



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

College	CLASS
Department	Social Work
Program Unit	Full time and Part Time Programs
Reporting for Academic Year	2014-2015
Department Chair	Evaon Won-Kim
Date Submitted	11/25/2015

1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)

A. Five-year Review Planning Goals

From our last Five Year Report filed in Winter, 2011, we identified three Planning Goals: (1) Increase the number of Tenure/Tenure Track faculty; in order to fully comply with Council of Social Work Education (CSWE) accreditation standards. The goal was to have a total of seven full time TT faculty. (2) Make changes to the Integrative Seminar (Capstone) class in order to reflect Social Work values and enhance student learning experience. This course should offer an opportunity for students to work closely with faculty, to explore community advocacy projects that will combine practice with theory, use evidence-based and cultural responsive approaches to demonstrate their sound understanding of social work values. This course should also provide students a culminating experience so that students can demonstrated their mastery of the six Program Learning Outcomes. (3) Maintain the student faculty ratio of 1:12 as required by CSWE.

B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress

For Goal (1) a New Faculty Justification was submitted to the CLASS Dean for new tenure, tenure track hires every year since the filing of the last Five Year report. We were able to hire one new Assistant Professor who started employment in 2014-2015, an Associate Professor started employment in 2015-2016 academic year. For Goal (2) we started a pilot approach of a year-long community based participatory research project led by Dr. Sarah Taylor. We have great student learning outcomes from course evaluation and project evaluation. We intend to start moving all of our Integrative Seminar to this model during the Q2S transformation process. This new course model will be implemented in Fall 2018. For Goal (3) we started limiting number of students accepted to the MSW program. The newest student faculty ratio calculated by our Associate Dean Dr. Hernandez indicated we have reached the desirable ratio of 1:12.

C. Program Changes and Needs

There are two program changes (1) we have requested and approved by our College and University Extension to put our MSW Self-Support Part-Time program in admission hiatus. We will not be admitting any new students to this program in the Fall of 2017. This will allow us time to concentrate on preparing Q2S work as well as our reaccreditation preparation work for 2018. We also lost one TT faculty this year, Dr. Mavis Braxton had resigned from her tenure track position in September 2015. We are in the process of requesting a new faculty position and hope we will be able to fill this position and bring the TT number back to 7 full time faculty.

2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)

A. Program Student Learning Outcomes

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

B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

3. Critical Thinking and Applying Research Evidence and Theory (aligns with ILO #1-Thinking & Reasoning & 5-Sustainability)
4. Advocacy (aligns with ILO 3-Diversity & Social Justice & 5-Sustainability)

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Three assistant professors teaching Social Work Policy (SW 6030) in Winter 2015 developed a new assessment based on the SW Policy Timeline Assignment. Their objective was to evaluate a new competency to be implemented by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) on students' mastery of social work policy and to prepare for upcoming CSWE re-accreditation in 2018. Five instructors, including the three assistant professors each teaching one section in the state-side MSW program and two lecturers each teaching one section in the self-support MSW program, rated their 104 first-year students' performance on the Policy Timeline Assignment, the course's main assignment, with regard to the following two components: (A) Knowledge of Complex Historical Policy Events Related to Social

Work Policy, and (B) Conceptual Understanding of Complex Historical Policy Events Related to Social Work Policy. A 10-point scale was applied to each component. (Rating Scale & Policy Timeline Assignment Instructions are attached.)

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Results summarized below for each component indicated that students, based on their performance on the Policy Timeline, successfully gained the CSWE-required competence related to mastery of social work policy, as well as showed attainment of related SLO and ILO. Only a very small percentage of students scored seven or fewer points, indicating fair to poor performance on each component. A- Knowledge of Complex Historical Policy Events (SLO #4; ILO #3 & #5): ---Mean (SD): 9.47 (.90) Scoring Very Good-Excellent (9-10 points): 79.9% Scoring Good (8 points): 16.3% Scoring Fair (7 points): 3.8% B- Conceptual Understanding of Complex Historical Policy Events (SLO #3 & #4; ILO #1 & #5): ---Mean (SD): 9.04 (1.08) Scoring Very Good-Excellent (9-10 points): 67.3% Scoring Good (8 points): 23.1% Scoring Fair (7 points): 7.7%% Scoring Poor (6 points): 1.9%

3. STATISTICAL DATA

APR Summary Data Fall 2010 - 2014

Social Work					
	Fall Quarter				
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A. Students Headcount					
Graduate	187	156	172	146	144
Total Number of Majors	187	156	172	146	144
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14
1. Undergraduate	0	0	0	0	0
2. Graduate	106	115	97	104	108
3. Total	106	115	97	104	108
Fall Quarter					
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	3	4	5	4	4
2. Part-Time	1	1	1	1	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	4	5	6	5	4
3b. % Tenure Track	21.1%	38.5%	31.6%	21.7%	25.0%
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	4	3	4	5	4
5. Part-Time	11	5	9	13	8
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	15	8	13	18	12
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	78.9%	61.5%	68.4%	78.3%	75.0%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	19	13	19	23	16
Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	1.4	3.3	4.0	2.7	3.3
9. Lecturer FTEF	9.8	5.6	6.6	9.0	7.9

10. Total Instructional FTEF	11.2	9.0	10.6	11.7	11.2
Lecturer Teaching					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	21.6	75.2	57.1	34.5	56.0
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	12.3%	46.3%	32.7%	24.5%	38.5%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	153.9	87.3	117.3	106.7	89.3
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	87.7%	53.7%	67.3%	75.5%	61.5%
13. Total FTES taught	175.5	162.5	174.4	141.2	145.3
14. Total SCU taught	2633.0	2437.0	2616.0	2118.0	2180.0
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	15.4	22.6	14.3	13.0	16.8
2. Lecturer	15.7	15.5	17.8	11.9	11.3
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	15.7	18.1	16.5	12.1	12.9
4. Lower Division
5. Upper Division
6. Graduate	15.7	18.1	16.5	12.1	12.9
E. Section Size					
1. Number of Sections Offered	36.0	31.0	32.0	33.0	32.0
2. Average Section Size	20.5	24.5	21.1	18.3	19.4
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	20.5	24.5	21.1	18.3	19.4
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	4	10	9	9	13
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	32	21	24	24	19