



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

College	CLASS
Department	Social Work
Program Unit	
Reporting for Academic Year	2012-2013
Department Chair	Evaon Wong-Kim
Date Submitted	8/13/2013

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

The Master of Social Work program meets the university, college and department strategic goals by training the much needed workforce in order to provide different types of social services in California. The program helps the College and University meet the important goal of regional stewardship. Our students provide more than 100,000 hours of volunteer community services in local and state agencies. The MSW program matriculates close to 100 students with the MSW degree that go on to become public or private non-profit sector social workers offering services to diverse age groups from children to gerontology. One of the most important goals identified in the last five year plan was to fully comply with CSWE accreditation standards to have a total of seven full time faculty members. If we are successful in our tenure track search this year, we will have four full time tenured/tenure track faculty starting year 2014-2015. Another important goal is to be able to replace our Foundation Chair, Dr. Terry Jones who is Professor Emeritus who will be fully retired by Spring of 2014.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

One TT position is approved for search while at the same time one tenured faculty had resigned.

C. Program Changes and Needs

The rapid growth in the part-time MSW program offered via DCIE is not sustainable though demands for this training program remain extremely high. An enrollment study was conducted and number of enrollment to this program has been reduced. Our faculty is concern about the ability to maintain program quality and integrity with a low number of TT faculty. At least three more faculty should be hired to meet the continue demands of both the full time and part time MSW program.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

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

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

All SLOs.

C. Summary of Assessment Process

The newly designed assessment instrument had six items that addressed each SLO. Each item asked the student to self-report his/her mastery level on the SLO prior to beginning and at the conclusion of the MSW program on a 1-4 scale (1-None/Inadequate, 2-Low/Needs Development, 3-Good/Professional Level, 4-Excellent/Professional Level). The instructor then assigned his/her evaluation on the same scale. Instructors' based their evaluations on the student's final paper/report, brief individual meetings with students, and/or knowledge of the student's performance in current course or past courses. (Only instructors' assessments are reported below.)

All students (N = 96) in 7 sections of "Integrative Seminar" (SW6959/6960, Spring 2013; 6 sections Hayward, 1 section Oakland; taught by 4 instructors; out of 8 sections offered), the culminating course for final-year MSW students, were evaluated by their tenured/tenure-track instructors in the last week of classes or finals week.

D. Summary of Assessment Results

RESULTS:

- (1) Students began the program with lowest mastery of SLO #1-#3 (62.4%-75.5% starting the program at levels 1/2 vs. 48.4%-54.7% for SLO #4-#6).
- (2) Nearly all students completed the program with “professional level” (levels 3/4) mastery of all SLO (95.7%-100%), except for SLO #6-Communication (79.8%).
- (3) Although nearly all students achieved “professional level” (levels 3/4) on SLO #2-Professional Use of Self and #3-Critical Thinking, these SLO showed the most students not achieving the highest level (level 4) (47.9% and 68.1%, respectively, at levels 2/3).

CONCLUSIONS:

- (1) SLO #6-Communications: Changes under consideration include: (a) hiring a writing tutor for the MSW program to support writing developing in specific courses; and (b) redesigning and balancing “academic” vs. “professional” writing assignments across required coursework.
- (2) SLO #2-Professional Use of Self: Individual meetings with students showed that they did not understand the definition of this SLO, which is complex. Department needs to further explore how to better assess and teach this SLO before making any changes.
- (3) SLO #4-Critical Thinking: Individual meetings with students, class meetings, and papers showed that they had most difficulty with remembering theories learned and applying theories as well as some had difficulty integrating research-based evidence. Changes under consideration include: (a) teaching fewer theories in the Human Behavior and Social Environment (HBSE) 2-course sequence; (b) more time spent applying theories, including those learned in HBSE, in the Generalist Practice 3-course sequence; (c) more time spent in second year courses on how to read, understand and make use of research findings through assignments and in-class close discussions of articles rather than having students browse a large number of articles on their own, which is what happens currently.

PLAN FOR 2013-14:

- (1) This year’s assessment was exploratory. It was intended as a qualitative tool to gain an overall impression of how well the Dept. is achieving each SLO. We may use it again but conduct the meetings or group discussions with students at the beginning of the quarter as well as conduct final assessments at the end of the quarter.
- (2) Since the Dept. has a specific accreditation agency (Council on Social Work Education) and a complex set of standards to meet, it remains to be decided whether this year’s exploratory assessment will become part of the battery of assessments. Also, the Dept. is having an outside consultant revise and improve its entire assessment procedure (in summer 2013) in preparation for the next CSWE accreditation to take place in 4 years.

3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

CAPR Table 1

California State University, East Bay

Student Demography

Social Work		Fall 2007		Fall 2008		Fall 2009		Fall 2010		Fall 2011	
		Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL	Degree Level	TOTAL
		Master		Master		Master		Master		Master	
Female	Black, non-Hispanic	30	30	35	35	46	46	29	29	21	21
	American Indian or Alaska Native			1	1	1	1				
	Asian	17	17	24	24	27	27	28	28	19	19
	Hispanic	31	31	36	36	48	48	39	39	26	26
	White	35	35	45	45	44	44	40	40	41	41
	Multiple ethnicity							8	8	6	6
	Race/ethnicity unknown	50	50	53	53	28	28	10	10	17	17
	Nonresident aliens	1	1	1	1					1	1
Male	Black, non-Hispanic	11	11	14	14	14	14	9	9	6	6
	American Indian or Alaska Native					1	1	1	1		
	Asian	9	9	4	4	4	4	9	9	9	9
	Hispanic	7	7	7	7	8	8	5	5	5	5
	White	10	10	9	9	10	10	7	7	2	2
	Multiple ethnicity							2	2	1	1
	Race/ethnicity unknown	5	5	5	5	4	4			2	2
	Nonresident aliens	1	1								
Total	Black, non-Hispanic	41	41	49	49	60	60	38	38	27	27
	American Indian or Alaska Native			1	1	2	2	1	1		
	Asian	26	26	28	28	31	31	37	37	28	28
	Hispanic	38	38	43	43	56	56	44	44	31	31
	White	45	45	54	54	54	54	47	47	43	43
	Multiple ethnicity							10	10	7	7
	Race/ethnicity unknown	55	55	58	58	32	32	10	10	19	19
	Nonresident aliens	2	2	1	1					1	1

Student and Faculty Headcounts, SFR, and Course Statistics

Social Work					
	Fall Quarter				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
A. Students Headcount					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Postbaccalaureate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	234	235	187	156	172
4. Total Number of Majors	234	235	187	156	172
	College Years				
	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12
B. Degrees Awarded					
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	79	103	106	115	97
3. Total	79	103	106	115	97
	Fall Quarter				
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	5	5	3	4	5
2. Part-Time	0	0	1	1	1
3a. Total Tenure Track	5	5	4	5	6
3b. % Tenure Track	20.8%	20.0%	21.1%	38.5%	31.6%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	5	5	4	3	4
5. Part-Time	14	15	11	5	9
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	19	20	15	8	13
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	79.2%	80.0%	78.9%	61.5%	68.4%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	24	25	19	13	19
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	2.5	2.6	1.4	3.3	4.0
9. Lecturer FTEF	9.6	11.1	9.8	5.6	6.6
10. Total Instructional FTEF	12.0	13.7	11.2	9.0	10.6
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	44.3	59.5	21.6	75.2	57.1
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	20.7%	27.5%	12.3%	46.3%	32.7%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	169.8	156.7	153.9	87.3	117.3
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	79.3%	72.5%	87.7%	53.7%	67.3%
13. Total FTES taught	214.1	216.2	175.5	162.5	174.4
14. Total SCU taught	3211.0	3243.0	2633.0	2437.0	2616.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	18.0	22.9	15.4	22.6	14.3
2. Lecturer	17.7	14.2	15.7	15.5	17.8
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	17.8	15.8	15.7	18.1	16.5
4. Lower Division
5. Upper Division
6. Graduate	17.8	15.8	15.7	18.1	16.5
E. Section Size					

1. Number of Sections Offered	44.0	47.0	36.0	31.0	32.0
2. Average Section Size	20.0	20.3	20.5	24.5	21.1
3. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for GD	20.0	20.3	20.5	24.5	21.1
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	7	12	4	10	9
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. GD Section taught by Lecturer	37	35	32	21	24