversity, PS=Professional Use of Self, VE=Social Work Values and Ethics, All=All 7 Objectives

The document design is such that the Department can easily:

1) Replace assignments/assessments as syllabi are modified,
2) Check to be sure that all objectives are being touched upon in all courses, and
3) Conveniently see an overview of the curriculum assignments/assessments to prevent redundancy and to increase diversity of assignment/assessment methods.

While an excellent tool for full-time faculty, it also creates a helpful overview for part-time instructors to see the relationship of their course to other courses in the curriculum. In addition, this graphic emphasizes attention to the seven program goals for all faculty, full and part-time, in the service of unified curriculum delivery.

The syllabi survey indicates that program objectives are consistently being targeted via course assignments and assessments. No course was identified that failed to address each objective; thus, the established benchmark was met. The document has been submitted to faculty for review and updated. Curriculum issues may be highlighted and create a strong foundation for discussion. Points of attention will be referred to the Curriculum Committee and the appropriate Sequence Committees. For example, examining the charts for SW 6500 and SW 6505 (Advanced Micro Practice for CYF and CMH respectively), one could explore whether the assignments between these two courses should reflect greater parity. On the other hand, the lack of redundancy in assignments, overall, appears commendable.

**Program Improvement**
Data from the Community Project assignment, the Capstone experiences, and alumni surveys show us that continuous dedication and improvements need to be made. One of the concerns that faculty identified for several years now is in the Communication program objective, which has been noted as one area of concern particularly in the writing skills of a segment of our students, and during Fall 2008, the faculty formulated a plan to complete writing assessments at initial student orientation. The assessment is evaluated by campus writing support staff, who then identifies students needing remedial help. Furthermore, in SW6011 Generalist Practice I, the first course all students have to take, the faculty identifies students needing extra help in writing also referring them to the Chair, who then asks students to register for a writing class. Funding for social work writing tutors was obtained, and this service is offered to those students in addition to offering an Academic and Technical Writing for a Social Workers course on campus. Initial course evaluation is positive and is on-going. Since the implementation of this writing course, faculty has reported improvements in the students of concern and this is encouraging news. We plan to keep this writing class as a part of the assistance provided students who need this help.

In relation to the pre- and post-test surveys, the Assessment Committee has decided to eliminate the pre-survey and replace it with the exit survey which includes a retrospective self-rating of entry level skills, as well as the current exit level competency. This change will take effect during the end of spring 2010.

In addition to using the assessment findings to strengthen the program’s ability to help students meet the seven objectives, efforts are also being made to address other areas of student feedback. For example, in response to the Alumni Survey results in relation to legal and ethical preparation, the department offered an elective, *Legal Issues in Social Work*, in the winter of 2008 and will continue to offer this class on an ongoing basis. The integration of further relevant material into required advanced classes is ongoing, such as the inclusion of child welfare and community mental health competencies into appropriate concentrations. The department is also organizing a working group of alumni to form an Alumni Organization, to help shed clearer light on findings, and plan desired alumni activities and communications.

The Assessment Committee also suggested that the Department Chair establish an annual "Brief Report to the Chair" to be submitted by all Curriculum Sequence Chairs to support a feedback cycle and document accomplishments, changes, and concerns.

We are pleased to have had the opportunity to implement other significant program changes based on feedback since the last communication with CSWE. These changes include:

1) Increased attention to the Concord program, including:
   a. Support for the Concord MSW Student Association, *Advocacy in Action*, in direct response to their requests for such intervention;
   b. Instituting a Departmental newsletter specifically for the Concord program, since the needs, issues, staff, and students reflect differences from the Hayward campus; and
   c. Orientations, trainings, and town hall meetings held specifically for the Concord Campus;

2) Increased frequency of the advanced field seminar to weekly rather than biweekly meetings;

3) An extended Field Orientation schedule for foundation year students, making use of the delayed placement start-up schedule to increase field readiness (covers items such as mandated reporting, use of supervision, sexual harassment, writing a learning agreement, writing process recordings, safety and self care, and so on);
4) Addition of CalSWEC II Community Mental Health funding stipends for full-time advanced year students, with ancillary support and an adjunctive seminar;
5) Increased use of the Department Website to post forms, schedules, and general information to improve communication;
6) Quarterly report and peer evaluation of all part-time faculty. Yearly report of all full-time staff and faculty related to teaching.
7) Quarterly town hall meetings of all students and faculty to receive program feedback, on both campuses.
8) Quarterly Departmental Newsletter to all alums, students, faculty, and community agency to inform/receive news and feedback.

The CSU East Bay Department of Social Work remains committed to using assessment data and feedback to strengthen the curriculum and program outcomes. In summary, plans are in place to:

1. Implement and continue to monitor and assess the utility of the Capstone Grading Rubric for all advanced year students,
2. Continue to monitor and assess the utility of the Generalist Practice III Community Project Grading Rubric for all foundation year students,
3. Continue a foundation year Academic and Technical Writing for Social Workers course in 2009-2010,
4. Continue the use of the Course Syllabi Matrix system to monitor objective compliance for all courses and sections.

The outcomes from the above plans and the well-established measures will continue to direct program improvement and renewal.
Note: The final evaluation is intended to provide an opportunity for discussing the student’s acquisition of skills, knowledge, and professional attitudes and behaviors. This discussion should occur in a meeting scheduled specifically for this purpose and should include:

- the student’s Evaluation of Field Placement (Appendix W) and the student’s Evaluation of Field Liaison (Appendix X)
- as well as the field instructor’s final evaluation (Appendix V) assessment of the student’s progress

In preparing for this discussion, the Field Instructor and student should utilize a variety of resources including the learning agreement, the list of minimum competencies and examples of the student’s work such as process recordings, charting and/or reports. A discussion of the learning environment is also useful at this time, including the effectiveness of the relationship between the student and the Field Instructor as it relates to teaching and learning activities.

Section I: Field Instructor’s Rating Assessment

Instructions: Using a rating scale of 1-4, the Field Instructor is to assess student's progress in the acquisition of skills, knowledge, and professional attitudes and behaviors acquired.

Section II: Field Instructor's Assessment of Student’s Progress

Instructions: Referring to the completed learning agreement and field objectives, the Field Instructor is to prepare written comments regarding the student’s progress in acquiring skills, knowledge and professional attitudes and behaviors for each field objective. A minimum of one paragraph is suggested for each field objective. There is also a brief rating scale to help the instructor track progress over the three quarters. Comments and ratings should be discussed with the student.

Section IV: Grade Recommendation and Signature Page

Attach signed signature/grade recommendation to final evaluation.
FIELD INSTRUCTOR

FINAL EVALUATION

___________________________________________________

Name of Student

1ST YEAR MSW [ ]

2ND YEAR MSW [ ]

TITLE IV-E [ ]

CALSWEC II MH [ ]

CYF [ ]

CMH [ ]

PLACEMENT BEGINNING DATE:________________ ENDING:________________

___________________________________________________

NAME OF AGENCY:_____________________________________________________

AGENCY ADDRESS:_____________________________________________________

PHONE:_________________EMAIL:_______________________________________

FIELD LIAISON:_______________________________________________________

FIELD INSTRUCTOR:___________________________________________________

5/17/07
Section I:  Field Instructor's Rating of Progress  

Part A: Rating Scale  
1= Area of Future Growth  
2= Demonstrates Emerging Skill  
3= Demonstrates Skill Consistently  
4= Demonstrates Advanced Accomplishment

Please use this table only for Foundation Year Students

Foundation Core Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VALUES &amp; ETHICS:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a beginning understanding of and a commitment to uphold the core values, ethical principles and ethical standards of the social work profession as codified in the NASW Code of Ethics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFESSIONAL USE OF SELF:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a beginning understanding of social work behavior. This includes abilities such as: distinguishing professional versus personal roles; the elevation of service to others above self interest; awareness of personal strengths and limitations; flexibility in assuming social work roles to cope with change; using supervision effectively; self-reflection; respecting standards of timeliness; appropriate dress and professional boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICAL THINKING:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows an ability to apply early critical thinking skills to challenges and issues that arise in field placement. This includes: understanding the differences between verifiable facts and value claims; critical examination of arguments and evidence; an openness to examine one’s own practice using research to inform practice; and a commitment to providing evidence-based practice when possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLYING THEORY TO PRACTICE:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shows a basic ability to apply community-based generalist practice perspectives to field situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADVOCACY:
Begins to advocate for underserved and disenfranchised clients or groups in the assigned field placements.

DIVERSITY:
Approaches fieldwork with an awareness of his or her personal cultural values and biases; shows awareness to self-reflection; and displays an interest in expanding culturally competent practice skills.

COMMUNICATION:
Demonstrates an ability to respectfully form professional relationships with ability to communicate to clients, groups and staff in the field practicum, as well as maintain basic documentation requirements of the agency.

Total for Final Evaluation (add all ratings)
Section I: Field Instructor's Rating of Progress

Part A: Rating Scale
1= Area of Future Growth
2= Demonstrates Emerging Skill
3= Demonstrates Skill Consistently
4= Demonstrates Advanced Accomplishment

Please use this table only for Advanced Year Students

Advanced Core Objectives

VALUES & ETHICS:
Demonstrates a firm understanding of and a commitment to uphold the core values, ethical principles and ethical standards of the social work profession as codified in the NASW Code of Ethics.

PROFESSIONAL USE OF SELF:
Conducts self with increased autonomy in the professional social work role in the placement setting. This includes abilities such as: understanding personal values and biases and knowing their impact on clients; a commitment to the ongoing development of professional knowledge and skills, and the use of self effectively in the chosen area of concentration.

CRITICAL THINKING:
Demonstrates the ability to use critical thinking skills in the field setting through successful analysis and synthesis of information, application of evidence-based practice, and a willingness to modify plans of intervention accordingly.

APPLYING THEORY TO PRACTICE:
Demonstrates an ability to integrate relevant theoretical materials into field experiences in the student’s area of concentration. This includes the ability to articulate such theories with field instructors, field staff and/or intervention teams.
ADVOCACY:
Demonstrates a commitment to and the ability to advocate for clients, groups and/or communities in increasingly complex situations, specific to the student’s area of concentration.

DIVERSITY:
Conducts self with self-awareness and shows increased knowledge of diverse populations with the commitment to provide culturally competent service and advocacy.

COMMUNICATION:
Demonstrates a professional level of written and oral communication skills relevant to the concentration and shows the ability to communicate across diverse client systems.

TOTAL for Final Evaluation (add all ratings)
Sections II: Field Instructor's Assessment of Student's Progress

1) **VALUES AND ETHICS**

   [ ] **Foundation Year**: Demonstrates a beginning understanding of and a commitment to uphold the core values, ethical principles and ethical standards of the social work profession as codified in the *NASW Code of Ethics*.

   [ ] **Advanced Year**: Demonstrates a firm understanding of and a commitment to uphold the core values, ethical principles and ethical standards of the social work profession as codified in the *NASW Code of Ethics*.

Field Instructor’s Summary/Comments:

2) **PROFESSIONAL USE OF SELF**

   [ ] **Foundation Year**: Demonstrates a beginning understanding of social work behavior. This includes abilities such as: distinguishing professional versus personal roles; the elevation of service to others above self interest; awareness of personal strengths and limitations; flexibility in assuming social work roles to cope with change; using supervision effectively; self-reflection; respecting standards of timeliness; appropriate dress and professional boundaries.

   [ ] **Advanced Year**: Ability to conduct self with increased autonomy in the professional social work role in the placement setting. This includes abilities such as: understanding personal values and biases and knowing their impact on clients; a commitment to the ongoing development of professional knowledge and skills, and the use of self effectively in the chosen area of concentration.

Field Instructor’s Summary/Comments:
3) **CRITICAL THINKING**

[ ] **Foundation Year**: Student shows an ability to apply early critical thinking skills to challenges and issues that arise in field placement. This includes: understanding the differences between verifiable facts and value claims; critical examination of arguments and evidence; an openness to examine one’s own practice using research to inform practice; and a commitment to providing evidence-based practice when possible.

[ ] **Advanced Year**: Demonstrates the ability to use critical thinking skills in the field setting through successful analysis and synthesis of information, application of evidenced-based practice, and a willingness to modify plans of intervention accordingly.

Field Instructor’s Summary/Comments:

4) **APPLYING THEORY TO PRACTICE**

[ ] **Foundation Year**: Student shows a basic ability to apply community-based, generalist practice perspectives to field situations.

[ ] **Advanced Year**: Demonstrates an ability to integrate relevant theoretical materials into field experiences in the student’s area of concentration. This includes the ability to articulate such theories with field instructors, field staff and/or intervention teams.

Field Instructor’s Summary/Comments:

5) **ADVOCACY**

[ ] **Foundation Year**: Begins to advocate for underserved and disenfranchised clients or groups in the assigned field placements.
[ ] Advanced Year: Demonstrates a commitment to and the ability to advocate for clients, groups, and/or communities in increasingly complex situations, specific to the student’s area of concentration.

Field Instructor's Summary/Comments:

6) **DIVERSITY**

[ ] Foundation Year: Approaches fieldwork with an awareness of his or her personal cultural values and biases; an awareness to self-reflection; and displays an interest in expanding culturally competent practice skills.

[ ] Advanced Year: Conducts self with self-awareness and shows increased knowledge of diverse populations with the commitment to provide culturally competent service and advocacy.

Field Instructor's Summary/Comments:

7) **COMMUNICATION**

[ ] Foundation Year: Demonstrates an ability to respectfully form professional relationships with ability to communicate to clients, groups and staff in the field practicum, as well as maintain basic documentation requirements of the agency.

[ ] Advanced Year: Demonstrates a professional level of written and oral communication skills relevant to the concentration and shows the ability to communicate across diverse client systems.

Field Instructor’s Summary/Comments:
Section IV: Grade Recommendation and Signature Page

Field Instructor’s Grade Recommendation

**Note:** Two options are available for a grade recommendation: satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Grade recommendations are for student’s overall learning and performance. If there are specific areas of learning and/or performance which are marginal (i.e. neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory, but needing substantial improvement), these areas should be identified and discussed with whom? in an accompanying narrative which describes the problem(s) as well as what the student needs to do to bring his/her performance up to a satisfactory level. **Circle one.**

**Satisfactory**

Note: A satisfactory grade recommendation indicates that the student’s overall learning and performance is proceeding at an appropriate rate without apparent problems.

**OR**

**Unsatisfactory**

Note: An unsatisfactory grade recommendation indicates that the student’s overall learning and/or performance is clearly unacceptable. If this is the case, the field instructor is required to write a narrative which describes the problem(s) as well as what the student needs to do to bring his/her performance up to a satisfactory level. This narrative should be attached to this evaluation form.

**Student’s comments (optional):** attach additional pages as necessary

Field Instructor’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________

Student’s Signature: __________________________ Date: __________

Faculty Field Liaison Signature: __________________________ Date: __________

Note: This document is a confidential communication between the field instructor, the student, and the School. It is not to be used as a placement of job reference.

PLEASE ATTACH THIS SIGNED SIGNATURE PAGE TO THE COMPLETED FINAL EVALUATION

REVISED 6/7/07
Appendix B: Generalist Practice III Community Project Rating

Expanded Grading Rubric

(Insert Here—in Landscape format)
Appendix C: Capstone Ratings

Expanded Grading Rubric for Capstone

(Insert Here—in Landscape format)
Appendix D: Student Self-Report Pre-Post Surveys

California State University, Eastbay
Department of Social Work
MSW Student Survey

- This survey assesses your perception of your current social work skills.
- THIS IS NOT A TEST.
- The information that you and your fellow students provide will assist the department in ongoing review and development of the Department of Social Work.
- Please be assured that your responses will remain anonymous and will in no way affect the evaluation of your performance as a student.
- Your responses will be grouped statistically and are completely confidential.

Instructions:

In the first section, please indicate how much you disagree or agree with the statements by circling the appropriate number.

In the Demographic section, please check your answer or fill in the blank.

Be sure to respond to all statements.

*Do not put your name or any other identifying information on the survey. Thank You!*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 E</td>
<td>I am prepared to practice social work following the <em>NASW Code of Ethics</em>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 TH</td>
<td>I am prepared to practice advanced social work skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 E</td>
<td>I am able to deal with ethical practice dilemmas.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 A</td>
<td>I am able to advocate from a strengths perspective for clients and families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A</td>
<td>I am able to advocate from a strengths perspective for groups and communities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 SC/A</td>
<td>I am able to write and manage a grant that would promote service or social change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Th</td>
<td>I am able to complete a professional psychosocial assessment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CT/R</td>
<td>I am able to evaluate research from both an ethical and culturally competent perspective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 CT/R/D/E</td>
<td>I am able to design research from both an ethical and culturally competent perspective.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Th</td>
<td>I am able to apply social work theory from multiple perspectives, (i.e., person-in-environment, policy analysis, and systems theory).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 PUS</td>
<td>I am able to seek and use professional supervision.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 PUS</td>
<td>I am able to set professional boundaries with clients.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 PUS/E</td>
<td>I am able to identify non-professional conduct and understand its consequences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 CT</td>
<td>I am able to apply professional critical thinking skills to practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 PUS</td>
<td>I am able to understand that my personal biases and reactions affect my practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 D</td>
<td>I am able to provide appropriate services to clients who are different from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 D</td>
<td>I am able to address practice issues relating to age, disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, and class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 D</td>
<td>I am able to engage and mobilize stakeholders with differing beliefs to work toward social change on behalf of oppressed populations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 C</td>
<td>I am able to write at a professional MSW level, using the APA style when necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 C</td>
<td>I am able to orally communicate with a broad social work audience, including clients, colleagues, professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Information

21. Concentration: (1) CYF (2) CYF-IVE (3) CMH (4) CMH-CalSWECII

22. Campus: (1) Hayward (2) Concord

23. Gender: (1) Female (2) Male (3) Transgender

24. Sexual Orientation: (1) Heterosexual (2) Gay/Lesbian (3) Bisexual (4) Other

25. Age: (1) 25 or under (2) 26-30 (3) 31-35 (4) 36-40 (5) 41-45 (6) 46-50 (7) 51-55 (8) 56-60 (9) 61-65 (10) over 65

26. Ethnicity: ________________________________________________________________

27. Marital Status: (1) single, never-married (2) married (3) separated (4) divorced (5) widowed (6) co-habiting (7) other, please specify __________________

28. Number of children at home under your care:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. While school was in session, how many hours per week on average did you work for pay (not including your internship)? (1) None (2) married (3) separated (4) divorced (5) widowed (6) co-habiting (7) other, please specify __________________

30. While in school, did you receive financial aid? (0) no (1) yes, please specify: __________________

31. How much paid social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?
32. How much unpaid social work related experience did you have prior to entering this program?

| 0 | 1 year or less | 2 years | 3 years | 4 years | 5 years or more |

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
Appendix E: CSUEB MSW Alumni Survey

(Insert Part 1 & 2 of Alumni Survey Here)
Appendix F: Intersection of Program Objectives with Major Course Assignments & Assessments

**Objective Abbreviation Key**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Application of Theory to Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Professional Use of Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VE</td>
<td>Social Work Values and Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>All 7 objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOUNDATION YEAR**

**SW 6000 Human Behavior and Social Environment I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation &amp; Reflection</td>
<td>PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Bibliography of Human</td>
<td>CT, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with a Young Adult</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SW 6001 Human Behavior and Social Environment II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annotated Bibliography of Human</td>
<td>CT, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Interview with Field</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with Older Adult</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Vignette Evaluations - 3</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Case Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SW 6010 Race, Gender, and Inequality in Social Work Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I: African American or</td>
<td>CT, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Out-Group paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II: Second Out-Group paper</td>
<td>CT, D, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III: Synergistic paper</td>
<td>CT, D, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Presentation of Final</td>
<td>C, CT, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SW 6011 Generalist Practice I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Assignment</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio psychosocial Assessment &amp;</td>
<td>C, AT, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SW 6012 Generalist Practice II**
### Course Assignments & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Website Report on Family or Group Intervention</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Assessment Paper <em>(Gilbert Grape)</em></td>
<td>C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Group Paper on Family or Group Issue</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Group Presentation/Role Play</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Reflection Paper on Task Group Process</td>
<td>VE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6013 Generalist Practice III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Observation</td>
<td>C, D, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Profile</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Analysis and Intervention Plan</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Presentation of Plan</td>
<td>C, CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6020 Field Instruction I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>CT, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Analysis</td>
<td>AP, CT, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segal et al., Text Exercises</td>
<td>Varies by exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Agreement</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Progress Report</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6021 Field Instruction II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segal et al., Text Exercises</td>
<td>Varies by exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply for 2nd Yr Placement &amp; Update Resume</td>
<td>A, C, CT, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>AP, C, CT, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Relationship Analysis</td>
<td>AP, C, CT, PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6022 Field Instruction III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segal et al., Text Exercises</td>
<td>Varies by exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>AP, C, CT, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Paper</td>
<td>AP, C, CT, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Progress Report</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6030 Social Welfare Policy: History and Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Social Welfare Policy Issue Position paper</td>
<td>C, CT, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Research Paper: Historical Issue &amp; Theme paper</td>
<td>A, CT, D, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SW 6032 Social Work Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal Articles Review</td>
<td>CT, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>CT, C, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Final Examination</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6400 Title IV-E Seminar (1 unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once We were Warriors Assessment/Case Plan paper</td>
<td>CT, AP, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Presentation - Public Child Welfare Policy</td>
<td>C, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview a child welfare worker</td>
<td>C, AP, VE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADVANCED YEAR: CHILDREN YOUTH & FAMILIES

### SW 6500 Advanced Micro Practice CYF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application of Intervention Based on Selected Theoretical Approach (Case Focused)</td>
<td>D, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory &amp; Evidence-Based Intervention Paper</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Response: <em>The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down</em></td>
<td>D, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Individual Paper Presentation</td>
<td>PS, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6510 Advanced Mezzo Practice CYF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Research Paper on Group Practice</td>
<td>D, VE, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYF Human Service Organization Group Presentation</td>
<td>PS, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYF Human Service Organization Group Paper</td>
<td>A, VE, C, AP, CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6520 Advocacy and Macro Practice CYF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Led Seminar Discussion</td>
<td>C, CT, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Bill and Position</td>
<td>A, C, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Presentation</td>
<td>C, CT, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>CT, A, D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6530 Field Instruction IV CYF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Agreement</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings and Activities - Summer's text</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Logs - minimum of 200 practicum hours</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>C, PS, A, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Progress Report</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6531 Field Instruction V CYF

#### Course Assignments & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of <em>Fitness for Duty</em> document and sign off</td>
<td>PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings &amp; Activities - Summer’s text</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Logs - minimum of 200 practicum hours</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Participation in the Field Fair</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6532 Field Instruction VI CYF

#### Course Assignments & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Logs - minimum of 200 practicum hours</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Paper and Policy Analysis</td>
<td>AP, C, CT, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Field Placement</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Field Liaison</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6932 Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

#### Course Assignment & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic/Qualitative Interview &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>D, CT , PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique of Empirical Research Paper</td>
<td>VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of SPSS Exercises</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Survey Data Project</td>
<td>A, CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6935 Program Evaluation

#### Course Assignments & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Proposal Part I</td>
<td>CT, AP, D, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Proposal Part II</td>
<td>CT, AP, D, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Proposal</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6959 Integrative Seminar (Capstone)

#### Course Assignment & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Project and Paper</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Poster Session</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ADVANCED YEAR: COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH

### SW 6405 Community Mental Health Seminar (for CalSWEC II students only, 1 unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>AP, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Advocacy</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6505 Advanced Micro Practice CMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Discussion Questions</td>
<td>CT, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-Based Practice paper</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Assessment &amp; Evidence-Based Treatment Plan</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6515 Advanced Mezzo Practice CMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Discussion Questions</td>
<td>CT, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-Based Practice paper</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Assessment &amp; Evidence-Based Treatment Plan</td>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6525 Advocacy and Macro Practice CMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Discussion Questions</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at a Community Meeting</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Contribution to Class Wiki (website)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis paper</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6530 Field Instruction IV CMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Agreement</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings and Activities - Summer’s text</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Logs - minimum of 200 practicum hours</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Progress Report</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6531 Field Instruction V CMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of Fitness for Duty document and sign off</td>
<td>PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings &amp; Activities - Summer’s text</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Logs - minimum of 200 practicum hours</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Participation in the Field Fair</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6532 Field Instruction VI CMH
### Course Assignments & Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Log</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Logs - minimum of 200 practicum hours</td>
<td>C, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Recording</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Presentation</td>
<td>C, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection Paper and Policy Analysis</td>
<td>AP, C, CT, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Field Placement</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation of Field Liaison</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SW 6932 Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic/Qualitative Interview &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>C, CT, VE, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique of Empirical Research Paper</td>
<td>C, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Survey Data Project</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SW 6935 Program Evaluation: CMH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignments &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Proposal Part I</td>
<td>CT, AP, D, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Proposal Part II</td>
<td>CT, AP, D, PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Proposal</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SW 6959 Integrative Seminar (Capstone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Project and Paper</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Poster Session</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELECTIVES

The electives have objectives that include the program objectives but are more specific to the topics addressed.

#### SW 6550 Social Work Social Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Comments on Readings</td>
<td>C, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review <em>Mad in America</em></td>
<td>CT, AP, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SW 6552 Legal Issues in Social Work Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Brief and Presentation</td>
<td>C, CT, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline of the Socio-legal analysis paper</td>
<td>C, A, D, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td>C, CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SW 6553 Assessment and Treatment of Substance Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Reports</td>
<td>AP, C, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Take Home Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies Paper and Presentation</td>
<td>CT, A, PS, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6560 Family Violence across the Lifespan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>A, AP, C, CT, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Violence Prevention Activity</td>
<td>A, AP, C, CT, D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6561 Advanced Psychosocial Assessment & Diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Oral Exam</td>
<td>CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Presentation</td>
<td>C, CT, AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Final Exam</td>
<td>CT, C, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6999 Social Work with Immigrants and Refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview an MSW (Who works with immigrants and refugees)</td>
<td>CT, AP, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>A, CT, AP, VE, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6999 Community Organizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Development Paper</td>
<td>CT, AP, C, VE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>A, CT, AP, VE, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>A, CT, AP, VE, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SW 6999 Social Work in Healthcare Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Assignment &amp; Assessments</th>
<th>Target Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Response</td>
<td>CT, AP, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Presentation</td>
<td>A, CT, AP, VE, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper</td>
<td>CT, C, AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>