

The Evaluation of the MSW Program, Spring 2009

The School Assessment Committee
Anh-Luu Huynh-Hohnbaum and Dale Weaver, Co-Chairs
Siyon Rhee, Carol Mroz, Tasha Willis, Members

September 17, 2009

Introduction

This is the second report of the MSW program, based on data collected in the Spring of 2009. There are no benchmark scores for comparison. These scores are for relative internal comparisons only. Thus, we can compare the score on one item in the survey with another item in the survey, but not with any outside standards. In this report we compare these data with those from 2008, and we compare scores across concentrations and programs.

Data are from a survey questionnaire which elicited both quantitative and qualitative data and from an optional Capstone written assignment, which asked students to describe their professional orientation and future career plans.

Questionnaire

The total number of items developed for the MSW survey questionnaire is 147. Thirty-four of these are demographic and career items. Most of the 113 items that ask respondents to rate specific aspects of the MSW program were derived from the published competencies of the CalSWEC, CalSWEC II, and GSWEC programs. There are hundreds of these competencies and every effort was made to address as many competencies as possible with as few questions as possible. CalSWEC II has a lot of specific competencies, and GSWEC relatively few. An effort was made to balance out these imbalances and have each concentration equally represented. The result was a survey that was still too long to be efficiently administered. Therefore two alternate surveys were created, each version containing half of the items, with the two versions being distributed randomly through the sample.

The opinion items are on a 7-point scale based on letter grades, from C (2) to A (4). The two versions of the survey are attached as Appendix A and B (p. 12 and 24).

There are three open-ended questions where respondents were invited to inform us of their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program, as well as any other comments they might have. Responses to these three questions were categorized together, and are given in Appendix C (p. 37).

Sample

One hundred and five MSW students were enrolled during the Spring of 2009, 59 in the two-year program, and 46 in the three-year program. Sixty-one surveys were completed, for a response rate of 58%. There were no surveys received from the three-year Aging Capstone course; 21 out of 22 from the three-year CYWF Capstone course; 21 of 21 from the two-year Forensic Capstone course; 8 of 23 from the two-year CYWF Capstone; and 11 of 15 from the two-year Aging Capstone course. The entire sample was split according to the version of the questionnaire received. One version was completed by 31 students, the other by 30 students.

Twenty-six students completed the optional Capstone written assignment. This of course is not a representative sample. Response depended on the willingness of instructors to include this assignment in their courses and on the willingness of students to choose this option.

Data Collection

Qualitative and quantitative data were collected by a survey questionnaire administered to all graduates of the MSW program in the Capstone courses of both the two-year and the three-year programs in the Spring of 2009. The two versions of the survey were alternated in the pile of surveys to be distributed to each class.

Though IRB approval is not necessary for educational evaluations, and was not obtained, subjects were guaranteed the right to not participate and were guaranteed anonymity in the reporting of results. No names or other identifying information were attached to the questionnaires.

The optional Capstone written assignment was distributed as part of the regular final assignment process. Identifying information was removed before the data were presented to the evaluator

Findings

Scores are given by letter grade. However, the tables include numeric scores, which do a more accurate job than the letter grades at identifying differences.

The tables of quantitative results with descriptive statistics for all items in the survey are in Appendix D (p. 49). Tables comparing results of this survey with those of 2008 are in Appendix E (p. 61). Letter grades and means of program evaluation items by CSWE competency are in Appendix F (p. 66), and by general topic in appendix G (p. 72). Appendix G is the best snapshot of generally how the program is doing, while Appendix F illustrates how well the program is meeting CSWE competencies.

Program Characteristics

As seen in Table 1, 40 (65.6%) of the sample were in the two year program; 21 (34.4%) were in the three year program. Table 2 shows that 29 (47.5%) were in the CYWF concentration, 11(18.0%) in the Aging and Families concentration, and 21 (34.4%) in the Forensic concentration. Seven (11.7%) received CalSWEC stipends, 6 (10.0%) CalSWEC II stipends, 8 (13.3%) IUC stipends, 5 (8.3%) GSWEC stipends, and 8 (13.3%) the DMH stipends. Thirty-six (42.4%) of the respondents did not receive stipends.

Forty-one (67.2%) of the respondents indicated that they were employed during their time in the MSW program. Among those who worked, the range of hours worked per week was 1 to 50, with a mean of about 25 hours per week. Thirteen students, 21% of the respondents, reported working 40 hours per week.

Demographic Characteristics

Personal

As shown in Table 3, 9 (15.8%) of the sample were male and 51 (89.5%) were heterosexual. The mean age was 33, with a range from 24 to 59. Thirty (51.7%) were never married, 21 (36.2%) married, 4 (6.6%) living with partner, and 3 (5.0%) were divorced or widowed. Five (8.6%) had one child, 7 (12.1%) had two children, and 5 (8.6%) had three or more children. Twenty-eight (43.1%) of the respondents had dependents at home.

Family Background

Table 4 shows the ethnicity and first language of the students. Twenty-seven (47.4%) were Latino; 13 (22.8%) were White; 9 (15.8%) were Asian/Pacific Islander; 6 (10.5%) were African-American; and 2 (4.8%) were Bi-Racial. Twenty-five (41.7%) reported that Spanish was their first language, 25 English, 2 (3.3%) Middle Eastern languages, and 5 (8.3%) Asian languages.

Table 5 shows the countries of origin of the student respondents and of their fathers. Forty-one (68.3%) of the students were born in the USA, 3 (5.0%) in Mexico, 5 (8.3%) in another Central American country, 7 (11.7%) in Asia or Pacific Islands, 1 (1.7%) in the Middle East, 1 in Europe and 1 in Africa. The fathers of 22 (37.3%) students were born in the USA, 14 (13.7%) in Mexico, 11 (18.6%) in another Central American country, 7 (11.9%) in Asia or Pacific Islands, 1 (1.7%) in the Middle East, and 2 (3.4%) in Europe.

Table 6 shows the highest level of education of respondents' parents. Thirteen (22.4%) of them did not go beyond elementary school; another 3 (5.2%) did not go beyond junior high school; another 7 (12.1%) had some high school; another 9 (15.5%) graduated from high school; 13 (22.5%) had some college; 6 (10.3%) were college graduates; and 7 (12.1%) finished graduate school.

Educational History

Over 40 per cent (24, 41.7%) of the MSW students reported social work as an undergraduate major (Table 7). Thirteen (21.7%) were psychology students and 10 (16.7%) were sociology students. Other majors included criminal justice, liberal arts, art, film, ethnic studies and literature.

As shown in Table 7, 27 (47.4%) of the respondents graduated from CSULA. Seven (12.3%) were from other CSU campuses (from CSULB, CSUDH, FSU, and Cal Poly Pomona). Nine (15.8%) were from UC (4 from UCI, 3 from UCLA, 2 from UCSB, and 1 from UCR). An additional five were from private universities in California (2 from Whittier College and one each from USC, Pepperdine, and Mount Saint Mary's). Eight students were from out of state universities (Penn State, ASU, University of Oklahoma, Tufts University, University of Phoenix, Amherst, Columbia College Chicago, and Virginia Tech). One student received an undergraduate education abroad. None of the respondents reported having an additional Master's degree.

Work History

Table 8 shows that 39 (66.1%) of the students had some past volunteer experience. For those that had volunteer experience, the range was from 1 month to 180 months, with a mean of 22 months. A similar number had paid work experience, with a range from 2 months to 364 months, and a mean of 60 months.

Job Plans

Thirty-one (50.8%) of the students have a job upon graduation; 53 (86.9%) intend to get an LCSW, and 6 (9.8%) intend to get a PhD later in their careers (Table 9).

Program Evaluation

Quantitative.

Clinical courses continue to be rated more highly than macro courses. This can be easily seen in Table 10, where working with individuals receives an A-, while working with families, groups, organizations, and communities all receive a B. Research courses likewise are not rated as highly. Within clinical skills, assessment generally does better than case planning. The ability to recognize substance abuse problems receives Bs only. Students are more comfortable with understanding child abuse (B+) than with understanding elder abuse (B). Grades for professional identification, working ethically, use of self, diversity, and social justice are very good – A- or B+.

Qualitative.

In looking at the qualitative data (Appendix C, p. 34) faculty were identified as a strength of the program, but also as a weakness. It seems that there are both highly rated and

poorly rated faculty. Part time faculty are likewise identified by some students as a strength and by others as a weakness. Part time faculty teaching HBSE made a strong positive impression on a number of students. The knowledge and the practice experience of faculty were highlighted as strengths. Grade inflation was identified as a problem by several respondents. Thesis advisors were identified by a number of students as weaknesses of the program.

Several aspects of the field program were noted as weaknesses, from field seminar instructors, to the quality and availability of placements. Process recordings and the general work load of field were noted as well.

There were a number of thoughtful comments about the curriculum of the program, both positive and negative. On the one hand, strengths were seen in the generalist perspective, the strengths approach, the clinical focus, the forensic concentration, and the thesis. On the other hand, many students indicated a desire for more clinical content, as well as courses in substance abuse, grief and loss, and ethics. Students want the DSM course to be mandatory and to occur earlier in the sequence of classes. Several students indicated that the foundation year was a strength, but that the second year was a disappointment. A number of students noted the thesis as a weakness of the program, making the point that the thesis is not a contribution toward become an effective social worker.

One of the strengths of the program is the support that students get from each other.

A lack of communication among the director, staff, faculty, and students continues to be identified as a problem. Again, this is particularly true of the 3-year program.

Capstone written assignment.

Following are the questions on the assignment and summaries of the responses.

1. How did the MSW program provide you with knowledge and skills to be a competent urban generalist capable of **autonomous, advanced practice** with diverse populations of individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities?

A number of students gave descriptions of the strengths of the program that were very broad, indicating that the program as a whole was responsible for providing knowledge and skills. Several students referred to the urban generalist and strengths-based perspectives. Eight students talked about the strong foundation from the curriculum, especially the first year foundation and the HBSE sequence. These students described a strong theoretical orientation. Other students indicated the priority of clinical classes, and one student macro classes in providing skills and knowledge.

Eight students stated the importance of professors in imparting skills and knowledge, especially those professors that brought their own practice experiences to the classroom. There were a dozen references to the importance of the field experience. Exposure to

diverse populations, the variety of other opportunities and the opportunity to develop self-confidence were some of the attributes of the field placements.

Four students emphasized the importance of their fellow students in imparting skills and knowledge. Eight students talked about their own personal change in response to the program as key to developing skills and knowledge. One student developed a strong professional identity, one became more open and patient, and several developed a strong understanding of the need to continue to educate themselves. Comments by only one student included the emphasis on diversity, historical background to the profession, and non-verbal communication.

Some negative comments regarded the need for more clinical courses and dissatisfaction with some macro courses. One student pointed out that the generalist perspective was a disadvantage because the education was too broad and lacked focus.

2. How did the MSW program provide you with knowledge and skills in order to **collaborate effectively** with individuals, organizations, and agencies from varied community-based disciplines that are involved in social service programs?

Primarily students pointed toward the quality of field placement experiences as crucial to learning how to collaborate effectively. Several mentioned the importance of good field supervisors. The experiences on multidisciplinary teams were mentioned. Generally, students felt they were placed in situations that required them to develop the communication skills to work with other agencies and other professionals. Several forensic students mentioned the importance of learning to work with law enforcement professionals.

Courses were also important, especially macro courses. Several students stated that the need to collaborate was present throughout all of the courses, including field seminars. Two students mentioned the assigned group projects as fostering collaboration. The importance of leaning advocacy skills was mentioned twice as part of developing collaboration, as was the importance of learning communication skills.

3. What knowledge and skills have you gained related to **cultural diversity, institutional discrimination, cultural awareness and competence**? And how has this training influenced your practice with diverse populations?

Again, students talked about the curriculum in general and about specific sequences. A lot of the cultural awareness stemmed from macro classes, especially a knowledge of institutional discrimination. Practice and HBSE Classes were also important. Class assignments were described as important in developing cultural awareness.

A dozen students talked about changes in themselves as instrumental in incorporating cultural awareness, in particular becoming aware of one's own biases, and being sensitive

and open to the cultures of others. Six students referred to field experiences as important, and six students referred to their experiences with classmates, as important in fostering cultural awareness.

4. As a practicing social worker, what will you do when you **lack knowledge and/or experience personal discomfort when working with clients from a different cultural background?**

Nearly every respondent gave similar responses to this question. Students would do their own research on the topic, speak with clients, consult with colleagues and consult with supervisors, though the order of these varied across responses. The importance of understanding one's own issues of counter transference were noted frequently. There was generally a sense for the need to continue to grow and learn as a professional.

5. As you seek your first professional position as an MSW, how will you describe your **professional orientation** to prospective employers? Which practice theories influenced your professional orientation?

Nine students present themselves in terms of having a very broad background of knowledge and skills that is applicable in any setting and with a range of clients. Three of these used the phrase 'urban generalist'. Three students were clever enough to claim that they would first identify what the agency required, then tailor their approach to match that. In this endeavor, they see their broad generalist background as an advantage.

Four students present themselves primarily in terms of taking a strengths-based approach. Four students present themselves first as having a specialization in forensics, though each of them goes on to talk about more broad-based skills as well. Two students present themselves as primarily clinicians. One student emphasizes cultural competence. Two students said that they always bring up the thesis in job interviews – that it impresses potential employers!

Several students talked about having certain attitudes and values that make them good employees – compassion, open communication, teamwork, positive working environment. Three students are still struggling with this issue and were not able to fully answer the question.

The second part of this question resulted in quite a long list of theoretical approaches. Cognitive behavioral therapy led the list with 13 mentions. Some of these mentions expressed the feeling that they were familiar with this more because it was required at a number of agencies, than because they endorsed it. Next came systems theory (7 mentions), solution-based approaches (6 mentions), attachment theory (5 mentions), Erikson (4 mentions), motivation (4 mentions), resilience (3 mentions). Maslow, empowerment, crisis intervention and psychodynamic approaches each received two mentions. Recovery model, Bowenian, case management, social learning, radical theory,

humanism, existentialism, and spirituality each received one mention. Four students indicated that it was important to employ a range of approaches, and one student was unsure of a theoretical approach.

6. In which **practice settings** do you feel most competent and comfortable working?

Fifteen students feel comfortable working in forensic settings, seven in schools, seven in health settings, five in mental health, four in macro settings, and two with adolescents in any setting. Settings where students did not want to work included forensic, child protection, and macro settings. In nearly every case, these were settings where students had their field placements or work experience. Therefore, the more work experience, the greater the number of comfortable work settings.

7. Social workers perform in multiple professional roles over their course of their career. How do you envision your **role as a social worker over time**?

Nearly all of the students anticipate taking on multiple roles over their careers. They see this as the path of typical social workers. All are beginning with clinical work, in any setting or with any population, though two are committed to working only with the elderly, and two intend to do somatic work. Nine specifically mentioned getting the LCSW. Very few see themselves doing only clinical work over their careers, though there is considerable uncertainty about what comes after that. Four students are interested in becoming educators; five are interested in doing community work; six may go into administration, in particular beginning their own agencies; several are interested in international social work (two are going directly to London); and three expressed interest in getting a doctorate and doing research.

Comparisons.

Statistical comparisons were not made between 2008 and 2009 data. But examination of the data shows that scores are generally somewhat lower for 2009 for most items. There seem to be particular declines in the evaluation of research courses, organizational courses, identification of both child and elder abuse, and with the DSM course.

Statistical comparisons were made on every item by program/concentration. There were four groups – 2-year CYWF, 2-year Aging, 2-year Forensic, and 3-year CYWF. (No surveys were returned from the 3-year Aging concentration.) While the data from 2008 showed no major differences among these groups, this year there are consistent and major differences by group. Because of the small number of students overall, and because the N was further reduced because there were two separate questionnaires, the numbers in the cells in these comparisons is at times small. However, the pattern of results is so consistent across items and for both surveys, that there can be considerable confidence in the overall pattern.

The evaluation scores from the 3-year CYWF were lowest on nearly every item, while the evaluation scores for the Forensic concentration were highest on nearly every item. The 2-year Aging concentration had scores that were almost as high as those for the Forensic concentration. The scores for the 2-year CYWF were lower, though not as low as for the 3-year CYWF concentration. Many of these differences were statistically significant. Tables 23 to 27 show a number of these important differences. This pattern was shown for professional identification items (including ethical practice), application of theory, macro practice, general School quality, and overall satisfaction. For one example, on a scale from one to four, for recommending the program to another, students from the Forensic concentration had a mean of 3.55, while students from the 3-year CYWF concentration were at 2.30.

There were not strong differences among the program/concentrations for specific clinical items, for issues of diversity and social justice, for professional activities such as time management, and for research courses.

Discussion – Findings

Two thirds of the MSW students work while in the program, many of them full time. All of the 3-year program students, except one, worked while in the program. Sixty-two per cent of them worked full time. The mean amount of hours worked per week was 35 hours. Among the 2-year program students, almost half did not work at all. The mean amount of work was 7 hours per week. It's important to recognize that, in spite of the load, our three year program consists of working students, most working full-time.

About one third of the MSW students graduated from our BASW program. Is this a desirable proportion of the student population coming from our own program? There were eight students from other CSULA majors.

Cost of the program was cited as the major reason for coming to CSULA.

Eighty-three per cent of our graduates definitely plan to get an LCSW. It is surprising that almost twenty per cent do not in fact intend to get an LCSW.

In the Capstone assignment, few students reported an intention to go on to do research. The thesis experience is apparently not generating enthusiasm for research.

One of the strengths of the program is the support that students get from each other. Are we doing all we can to foster this collegiality?

In spite of the good relations among students the perceived lack of communication among the director, staff, faculty, and students continues to be identified as a problem. Again, this is particularly true of the 3-year program. This problem requires some attention.

As perceived by students, the quality of our faculty is bi-modal. One student expressed it well: “You either were lucky and had a great professor, or you were stuck with horrible instruction. There were no in-between type of professors here.” Positive comments about instructors tended to emphasize the practice experience that professors are able to bring into the classroom.

A major conclusion of this study was the high regard students have for the Forensic concentration. As described above, scores from this group were nearly always higher than those for the other program/concentrations. As shown on Table 23, for many important items, every student entered an A. Four students provided commentary about the Forensic concentration as a strength of the program. On item J1 – Why would you recommend the program to others? – eight students entered Forensic Concentration under Other, resulting in a new category for this item.

Another major conclusion of this study was the low regard students reported for the 3-year CYWF program. It is not known if the dissatisfaction was due to the 3-year program or due to the CYWF structure and faculty – probably a combination of both. A number of qualitative comments indicated dissatisfaction with the structure and the status of the 3-year program. At the same time, there were a number of comments regarding the lack of designated CYWF faculty for the sequence.

Discussion - Methodological Issues

There were serious sampling problems, which limit the possible interpretation of data. The response rate was low from the 2-year CYWF class, and there were no responses from the 3-year Aging course. Next year, there needs to be more careful follow-up in terms of data collection.

The original idea of including items specific to each concentration, but having everyone answer these ideas has not worked out so well. A better idea might be to have separate surveys for each concentration, with a foundation section in common but with separate questions for each concentration. This will require clearly differentiating items from foundation to advanced year. At the same time, the overall number of items for the common section can be reduced by factor analysis, and by looking at the items by topic and items by topic sections to see where there is duplication. This will eliminate the problem of reducing the N by having two different surveys.

Appendices

C. Qualitative Data	p. 12
D. Tables	p. 24
E. Comparison Tables	p. 36
F. Results by CSWE competencies	p. 41
G. Results by general topic	p. 47

MSW Qualitative Data, 2009

Strengths

General

A good experience overall.

I'm grateful for the experience.

It is great quality at a reasonable price.

I hope that my daughter gets to come here.

The accessibility to a good education at a reasonable cost.

I think the program is well-rounded and is applicable to field and the profession in a practical sense.

I'm satisfied, but I would have liked some variety.

Overall it was a thought provoking knowledge instilling program. It had several notable flaws but the good far outweighed the bad.

Overall, I'm very pleased with the program and professors, with a couple of exceptions.

Faculty

Good professors.

Dedicated professors and staff.

Accessibility of professors.

Enjoyed my professors.

Dedicated staff and students.

Dedicated social work professors who care about the integrity of the profession.

The teachers have been amazing.

The faculty and professors make it a great program.

The faculty seem to be on board with the mission and along with providing expert knowledge.

I had some excellent experiences with most of the faculty and staff – learning and interpersonal.

One of the reasons I chose to stay at CSULA for my MSW is the faculty and diversity. I think that for the most part, the professors are excellent and very accessible to provide guidance, clarification and support.

The majority of staff in the class room are well educated in the field and bring great experience to the learners.

The professors have been dedicated to our learning. They have allowed us to bring our own ideas and creativity into the curriculum.

The strengths of the program are the faculty. The faculty is diverse in their experiences and very supportive towards the students' success.

The faculty was always very supportive and encouraging.

Experienced and caring/supportive faculty.

Closeness of bonds between faculty and students.

Please maintain the easy accessibility of faculty. It's a strength.

The faculty and professors have such diversity, life experiences, and practice skills that you truly walk away with the urban generalist practice.

I also like the diversity of clinically oriented professors, macro oriented, research, etc.

Knowledgeable professors.

Professors that are still currently practicing.

The faculty are focused on facilitating students' learning.

Knowledge of faculty.

Experience of faculty

Excellent professors with good solid practice skills.

The professor's diverse knowledge, and various clinical backgrounds.

The quality of the educational experience of the staff/professors.

I truly love CSULA but that's only because of staff. I have my BSW and soon to be MSW from CSULA and I wouldn't change that. More importantly, it's the staff and the fact that we're treated with respect and seen as future colleagues. Our clinical professors truly ROCK. I learned so much from him and my clinical professors. Things that benefit me and have helped me grow as an individual and practitioner.

Professors are knowledgeable in the 3 year program, and are bringing current experience from their work outside the school.

Many of the part time professors that I was exposed to during my first year in the MSW program were very good professors. It was a real shame that the class of 2010 did not get that opportunity/ education.

The program has some excellent part time LCSWs that really helped prepare for work in the field.

The passion of a couple of the part-time profs who taught HBSE 1st year.

Human behavior professor was great.

Some faculty members.

Some of the faculty is excellent.

A number of excellent faculty members.

The faculty for my concentration.

I appreciate the dedication of certain faculty to students.

There are a couple people/faculty members who have made this program.

Most professors have high expectations with fair grading.

Field

Field placement instructors.

Learning through field experience.

There are a wide variety of field placements to choose from.

The mandatory experience in internship. Being able to apply my classroom skills in the field was more significant to my learning than any paper I wrote.

Diversity

Diversity.
Diversity.
Culturally diverse.
Culturally diverse.
Cultural diversity.
Diverse campus.
Cultural diversity.
Culturally diverse.
Cultural diversity on campus and in program.
Cultural diversity – did not expect that from CSULA

Cultural diversity focus.
Cultural competence preparation is strong.
Emphasis on cultural diversity and the use of strengths.
I think that the program's emphasis on learning to work with diverse populations is excellent.

Diversity of students
Diverse student population.
The student body is diverse.
Good cultural diversity among students and staff.
Access/exposure to a diverse student population.
Cultural and professional diversity of the student body.
Diversity in faculty and students in terms of backgrounds and strengths.
I believe we as students are diverse and represent our client population as well.
I loved how diverse my class was (although we could use couple of more Armenians in the program).

Structure

Hours.
Structure of classes.
Primarily set days of school attendance (T/Th)
Class availability on evenings and Saturdays.
Other strengths include the structure of the program.

Curriculum

Great curriculum.
The strong curriculum.
The curriculum is excellent.

Strengths based.
Promotes strengths based practice.

Strengths perspective focus is helpful.
Emphasis on strengths perspective.

Generalist perspective.
Generalist practice.
Diversity of classes (generalist perspective).
Exposure to a broad range of subject and practice areas.

Topics discussed in the class.
In depth knowledge on social practice is gained through written assignments.
Being challenged to grow personally throughout program and cultivate self-awareness.
Opportunity to put into practice what students learn in class.
Emphasis on evidence based practice.
Readings and teachings are very good.
The reading materials provided.
The emphasis on self care.
Emphasis on social justice, ethics, and practice implications.
The DCFS/IUC program was a great learning experience.
Prepares students for clinical, community and policy practice.
Research preparation is good.
Electives are efficient in helping our individual needs.

First year was educational in clinical.
Great first year foundation.

How clinically oriented the program is.
Clinical focus.
Clinical practice classes.
Program teaches variety of interventions, not just cbt.
I grew as a clinician thanks to the program.
Gaining more knowledge and experience, skills in working with individual, families, groups, etc.
Learning various theories and utilizing interventions into practice settings.

Its different concentrations.
The strengths of the program would be the option of the three concentrations available.
Concentration year truly helps you learn about yourself, build better rapport with professors, smaller class sizes, more intimate, get to know fellow colleagues.
Aging concentration professors and curriculum.
Forensic concentration.
Forensic program.
The forensic concentration was very well put together and I gained a lot of knowledge about the population I want to work with.
It provided me with a unique experience in the forensic field in and educational level and it concluded with my learning at my internship

Thesis.

I also much appreciated the thesis experience. It was a challenge.

Thesis – apart from the stress it puts on students, can teach as about sw research and its importance to other fields.

Administration

Flexibility.

Strong program director.

One major plus is having Dr. Brown so supportive of the students.

Students

Friendly environment among students.

Going through the experience with a cohort.

The students help each other pass essential information that we did not get from faculty.

Location/Cost

The location.

Location of school.

Proximity from home.

Location – LA is an urban city with many needs.

The location – field locations are great because of the large scale of LA.

Cost.

Cost.

Affordability.

MSW Qualitative Data, 2009

Weaknesses

General

Students are expected to be flexible, but the program is very rigid.
Being told to quit my job and fully commit to a program that is not willing to commit to me as a part time student was disheartening and unacceptable.
I am a sw undergraduate who also attended the MSW program. A lot of what I built on in MSW came from undergrad.

Faculty

You either were lucky and had a great professor, or you were stuck with horrible instruction. There were no in-between type of professors here.
Some faculty.
Pay more attention to who teaches what classes.
New professors are not well-prepared to teach. Should be trained.
Some of the faculty presented as being unprofessional, showing bias and favoritism.
Some of them came to class unprepared, and I ended up not learning a lot from them.
Inappropriate self disclosure. Unfortunately, as we learned in human behavior, the human mind tends to remember the negatives more than the positives.
Had instructors/professors who were not interested in subject teaching courses.
Most teachers should not be teaching. Lectures were poor, professors unethical, didn't teach anything, and no one did anything about it.
I hope new professors can teach classes next year.
Second year professors weren't prepared to teach their subjects.
Some profs did not teach or were knowledgeable in the subject matter they were assigned to teach. Need better matching of expertise with course assignments.
Not all professors are approachable and willing to help or better guide students.
Too many professors/lecturers use group projects instead of instruction.
Turn around response time from teachers (e-mail, calls)
Inconsistency between professors' regulations and guidelines for assignments that were assigned across all three cohorts.
Professors' inability to state clear instructions on how to complete certain assignments.
Expectations of students' writing skills / too low.
No measurements/feedbacks of oral presentations.
Some teachers are unable to stop some students from ranting.

Please take a look at part time instructors who do not teach.
Non-tenured professors which rotate (not stable) through academic year.
Very disappointing courses being taught by visiting or part time professors.
I think the faculty (part time) needs to be evaluated. There are some who should not be here.

Inflation of grades with no guidance from faculty on how to improve.
Grading is easy and it does not seem that completing class readings is important.
Some professors appear to inflate grades.

Having no full-time quality CYWF faculty.
Need a set CYWF professor.
Does not have professors who are experts in CYWF (have a long career experience in this concentration.)
No identifiable faculty for CYWF concentration.
Also by professors whose specialty is not CYSF or policy.

Thesis

Thesis advisors need to cut down their time in teaching other classes. Instead, they should focus more on thesis students.

Thesis advisors are overburdened.

Some professors were clueless about the thesis guidelines, process, etc.

Screen thesis advisors better. Are they passionate? Do they know the rules and expectations of thesis students? Do they have communication with their students and follow thesis advisors?

There should be different thesis professors because mine kept losing my drafts, turn around time in receiving papers back was long and not productive.

All thesis professors need to be consistent. Some professors helped their students a lot, and some didn't. Some profs approved students' theses after oral presentation even if a complete work has not been accomplished. All profs need to follow the same protocol to be fair.

The sloppy work of thesis. The professors themselves seem lost, confused, unorganized. Yet they expect the students to show perfection. I felt as though the thesis process completely changed my opinion of the program. I see it as unnecessary, especially when my professor was unapproachable, hardly accessible, uninformative and very rude.

I am disappointed that I leave this program on a very low note due to interactions with my thesis professor after a partially disabling illness. Unfortunately, I am left wondering at the social work concepts and whether some of the faculty are conversant and apply these concepts. I am disappointed that disability help is not extended to students despite a clause in all the syllabi within the school of social work. The professor increased my stress level in the 2 years I had the misfortune of being her student.

Field

Field liaison instructors

Need to have better field seminar instructors.

Field faculty is inexperienced and unprofessional. Lack of direction from administration may be partially responsible for lack of performance.

Field – field faculty should help students as soon as the student feels something is wrong at internship.

“Scare” to be honest in your field class because of “bad” events that have occurred with other students.

Seminar classes need more introspection, depth. It’s too much complaining. (I sat in on an MFT group seminar once. Wow, totally different – it helped develop so much more insight.)

The field faculty was not helpful to internship experience. They were inflexible with students, yet allowed many changes in curriculum, cancelled classes, lateness to class, for themselves. Complaints about this part of the program have seemed to be generally ignored.

Overall I think the program would improve if communication about practice, expectations and feedback improved between the school and field supervisors. Also, know when the supervisor is sugarcoating what happens at field. Visit more often without making it a disruptive occasion. Visit the actual sites.

More careful selection of field placement, especially supervisors, their quality and dedication to provide ongoing supervision.

Quality of field placements varies, also not a broad enough range of placements esp. within City of LA.

Some of the county sites such as probation provide poor experience for MSW students.

Lack of macro field opportunities – no variety when choosing placements.

Field placements for FSW concentration limited and quality of field instructors is poor.

Having 10 process recordings is pointless. It needs to be decreased.

Do not believe process recordings are useful for 2nd year students.

Process recordings.

The length of 1st year field class.

The 20 hours of field should be in the first year instead of the second.

20 hour of field first year.

2nd year – 16 hours of field to provide more time to dedicate to thesis.

The uptightness of the field placement class 1st year.

Too strict in first year internship. Too stringent on hierarchy of staff/student.

Curriculum

Generalist approach gives a taste of many areas but does not offer chance to go deep enough into any one, particularly clinical practice.

Practice classes/ 1st year.

Minimal clinical classes.

Not having enough quality clinical courses.

More practice using theory.

Need more clinical training.

Family and group therapy not given enough time at all.

Not enough practice training.

Reinforce direct social service. Clinical skills more role playing will be more beneficial.

CSULA MSW program can improve by strengthening its curriculums in practice, especially clinical assessment.

More emphasis on DSC diagnosis.

Need more practice on theories, interventions and treatment plans.

Not enough clinical experience/training for students who want to continue their education and obtain a LCSW.

The weakness of the program is that it needs to be more attuned to current social work practice.

More emphasis on alcohol and drug abuse.

Students need to be more educated about substance abuse.

Substance abuse issues should be incorporated more in practice class.

Lack of mandatory classes such as substance abuse, juvenile justice system.

The program lacks learning about diagnosing clients and substance abuse. They should be incorporated in the curriculum.

I don't feel that this program prepares me enough for therapeutic work. For instance, we are not trained on play therapy, art therapy, etc. We are not trained on substance abuse. Capstone class on cultural diversity we should have been offered choices for more advanced learning.

Also, grief and loss should be mandatory, not an elective.

No ethics course/class

Needs a course on sw ethics.

Needs more elective options.

Electives that were offered didn't have variety.

Re look at the electives to see if they should be part of the mandatory classes.

The DSM should be a required course and taught in detail.

DSM IV should be required.

Make DSM-IV mandatory

Not having DSM-IV as a mandatory class also is a limitation. I feel that everyone needs to have some knowledge in the area when dealing with clients.

I understand DSM-IV is a more case by case, learn as you go experience, but I felt it was unorganized, needs to be structured differently.

While most courses were relevant and useful, the community organizing class in the first year could use improvement as did the DSM – IV course.

Disappointing second year.

Second year was repetitive.

2nd year MSW curriculum did not seem well planned.

The 2 year program was extremely intense. It is physically, mentally, and emotionally draining. It was all about trying to complete 3 assignments for each class (paper one, midterm, final). Students didn't have time to read the books.

Overall I have been disappointed with the 3rd year classes completely. I think the

No focus on macro or community work.

I would like a stronger emphasis on macro sw.

Students don't get the opportunity to do more macro work.

Micro practice classes much stronger than macro side.

Macro classes – weak! No curriculum, no instructions, little lecture, projects not structured, no real world application.

Too many presentations and group activities.

Provide more speakers, field trips, more exposure for FSW students.

Not emphasis on the ability to speak up in class. If you can not speak in front of a class of your peers, how will you advocate for clients in front of judges, social security, medical difficulties for clients. A social worker cannot be shy in advocating for clients.

Undergrad writing in all courses should prepare the students for expected writing skills in grad school whether they intend to attend or not. Good writing skills are expected in social work whether one has a MSW or not.

The program does not challenge students nor does it use their strengths and ideas to improve the program or classes.

It should improve the quality, integrity, and educational focus from just research and presentations to student documentaries, films, etc.

The program should challenge students to develop cutting edge projects.

Thesis

I believe thesis was irrelevant.

Thesis doesn't seem like it will be useful in practice.

The thesis is not practical in the real work world.

Thesis really needs to be broken down and organized.

The thesis is not a good measure of how competent students are ready to practice social work.

Thesis seems to be unhelpful in practice and did not help with gaining knowledge in the sw field.

Thesis – it doesn't measure our overall learning experience. It should be an option, not mandatory.

Need to consider giving students other options instead of just assigning thesis. Other schools have 2 to 3 options on projects that are cumulative to thesis.

Thesis – could there also be an option of a group research project? Too stressful!

Limited preparation prior to thesis.

Limited thesis time allocated.

Having to complete a thesis with the time delay of IRB approval.

Thesis – time consuming and energy zapping in the 2nd year when we should be learning about advance practice skills and intervention techniques to prepare us for the workforce. Having thesis second year makes a big difference if students had field work experience.

Having the additional field work hours doesn't make a big difference. Students have already gained work experience from previous year.

Thesis – qualitative researchers did not receive IRB approval until March which allowed for only 2 months to collect, analyze and complete thesis.

Structure

Lack of time.

Would have enjoyed exposure to a broader range of staff.

More elective options throughout the program.

Make DSM requirement in 1st quarter.

DSM-IV elective would be more beneficial during the foundation year.

Electives are late, esp DSM.

Electives that are needed at the beginning of the program are offered right before getting ready to graduate.

Some of the curriculum should be started earlier (Ex: lit review/annotate bib earlier to prepare for thesis).

Not having a clinical class in the spring of 1st year threw you off because you go 2 quarters without that clinical practice. When I returned in the fall I felt rusty, but that could be the rookie effect.

The 3 year program is not part time when field starts. The entire program is not fully explained.

The program did not take into consideration the schedules of working clients.

The concentrations available for fulltime students are not available for part time students.

Semester might be beneficial. There's not enough time to really embrace and digest all the information presented in text, readings, lectures.

Administration/Communication

Organization.

A lack of communication, integrity, and consistency.

The administration needs improvement.

Administration. Staff does not return phone calls or emails. If they do, they give you a run around and nothing ever gets solved.

The program is poorly organized and uses the excuses that it is a university, not program problem, or that learning to navigate a disorganized system helps us empathize with clients.

Though the office staff is excellent, I was told more than once that paperwork and records of mine were lost.

Office personnel – sometimes were not the nicest people, did not help students with paper (EX: “you have to go to that office yourself” instead of simply calling for us); need to be more approachable.

Students are expected to be flexible, but the program is very rigid.

Communication within the department.

Communication to students is not standardized.

Not enough communication with students on meetings and requirements.

No communication with office staff or director.

School needs to communicate better with the MSW students.

Communication from Dean/admin side very poor.

Information/communication from staff to students.

I think that there needs to be better communication with the administrative office and students about deadlines and administrative information.

There are huge gaps in communication between administration and the students. When we are not informed of information due to these administrative complications, we still have to pay the price for it.

I believe the lack of communication between the faculty and students. In the later part of the program there has been improvements with the stressed?? Usage of email addressed from CSULA

Did not offer the electives that were presented in the orientation.

Administration's inability to include the 3 year part time program in all notices and inform on a timely basis.

More empathy and effort from the program towards 3 year working adults.

Availability of administration for 3 year students.

Excludes 3 year students.

I felt in this program that I was not supported by the administration at all. The communication between part time program and school is poor.

Advisement

Office hours available to students.

I think that orienting new students and providing them with advisors where they can talk about their educational and career goals early on would have been helpful.

I think that students should receive more academic advisement when first entering the program and that it should be more clear how to obtain an advisor.

Students

Some students should not be in this program and there needs to be a different acceptance process.

Classrooms

Classrooms.

Class room size.

Tables
MSW Evaluation, 2008

Table 1 - Numbers and percentages of program and concentration.

Variable	N	%
Program		
Two Year	40	65.6
Three Year	21	34.4
Total	61	100
Concentration		
Children, Youth and Families	29	47.5
Aging and Families	11	18.0
Forensic Social Work	21	34.4
Total	61	100

Table 2 - Numbers and percentages of financial factors.

Variable	N	%
Stipend		
CalSWEC	7	11.7
CalSWEC II	6	10.0
IUC	8	13.3
GSWEC	5	8.3
DMH	8	13.3
Other	1	1.7
None	25	41.7
Total	60	100
Employed While In School		
Yes	41	67.2
No	20	32.8
Total	61	100

Table 3 - Numbers and percentages of demographic factors.

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Male	9	15.8
Female	48	84.2
Total	57	100
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	51	89.5
Homosexual	4	7.0
Bisexual	2	3.5
Total	57	100
Marital Status		
Never Married	30	51.7
Married	21	36.2
Living With Partner	4	6.6
Divorced	2	3.4
Widowed	1	1.6
Total	58	100
Number of Dependent Children		
None	41	70.7
One	5	8.6
Two	7	12.1
Three or More	5	8.6
Total	58	100
Total Number of Dependent People		
None	33	56.9
One	6	10.3
Two	10	17.2
Three or More	9	15.4
Total	58	100

Table 4 - Numbers and percentages of ethnicity and first language.

Variable	N	%
Ethnicity		
Latino	27	47.4
African-American	6	10.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	15.8
White	13	22.8
Bi/Multi Racial	2	3.5
Total	57	100
First Language		
Spanish	25	41.7
English	25	41.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	5	8.3
Middle Eastern	2	3.3
Other	3	5.0
Total		10060

Table 5 - Numbers and percentages of countries of origin.

Variable	N	%
Country Where Student Born		
USA	41	68.3
Mexico	3	5.0
Other Central American	5	8.3
Asia/Pacific Islands	7	11.7
Middle East	1	1.7
Europe	1	1.7
Africa	1	1.7
Other	1	1.7
Total	60	100
Country Where Father Born		
USA	22	37.3
Mexico	14	13.7
Other Central American	11	18.6
Asia/Pacific Islands	7	11.9
Middle East	1	1.7
Europe	2	3.4
Africa	1	1.7
Other	1	1.7
Total	59	100

Table 6 - Numbers and percentages of fathers' highest education.

Variable	N	%
Father's Education		
Elementary School	13	22.4
Junior High School Graduate	3	5.2
Some High School	7	12.1
High School Graduate	9	15.5
Some College	13	22.4
College Graduate	6	10.3
Graduate School	7	12.1
Total	58	100

Table 7 – Numbers and percentages of educational history factors.

Variable	N	%
Undergraduate Major		
Social Work/Human Services	25	41.7
Psychology	13	21.7
Sociology/Gerontology	10	16.7
Criminal Justice	3	5.0
Other Liberal Arts	5	8.3
Art/Theater	2	3.3
Ethnic Studies/Literature	2	3.3
Total	60	100
Undergraduate Institution		
CSULA	27	47.4
Other CSU	7	12.3
UC	9	15.8
California Private University	5	8.8
Out of State	8	14.0
Out of Country	1	1.8
Total	57	100
Other Master's Degree		
Yes	0	0
No	61	100
Total	61	100

Table 8 - Numbers and percentages of work history factors.

Variable	N	%
Unpaid Social Work Experience		
Yes	39	66.1
No	20	33.9
Total	59	100
Paid Social Work Experience		
Yes	39	63.9
No	22	36.1
Total	61	100

Table 9 - Numbers and percentages of job plans.

Variable	N	%
Have A Job		
Yes	31	50.8
No	30	49.2
Total	61	100
Intend to Get LCSW		
Yes	53	86.9
No	1	1.6
Maybe	7	11.5
Total	61	100
Intend to Get PhD		
Yes	6	9.8
No	24	39.3
Maybe	31	50.8
Total	61	100

Table 10 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to practice generalist social work with:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Individuals	60	.45	3.52	A-
Families	60	.47	3.12	B
Groups	61	.50	3.04	B
Organizations	61	.53	2.93	B
Communities	60	.52	2.94	B
Clients of different ethnic backgrounds	61	.49	3.54	A-
Oppressed populations	60	.50	3.47	B+
Clients of different sexual orientations	61	.62	3.21	B+
Clients of different ages	60	.46	3.32	B+

Table 11 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to apply in your practice:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Knowledge of human behavior and development	61	.42	3.66	A-
Family systems theories	61	.50	3.44	B+
Theories of aging	60	.65	3.14	B
The strengths and empowerment perspective	61	.36	3.76	A-
Authority and power	61	.59	3.24	B+
Intervention models	60	.53	3.18	B+
Clinical knowledge	60	.56	3.28	B+
Principles of psychosocial rehabilitation	61	.63	3.06	B
Knowledge of the stages of development in children	61	.53	3.55	A-
Knowledge of the stages of adult development	61	.54	3.53	A-
Knowledge of mental illness along the life cycle	61	.64	3.12	B

Table 12 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Manage time effectively	29	.54	3.22	B+
Manage tasks effectively	29	.53	3.28	B+
Communicate in writing	29	.57	3.53	A-
Communicate orally	29	.54	3.55	A-
Document your work	29	.60	3.37	B+
Use supervision	29	.60	3.45	B+
Practice ethically	29	.44	3.75	A-
Work collaboratively	29	.54	3.51	A-

Table 13 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to be sensitive to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Differences in clients' culture and ethnicity	29	.48	3.72	A-
Differences in clients' sexual orientation	29	.66	3.44	B+
The importance of the clients' primary language	29	.59	3.45	B+
Diversity within ethnic and cultural groups	29	.54	3.61	A-
Differences in clients' religious beliefs	29	.59	3.48	B+
Differences in clients' ages	29	.72	3.33	B+

Table 14 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Use social research to evaluate your practice	31	.50	3.18	B+
Use research methodology to evaluate your practice	31	.54	3.08	B
Conduct social work research	31	.61	3.24	B+

Table 15 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Conduct a mental status exam	31	.62	3.20	B+
Understand the importance of attachment and separation in working with children	31	.58	3.55	A-
Use the DSM-IV-TR	31	.62	2.66	B
Understand the principles of concurrent and permanency planning in child welfare	30	.55	2.88	B
Understand the use of psychotropic medications	30	.64	2.63	B-
Interview children	31	.59	2.84	B
Understand the principles of the consumer movement in mental health	31	.65	2.89	B
Prepare written reports for dependency court	31	.36	2.27	C+

Table 16 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Apply social work ethical principles	29	.41	3.68	A-
Uphold professional roles and boundaries	29	.43	3.71	A-
Identify with the profession of social work	29	.50	3.69	A-
Use your professional self in social work practice	29	.42	3.71	A-
Recognize effect of own cultural values on your practice	29	.32	3.76	A-
Recognize effect of own emotional responses on your practice	29	.44	3.71	A-
Engage in career-long learning	29	.66	3.46	B+
Have an interest in further study in the field of social work	29	.76	3.28	B+
Provide leadership in your practice setting	29	.68	3.33	B+
Apply self-care strategies	29	.68	3.35	B+
Practice with a high degree of professional autonomy	29	.62	3.49	B+
Advocate on behalf of individual clients	29	.52	3.60	A-
Advocate in the community and with policy makers	29	.61	3.32	B+
Promote human rights and social justice	29	.59	3.55	A-
Understand the forms of oppression	29	.64	3.48	B+
Understand the effects of poverty	29	.55	3.66	A-
Understand the effects of discrimination	29	.54	3.63	A-

Table 17 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Interview clients	31	.57	3.43	B+
Use empathy and other interpersonal skills	30	.42	3.66	A-
Conduct bio-psychosocial assessments	31	.47	3.62	A-
Assess a client's strengths and limitations	31	.42	3.67	A-
Assess a client's health status and physical functioning	30	.49	3.40	B+
Assess a client's mental health status	31	.53	3.30	B+
Assess a client's level of social functioning	30	.50	3.42	B+
Develop a case plan with goals and outcomes	31	.60	3.31	B+
Select appropriate intervention strategies	29	.56	3.24	B+
Work effectively with clients' families	31	.54	3.17	B+
Work effectively with care givers	31	.57	3.06	B
Understand the dynamics of family violence	30	.61	3.05	B
Work effectively with angry or hostile clients	29	.63	2.95	B
Effectively terminate with clients	31	.64	3.34	B+
Provide case management services	31	.60	3.33	B+
Use group interventions	31	.60	3.05	B
Work with involuntary clients	31	.61	3.20	B+
Provide outreach to clients	31	.54	3.06	B
Work effectively with immigrants and refugees	31	.54	2.91	B
Recognize the effects of acute and cumulative trauma on clients	31	.62	3.24	B+
Recognize potentially harmful behaviors	31	.49	3.38	B+

Table 18 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Recognize problems of substance abuse	30	.66	3.06	B
Apply knowledge of the recovery process	30	.59	3.12	B
Identify the signs of abuse/neglect with minors	30	.62	3.24	B+
Identify the signs of abuse/neglect with older adults	30	.66	3.09	B
Identify the forces contributing to child neglect and abuse	30	.52	3.40	B+
Identify the forces contributing to the abuse of older adults	30	.68	3.08	B

Table 19 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Assess an organization's strengths and limitations	30	.65	3.12	B
Assess an organization's cultural competence	30	.64	3.21	B+
Identify agency factors that impede practice	30	.62	3.17	B+
Apply the basic principles of administrative practice	29	.68	3.13	B
Apply the basic principles of budgeting	30	.69	2.91	B
Supervise other staff	30	.76	2.80	B
Identify community supports for clients	30	.67	3.37	B+
Mobilize natural and community supports	29	.65	3.24	B+
Engage in effective policy practice	30	.56	3.22	B+
Analyze social policies	29	.57	3.36	B+
Define social problems	30	.46	3.54	A-
Understand the laws that regulate your practice	30	.59	3.22	B+
Understand the role of social workers in relation to the courts	30	.77	3.10	B

Table 20 – Grade, mean, standard deviation and N.

How would you rate each of the following aspects of the MSW program:

Variable	N	SD	Mean	Grade
Quality of classroom faculty	61	.50	3.42	B+
Quality of field faculty	61	.64	3.20	B+
Accessibility of faculty	61	.57	3.41	B+
Quality of field instructors	61	.62	3.38	B+
Overall structure of the program	61	.59	3.20	B+
Quality of the curriculum	60	.53	3.27	B+
Fairness of the grading	61	.53	3.46	B+
Advisement	61	.66	3.09	B
Quality of office staff	61	.67	3.14	B
Communication within the school	61	.72	2.96	B

Table 21 – Mean (on a scale from one to four), standard deviation and N.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Variable	N	SD	Mean
I would recommend this program to another student.	60	.86	3.00
I am satisfied with the overall educational experience at this program.	61	.82	3.03
If I were starting over, I would attend this program.	59	.94	2.95

Table 22 - Numbers and percentages of reasons to recommend the BSW program.

Variable	N	%
Primary Reason to Recommend		
CSULA		
Cost	23	39.7
Location	9	15.5
Faculty	3	5.2
Cultural diversity	3	5.2
Education	11	19.0
Forensic concentration	8	13.8
Other	1	1.7
Total	58	100

Table 23 – Mean grade, standard deviation, and N of professional identification items by program/concentration.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	Mean Grade	SD	F	p
Apply ethical principles				3.22	.040
2-year CYWF	5	3.60	.44		
2-year Aging	4	3.75	.50		
2-year Forensic	9	3.63	.11		
3-year CYWF	11	3.45	.43		
Total	29	3.68	.41		
Identify with social work				2.76	.063
2-year CYWF	5	3.60	.55		
2-year Aging	4	3.83	.34		
2-year Forensic	9	4.00	.00		
3-year CYWF	11	3.42	.62		
Total	29	3.69	.50		
Use one's professional self				3.30	.037
2-year CYWF	5	3.60	.55		
2-year Aging	4	3.83	.34		
2-year Forensic	9	4.00	.00		
3-year CYWF	11	3.49	.46		
Total	29	3.71	.42		
Use one's own cultural values				3.76	.023
2-year CYWF	5	3.73	.28		
2-year Aging	4	3.75	.32		
2-year Forensic	9	4.00	.00		
3-year CYWF	11	3.58	.37		
Total	29	3.76	.32		
Provide leadership				3.18	.041
2-year CYWF	5	3.40	.55		
2-year Aging	4	2.92	.83		
2-year Forensic	9	3.82	.24		
3-year CYWF	11	3.06	.76		
Total	29	3.33	.68		
Practice autonomously				4.61	.011
2-year CYWF	5	3.60	.55		
2-year Aging	4	3.42	.74		
2-year Forensic	9	3.96	.11		
3-year CYWF	11	3.09	.64		
Total	29	3.49	.62		

Table 24 – Mean grade, standard deviation, and N of application of theories items by program/concentration.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to apply in your practice:

Variable	N	Mean Grade	SD	F	p
Human behavior				5.92	.001
2-year CYWF	8	3.95	.15		
2-year Aging	11	3.67	.30		
2-year Forensic	21	3.83	.27		
3-year CYWF	21	3.40	.53		
Total	61	3.66	.42		
Strengths perspective				5.167	.003
2-year CYWF	8	3.79	.25		
2-year Aging	11	3.88	.17		
2-year Forensic	21	3.91	.09		
3-year CYWF	21	3.54	.48		
Total	61	3.76	.36		
Authority and power				3.92	.013
2-year CYWF	8	3.04	.82		
2-year Aging	11	3.24	.40		
2-year Forensic	21	3.56	.43		
3-year CYWF	21	3.00	.61		
Total	61	3.24	.59		
Intervention models				5.58	.002
2-year CYWF	8	3.29	.45		
2-year Aging	11	3.06	.61		
2-year Forensic	21	3.48	.37		
3-year CYWF	20	2.88	.51		
Total	60	3.18	.53		
Clinical knowledge				12.92	.000
2-year CYWF	8	3.29	.42		
2-year Aging	11	3.43	.42		
2-year Forensic	21	3.65	.33		
3-year CYWF	20	2.83	.54		
Total	60	3.28	.56		

Table 25 – Mean grade, standard deviation, and N of macro practice items by program/concentration.

How well has the MSW program prepared you to:

Variable	N	Mean Grade	SD	F	p
Apply the principles of administrative practice				5.05	.007
2-year CYWF	5	3.40	.55		
2-year Aging	4	3.08	.67		
2-year Forensic	10	3.54	.24		
3-year CYWF	10	2.60	.73		
Total	29	3.13	.68		
Supervise staff				4.62	.010
2-year CYWF	5	3.00	.82		
2-year Aging	4	2.75	.96		
2-year Forensic	10	3.30	.43		
3-year CYWF	11	2.27	.61		
Total	30	2.80	.76		
Identify community support				2.58	.075
2-year CYWF	5	3.13	.56		
2-year Aging	4	3.50	1.00		
2-year Forensic	10	3.77	.28		
3-year CYWF	11	3.06	.71		
Total	30	3.37	.67		
Mobilize community support				2.41	.091
2-year CYWF	5	3.40	.49		
2-year Aging	4	3.34	.90		
2-year Forensic	10	3.54	.42		
3-year CYWF	11	2.83	.69		
Total	30	3.24	.65		
Effective policy practice				3.33	.035
2-year CYWF	5	3.47	.60		
2-year Aging	4	3.00	.72		
2-year Forensic	10	3.53	.36		
3-year CYWF	11	2.91	.50		
Total	30	3.22	.56		
Analyze social problems				1.88	.158
2-year CYWF	5	3.47	.45		
2-year Aging	4	3.17	.69		
2-year Forensic	9	3.67	.29		
3-year CYWF	11	3.12	.67		
Total	29	3.36	.57		

Table 26 – Mean grade, standard deviation, and N of School quality items by program/concentration.

How would you rate each of the following aspects of the MSW program:

Variable	N	Mean Grade	SD	F	p
Classroom faculty				4.83	.005
2-year CYWF	8	3.25	.58		
2-year Aging	11	3.48	.38		
2-year Forensic	21	3.68	.27		
3-year CYWF	21	3.17	.57		
Total	61	3.41	.50		
Field faculty				12.10	.000
2-year CYWF	8	3.25	.58		
2-year Aging	11	3.67	.37		
2-year Forensic	21	3.46	.39		
3-year CYWF	21	2.68	.65		
Total	61	3.20	.64		
Structure of program				10.07	.000
2-year CYWF	8	3.25	.73		
2-year Aging	11	3.49	.38		
2-year Forensic	21	3.49	.36		
3-year CYWF	21	2.73	.55		
Total	61	3.20	.59		
Curriculum				9.14	.000
2-year CYWF	8	3.08	.56		
2-year Aging	11	3.52	.40		
2-year Forensic	21	3.56	.32		
3-year CYWF	20	2.90	.52		
Total	60	3.27	.53		
Office staff				7.82	.000
2-year CYWF	8	3.04	.72		
2-year Aging	11	3.46	.62		
2-year Forensic	21	3.47	.50		
3-year CYWF	21	2.68	.58		
Total	61	3.14	.67		
Communication				17.22	.000
2-year CYWF	8	3.12	.67		
2-year Aging	11	3.55	.34		
2-year Forensic	21	3.25	.59		
3-year CYWF	21	2.30	.52		
Total	61	2.96	.72		

Table 27 – Mean (on a scale from 1 to 4), standard deviation, and N of overall items by program/concentration.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Variable	N	Mean Grade	SD	F	p
Recommend the program to another				5.80	.002
2-year CYWF	8	3.12	.67		
2-year Aging	11	3.55	.34		
2-year Forensic	21	3.25	.59		
3-year CYWF	21	2.30	.52		
Total	61	2.96	.72		
Satisfied overall with the program				4.87	.004
2-year CYWF	8	2.75	1.04		
2-year Aging	10	3.20	.63		
2-year Forensic	21	3.48	.75		
3-year CYWF	21	2.52	.75		
Total	60	3.00	.86		
Would attend this program again				3.55	.020
2-year CYWF	8	2.37	1.19		
2-year Aging	11	3.18	.75		
2-year Forensic	19	3.37	.76		
3-year CYWF	21	2.67	.91		
Total	59	2.95	.94		

**Item Scores by CSWE outcomes
MSW Evaluation 2009**

2.1.1 – Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.

Identify with the profession of social work? A- (3.69)

Advocate for client access to the services of social work;

Advocate on behalf of individual clients? A- (3.60)

Advocate in the community and with policy makers for your clients?
B+ (3.32)

Practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development;

Use your professional self in social work practice? A- (3.71)

Apply self-care strategies to minimize work stress? B+ (3.35)

Attend to professional roles and boundaries;

Uphold professional roles and boundaries? A- (3.71)

Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication;

Engage in career-long learning;

Engage in career-long learning? B+ (3.46)

Have an interest in further study in the field of social work? B+ (3.28)

Use supervision and consultation.

Use supervision to assess your practice? B+ (3.45)

2.1.2 – Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.

Practice ethically? A- (3.75)

Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice;

Recognize how your emotional responses to clients affect your practice?
A- (3.71)

Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the NASW Code of Ethics;

Apply social work ethical principles to practice? A- (3.68)

Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts;

Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.

2.1.3 – Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.

Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom;

Apply clinical knowledge? B+ (3.28)

Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation;

Apply intervention models? B+ (3.18)

Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.

Communicate in writing? A- (3.53)

Communicate orally? A- (3.55)

Document your work as required by the agency? B+ (3.37)

Work collaboratively with your colleagues? A- (3.51)

2.1.4 – Engage diversity and difference in practice.

Work with clients of different ethnic, racial and cultural backgrounds?
A- (3.54)

Recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power;

Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups;

Recognize how your own cultural values affect your practice? A- (3.76)

Recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences;

<i>Understand differences in clients' culture and ethnicity?</i>	A- (3.72)
<i>Understand differences in clients' sexual orientation?</i>	B+ (3.44)
<i>Understand the importance of the clients' primary language?</i>	B+ (3.45)
<i>Understand diversity within ethnic and cultural groups?</i>	A- (3.61)
<i>Understand differences in clients' religious beliefs?</i>	B+ (3.48)

View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.

2.1.5 – Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination;

<i>Understand the forms of oppression?</i>	B+ (3.48)
<i>Understand the effects of discrimination?</i>	A- (3.63)
<i>Apply the strengths and empowerment perspective?</i>	A- (3.76)

Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice;

<i>Promote human rights and social justice?</i>	A- (3.55)
---	-----------

Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.

<i>Work with oppressed populations?</i>	B+ (3.47)
---	-----------

2.1.6 – Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.

<i>Conduct social work research?</i>	B+ (3.24)
--------------------------------------	-----------

Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry;

Use research evidence to inform practice.

<i>Use social research to evaluate your practice?</i>	B+ (3.18)
<i>Use research methodology to evaluate your practice?</i>	B (3.08)

2.1.7 - Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.

<i>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment?</i>	A- (3.66)
<i>Apply knowledge of the stages of development in children?</i>	A- (3.55)
<i>Apply knowledge of the stages of adult development?</i>	A- (3.53)

Utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation;

<i>Apply family systems theories?</i>	B+ (3.44)
<i>Apply theories of aging?</i>	B (3.14)
<i>Understand authority and power?</i>	B+ (3.24)

Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

<i>Understand the importance of attachment and separation in working with children?</i>	B (3.05)
<i>Understand the dynamics of family violence?</i>	
<i>Recognize the effects of acute and cumulative trauma on clients?</i>	B+ (3.24)
<i>Apply knowledge of mental illness along the life cycle?</i>	B (3.12)
<i>Identify the forces contributing to child neglect and abuse?</i>	B+ (3.40)
<i>Identify the forces contributing to the abuse of older adults?</i>	B (3.08)

2.1.8 – Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.

Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being;

<i>Analyze social policies?</i>	B+ (3.36)
<i>Define social problems?</i>	A- (3.54)

Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.

<i>Engage in effective policy practice?</i>	B+ (3.22)
---	-----------

2.1.9 – Respond to contexts that shape practice.

Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services;

Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.

<i>Provide leadership in your practice setting?</i>	B+ (3.33)
---	-----------

2.1.10 (a-d) – Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

<i>Work with individuals?</i>	A- (3.52)
<i>Work with families?</i>	B (3.12)
<i>Work with groups?</i>	B (3.04)
<i>Work with organizations?</i>	B (2.93)
<i>Work with communities?</i>	B (2.94)

a. Engagement

Substantively and affectively prepare for action with individual, families, groups, organizations, and communities;

<i>Interview clients?</i>	B+ (3.43)
<i>Interview children?</i>	B (2.84)

Use empathy and other interpersonal skills;

<i>Use empathy and other interpersonal skills?</i>	A- (3.66)
--	-----------

Develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.

b. Assessment

Collect, organize, and interpret client data;

<i>Conduct bio-psychosocial assessments?</i>	A- (3.62)
<i>Assess a client's health status and physical functioning?</i>	A- (3.67)
<i>Assess a client's mental health status?</i>	B+ (3.30)
<i>Assess a client's level of social functioning?</i>	B+ (3.42)
<i>Use the DSM-IV-TR?</i>	B (2.66)
<i>Recognize problems of substance abuse?</i>	B (3.06)
<i>Identify the signs of abuse/neglect with minors?</i>	B+ (3.24)
<i>Identify the signs of abuse/neglect with older adults?</i>	B (3.09)
<i>Assess an organizations strengths and limitations?</i>	B (3.12)
<i>Assess an organization's cultural competence?</i>	B+ (3.21)
<i>Identify agency factors that impede practice?</i>	B+ (3.17)
<i>Identify community supports for clients?</i>	B+ (3.37)

Assess client strengths and limitations;

<i>Assess a client's strengths and limitations?</i>	A- (3.67)
---	-----------

Develop mutually agreed-on interventional goals and objectives;

Develop a case plan with goals and outcomes? B+ (3.31)

Select appropriate intervention strategies.

Select appropriate intervention strategies? B+ (3.24)

c. Intervention

Use group interventions? B (3.05)

Mobilize natural and community supports? B+ (3.24)

Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals;

Apply the basic principles of administrative practice? B (3.13)

Supervise other staff? B (2.80)

Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities;

Provide outreach to clients? B (3.06)

Understand the use of psychotropic medications? B- (2.63)

Work effectively with angry or hostile clients? B (2.95)

Help clients resolve problems;

Work with involuntary clients? B+ (3.20)

Work effectively with clients' families? B+ (3.17)

Work effectively with care givers? B (3.06)

Recognize potentially harmful behaviors? B+ (3.38)

Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients;

Provide social work case management services? B+ (3.33)

Work effectively with immigrants and refugees? B (2.91)

Facilitate transitions and endings.

Effectively terminate with clients? B+ (3.34)

d. Evaluation

Survey Items by Topic MSW Evaluation 2008

Professional Identification

<i>Uphold professional roles and boundaries?</i>	A- (3.71)
<i>Identify with the profession of social work?</i>	A- (3.69)
<i>Engage in career-long learning?</i>	B+ (3.46)
<i>Have an interest in further study in the field of social work?</i>	B+ (3.28)

Ethical Practice

<i>Practice ethically?</i>	A- (3.75)
<i>Apply social work ethical principles to practice?</i>	A- (3.68)

General Professional Practice

<i>Manage time effectively?</i>	B+ (3.22)
<i>Manage tasks effectively?</i>	B+ (3.28)
<i>Communicate in writing?</i>	A- (3.53)
<i>Communicate orally?</i>	A- (3.55)
<i>Document your work as required by the agency?</i>	B+ (3.17)
<i>Use supervision to assess your practice?</i>	B+ (3.45)
<i>Work collaboratively with other professionals?</i>	A- (3.51)
<i>Provide leadership in your practice setting?</i>	B+ (3.33)
<i>Practice with a high degree of professional autonomy?</i>	B+ (3.49)
<i>Use authority and power?</i>	B+ (3.24)

Use of Self

<i>Use your professional self in social work practice?</i>	A- (3.71)
<i>Recognize how your own cultural values affect your practice?</i>	A- (3.76)
<i>Recognize how your emotional responses to clients affect your practice?</i>	A- (3.71)
<i>Apply self-care strategies to minimize work stress?</i>	B+ (3.35)

Critical Thinking

Use Theory

Generally

Specific Theories

<i>Apply family systems theories?</i>	B+ (3.48)
<i>Apply theories of aging?</i>	B (3.14)
<i>Apply the strengths and empowerment perspective?</i>	A- (3.76)

Use Intervention Models

Generally

<i>Apply clinical knowledge?</i>	B+ (3.28)
<i>Apply intervention models?</i>	B+ (3.18)

Specific Models

Human Development

<i>Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment?</i>	A- (3.66)
<i>Apply knowledge of the stages of development in children?</i>	A- (3.55)
<i>Apply knowledge of the stages of adult development?</i>	A- (3.53)
<i>Apply knowledge of mental illness along the life cycle?</i>	B (3.12)

Diversity

<i>Work with clients of different ethnic, racial and cultural backgrounds?</i>	A- (3.54)
<i>Work with clients of different sexual orientations?</i>	B+ (3.21)
<i>Understand differences in clients' culture and ethnicity?</i>	A- (3.72)
<i>Understand differences in clients' sexual orientation?</i>	B+ (3.44)
<i>Understand the importance of clients' primary language?</i>	B+ (3.45)
<i>Understand diversity within ethnic and cultural groups?</i>	A- (3.61)
<i>Understand differences in clients' religious beliefs?</i>	B+ (3.48)
<i>Understand differences in clients' ages?</i>	B+ (3.33)
<i>Work effectively with immigrants and refugees?</i>	B (2.91)

Social Justice

<i>Work with oppressed populations?</i>	B+ (3.47)
<i>Promote human rights and social justice?</i>	A- (3.55)
<i>Understand the forms of oppression?</i>	B+ (3.48)
<i>Understand the effects of poverty on your clients?</i>	A- (3.66)
<i>Understand the effects of discrimination?</i>	A- (3.63)

Advocacy

<i>Advocate on behalf of individual clients?</i>	A- (3.60)
<i>Advocate in the community and with policy makers for your clients?</i>	B+ (3.32)

Micro Practice Skills

General

<i>Work with Individuals?</i>	A- (3.52)
<i>Interview clients?</i>	B+ (3.43)
<i>Provide social work case management services?</i>	B+ (3.33)
<i>Work with involuntary clients?</i>	B+ (3.20)
<i>Recognize the effects of acute and cumulative trauma on clients?</i>	B+ (3.24)

Engagement

<i>Provide outreach to clients?</i>	B (3.06)
<i>Use empathy and other interpersonal skills?</i>	A- (3.66)

Assessment

<i>Conduct bio-psychosocial assessments?</i>	A- (3.62)
<i>Assess a client's strengths and limitations?</i>	A- (3.67)
<i>Assess a client's health status and physical functioning?</i>	B+ (3.40)
<i>Assess a client's mental health status?</i>	B+ (3.30)
<i>Assess a client's level of social functioning?</i>	B+ (3.42)
<i>Recognize potentially harmful behaviors?</i>	B+ (3.38)

Planning

<i>Develop a case plan with goals and outcomes?</i>	B+ (3.31)
<i>Select appropriate intervention strategies?</i>	B+ (3.24)
<i>Effectively terminate with clients?</i>	B+ (3.34)

Family Involvement

<i>Work with families?</i>	B (3.12)
<i>Work effectively with clients' families?</i>	B+ (3.17)
<i>Work effectively with care givers?</i>	B (3.06)
<i>Understand the dynamics of family violence?</i>	B (3.05)

Legal

<i>Understand the laws that regulate your practice?</i>	B+ (3.22)
<i>Understand the role of social workers in relation to the courts?</i>	B (3.10)

Abuse

Child

- Identify the signs of abuse/neglect with minors?* B+ (3.24)
Identify the forces contributing to child neglect and abuse? B+ (3.40)

Elderly

- Identify the signs of abuse/ neglect with older adults?* B (3.09)
Identify the forces contributing to the abuse of older adults? B (3.08)

Substance Abuse

- Recognize problems of substance abuse?* B (3.06)
Apply knowledge of the recovery process? B (3.12)

Group

- Work with groups?* B (3.04)
Use group interventions? B (3.05)

Agency

- Work with organizations?* B (2.93)
Assess an organization's strengths and limitations? B (3.12)
Assess an organization's cultural competence? B+ (3.21)
Identify agency factors that impede practice? B+ (3.17)
Apply the basic principles of administrative practice? B (3.13)
Apply the basic principles of budgeting? B (2.91)
Supervise other staff? B (2.80)

Community

- Work with communities?* B (2.94)
Identify community supports for clients? B+ (3.37)
Mobilize natural and community supports? B+ (3.24)

Policy

- Engage in effective policy practice?* B+ (3.22)
Analyze social policies? B+ (3.36)
Define social problems? A- (3.54)

Evaluate Practice

<i>Use social research to evaluate your practice?</i>	B+ (3.18)
<i>Use research methodology to evaluate your practice?</i>	B (3.08)
<i>Conduct social work research?</i>	B+ (3.24)

Specific to Concentration

Child

<i>Interview children?</i>	B (2.84)
<i>Understand the importance of attachment and separation in working with children?</i>	A- (3.55)
<i>Understand the principles of concurrent and permanency planning in child welfare?</i>	B (2.88)
<i>Prepare written reports for dependency court?</i>	C+ (2.27)

Aging

Forensic

<i>Conduct a mental status exam?</i>	B+ (3.20)
<i>Use the DSM-IV-TR?</i>	B (2.66)
<i>Understand the use of psychotropic medications?</i>	B- (2.63)
<i>Understand the principles of the consumer movement in mental health?</i>	B (2.89)
<i>Work effectively with angry or hostile clients?</i>	B (2.95)