



College	CLASS
Department	Social Work
Program	Full-time and Part-time Programs
Reporting for Academic Year	2016-17
Last 5-Year Review	2012-13 (Report submitted Winter 2011)
Next 5-Year Review	2018-19 (6 years from last 5-year review due to CSWE approved 1 year postponement)
Department Chair	Rose Wong
Date Submitted	10/16/2017

ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

I. SELF-STUDY *(suggested length of 1-3 pages)*

A. FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PLANNING GOALS

In our last Five Year Report (filed in Winter 2011), we identified four planning goals:

- (1) Start a Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program funded by our Title IV-E Training Grant and continue the current Children, Youth and Family (CYF) and Community Mental Health (CMH) concentrations in our MSW program.
- (2) Create with more hybrid and online courses to accommodate working adults in our existing MSW Part-time Program (a self-support, 3-year program held on Saturdays), which is offered at the Oakland Center.
- (3) Maintain our assessment plan which consists of five instruments (Field Instructor Assessment of Student Performance, Community Project Assessment, Capstone Assessment, Pre-post Student Survey, and Alumni Survey). The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) was complimentary of our plan and had requested no changes at time of accreditation in 2010.
- (4) Replace two assistant professors who left in Spring 2010 to (a) achieve 7 full-time faculty members, (b) maintain a 1:12 FSR, and (c) be able to have TT faculty teach the capstone course, which are CSWE requirements and expectations. At the time of writing the Five Year Report, two hires were in progress, and by Fall 2012, we had 5 full-time TT faculty and 1 Professor Emeritus.

B. PROGRESS TOWARD FIVE-YEAR REVIEW PLANNING GOALS

- (1) *Start a BSW program and continue CYF & CMH concentrations in MSW program.* We have not yet begun to pursue starting a BSW program, and we will maintain our current concentrations until we do further planning after we receive re-accreditation and semester

conversion has occurred. We will submit our re-accreditation self-study report to the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) in Summer 2018 in preparation for their visit in Winter 2019 with the expectation of gaining a second 8-year accreditation period.

(2) *Create more hybrid/online courses in the Part-time Self-Support Program.* We did not undertake new initiatives with regard to this goal because we have been phasing out the program with the intention of restarting it in Fall 2019, after re-accreditation and semester conversion. In Spring & Summer 2018, our final cohort of 45 part-time students will graduate (42 graduate in spring, 3 in summer).

We had initially proposed to restart the program in Fall 2018, but CLASS asked us to target Fall 2019, asking that we first (a) redesign the program more creatively including with more hybrid/online courses, and (b) include the proposed redesigned program in our re-affirmation report to gain CSWE's acknowledgement of the new program. Given that we postponed our re-accreditation visit by one year, we will not be re-accredited until June 2019, which means the earliest we will accept applications is Fall 2019, with the program restarting only in Fall 2020. However, we would prefer and will consider the possibility of restarting the program in Fall 2019 if we let applicants know that it is contingent on receiving notice of re-accreditation in June 2019.

Part of the decision making by our department and CLASS regarding when to restart the program had to do with the need to stabilize our FSR close to 1:12, which is the maximum FSR specified by CSWE. The program has had ongoing high demand among people who are employed part- or full-time, and our students in town hall meetings over the past several years have repeatedly and strongly expressed the need for restarting our self-support MSW program in order to meet the needs of social services agencies and future students.

As we plan our new self-support part-time program, we will consider having more courses that are hybrid/online compared with the program that is phasing out.

(3) *Maintain our assessment plan.* We revised this goal due to (a) CSWE introducing a new set of nine competencies and new assessment planning and measurement requirements in the *2015 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS)*, replacing a previous set of eight, moderately different competencies, and (b) re-accreditation visit by CSWE approaching in Winter 2019, with re-affirmation report due to CSWE in Summer 2018.

As a start, in 2015-16, we introduced a new instrument, called Policy Assessment, to address the completely new 'Policy Competency' introduced in the 2015 EPAS. To meet the new EPAS requirements, we will: (a) develop a set of six new instruments based on practice/internship performance and embedded assignments (Year 1 Field Assessment, Year 2 Field Assessment for CYF, Year 2 Field Assessment for CMH, Year 1 Community Project Assessment, Year 2 Integrative Seminar Yearlong Research Project Paper Assessment for CYF, & Year 2 Integrative Seminar Yearlong Research Project Paper Assessment for CMH); (b) apply the new nine competencies for Year 1 instruments and develop our own program-specific version of the nine competencies for each of our concentrations to apply in Year 2 instruments; (c) collect data in 2017-18 using the six new instruments to develop a report to include in our re-affirmation self-study report due to CSWE in Summer 2018. We began work to meet these requirements in spring 2017 and will continue this year.

(3) Replace two assistant professors who left in Spring 2010. A New Faculty Justification was submitted to the CLASS Dean for new TT hires every year since the filing of the last Five Year Report. In September 2014, the last new hire (Assoc. Prof. Naccarato) joined our faculty. In September 2015, one TT faculty member resigned (Asst. Prof. Braxton) and one TT faculty member (Assoc. Prof. Vugia) transferred to our department from the Sociology/Social Services Dept. In Summer 2016, one TT faculty member (Professor & Chair Wong-Kim) unexpectedly resigned. For AY 2016-2017 and 2017-18, we have had five TT faculty (Prof. Vugia, Assoc. Profs. Naccarato & Taylor; Assist. Profs. Wong & Payne). To increase back to six TT faculty in Fall 2018, we received approval in Spring 2017 for a search for one TT faculty member, which is currently in progress.

C. Program Changes and Needs

Faculty

All changes and emerging needs were summarized in Item B above except for two faculty issues. First, the department chair, Evaon Wong-Kim, unexpectedly resigned in Summer 2016. The TT faculty selected Holly Vugia to be the interim chair for one year and expected her to continue as chair for three years. However, because Dr. Vugia decided to not continue, a chair selection process took place, with an outside advisory committee making a recommendation to CLASS and a new chair being appointed for a three-year term, which began this fall.

Second, we need more faculty members and decreased class sizes simultaneously. Our current FSR does not meet the CSWE accreditation requirement: “The program documents a full-time equivalent faculty-to-student ratio...not greater than 1:12 for master’s programs” (2015 EPAS Accreditation Standard 3.2.3). This issue is discussed in detail below in Part III.

II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT

A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

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 Learning Outcomes Assessed

PLO #1, #2, #4 & #6 are assessed in our Integrative Seminar ('Capstone') Project Paper, an embedded assignment, which was introduced in 2013-14 when we introduced a new Integrative Seminar syllabus oriented toward a community-based advocacy project. One CSWE competency on 'Assessment of Individuals, Families, Organizations & Communities', not mapped to any PLO is also assessed. See below table. This assessment is a part of a set of six assessment instruments we have used to satisfy CSWE requirements for posting assessment results on our program website bi-annually. Note that this instrument along with others will be phased out and a new integrative seminar embedded assignment assessment based on new CSWE competencies will be used beginning in 2017-18.

PLO	CSWE COMPETENCY	PART OF PAPER	POSSIBLE POINTS
PLO-1. Values and Ethics (ILO 5 & 6)	C1. Ethical and Prof. Behavior (PLO1, PLO2, PLO6)	2	6 points
PLO-2. Prof. Use of Self (ILO 1, 2 & 6)	C1. Ethical and Prof. Behavior (PLO1, PLO2, PLO6)	6	3 points
PLO3. Critical Thinking & Applying Research Evidence and Theory (ILO 1 & 5)	C4. Practice-informed Research and Research-informed Practice (PLO3, PLO4)		
PLO4. Advocacy (ILO 3 & 5)	C3. Advance Human Rights and Social, Economic and Environmental Justice (PLO4)	1	6 points
PLO5. Diversity (ILO 3 & 4)	C2. Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice (PLO5)		
PLO6. Communication (ILO 2)	C1. Ethical and Prof. Behavior (related to communication) (PLO1, PLO2, PLO6)	7	4 points
<i>No Direct Match</i>	C5. Engage in Policy Practice (PLO3, PLO4)		
<i>No Direct Match</i>	C6. Engage with Individuals, Families, Groups, Org's, and Communities (IFGOC) (PLO2, PLO3, PLO6)		
<i>No Direct Match</i>	C7. Assess IFGOC (PLO3, PLO5)	3, 4	12 points
<i>No Direct Match</i>	C8. Intervene with IFGOC (PLO3, PLO4, PLO6)		
<i>No Direct Match</i>	C9. Evaluate practice with IFGOC (PLO3, PLO4)		

C. Summary of Assessment Process

Instrument: Integrative Seminar Paper Assessment

The assessment consists of using a rubric to grade the course's main paper assignment. The paper contains six parts: (1) literature review and social justice advocacy issue description, (2) ethical discussion of the social justice issue, (3) theoretical discussion, (4) organizational discussion, (5) discussion of activities with the organization, (6) reflection on use of self and future professional development goals, (7) assessment of writing and use of APA style.

Sampling Procedure: Integrative Seminar ('Capstone') Course Students

All instructors who teach Integrative Seminar are asked to provide spreadsheets with the points assigned based on the master assignment rubric.

Sample Characteristics: Students in Final Quarter of Part-Time & Full-Time Programs

The sample consists of students in their final quarter of study in both programs.

Data Collection: Instructors Provide Assignment Scores Based on a Master Rubric

In the full-time program, $N=21$ students belonging to two of four sections offered in the Spring 2016 Integrative Seminar course participated in this assessment. In the part-time program, $N=30$ students belonging to both sections offered in the Summer 2016 Integrative Seminar course participated in this assessment.

Data Analysis: Mean Scores and Benchmarks are Calculate for Each Concentration

The benchmark is 85.0% of students scoring above 80.0% of possible points. The calculation thus has two parts. The first is an individual score benchmark of 80.0% (i.e., each student is expected to obtain 80.0% of possible points for the item(s) relevant to each PLO/Competency). The application of 80.0% is based on the Likert-scale options that were defined with this percentage representing 'very good' achievement. The second is a group benchmark of 85.0% (i.e., 85.0% of the sample is expected to score 80.0% of possible points for each PLO/Competency).

D. Summary of Assessment Results

Main Findings:

Full-time Program. All benchmarks were met except for Communication (which are mapped to PLO 1, 2 & 6). In this case communication was based on writing quality and APA style. Note that applying a lower individual benchmark of 75.0% rather than 80.0% results in meeting the group benchmark, with 100.0% (CMH) and 81.9% (CYF) of students scoring above 80.0% of possible points. See Table 1.

Part-Time Program. The benchmarks were not met in three categories: Professional Use of Self (PLO2, but related to Communication), Advocacy and Social Justice (PLO4), and Communication (PLO 1, 2 & 6). See Table 2.

Recommendations for Program Improvement:

Our plan is to eliminate this paper assignment based on an advocacy project in 2018-19 at the time of semester conversion. We have been piloting a new version of our Integrative Seminar course, which students and instructors have evaluated positively (although not yet formally assessed), for three years. In this new course, students will be completing a Yearlong Research Project Paper, which is usually based on a small program evaluation project oriented toward advocacy aims and which they work on for three quarters with the same instructor. We are currently developing the embedded assignment assessment for this Yearlong Research Project Paper. We will continue to use the Integrative Seminar Paper Assessment for one last year, in 2017-18.

Next Steps for Closing the Loop:

Our students' writing skills have always been a concern to our program. To address this concern, and the results from the reported assessment, we are taking steps to gain approval for making a writing course that satisfies the WSR out of a first-semester required course for all students called Human Behavior and Social Environment at the time of semester conversion. In this way, all students will have intensive writing skills training.

We will also improve inter-rater reliability in the scoring of students using the rubric. Basically, we have one or two instructors who grade 'extremely hard' compared to the others on written communication, and we need to assess why and how this is happening and to conduct some rating trainings to achieve better reliability.

Regarding our CYF students not meeting the benchmark for Advocacy and Social Justice (PLO4), we will need to examine with the instructors the aspects of the project and paper assignment that are difficult for students or other reasons why scoring shows that over 20% of students are not achieving the expected level.

Table 1. Integrative Seminar Paper Results, Full-Time Prog. (N = 21, CMH = 10, CYF = 11)

PLO/COMPETENCY	Mean Score % (SD) of Points Out of Total Possible		Benchmark % Scoring ≥ 80.0% of Possible Points	
	CMH	CYF	CMH	CYF
Values and Ethics (PLO1, C1)	.98 (.05)	.97 (.07)	100.0%	100.0%
Professional Use of Self (PLO2, C1)	1.00 (.00)	.97 (.10)	100.0%	91.0%
Advocacy, Social Justice (PLO4, C3)	1.00 (.00)	.92 (.09)	100.0%	100.0%
Communication (PLO6, C1)	.85 (.11)	.90 (.15)	50.0%	63.6%
Practice – Assess (C7, PLO3)	.98 (.06)	.97 (.05)	100.0%	100.0%

Table 2. Integrative Seminar Paper Results, Part-Time Prog. (N = 30, CMH = 16, CYF = 14)

PLO/COMPETENCY	Mean Score % (SD) of Points Out of Total Possible		Benchmark % Scoring ≥ 80.0% of Possible Points	
	CMH	CYF	CMH	CYF
Values and Ethics (PLO1, C1)	.91 (.22)	.94 (.12)	87.5%	85.7%
Professional Use of Self (PLO2, C1)	.88 (.17)	.88 (.17)	62.5%	64.3%
Advocacy, Social Justice (PLO4, C3)	.95 (.12)	.92 (.14)	87.5%	78.6%
Communication (PLO6, C1)	.45 (.19)	.52 (.18)	0.0%	0.0%
Practice – Assess (C7, PLO3)	.96 (.08)	.93 (.09)	93.7%	92.9%

E. Assessment Plans for Next Year

In 2017-18, as discussed above, we will finish developing our new assessment plan and instruments in preparation for the CSWE re-accreditation in Winter 2019. We will be collecting one year's worth of data to develop reports to include in the self-study due in Summer 2018.

III. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS

A. Discussion of Trends & Reflections

Notable Trends and Reflections on Trends

1. TT FTEF has fluctuated over the past five years indicating some turnover. TT faculty was highest at 6 members in 2012 & 2015. In the past five years, two faculty members resigned (E. Wong-Kim, M. Braxton), one retired (T. Jones), three were hired (R. Wong, M. Payne, T. Naccarato), and one transferred in from another dept. (H. Vugia). Given the promotions of two faculty (H. Vugia to Professor, S. Taylor to Associate) and one hired as an Associate Professor (T. Naccarato), the Dept. is now more balanced between senior vs. junior faculty.
2. Full-time Lecturers, our “Field Liaisons” who provide a field instruction seminar and arrange and monitor students’ internships and agency contracts, has fluctuated slightly over the past five years, stabilizing at three over the past three years. Having more full-time field liaisons, as well as TT faculty, allows the department to provide a larger number of hours of advising given that part-time lecturers do not provide advising.
3. The decrease in FTES across the past five years reflects the phasing out of the part-time self-support program. This three-year program had a headcount of approximately 40-50 students per year.
4. The SFR (Instructional) has hovered from 15.1-16.2, with the very high outlier of 20.6 in 2012, which corresponds with the high FTES of 218 and high average enrollment of 20.4. Note that 15:1 to 16:1 is far above the accreditation standard of 12:1, which justifies the need for more faculty (especially TT and full-time lecturers) and smaller average section sizes. Having more full-time faculty lets us meet CSWE’s advising and other requirements: “...faculty size is commensurate with the number of curricular offerings in class and field; number of program options; class size; number of students; advising; and the faculty’s teaching, scholarly, and service responsibilities” (EPAS 3.2.3)

B. Request for Resources

Request for Tenure-Track Hires

If the current TT search for someone specialized in gerontology and medical social work (but who would span CYF and CMH concentrations) is not successful, this search will be extended to 2018-19. If it is successful, the department will reach 6 TT faculty in Fall 2018, when the new hire begins work.

The department requests another TT search in 2018-19 in order to reach a total of 7 TT faculty in Fall 2020. There are several justifications for this request. *The first justification is that the department is far from the required SFR of 12:1.* How far the program is from meeting the CSWE requirement with regard to SFR and other faculty-related requirements (e.g., advising, courses that must be taught by TT faculty) remains to be determined in the upcoming re-accreditation process. To meet CSWE faculty requirements, there is no doubt that having 7 TT faculty would bring and stabilize the department closer to the requirements.

The second justification is that the department currently does not have enough TT faculty to teach its Integrative Seminar sections and will definitely not have enough once the semester systems begins due to changing the course objectives and content. In the past several years, two sections per quarter (out of 7, which includes 5 in the full-time program and 2 in the part-time program) have not been taught by TT faculty due to not having enough TT faculty, who possess the doctoral level research training required for the course. (Note that TT faculty can only teach in the self-support program on overload.) CSWE Educational Policy 3.2 states that “Faculty qualifications, including experience related to the Social Work Competencies, an appropriate SFR, and sufficient faculty to carry out a program’s mission and goals are essential... Programs demonstrate that faculty is qualified to teach the courses to which they are assigned.” The department has not been meeting this requirement. Additionally, the problem will be compounded when the semester system begins. At that time, the department has been approved to begin a two-semester sequence in which all students will conduct a yearlong research project in which the same instructor teaches both courses (consisting of two courses, *Community Based Research* and *Integrative Seminar*).

The third justification concerns making the new part-time self-support (Oakland) program viable once it starts up in Fall 2019 or 2020. In the past years of, the part-time program has faced important issues related to turnover of lecturers, ensuring quality of instruction, and adequate supervision and management of the program. An option being considered is for University Extension to buy out part of a TT faculty member’s time to teach or provide program coordination activities in the part-time program. For this to be possible, the department needs that additional faculty member. It is important to note that the part-time program has very high demand in the community as well as an important role for CSUEB in providing the MSW level social workers in high demand by local public and non-profit community agencies.