



NEW MEXICO
HIGHLANDS
UNIVERSITY®

School of Social Work

CSWE
SELF STUDY

BSW
VOLUME I
2011-2012

Las Vegas - Albuquerque - Roswell - Santa Fe - Farmington

Chapter 1

Program Mission and Goals

AS 1.0.1 The program submits its mission statement and describes how it is consistent with the profession's purpose and values and the program's context.

Introduction and Statement of Context

Reflecting on thirty-five years of providing graduate and undergraduate social work education to New Mexico, the Highlands University School of Social Work welcomes the opportunity presented by the reaffirmation of accreditation process to undertake a comprehensive review of its present programs and to chart its future direction. The School is proud of its record of accomplishment, as exemplified by the recognition afforded to it by the North Central Association as an institution “of distinction,” and also by the record of achievement of its graduates as direct service providers, social work educators and social service and mental health administrators and managers. With this acknowledgment, the School nonetheless appreciates the gravity of the responsibility it has to assess the quality of its programs and ensure that they reflect the interests of its broader constituency, including the diverse social work consumers and providers of New Mexico and the Southwest.

New Mexico is one of the first “minority-majority” states in the country, meaning that the Hispanic population now exceeds 46% of the total, with the combined Hispanic and Native American population exceeding 55%. Additionally, New Mexico leads the nation with the highest percentage of Spanish speakers—roughly 30% of the total population. Rather than demonstrating an aberration in terms of demographics within the United States at large, New Mexico contains urban and rural centers whose diverse populations, including such additional groups as African American and other population clusters, increasingly represent a microcosm of the United States in the twenty-first century.

The foregoing discussion must be understood with the additional qualification that great diversity exists within the population groups already identified. For example, one cannot speak of New Mexico’s Hispanic population without noting the mixture of subgroups that exists within the larger population. For example, New Mexico contains native Hispanic persons whose presence in the region and cultural traditions date back more than 400 years. This subgroup is to be compared with the more recent arrival of Mexican American persons whose immigration increases yearly at unprecedented levels. Although both subgroups constitute a significant percentage of the consumers of health, mental health, child protective, and other human services statewide, the newer Mexican American populations additionally require specialized immigration and public assistance services that address basic human needs.

New Mexico’s urban/rural population centers demonstrate profound cultural and socioeconomic diversity; extreme poverty and comparative affluence exist virtually side by side in the state. As only one example, two counties, Mora and Los Alamos, have been recognized at various times by the United States Census Bureau as presenting the lowest and highest per capita income respectively within the United States, despite the startling fact that Mora and Los Alamos Counties are geographically separated by less than 150 miles.

New Mexico's Native American populations reflect similarly profound diversity among its subpopulations. New Mexico's three Indian nations (Navajo, Jicarilla Apache, and Mescalero Apache) contrast culturally and socioeconomically with its 19 pueblos. The demographic representation at the School's program sites is itself different. Thus, the Las Vegas, Albuquerque/Rio Rancho, Santa Fe and Roswell program sites have a high percentage of Hispanic constituents. In contrast, the Farmington program site has a significant percentage of Native American constituents from regional Indian nations, most particularly the Navajo Nation.

With the foregoing demographic characteristics considered, several outstanding features must be identified with respect to the manner in which health and human services have been offered to the population groups previously identified. First, particularly in New Mexico's more rural communities, social workers and other care providers must all be prepared to offer a broad range of social work services, including clinical mental health services, income support, community organization and client advocacy services. In other words, the dire and varied needs of New Mexico's client populations require that health and human service practitioners must all be equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary to provide basic clinical, client advocacy, community organizing, program development and administrative services in a culturally, linguistically, and regionally competent manner. Put somewhat differently, it is generally true that among social workers and other behavioral health providers, practitioners must be able to satisfactorily address the urgent and divergent needs of urban and rural populations. Therefore, educational and professional training must be sensitive to this important reality.

Consistent with the needs of its multicultural and impoverished populations, and given the reality of the demand for services within New Mexico's urban and rural environments, health and human service agencies have become increasingly inclined to offer services through the use of multidisciplinary team approaches that unite social workers with medical professionals, counselors, and clinical psychologists. Therefore, it is urgent that social workers have a basic familiarity with the medical and psychological terminology and treatment modalities of allied health professions in order to be able to serve as fully functioning members of a multidisciplinary team.

Given the practice environment already described, the School has embraced its special responsibility to educate social workers with the breadth of knowledge and competencies in the micro, mezzo and macro spheres necessary to provide culturally and regionally competent services to their clients. This need explains the School's creation of graduate concentrations in clinical practice, government/non-profit practice and human resource management. It also explains the School's development of a bilingual concentration emphasizing clinical practice with the Spanish speaking clients of New Mexico. The School's responsibility to the constituents of its service areas has also led it to take strides in enhancing the diversity representation among its student community and faculty ranks at its program sites in Las Vegas, Albuquerque, Farmington and Santa Fe.

The School's commitment to offer regionally relevant programs has directed its present planning to seek broader affiliation—including multidisciplinary collaborations—with other academic program units and the School's community agency partners. Toward this end, as already noted, the School has created graduate concentrations in government/non-profit practice and human resource management. In cooperation with the School of Business, the School has developed a graduate program allowing students to earn both the MSW and MBA degrees simultaneously. Each of these programs represents a specific response to the need in urban and rural New Mexico communities for social workers who are skilled administrators, program

designers and supervisors. Moreover, the School's obligation to address the educational needs of New Mexico's expansive rural communities has led it to seek the benefits and assume the challenges of distance education. Indeed, this step is central to the School's planning for programmatic and curricular development in the near future.

Consistent with the foregoing considerations, in 1996 the School adopted a mission statement that reflects its primary commitment to the diverse communities served by its educational programs. The mission, with modifications, has remained undiluted through several reviews by CSWE over the past fourteen years, including the Council's reaffirmation site visits in 1996 and 2004. During this time, the School has endeavored faithfully to apply the mission in its efforts to enhance classroom and field education programs, streamline administrative organization, employ technology in its classroom instruction, and extend course offerings to previously underserved New Mexico communities.

Steps Taken to Review and Revise Mission Statement and Goals

In initiating the preparatory work for the present self-study, the School has sought the participation of two consultants in helping to review and evaluate the link between the School's academic program offerings and the essential purposes of the social work profession, as required by AS 1.01. The School has benefitted from the advisory assistance provided by Dr. Kay Hoffman, a past president of the Council on Social Work Education and former dean of the University of Kentucky's social work program. Dr. Hoffman has been instrumental in lending advice and consultation to the planning and implementation of the program review associated with this self-study.

The preparatory phase of the self-study was initiated when the School's Curriculum Committee met with Dr. Hoffman during the fall of 2009 and spring of 2010 to plan the review process. The Curriculum Committee consists of the faculty chairs of each of the course sequences, including social policy, research, practice, human behavior in the social environment and the government and non-profit graduate concentration, together with the Director of Field Education. The BSW Program Coordinator also serves on the committee as a non-voting member *ex officio*, as does an additional off-campus site coordinator and a student member nominated by the Graduate Social Work Students Association.

In consultation with faculty members teaching in each of the aforementioned curricular areas, in 2009 and 2010 committee members undertook a comprehensive review of the School's mission statement and goals, as well as present undergraduate and graduate curricula. This review focused on the following tasks: (a) inventorying all present course syllabi in order to evaluate the degree and quality of linkage between the School's mission, goals, core competencies, practice behaviors and objectives outlined within individual social work courses; (b) evaluating and reporting on the degree and quality of linkage between foundational and advanced courses within each sequence; and (c) assessment of the overall social work programs in light of current CSWE Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards. The reports filed by Curriculum Committee members have been assembled and integrated into the present document. Additionally, the Curriculum Committee has created a reaffirmation of accreditation task group which has taken on the task of completing the programmatic review incorporated into this self-study. As noted earlier, the continuing relationship between the School and its students, alumni, field agency personnel and constituents has been strengthened recently by means of Web based

technology, an approach that enhances the ability of community constituents to play a direct, ongoing role in program planning.

In light of the foregoing, the present self-study document reflects the combined efforts of the school's stakeholders to identify objectively the collective strengths and areas of concern that now characterize the School's undergraduate and graduate programs. Moreover, it outlines the School's methodology for integrating course and program outcomes into programmatic change. In addition to the direct participation of faculty and course sequence chairs contributing to the construction of the document, draft copies have been submitted for review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, and copies of the document have been made available for review and comment by faculty and staff at all program sites. Finally, a draft copy of the document has been posted on the School's Web based information center for review and comment by members of the community advisory board, participants in distance education programs and other interested constituents.

Mission Statement's Consistency with the Profession's Purpose and Values and the School's Context

Consistency of Mission with Profession's Purpose and Values. CSWE's introductory statement to the EPAS sets forth the idea that

The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person-and-environment construct, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, social work's purpose is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons,

Consideration of the mission, as set forth below, reflects that its development has been entirely guided and inspired by CSWE's introductory statements quoted above. Indeed, the themes of promotion of client and community well-being, respect for diversity, the quest for social and economic justice, and the elimination of poverty, among others, are concepts directly embedded both in the School's mission, as highlighted below.

Consistency of Mission with Context. The School's context as already noted presents a vigorous environment in which the needs and opportunities associated with the social work practice setting, including the historical, political, economic, social, cultural, demographic and global factors presented demand that the School's mission statement, as presented below, address these factors in a manner that bears on the education of contemporary and future social workers and the practice of social work in New Mexico and the Southwest.

School of Social Work and University Mission Statements. Consistent with the social work purpose and values cited above, as well as the School's context, the School has adopted the following mission statement:

The mission of the School of Social Work is to educate students to practice social work competently with the diverse, multicultural populations of New Mexico and the Southwest. This context of cultural and regional responsiveness informs the School's creation and implementation of all its educational programs. The School has a primary commitment to Hispanic and Native American people. Our curriculum grounds students in core professional social work values, skills and ethical principles, with a focus on promoting

an awareness and respect for cultural and gender differences and how poverty affects the well being of people in the region.

As noted, the School's mission derives from the School's context and the essential purpose and values of social work, as well as New Mexico Highlands University's institutional mission, which alludes to Highlands' status as a Hispanic Serving Institution ("HSI," a classification that extends to institutions at which at least 25% of the overall student enrollment is characterized as "Hispanic," with at least half of this student population falling below the federal poverty threshold) (Higher Education Act of 1965, 2004), and which avows its further responsibility to meet the program needs of regional Native American peoples. The University's institutional mission provides as follows:

The vision of New Mexico Highlands University will provide an inspiring multicultural learning environment that promotes excellence, empowerment, transformation, and global understanding.

The mission of New Mexico Highlands University is: Education through teaching, research, and service.

The core values are: advancement of knowledge, student success, a diversity of ideas, accessible education, community, individual well-being, sustainable practices, and multiculturalism.

New Mexico Highlands University's primary mission is to advance student knowledge and promote student success. In order to achieve this, all members of the university community will endeavor to promote a respectful and stimulating living and learning environment. To succeed in meeting and, more importantly, maintaining these goals, we will develop effective and efficient academic and administrative processes, systems, and structures that support continuous improvement.

We realize that our responsibility as an institution of higher learning extends beyond the confines of the campus. To meet this responsibility, we will promote the educational, social, cultural, and economic advancement as well as the environmental sustainability of the region. Through these outreach activities, we seek to enhance the University's reputation and external support. Finally, if all of the goals and objectives are successfully met, student enrollment at NMHU will increase.

The School's and University's missions are consistent with the demographic characteristics of a community and region in which Hispanics and Native Americans comprise more than 55% of the overall population. Indeed, the School's mission acknowledges the special needs that these populations have as the dominant consumers of public health and human services in New Mexico. Additionally, the School's mission respects the standing of New Mexico's Hispanic and Native American populations as the poorest residents of the Southwest and United States as a whole.

With the aim of addressing the aforementioned needs, the School's mission is intended to foster the development of curricula that prepare social workers capable of providing competent public and private sector social work services to the most impoverished and oppressed populations in the region. The School's present mission is derived from a version first adopted in 1996. The 1996 version was reviewed by CSWE during the School's previous accreditation cycle, and highlight the School's primary obligation to these groups. Pursuant to then-existing Accreditation Standards 1.3 and 7.0, they were adopted in consultation with a series of community focus groups held statewide during 1996 and approved by the faculty. The mission statement's present version, as highlighted above, has been modified slightly on the basis of outcomes assessment and feedback from faculty members, students and community constituents. Specifically, the present version of the mission statement is intended to advance the social work professionalism of all program participants, in the spirit of CSWE's competency-based ideal that a social work graduate should "identify oneself as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly" (EPAS 2.1.1) in the context of the environment in which the School delivers its program.

The School's implementation of its mission statement, including its development of programmatic goals and objectives, should be understood by reference to New Mexico's geographic and demographic characteristics. New Mexico is the fifth largest state in terms of land mass, yet in terms of its population it can be described as primarily a rural state with several urbanized population areas: Albuquerque (pop. 545,000), Las Cruces (pop. 97,000), Santa Fe (pop. 67,000), Rio Rancho (pop. 87,500) and Roswell (pop. 48,000). (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001). Additionally, New Mexico shares an extensive border with Mexico, a fact that helps to explain the increasing influx of Mexican nationals into the state. Recent federal free trade policy also helps to explain this northern migration, with the result that Mexican immigrants account for an ever-increasing number of consumers of public services in New Mexico and the Southwest (Martin & Midgley, 2003). This migration also adds to the dominance of Spanish-speaking peoples in a state whose already-existing Hispanic population has a rich cultural and historic heritage predating the arrival of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock. New Mexico's Native American communities share a legacy equal in richness and diversity to that of its Hispanic peoples. Native American groups represented in New Mexico include the Navajo, Mescalero Apache and Jicarilla Apache Nations, as well as nineteen Pueblos. These native peoples inhabit vast sovereign territories, and are also represented in increasing numbers among the state's urban populations.

The combined experience of New Mexico's Hispanic and Native American populations is characterized by a history of social injustice and discrimination, as well as severe economic deprivation. In the face of this record of oppression, the region's minority populations have maintained coping strategies that draw upon deeply rooted cultural beliefs, traditions, practices and values. Thus, religious institutions, extended family relationships, tribal kinship networks and other social structures continue to provide vital human and economic resources to peoples often beset by poverty and marginalization.

AS 1.0.2 The program identifies its goals and demonstrates how they are derived from the program's mission.

Issues Addressed by BSW Goals

In view of the foregoing considerations, the School's implementation of its mission has focused on the design of the BSW program and supportive goals intended primarily to address the social service needs of the underserved populations of the School's constituent communities. Particularly in the rural areas and Indian country served by the School, the need for entry-level social work practitioners in child welfare, school settings, mental health, substance abuse treatment and elder care, among other basic service areas, has been apparent. For this reason, the School's mission has been implemented at the BSW level through the delivery of educational programs that train generalist practitioners prepared to offer these services. In the development of the BSW programs, the School's intent has been to prepare social work practitioners and leaders who are able to improve the social service delivery systems in the rural communities served by the School. In particular, this requires that the School do justice to the simple truth that a rapidly changing global environment has a strong regional and local impact.

In New Mexico, social workers have attained a growing responsibility in recent years to provide clinical psychotherapeutic and counseling services, including the evaluation and treatment of psychosocial dysfunction, to the mentally ill—most particularly the poor mentally

ill. The need for social work clinicians and direct service providers skilled in culturally competent treatment methodologies is therefore apparent.

Identification of Goals and Relationship to Mission Statement

BSW Goals. As outlined below, the School has established BSW program goals that link directly to the School’s mission statement, as presented in the table below and as discussed more fully in this section. It is to be noted that these goals flow directly from the EPAS. As discussed in Chapter 2, the competencies and practice behaviors established for the BSW program are identical in significant part to the competencies and behaviors defined by the EPAS. Additionally, linkages between goals, mission statement, competencies and practice behaviors are clearly demonstrated within the discussion contained in Chapter 2’s narrative.

BSW Program Goals
(1) BSW graduates will incorporate core professional social work values, principles, and generalist practice skills into their public and private sector practice with the diverse and multicultural individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities present in New Mexico
(2) BSW graduates will conduct themselves ethically by adherence to the ideals, values, and principles embedded in the NASW Code of Ethics, will attend to personal bias and differential power, and will attempt to follow the Code’s guidance in resolving ethical dilemmas.
(3) BSW graduates will critically and comprehensively collect and appraise evidence and points of view from multiple sources in making informed professional decisions, will question assumptions about the special New Mexican populations they encounter in practice, and will communicate their professional judgments in a logical and clear manner.
(4) BSW graduates will demonstrate an awareness of and respect for cultural, language, country of origin, geographic, socio-economic, and gender differences, and will make efforts to practice competently with the diverse Hispanic and Native American, and tribal, rural and metropolitan area, individuals and communities present in New Mexico.
(5) BSW graduates will recognize discrimination and oppression due to racial or ethnic group membership, historical trauma, poverty, and other causes, will advocate for social and economic justice, and will work in generalist practice with individuals and communities to ameliorate poor and unfair conditions.
(6) BSW graduates will apply evidenced-based interventions where it is culturally and individually appropriate, will systematically assess client and community needs, and will evaluate their own and their agency’s practices in order to assure quality service delivery.
(7) BSW graduates will synthesize theory into practice, will assess and attend to the social and societal contexts in which clients and client groups live and in which social work is practiced in New Mexico, and they will intervene within multiple systems, as indicated, in order to best meet client and community needs.
(8) BSW graduates will use insights gained through social work practice with individuals and communities, and through research, to propose, advocate for, and effectively change agency and governmental policies so as to promote social economic justice and well-being,

to help powerless groups improve their resources and opportunities, and to improve service delivery to poor and other marginalized groups in New Mexico.
(9) BSW graduates will continue to assess and build their knowledge base regarding changing community needs and strengths, policy, and best social work practices, and will work collaboratively to respond to and effect systemic change.
(10) BSW graduates will apply knowledge, theory, values, and skills necessary to form relationships with members of the economically and culturally diverse populations present in New Mexico; they will assess needs, resources, strengths and systemic influences; they will identify, recommend, adapt, and implement interventions based on continuous assessment; and they will assess practice and agency outputs and client and client system outcomes, will make efforts to improve practice, as indicated, and will share and communicate their findings.

Relationship of BSW Goals to Mission Statement.

BSW Goal 1’s promotion of students’ incorporation of social work values and principles in their professional practice is a direct application of a dominant theme of the mission statement. Moreover, BSW Goal 1 clearly identifies the expectation that students serve diverse and multicultural populations. This principle is at the forefront of the mission statement’s philosophy.

BSW Goal 2’s direction that students conduct themselves by adherence to the NASW Code of Ethics implements a central theme of the mission statement addressing the importance of students’ observance of ethical principles. Similarly, Goal 2’s anticipation that students are to attend to personal bias and differential power is a direct reflection of the mission statement’s expression of the need for cultural and regional responsiveness in social work practice, as well as the overriding consideration that students must promote the well-being of all persons, including clients, served or affected by social work interventions.

BSW Goal 3 directs that students use critical thinking and comprehensive analysis in their selection of evidence informing social work practice. This echoes an important theme of the mission statement expressing the value that students should be educated to apply social work skills and awareness of clients and communities in their preparation for practice and the design of interventions.

BSW Goal 4’s expectation that students are to demonstrate an awareness of and respect for cultural, language, country of origin, geographic, socioeconomic, and gender differences represents the implementation of the mission statement’s ideology that students are to develop an awareness of and respect for cultural and gender differences as well as an appreciation for the impact of poverty and socioeconomic factors on client populations. As well, the mission statement’s declaration that the School has a primary commitment to Hispanic and Native American people, the primary recipients and consumers of social work services regionally, is put into action through Goal 4’s focus on student’s engagement in an effort to practice competently with Hispanic and Native American individuals, communities, and client systems.

BSW Goal 5 anticipates that students are to recognize discrimination and oppression based on race and ethnicity, and that they are to advocate for social and economic justice in a manner that

effects change in social conditions. This goal therefore directly expresses the mission statement's provisions addressing cultural and regional responsiveness and the adoption of social work values and skills into students' social consciousness and practice repertoire. Goal 5 additionally places into practice the mission statement's expression of the importance of student awareness of the impact of poverty on regional populations.

BSW Goal 6 expresses the important and interrelated expectations that students will introduce evidence-based analysis into their development of culturally and regionally relevant social work interventions, that they will systematically conduct needs assessments to gauge the competence of their interventions, and that they will evaluate their own practice and their agency's practice in order to ensure the competence and effectiveness of social work interventions. This goal therefore directly conveys the mission statement's communication of the importance of educating students to practice social work competently with the diverse, multicultural populations of New Mexico and the Southwest. Additionally expressed in Goal 6 is the mission's communication of the need to integrate the context of culturally and regionally relevant practice into all of the School's educational programs.

BSW Goal 7's focus is on the preparation of students to integrate theory into their social work practice, and further includes the consideration of social and societal contexts into their professional interventions. Furthermore, Goal 7 addresses the aim that students must work within multiple clients systems, as necessary, in order to address client and community needs. The main points of BSW Goal 7 therefore execute the mission statement's central focus on competent and ethical social work practice, the design of culturally and regionally relevant social work interventions, and the further integration of an awareness of cultural and gender difference into interactions with a variety of client systems.

BSW Goal 8 espouses the aspiration that students are to employ social work interventions and research to promote social and economic justice in order to enhance the well-being of their clients. Additionally, BSW Goal 8 expresses the aim that students be educated to improve the resources and opportunities of powerless groups in order to improve service delivery to poor and other marginalized client groups. This goal advances the mission statement's intent that the School's educational programs teach students to understand the impact of poverty on client well-being and further learn to integrate the practice of cultural and regional responsiveness into their practice with the diverse, multicultural groups of New Mexico and the Southwest.

BSW Goal 9 captures the idea that students should integrate their knowledge base concerning community needs in order to work collaboratively to effect systemic change. This goal advances the mission statement's central theme of creating educational programs that introduce students to regionally and culturally appropriate interventions in an effort to promote the well-being of clients. Also address is the mission's emphasis on educating students in core professional social work values, skills and ethical principles.

BSW Goal 10's purpose is to promote the adoption by students of knowledge, theory, values and skills in order to form professional relationships with member of the economically and culturally diverse populations within students' practice regions. As a related point, Goal 10 aspires that students be taught to assess their practice and their interventions based on continuous outcome assessment. This goal therefore objectifies the teaching to students of evidence based social work

strategies that are vitally necessary in order that students learn to implement and modify their social work interventions as called for by the specific practice context. The aims of BSW Goal 10 therefore advance the mission statement's essential emphasis on the design of educational programs and curricula that teach students to practice social work competently and adopt core professional social work values, skills and ethical principles in their ongoing practice. Additionally, BSW Goal 10 promotes the mission's primary focus on culturally and economically diverse populations and the understanding of how poverty impacts clients well-being.

It is to be noted that BSW Goal 10 specifically addresses an important element of Highlands University's mission statement, which stresses the "advancement of knowledge, student success, a diversity of ideas, accessible education, community, individual well-being, sustainable practices, and multiculturalism" Additionally promoted is the university mission's emphasis on the promotion of "educational, social, cultural, and economic advancement as well as the environmental sustainability of the region."

Consistency of BSW Goals with AS 1.0. As a final statement of the School's purpose in adopting the above-presented mission statement and goals, the School has aimed to act in compliance with AS 1.0.2, which requires schools of social work to demonstrate how programmatic goals are derived from the program's mission. Moreover the school's mission and interconnected goals are entirely consistent with the aim of encouraging social work programs to explain in concrete terms how the School proposes to prepare its students for competent and ethical social work practice in a rapidly changing global environment, educate lifelong learners who can think critically about the world around them, and to develop social work leaders who are ready to practice within and improve the social service delivery systems in rural communities. In furtherance of the mission statement, the School has also established criteria which flow from the mission and make the School's aims more concrete and specific. Further, the School's identification of its goals demonstrates consistency with CSWE's operating definition of the term "goals," through which they are defined as "a limited number of statements which translate the program mission into major...directions." As already noted, the School has endeavored to link its goals directly to the core competencies set forth in the EPAS, presented above. In this respect, the School overall has aspired to reinforce the basic theme set forth in EP 2.1, by which "competency based education is an outcome performance approach to curriculum design."

References

- Higher Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. §1101a(A)(5) (Supp. 2004).
Martin, P., & Midgley, E. (2003). Immigration: Shaping and reshaping America. *Population Bulletin* 58, 3.
Tolson, E., Reid, W., & Garvin, C. (1994). *Generalist practice: a task centered approach*. NY: Columbia University Press.
U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *Statistical abstract of the United States*. Washington: U.S. G.P.O.

Chapter 2

BSW Explicit Curriculum

AS B 2.0.1 The program discusses how its mission and goals are consistent with core competencies that define generalist practice.

As discussed in the narrative and accompanying tables set forth in Chapter 1, the School has established a competency-based bachelor’s program which focuses on the instilling in students of foundational social work skills through curriculum design. This curriculum design includes formal baccalaureate classes and field education. Summarizing the information contained in Chapter 1, the BSW Program is based upon a formal educational structure that flows from the School’s mission statement, and is identified within the BSW Program goals, which are linked directly to the ten core competencies, as presented in the following table.

EPAS in Relation to BSW Program Goals

Competency	BSW Program Goals
EP 2.1.1 Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly	(1) BSW graduates will incorporate core professional social work values, principles, and generalist practice skills into their public and private sector practice with the diverse and multicultural individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities present in New Mexico.
EP 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.	(2) BSW graduates will conduct themselves ethically by adherence to the ideals, values, and principles embedded in the NASW Code of Ethics, will attend to personal bias and differential power, and will attempt to follow the Code’s guidance in resolving ethical dilemmas.
EP 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments	(3) BSW graduates will critically and comprehensively collect and appraise evidence and points of view from multiple sources in making informed professional decisions, will question assumptions about the special New Mexican populations they encounter in practice, and will communicate their professional judgments in a logical and clear manner.
EP 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice	(4) BSW graduates will demonstrate an awareness of and respect for cultural, language, country of origin, geographic, socio-economic, and gender differences, and will make efforts to practice competently with the diverse Hispanic and Native American, and tribal, rural and metropolitan area, individuals and communities present in New Mexico.
EP 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice	(5) BSW graduates will recognize discrimination and oppression due to racial or ethnic group membership, historical trauma, poverty, and other causes, will advocate for social and economic justice, and will work in generalist practice with individuals and communities to ameliorate poor and unfair conditions.
EP 2.1.6 Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research	(6) BSW graduates will apply evidenced-based interventions where it is culturally and individually appropriate, will systematically assess client and community needs, and will evaluate their own and their agency’s practices in order to assure quality service delivery.
EP 2.1.7 Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment	(7) BSW graduates will synthesize theory into practice, will assess and attend to the social and societal contexts in which clients and client groups live and in which social work is practiced in New Mexico, and they will intervene within multiple systems, as indicated, in order to best meet client and community needs.
EP 2.1.8 Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being	(8) BSW graduates will use insights gained through social work practice with individuals and communities, and through research, to propose, advocate for, and effectively change agency and governmental policies so as to promote social economic justice and well-being, to help powerless groups improve their

and to deliver effective social work services	resources and opportunities, and to improve service delivery to poor and other marginalized groups in New Mexico.
EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice	(9) BSW graduates will continue to assess and build their knowledge base regarding changing community needs and strengths, policy, and best social work practices, and will work collaboratively to respond to and effect systemic change.
EP 2.1.10 (a)-(d) Engage, assess, intervene and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities	(10) BSW graduates will apply knowledge, theory, values, and skills necessary to form relationships with members of the economically and culturally diverse populations present in New Mexico; they will assess needs, resources, strengths and systemic influences; they will identify, recommend, adapt, and implement interventions based on continuous assessment; and they will assess practice and agency outputs and client and client system outcomes, will make efforts to improve practice, as indicated, and will share and communicate their findings.

As demonstrated by the table, BSW goals have been chosen that clearly link to the EPAS’s ten core competency areas. As more fully discussed in the sections addressing AS B2.02, below, the competencies established for the BSW program are identical in significant part to the competencies defined by the EPAS. Additionally, linkages between goals, mission statement and competencies are clearly demonstrated within the discussion here, in Chapter 1’s narrative, and also as discussed within succeeding sections of Chapter 2. In this respect, the School overall has aspired to reinforce the basic theme set forth in EP 2.1, by which “competency based education is an outcome performance approach to curriculum design.”

As more fully discussed in succeeding sections of the present chapter, the BSW program has established core competencies and linked practice behaviors as highlighted below in the section addressing AS B2.03, as well as in the *curriculum matrix* contained in this chapter’s appendix. This curriculum matrix additionally identifies the linkage between core competencies and specific areas of BSW program course content.

As noted, the School derives its student competencies directly from CSWE’s list of core competencies, which are linked to program goals and which fulfill the School’s mission of educating generalist-level social workers who are competent in their abilities and skills and who are further competent in their understanding and implementation of cultural diversity and regional relevance in their social work practice.

The competencies created for the BSW Program address the following elements of the core competencies:

1. understand and apply the values, goals and ethical standards associated with the social work profession;
2. apply ethical and legal standards in social work practice;
3. apply critical thinking in practice;
4. understand and incorporate diversity in their practice;
5. advocate for human rights and social and economic justice;
6. engage in informed research;
7. apply knowledge of human behavior in the social environment;
8. engage in policy practice for the purpose of advancing social and economic well-being;
9. respond to contexts that shape practice
10. engage, assess, intervene, evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

AS B.0.2 (The program) identifies its competencies consistent with EP 2.1.1 – 2.1.10d

As already noted, the School has identified its competencies by adopting CSWE’s core competencies in total. Thus, the School’s competencies are literally identical to those identified by CSWE:

- EP 2.1.1 Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly
- EP 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice
- EP 2.1.3 Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments
- EP 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice
- EP 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice
- EP 2.1.6 Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research
- EP 2.1.7 Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment
- EP 2.1.8 Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services
- EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice
- EP 2.1.10-a-d Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities

AS B2.0.3 (The program) provides an operational definition for each of its competencies used in its curriculum design and its assessment EP 2.1 through 2.1.10(d)

As more fully set forth in this chapter, the School operationalizes its core competencies with Practice Behaviors which are outcome-based and which describe students’ accomplishment of and ability to implement each behavior. The behaviors can also be thought of as measureable student outcomes whose achievement can be assessed, as more fully set forth in Chapter 4’s discussion of programmatic assessment.

The School’s establishment of Practice Behaviors at the baccalaureate level can be summarized as follows:

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.1

Social workers a) advocate for client access to the services of social work; b) practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development; c) attend to professional roles and boundaries; d) demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance and communication; e) engage in career-long learning; and f) use supervision and consultation.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.2

Social workers a) recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice; b) make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the International Federation of Social Workers/International Association of Schools of Social Work Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles; c) tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts; and d) apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.3

Social workers a) distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom; b) analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation; c) demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.4

Social workers a) recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power; b) gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups; c) recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences; d) view themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.5

Social workers a) understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination; b) advocate for human rights and social and economic justice; c) engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.6

Social workers a) use practice inquiry to inform scientific inquiry; b) use research evidence to inform practice.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.7

Social workers a) utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation; b) critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.8

Social workers a) analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being; b) collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.9

Social workers a) continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services; b) provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.

Practice Behaviors for EP 2.1.10 (a-d)

ENGAGEMENT:

Social workers a) substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities; b) use empathy and other interpersonal skills; c) develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.

ASSESSMENT:

Social workers a) collect, organize, and interpret client data; b) assess client strengths and limitations; c) develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives; d) select appropriate intervention strategies.

INTERVENTION:

Social workers a) initiate actions to achieve organizational goals; b) implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities; c) help clients resolve problems; d) negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients; e) facilitate transitions and endings.

EVALUATION:

Social workers a) critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.

AS B2.0.4 Provides a rationale for its formal curriculum design demonstrating how it is used to develop a coherent and integrated curriculum for classroom and field.

During the current reaffirmation of accreditation cycle, formative and summative outcome assessments, as discussed more fully in Chapter 4, Assessment, have informed the structure and content of the BSW curriculum design and structure. The School's predominant goal has been to enhance the provision of culturally relevant, skill building courses emphasizing applied learning and competency-based education. This approach is deemed to be relevant to the School's mission to the extent that it speaks to the preparation of social workers with the knowledge, skills, values and ethical principles necessary to practice with Hispanic and Native American populations of New Mexico the Southwest. (A comprehensive discussion of the use of outcome measures in programmatic changes is presented in this self-study's discussion of Assessment in Chapter 4.)

The need for the BSW Program design has been even more critical given the demonstrable need for social workers in Indian country, where lack of educational opportunities and resources—with the resulting lower numbers of formally trained social service providers—forces tribes to use paraprofessional and non-social work personnel in these positions. In addition, non-Indian social workers lacking the cultural competence and sensitivity and unacquainted with the lifestyles, traditions, language and help-seeking ways of Native American populations are not able to provide relevant services without an education emphasizing cultural competence.

A similar problem exists with the Hispanic communities in rural northern New Mexico, where professional social workers from different parts of the country are attracted to the region because of its rich cultural heritage and the beautiful environment, but are ill-equipped to respond to the needs and unique sociocultural experiences of native populations. The rationale

for the BSW curriculum design is therefore intended to be responsive to the special requirements of the rural and urban Hispanic and Native American populations of New Mexico through the training of more culturally prepared social workers. An additional aim of programmatic offerings at the BSW level has been to graduate more minority practitioners from the regions served by the School.

With the foregoing in mind, the BSW Program’s generalist curriculum continues to reflect the School’s core commitment to respond to the social service needs of regional individuals, families, groups and communities. The skill-based curriculum provides students with more depth in the areas of practice, research, theory and policy. In addition, courses have been adopted covering specific population groups—including children and the aging—that better ensure the development of skills and knowledge necessary to work with these vulnerable populations at the generalist level. Because of the importance of promoting the application of social work values and ethics, a course in social work law and ethics has been developed and implemented.

Table 1 outlines the current BSW curriculum, which is offered identically at all current BSW program sites.

Table 1 BSW - COURSE SEQUENCING 2011-12

JUNIOR COURSES	Fall Semester I	Spring Semester II	Summer (Optional Semester)
	333 Aspects of Aging (3)	366 Generalist Practice II (3) (Interviewing/Assessment)	345 Children’s Services (3)
341 Social Policy & Services (3)	330 Research Methods I (3)	333 Aspects of Aging (3)	
365 Generalist Practice I (3)	345 Children’s Services (3)		
385 HBSE I (Individual & Family Theories) (3)	386 HBSE II (Group & Org. Theories) (3)		
Total: 12	Total: 12		
SENIOR COURSES	Fall (Semester III)	Spring (Semester IV)	Summer (Optional Semester)
	430 Research Methods II (3)	468 Theories of SW Practice (3)	345 Children’s Services (3)
432 Field Practicum I (4)	433 Law, Ethics, & SW Practice (3)	333 Aspects of Aging (3)	
451 Field Seminar I (1)	434 Field Practicum II (4)	Students may choose to do a “block Field Practicum” during the summer semester with the approval from the Director/Coordinators, Field Education	
465 Generalist Practice III (3)	452 Field Seminar II (1)		
485 HBSE III (Human Diversity & Multi-Cultural Theory) (3)	466 Generalist Practice IV (Macro-Practice) (3)		
Total 14	Total: 14		

Prior to implementation, the curriculum was reviewed by the School's Curriculum Committee and approved by the University's Academic Affairs Committee. The total of credits required—52—represents a substantial increase in the number required as compared to the previously offered BSW curriculum. With this increase, it is intended that social work graduates be better prepared for the BSW level licensing exam, whose pass rates for graduates of the School have frequently been below average. Additionally, the programmatic design includes the provision that social work majors not be required to have a minor program of study. Consequently, students who complete the required 54 credit-hour university core or have an associate of arts degree may enroll in the BSW Program. The overall aim of this formal design is to promote coherence and integration for both classroom and field education in the undergraduate program.

Consistent with the aforementioned programmatic design, the School continues to reach out to community colleges and tribal governments in an effort to recruit both Native American and Hispanic students. Agreements have been made with two community colleges serving primarily Native American and Hispanic students: San Juan College, in Farmington, and Eastern New Mexico University, in Roswell.

Articulation agreements with the above-mentioned community colleges permit their students to graduate with the A.A. degree including the required liberal arts foundation and to complete the BSW at NMHU without losing credits. These agreements between the School and its partner community colleges have led to the offering of the BSW curriculum at these same colleges. Moreover, students who have completed the BSW successfully have been able to apply to the advanced standing MSW program at multiple program sites. The offerings of the BSW Program continue to respond to the critical need for generalist social workers across New Mexico and enforce the framework of the University's and School's missions.

Conception of Generalist Social Work Practice

The BSW Program regards the generalist social work practitioner as a professional who has acquired a transferable body of knowledge and skills that can be used to enhance the functioning of diverse types and sizes of client systems in a wide variety of situations. The Program acknowledges that the undergraduate generalist practitioner works under supervision and must be guided by professional values and ethics.

Generalist practice requires broad academic preparation. The generalist must have an extensive knowledge base and a wide array of skills in order to work effectively with individuals, families, task and treatment groups, organizations and communities. The practitioner must be sensitive to and comfortable with diversity in clients and environments. This sensitivity and comfort involves awareness of one's own cultural heritage and appreciation of other cultures. Sensitivity to diversity issues is the first step in the acquisition of cultural competence, which the practitioner attains when a working understanding is acquired of the impact the client's cultural heritage has on the professional relationship and the client's needs.

Generalist practice is based on the use of a problem solving process that is guided by theoretical approaches and frameworks such as the ethnocultural perspective, the strengths perspective, the problem solving perspective, the systems perspective and the ecological perspective. Generalist social workers must be able to think critically in order to analyze and understand social problems, to evaluate societal responses, and to improve conditions for individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities through social action and societal change. Generalist practitioners must practice according to professional social work values and

must use lawful and ethical strategies in their interactions with clients, colleagues, employers, the practice community and society.

The Foundation Curriculum

Liberal Arts Grounding. Students demonstrate the attainment of a liberal arts perspective when they (a) understand and appreciate the importance of culture, including artistic expressions, philosophy, history and science, (b) understand cultural diversity and how it affects inter-group relationships, (c) exhibit the knowledge, attitudes and ways of thinking and communicating of an educated person, (d) understand how knowledge is acquired and the methods of inquiry that contribute to knowledge building and (e) think critically about society and social problems. An outline of the foundation liberal arts curriculum is provided in below.

PRE-CORE, PROFICIENCY AND ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

SEMESTER: _____ DATE: _____

NAME: _____ ID#: _____

PRE-CORE COURSES – courses to be taken prior to the core curriculum.

Note: Courses with a double asterisk (**) are suggested for students requiring these pre-core courses.

English competency is demonstrated by:

_____ ENGL 100: Reading and Writing for College (3) [if ACT English = 0-16 or COMPASS Reading = 0-79]

Mathematics is demonstrated by both:

_____ MATH 100: Intro to Algebra (3) [if ACT Math = 0-16 or COMPASS Algebra = 0-45] AND **Lab**

PROFICIENCY COURSES - all proficiency courses are a university requirement, however you have the option to test out, see below:

Computer Science (3 credit hours)

_____ CS 101: Living with Computers (3) [if NMHU Computer Science Test score = 0-69] AND **Lab**

*Note: see Office of Academic Success Services (SASS) to test out. **OR**

_____ CS 144: Introduction to Computer **OR**

*For students majoring in Computer Science, Math or any other science

_____ CS 145: Introduction to Object –Oriented Programming

*For students majoring in Computer Science, Math or any other science

Language (8 credit hours)

NOTE: Proficiency assessment or two semesters of a language other than English:

_____ SPAN 101: Beginning Spanish 1 (4) AND _____ SPAN 102: Beginning Spanish 2 (4)

*Note: see Spanish Department to test out.

_____ SPAN 111: Spanish as Heritage Language I (4) AND _____ SPAN 112: Spanish as Heritage Language II (4)

*Note: see Spanish Department to test out.

_____ LANG 135 ST: Beginning German I (4) AND _____ LANG 135 ST: Beginning German II (4)

*Note: see Language Department to test out.

_____ LANG 109: American Sign Language 1 (4) AND _____ LANG 110: American Sign Language 2 (4)

*Note: see Language Department to test out.

FRESHMAN REQUIREMENT – required of all students entering their freshman year of college.

_____ INDP 135: First Year Experience (3)

CORE CURRICULUM – required of all students seeking a bachelor's degree. Core courses provide broad exposure to important academic subjects essential to a university education.

TOTAL CORE CURRICULUM: 40 CREDIT HOURS

Area I: Communications (9 credit hours)

- _____ ENGL 111: Freshman Composition I (3) [if ACT English = 17-28 or COMPASS Reading = 80+] **AND Workshop**
- _____ ENGL 112: Freshman Composition II (3) [if ACT English = 29+]
- ** _____ MART 124: Beginning Speech (3)

Area II: Mathematics (3 credit hours)

- _____ MATH 140: College Algebra (3) [ACT Math = 24-28, or COMPASS = 66-100]
- *Note: - **Math 140 is a CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENT (pre-requisites may also be required; however, the pre-requisites do not count for the CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENT)**

WITHIN AREA II If your ACT or COMPASS Math scores are higher than indicated here, contact the Department of Math for assistance in selecting an appropriate Math course.

- _____ MATH 120: Intermediate Algebra (3) [if ACT Math = 17-23 or COMPASS Algebra = 46-65] AND Lab
- *Note: Math 120 is a **pre-requisite** for MATH 140 - after successful completion GOTO MATH 140
- _____ MATH 115: Mathematics for Elementary Teachers I (3)
- *Note: All Education Majors MUST take MATH 115 (**MATH 100 Pre-req.** - after successful completion GOTO MATH 130)
- _____ MATH 130: Mathematics for Elementary Teachers II (3) *Note: **MATH 115 Pre-requisite**
- _____ MATH 150: Trigonometry (3)
- _____ MATH 155: Applied Calculus I (3)
- _____ MATH 211: Calculus I (4)

Area III: Lab Sciences (8 credit hours)

BIOLOGY:

- _____ BIOL 110: Biological Perspectives (4) AND Lab
- _____ BIOL 131: Human Biology (4) AND Lab
- _____ BIOL 211: General Biology I (4) AND Lab
- _____ BIOL 212: General Biology II (4) AND Lab

CHEMISTRY:

- _____ CHEM 100: Non-Scientist Chemistry (4) AND Lab
- _____ CHEM 211: General Chemistry I (4) AND CHEM 215: Chemistry Lab I (2)

FORESTRY:

- _____ FOR 105: Humans & Ecosystems (4) AND Lab

GEOLOGY:

- _____ GEOL 101: Survey of Earth Science (4) AND Lab
- _____ GEOL 102: Survey of Earth History (4) AND Lab
- _____ GEOL 110: Survey of Astronomy (4) AND Lab (If not listed in schedule, check under Physics)

PHYSICS:

- _____ PHYS 105: Elementary Physics (4) AND Lab
- _____ PHYS 110: Survey of Astronomy (4) AND Lab (If not listed in schedule, check under Geology)
- _____ PHYS 151: Algebra Physics I (4)
- _____ PHYS 152: Algebra Physics II (4) AND Lab
- _____ PHYS 291: Calculus Physics I (5) AND Lab
- _____ PHYS 292: Calculus Physics II (5) AND Lab

Area IV: Social/Behavioral Sciences (6 or 9 credit hours)

- _____ PSY 101: Psychology & Society (3) AND Lab
- _____ POLS 151: American National Government (3)
- _____ SOC 152: Introduction to Sociology (4) AND Lab
- _____ ECON 216: Principles of Macroeconomics (3)
- _____ ECON 217: Principles of Microeconomics (3)
- _____ ANTH 102: Intro to Sociocultural Anth (3)
- _____ ANTH 103: Development of Cultures & Civilizations (3)

Area V: Humanities and Fine Arts (6 or 9 credit hours)

HUMANITIES (3 or 6 credit hours):

- _____ HIST 100: Western World (3)
- _____ HIST 201: US History to 1877 (3)
- _____ HIST 202: US History since 1877 (3)
- _____ PHIL 100: Introduction to Philosophy (3)

FINE ARTS (3 or 6 credit hours):

- _____ MUS 100: Introduction to Music (3)
- _____ MUS 101: Rudiments of Music (3)
- _____ ART 100: Introduction to Art (3)
- _____ THEA 100: Introduction to Theater (3)
- _____ MART 261: History of Motion Pictures (3)

Area VI: Other University Requirements (5 credit hours)

_____ Literature Course (See English or Spanish Dept. for Listing) _____: _____ (3) [choose one literature course] **AND**

_____ PE 100: Fit for Life (2) **OR**

_____ PE _____: _____ (1) **AND** PE _____: _____ (1)] [choose a different activity for each course]

Revised 05/08 - tog

WITHIN AREA III

You must choose **2 courses** from different disciplines! Note: Your major may require you to take specific core courses. Consult the major requirements in your catalog to help you decide which courses to take.

WITHIN AREAS IV AND V

You must complete a minimum of **15 (fifteen) credits!**

WITHIN AREA V

You must choose a **minimum of one course from each discipline.**

The liberal arts perspective is related to and supports the generalist social work perspective. Sensitivity to cultural differences is a competency-based skill because it enables the generalist to work in an effective and non-judgmental way with diverse clients and situations. Understanding of historical influences and philosophical perspectives strengthens the practitioner's grasp of the contextual features of client problems. Critical thinking enables the practitioner to effectively assess client strengths and needs and plan and evaluate interventions. Presenting oneself as a well-educated person gives the generalist credibility with client systems, colleagues and the community.

Social work students need basic verbal and written communication skills, and the capacity to write clearly and correctly is an area of competency vital to success in all social work courses. Many social work courses require students to make verbal presentations, and class discussions are an important part of all social work classes. Skill demonstrations depend on good oral communication skills. For these reasons, social work students must master effective oral and written communication skills early in the educational process. The University's core curriculum requirements include six semester hours of English Composition (ENG 111 and ENG 112). These courses help students improve the mechanics and style of their writing. The core requirements also include three semester hours of Speech (COMM 124), a course that emphasizes professional public speaking and the structure and techniques of presentation. This course therefore offers needed training in support of the social work foundation content.

Ability to use the scientific method forms the basis for developing the practice skills of assessment and evaluation. Critical thinking skills are also vital to these processes, as well as other aspects of practice. Social work students need to acquire an aptitude in math and science in preparation for professional foundation content in assessment and evaluation.

The University's core curriculum includes three semester hours of College Algebra (MATH 140); however, many students find it necessary to take one or more remedial math classes before they enroll in MATH 140. The first social work course requiring math proficiency is Research Methods I (SW 330), which is taken in the second semester of the junior year.

Eight semester hours of science are included in the core curriculum. Students must choose two lab science courses from different disciplines; one of these must be Biology (BIOL 110), a prerequisite required by the BSW program. This course includes content that supports the student's ability to use the bio-psycho-social perspective in client assessment. Both lab science classes support the student's grasp of methods of scientific inquiry as presented in the social work research course.

As noted, cultural awareness and appreciation of diversity are critical attributes for effective social work with any client system. Several courses included in the core curriculum support students' awareness of their own cultural heritage and enhance their appreciation of the unique characteristics and struggles of various ethnic groups in the United States. All students must take either Microeconomics (ECON 216) or Macroeconomics (ECON 217) to provide a foundation of awareness of the economic causes of human suffering. In addition, all students must take either three semester hours of Political Science (PSCI 151 or 251 or 316) focused on either national or state and local governments. These courses provide social work students with enhanced appreciation of how historical events and trends have shaped present American social groups, and how federal and state governments affect social life. The aforementioned prerequisites therefore support the social work foundation content in organizational and community interventions and evaluations.

Exposure to artistic expression and philosophy adds to cultural awareness, appreciation and competence. The University's core curriculum includes three semester hours of humanities and three semester hours of visual and performing arts. Students are able to choose from an array of philosophy, art, literature, music, theater and world civilization courses. The University does not mandate any specific courses, but rather identifies a spectrum of available choices. These approved choices contribute to the students' cultural sensitivity and appreciation of the context of client systems. The courses are prerequisites to Social Work Practice II (SW 465), which is taken in the Senior I semester and focuses on assessment and planning.

Social work students must have an understanding of psychology and sociology, in addition to human biology, in order to appreciate the bio-psycho-social determinants of human behavior, and must further be aware of diverse social and cultural conditions and problems. The prerequisites for the BSW Program include three semester hours of Introduction to Psychology (PSY 101) and Introduction to Sociology (SOC 152). PSY 101 prepares students for Human Behavior and the Social Environment I (SW 385), which is a junior I class, and focuses on theories addressing practice with individuals and families. SOC 152 prepares students for Human Behavior and the Social Environment II (SW 485), which is a Senior I class, and focuses on theories of practice with groups, organizations and communities. Social work students must also take Cultural Anthropology (ANTH 221) to meet the BSW Program's core social/behavioral science requirement. This course supplies specific content highlighting the importance and diversity of culture.

The remaining core curriculum requirements include two foreign language courses (which can include sign language), an introductory computer course, a three semester hour literature course and two semester hours of physical education and/or wellness courses. In addition to completing the required 42 core curriculum hours, social work students complete 52 hours of social work courses. Students must also complete general electives in order to meet the required 128 semester hours for graduation.

In addition to the requirement of prerequisites and co-requisites, sequencing of courses is enforced through the program admission and field placement processes. For full admission to the BSW program, students must have completed all but nine to twelve hours of the core curriculum. Students who lack some of the courses that are prerequisites to Junior II courses can be admitted conditionally, and are expected to complete these courses prior to the Senior I semester. The field placement process requires that all practice coursework be completed or in progress.

In summary, the BSW Program curriculum's professional foundation is built on a liberal arts perspective. Specific core curriculum requirements have been selected to support social work professional foundation content. Specifically, the liberal arts perspective provides a curricular foundation that enhances students' understanding of the person-environment context of social work practice, the capacity for critical thinking, and the integration and mastery of social work knowledge, skills and values.

Because of the rich multicultural historical heritage and thriving traditional cultures of the large Hispanic and Native American populations of the Southwest, it is imperative that social work students understand this heritage and the present impact it has on social work practice in the dynamic, rural/urban context of New Mexico. Therefore, the liberal arts foundation enables students to think critically about these populations, including their socioeconomic, cultural, political, religious and linguistic attributes. Additionally, the liberal arts foundation provides an overview of the living conditions of these populations, and introduces students to the concept that these and other bio-psycho-social factors may influence human behavior individually and collectively.

Courses in psychology, sociology, anthropology and biology provide the student with a broad and rich foundation for social work curricula in human behavior and the social environment and generalist practice. These courses enhance the student's knowledge and understanding of the urban/rural multicultural populations of New Mexico and the Southwest. Courses in political science, economics and philosophy enable students to understand and analyze the creation of social welfare policy and services and to appreciate the professional values and ethics infused throughout the social work professional foundation. The mathematics and computer/statistic courses give students analytical and reasoning tools to be applied in the social work research and social welfare policy and services courses.

In addition, courses in English, speech, music, art and literature give students a strong foundation in oral and written communication and a deeper appreciation for the cultural contributions made by the multicultural populations of New Mexico. Most importantly, the core courses noted provide students with a broad liberal arts perspective and a framework to understand the interrelationship between their own cultural heritage and the diverse traditions of New Mexico, and also to understand critically how that connection affects professional practice.

Integrated Professional Foundation

The BSW professional foundation builds on the liberal arts perspective described in the previous section through the knowledge connections established between the liberal arts courses and the BSW curricular objectives. The BSW curriculum is designed so that students achieve the competencies and practice behaviors relevant to generalist social work practice. Social work majors complete courses in the areas of practice, human behavior and the social environment, research and policy. The BSW foundation courses are designed to introduce students to the knowledge, skills, and values of the social work profession and develop generalist practice competencies. The overall BSW foundation curriculum is outlined in an earlier table. The following course descriptions are provided.

330. Research Methods 1

This is the first course in the undergraduate research sequence. It introduces students to qualitative and quantitative methodologies used in social research and assessment. The course

also covers statistical analysis and the use of computer technology in social research. Research on behalf of the diverse populations of New Mexico and the Southwest is emphasized.

333. Aspects of Aging

The course covers the emotional, biological, environmental, mental, and legal aspects of aging that occur in the elderly, with special emphasis on the Hispanic and Native American populations of New Mexico and the Southwest. Summer courses offered at the Rio Rancho Campus only.

341. Social Policy and Services 1

This first course in the two-part sequence covers the history of social work, the history and current structures of social welfare services, and the knowledge, values, and skills necessary to understand major social welfare policies. This foundation course introduces analysis of organizational, local and state issues, and policy analysis and advocacy. All course content is oriented to understanding the effects of social policies on Hispanics, Native Americans and other historically oppressed populations.

345. Children's Services

This course provides an overview of services for the protection of children. The intersection of human behavior theory with micro level generalist practice and with macro level program and policy formulation in child welfare is presented within a framework of critical thinking and sound decision-making. Medical and legal aspects of child abuse and neglect are addressed as well as federal, state and community based child welfare policies and programs. Emphasis is placed on child welfare practice with Hispanic, American Indian, and other oppressed populations of New Mexico and the Southwest.

365. Generalist Social Work Practice 1

This first course in the practice sequence introduces students to multiple theoretical approaches to generalist practice with diverse individuals. The philosophical and ethical foundations of social work are examined as they manifest in each step of the social work process. Practice knowledge and skills necessary for ethical and competent generalist practice with emphasis on the diverse populations of New Mexico and the Southwest are covered.

366. Generalist SW Practice 2: Interviewing and Assessment

This second course in the practice sequence focuses on skills and strategies for competent and ethical foundation level interviewing and assessment with diverse clients throughout the life span. Generalist practice interviewing and assessment techniques for children, adolescents and adults will be included. Emphasis is placed upon practice with Hispanic, American Indian, and other oppressed populations of New Mexico and the Southwest.

385. Individual and Family Theories (HBSE 1)

This two-semester course sequence surveys theoretical perspectives of human life course development and the environmental contexts within which development occurs. The sequence explores the interactions among individuals and between individuals and families, groups,

organizations, communities, society, and culture. The sequence emphasizes ethno-cultural contexts with special attention on the diverse populations of New Mexico and the Southwest.

386. Group, Organization, and Community Theories (HBSE 2)

This is the second course of a two-semester sequence described in SW 385.

430. Research Methods 2

This second course in the undergraduate research sequence builds on knowledge and skills introduced in SW 330. Additional topics presented include hypothesis development, variables, methods of data collection, research design, instrumentation, and applied research strategies. Research on behalf of the diverse populations of New Mexico and the Southwest is emphasized.

432. Field Practicum 1

The purpose of field practicum is to offer students the opportunity to apply classroom knowledge to practice. The field practicum requires students to be placed with a community agency during their senior year. In their agency placement, students are expected to demonstrate social work skills, knowledge, and values in working with individuals, groups, families, and communities. A total of 208 hours of field practicum/placement are required.

433. Law and Ethics in Social Work

The course examines areas of the law in which social work and our legal system intertwine. It also surveys ethical principles and related legal concepts that impact professional social work, and introduces a framework for the resolution of practice dilemmas. Finally, the course provides students with basic practice skills necessary to find and interpret the law. Major emphasis is placed on the operation of the legal system in New Mexico and the Southwest.

434. Field Practicum 2

This foundation practicum sequence is designed to help students apply foundation knowledge of social work skills, values and ethics in practice. By providing a series of supervised assignments and tasks, the practicum experience will expose students to a variety of social work roles. Students will apply generalist social work knowledge, skills and values to practice with individuals, couples, families, groups and communities.

451. Field Practicum Seminar 1

This seminar provides students an opportunity to integrate practice theory with field (practicum) experience. Students are exposed to a wide range of practice situations and will have an opportunity to address pragmatic and procedural aspects of field instruction.

452. Field Practicum Seminar 2

This seminar provides students an opportunity to integrate practice theory with field (practicum) experience. Students are exposed to a wide range of practice situations and will have an opportunity to address pragmatic and procedural aspects of field instruction.

465. Generalist Social Work Practice 2

This third course in the practice sequence builds upon the knowledge and skills developed previously. The course focuses on practice skills necessary for competent and ethical practice with diverse families and groups. Emphasis is placed upon generalist social work practice with Hispanic, American Indian and other oppressed populations of New Mexico and the Southwest.

466. Generalist Social Work Practice 3

This final course in the undergraduate practice sequence builds upon the knowledge and skills previously developed. This course introduces students to macro-level practice theory and skills necessary for competent and ethical practice. Topics include community organizing, development, and resource-building with a focus on the rural and urban communities of New Mexico and the Southwest. Emphasis is placed on macro practice with Hispanic, American Indian and other oppressed communities.

468. Theories of Social Work Practice

This course focuses on a comparative analysis of frameworks, theories and models of social work practice. The course examines the four forces in psychology as the building blocks of an integrative, multicultural, ecosystems approach to social work practice. Implications of each practice approach for work at the micro, mezzo, and macro level are examined. Emphasis is placed on the evaluation of the practice approaches for work with diverse populations, with special emphasis on the Native American and Hispanic Populations of New Mexico.

485. Human Diversity and Multicultural Theory (HBSE 3)

The course surveys relevant theory describing the ethno-cultural context of human behavior. The manner in which culture impacts the social functioning of individuals, families, organizations and communities is addressed. Consistent with the mission of the social work program, primary emphasis is placed upon Hispanic, Native American, and other diverse populations of New Mexico and the Southwest.

492. Independent Research (1 – 4 VC)

Individual, directed research arranged with an instructor. Prerequisite: Permission of instructor.

The School's Curriculum Committee has identified several themes upon which the BSW foundation curriculum is established. In so doing, the Committee has based its work on the prior discussions of faculty members serving on the Committee and its course sequence subcommittees. Committee and subcommittee meetings have served as forums for discussion and faculty consensus-building, with the result that the Curriculum Committee has been able to identify theoretical approaches that have clear empirical support and are therefore evidence-based, and that also guide and inform generalist practice approaches. Moreover, with the acknowledgement that regional generalist social work practice must serve diverse communities, the Curriculum Committee has further sought to target practice approaches that are minimally intrusive with clients, time-limited and cost-effective. This emphasis on courses that promote outcome attainment and skill development is an integral part of the undergraduate curriculum.

With the foregoing in mind, the BSW Program bases its foundation on several complementary theoretical approaches, including the *Ethnocultural Perspective*, *Strengths*

Perspective, Problem-Solving Perspective, Systems Perspective and Ecological Perspective.

These perspectives are viewed as interrelated and providing a holistic conceptual foundation for the preparation of generalist social workers at the undergraduate level and advanced social work practitioners at the graduate level. Each of these is discussed in succeeding sections, with relevant authorities referenced.

In addition to the themes mentioned above, a variety of related perspectives are offered to students within individual courses, including theoretical approaches in the areas of organizational behavior, management, leadership, group and community development, the psychosocial and psychodynamic paradigms, the structural/functional model, conflict theory, ego psychology and behavioral and cognitive/behavioral approaches.

Ethnocultural Perspective. The ethnocultural perspective is a theoretical and practice paradigm that integrates the ethnic and cultural attributes and psycho-socio-historical experiences of population groups who identify themselves as members of an ethnic and/or cultural family; for example: African American, Hispanic (Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, New Mexican Hispanic, Central American) or Asian (Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Vietnamese, Pacific Island, Hmong) persons. The paradigm is based on a concept of cultural competence—the ability to intervene across cultures—as defined by Valle (1986), Cross (1988) and Sergeeva (2003). Valle (p. 29) describes the ethnocultural perspective as follows:

Cross cultural competence can best be conceptualized as the ability of the mental health practitioner and researcher to demonstrate a working understanding of: (1) the symbolic/linguistic systems; (2) the naturalistic interactional pattern; and (3) the values and beliefs held by a target ethnic minority population and the ability to incorporate these elements into any planned intervention with members of the ethnic group.

Cross (p. 1) defines “cultural competence” in the following terms:

Cultural competence is a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency, or among professionals that enable them to work effectively in cross-cultural situations. The word ‘cultural’ is used because it implies the integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thoughts, communications, actions, customs, beliefs, values, and institutions of racial, ethnic, religious, or social groups. The word ‘competence’ is used because it implies having the capacity to function effectively. A culturally competent system of care acknowledges and incorporates at all levels the importance of culture, the assessment of cross-cultural relations, vigilance towards the dynamics that result from cultural differences, the expansion of cultural knowledge, and the adaptation of services to meet culturally-unique needs.

With respect to social work in New Mexico and the Southwest, ethnocultural practice and cultural competence are based on (a) a foundation of knowledge about the socio-historical and cultural experiences of Hispanics, American Indians and other ethnic minorities, (b) the influence of culture, ethnicity, race, class and gender on behaviors and life styles and (c) the application of this knowledge in interventions with clients of diverse cultural backgrounds. The culturally competent social worker will also understand the function of languages, speech and communication patterns in the helping process. Similarly, the ethnoculturally appropriate practitioner will be aware of the impact of social policies on ethnic minority populations, their help-seeking behaviors and the responses of health and human service agencies. Implied in the ethnocultural practice approach is the ability to use ethnographic information in the competent planning, delivery and evaluation of social services to various ethnic groups.

The cultural competence-based curricular perspective suggests that practitioners must have knowledge of their clients' ethnocultural attributes in three specific areas identified by Valle (1986): (a) symbolic/linguistic characteristics, including written and spoken languages and traditional cultural identity symbols (such as ethnic ceremonies, celebrations, art and folklore), (b) interactional patterns existing between individuals and their social supports (including families, peers, community groups and natural helpers) and (c) the norms, value and belief systems of each ethnocultural group.

Valle (1986, p. 29) summarizes the ethnocultural paradigm as follows:

Within the cross cultural intervention context, the mainstream mental health clinician and researcher must be sufficiently grounded in the day-to-day meanings of the ethnic minority group member's symbolic, interactional and narrative belief system... These competencies are incomplete, if they are not linked to the actual behaviors of the members of ethnic minority groups in the context of their social environment.

Sergeeva (2003, p. 5) further highlights the relationship between ethnocultural factors and the marginalization of individuals and communities:

[I]t is especially important to identify the social activity of ethnoculturally marginal individuals.... No matter what society's position is [it] is the marginal individuals that are separated from the commonly used sociocultural mechanisms of self-realization.... Society, in turn regards such mechanisms as violating the accepted behavioral patterns.

The Strengths Perspective. The strengths perspective complements the ethnocultural or cultural competence paradigm by suggesting that the strengths, potential and capacity of client systems are important focal points for intervention. The symbolic/linguistic attributes, the interventional patterns of primary groups/natural social networks and the norms, values and belief systems of clients are viewed as integral strengths rather than deficits to be corrected.

For many years the body of literature and research that served as the foundation for interventions with ethnic minority populations was found to be ethnocentric, stereotypic, exclusionary, damaging and irrelevant to the reality experienced by people of color. The constructs or frameworks used to analyze and define the experiences of ethnic groups in relation to the continuum of health and illness were expressed in terms of cultural deficits (e.g., the "culture" of poverty), social and individual pathology, ethnocentric life styles, class status and aberrations relevant to minority and immigrant populations. As Montiel & Wong (1982) suggest, in the traditional medical model and derivative social work paradigms, "the social and individual pathology of minority groups is emphasized while neglecting their healthy adjustment as well as positive methods of coping with the problems of living in a racist environment."

The strengths perspective takes the opposite approach in that it is not based on a deficit or pathology perspective. Instead, Lee (2003, p. 386) notes:

The strengths perspective is based on two key assumptions: (1) all people and environments have abilities and resources that are not being used, are underused, or perhaps have been forgotten, and (2) all people are capable of continued growth and change.

Saleebey (1992, p. 169) argues that the strengths perspective is consonant with social work's fundamental values. Montiel & Wong (1982) add that it is consistent with the promotion of human worth and social justice:

Focusing and building on client strengths is not only a counterweight to the prevalent deficit model. It is an imperative of the several values that govern our work and the operation of a democratic and pluralistic society including distributive justice, equality, respect for the dignity of the individual, and the search for maximum autonomy within maximum community.

According to Miley, O'Melia, & Dubois (1995, p. 70),

Strengths-oriented social workers believe that the strengths of client systems—individual, interpersonal, familial, organizational, and social—are resources to initiate, energize, and sustain change processes. Workers draw upon the resources available, both within client systems and in their environmental contexts, to promote more effective functioning.

The strengths perspective is, therefore, based on strategies of *empowerment* as a “process—organizational and community” enabling the gaining of environmental control and the attaining of aspirations (Hosenfeld, 1987, p. 469-83). Rappaport (1981) views empowerment as the process by which client systems, including people, communities and organizations, gain mastery over their own existence. The goals and processes of strengths-focused social work interventions incorporate basic principles of empowerment, including (a) enhancement of the “competence of human systems toward more adaptive social functioning” and (b) seeking “the responsiveness of social institutions by increasing the availability of societal opportunities and resources” (Miley, O'Melia, & Dubois, 1995, p. 70).

The Problem Solving Perspective. As interpreted by Kirst-Ashman & Hull (1993, p. 25), generalist practices stresses a problem solving approach with “problem” defined as “an intricate, unsettled question or a source of perplexity, distress or vexation.” The problem solving perspective proposes that the function of social workers is “to assist clients to resolve problems in person-situation interactions...and to create healthy communities...by building a meaning, a purpose and sense of obligation for the community” (Specht, 1990, p. 345). Compton & Galaway (1994, p.10) suggest that the process of problem solving “involves the use of strengths brought by the client, the worker and the environment.”

Problem solving, as a practice model, is a strengths-focused helping process through which client systems are empowered to find ethnoculturally responsive solutions to their problems through partnerships, resources, opportunities development and environmental enhancement. The problem solving model is applicable to direct services, group work and community organization and development.

As an empowering process that promotes competence within client systems, problem solving is based on the assumption that “clients have strengths, that environments hold potential resources, and that clients should participate as full partners in all aspects of change processes” (Germain & Gitterman, 1996, p. 6). Problem solving is conceived as a planned, systematic, cognitive and affective process based on social work values and ethics, and which follows six major steps or phases: (a) assessment; (b) planning; (c) intervention; (d) evaluation; (e) termination; and (f) follow-up (Kirst-Ashman & Hull, 1993, p. 25-37). These steps are viewed as applicable to the generalist continuum of intervention with all levels of systems—the micro, mezzo and macro.

The Systems Perspective. The systems paradigm provides a framework for the understanding of person-environment dynamics at the micro, mezzo and macro levels of social organizations. As defined by Olsen (1968),

a social system is a model of a social organization that possesses a distinct total unit beyond its component parts, that is distinguished from its environment by a clearly defined boundary, and whose sub-units are at least partially interrelated within relatively stable patterns of social order.

Anderson and Carter (1990, p. 266-67) define a system as “an organized whole made up of components that interact in a way distinct with other entities and which endures over a period of time.” The systems perspective or paradigm as applied in the School’s social work curriculum is based on an ecosystems framework for the understanding of “human diversity and the relationship between humans and their environments” (Miley, O’Melia, & Dubois, 1995, p. 70).

Kozłowska & Hanney (2002, p. 285) add to this definition of the systems perspective by noting that it

refers to the application of general systems theory to living systems....[It] requires the [holding of] multiple perspectives in mind, considers each system level as both a part and a whole, and shifts the focus of attention between levels as required.

Human systems are defined as structural, bio-psycho-social and ethnocultural entities with intrinsic strengths and interaction among themselves and within their environments. The systems perspective views human entities or systems—individual, family, group, communities, agencies, organizations, institutions and cities—in dynamic interaction with each other and their environment. Problem solving within this ecosystem paradigm is focused on the interaction between individuals, families, groups, communities or organizations and their subsystems and environments. Within this context, social work practitioners are expected to focus on the promotion of growth by individual clients as well as on systemic issues impeding growth, such as inadequate housing, medical care and education, poverty, lack of services, and discrimination within socioeconomic and political environments.

Throughout the curriculum, students are taught that the assessment and design of client interventions must be relevant to the environmental conditions in which clients exist, and must be supported by empirically based theories and research. Students are taught the importance of the evaluation of practice and programs, and learn appropriate evaluative methods and skills. Content provided in each curricular area is related to the School’s mission and to the competencies and practice behaviors derived from the mission.

The Ecological Perspective. Germain & Gitterman (1996, p.6) view culture as

part of the environment, part of the person and...expressed through each person’s values, norms, beliefs and language...[It enables] people to transcend limitations imposed by the environmental conditions.

Because the ethnocultural experience of people is “part of their person and their environment,” the ecological perspective can be viewed as a complementary model. Indeed, is a very important paradigm in the implementation of NMHU’s generalist curriculum given its consistency with NMHU’s dedication to the multicultural populations of New Mexico.

The ecological perspective tends to integrate the treatment and reform traditions in social work practice by emphasizing the *person-in-situation*, which can also be described as the

interaction and transaction between human systems, including individuals, families, groups, communities and organizations, and their environments. Compton & Galaway (1994, p.4) define the ecological perspective as a reciprocal transaction between individuals and environments that are “in a constant state of reciprocity,” each shaping the other.

The School adopts Germain’s and Gitterman’s concept of the social work function by educating students to help clients (a) “mobilize and draw upon personal and environmental resources for effective coping” and (b) “influence social and physical environmental forces to be responsive to people’s needs” (1996, p. 26). When this model is applied to social work education in New Mexico, the School’s programs emphasize the teaching of the socio-historical experiences of regional Hispanic and Native American communities, and the identification of ethnocultural attributes that these groups have relied upon to cope with oppression, poverty, discrimination and life transitions. Indeed, empowerment through group, neighborhood, community and tribal involvement and collective action in rural and urban environments are integral aspects of the ecological perspective. The ecological continuum of intervention includes teaching competent practice with individuals, families, groups, communities, tribes, organizations and political units, and is reflected in the School’s programs both at the BSW and MSW levels.

AS B2.0.5 Describes and explains how its curriculum content (knowledge, values, and skills) implements the operational definition of each of its competencies.

Integration of the Core Competencies in Practice Behaviors, in Specific Curriculum Content, and in Signature Assignments

Core Competencies and Practice Behaviors Depicted in Curriculum Matrix. As already noted, the School has adopted CSWE’s core competencies in a manner that demonstrates linkage to, and consistency with, the School’s mission statement. Additionally, these competencies are operationalized through the practice behaviors identified for each competency. Indeed, the School, through the leadership and guidance of the Curriculum Committee, has endeavored to integrate the competencies, EP 2.1.1 through 2.1.10, together with all associated practice behaviors, in all courses offered within the BSW program. As a means of graphically depicting the integration of competencies throughout the BSW curriculum, the School has developed a *curriculum matrix* as graphically depicted in the Appendix 2A to this chapter. The curriculum matrix sets forth the specific integration of core competencies and affiliated practice behaviors within particular BSW courses.

Signature Assignments. Through the Curriculum Committee’s direction, the School has implemented *signature assignments* in designated courses. Signature assignments are intended to represent capstone exercises that require students to demonstrate mastery of one or more competencies and practice behaviors. Additionally, signature assignments offer students the opportunity to apply, reinforce and coordinate their learning experiences. Signature assignments therefore help students to build towards or demonstrate proficiency in specific competencies and practice behaviors. Indeed, signature assignments are created with due consideration of the practice behaviors developed for each course. Accomplishment of these practice behaviors is assessed with the assistance of a *grading rubric* developed for each course. Each of the ten competencies and their related practice behaviors are addressed in signature assignments. The

signature assignments created for each course, together with their affiliated grading rubrics, are presented in the master course syllabi located in Volume II of this self study.

Narrative Discussion of Program Competencies and Practice Behaviors within the Curriculum. The following narrative identifies program competencies and highlights the operationalization of each of the associated practice behaviors in the core curriculum. The narrative is organized according to program competencies and demonstrates implementation of competencies and practice behaviors in specific courses. Additionally, the curriculum matrix, which demonstrates linkage between core competencies and practice behaviors, is presented in the appendix to this chapter.

As noted, the School, through the leadership and guidance of the Curriculum Committee, strives to promote the integration of CSWE's core competencies, EP 2.1.1 through 2.1.10, throughout the BSW curriculum. These competencies include, respectively, the student's identification as a professional social worker (2.1.1), the application of social work ethical principles in practice (2.1.2), the application of critical thinking in making professional judgments (2.1.3), the engagement of diversity in practice (2.1.4), the advancement of human rights and social and economic justice (2.1.5), the engagement of students in research-informed practice and practice-informed research (2.1.6), the application of knowledge of human behavior in the social environment (2.1.7), the engagement of students in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services (2.1.8), the ability to respond to contexts that shape practice (2.1.9), and the engagement, assessment, intervention with, and evaluation of various client systems (2.1.10a-d).

By providing a foundational base in each of the competencies, the School intends that its competence-based concept of a generalist social work practitioner is integrated within the BSW curriculum. Thus, graduates of the BSW Program are well prepared with the competencies necessary to succeed professionally and also academically in advanced-level courses offered within the MSW Program. The following section outlines the manner in which each of the aforementioned competencies is addressed within the BSW Program's course sequence. As noted, a curriculum matrix highlighting the BSW Program competencies and associated practice behaviors is presented in appendix 2A to this chapter.

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

Generalist practitioners identify with and represent social work as a profession. They do so by learning about and behaving in ways that reflect the practice behaviors that operationalize this competency. A number of courses address one or more of the practice behaviors for EP 2.1.1.

EP 2.1.1 (a) Advocate for client access to social work services.

The concept of advocacy and its importance for social work is introduced to students in the first practice course, SW 365, Generalist Practice I, which focuses on defining the advocacy role in planning for change. It is also emphasized in SW 333, Aspects of Aging, as students learn about empowerment and community resources for elders. In SW 341, Social Policy and

Services, students apply advocacy skills with a policy advocacy assignment related to a client population. These courses emphasize the role of social worker as advocate in a range of settings and help students develop advocacy knowledge, mindsets and skills. In SW 433, Law and Ethics, students practice in the organization and presentation of social work testimony in court.

Students further develop and apply knowledge and skills of advocacy on behalf of clients in both of their Field Practicum courses (SW432 and 434) and in assignments in the first Field Seminar (SW 451) related to resource needs and social work roles. In SW 465 Generalist Practice III students learn about family case management and the basics of advocacy with families and groups; in SW 468 Theories of SW Practice knowledge of ecological assessment is applied to understanding case management and advocacy. In SW 466 Generalist Practice IV students further learn macro level knowledge and skills related to community organization and advocacy techniques.

EP 2.1.1(b) Practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development.

Practices of personal reflection and self-correction are integral to a number of practice courses (SW333, 365, 366, 465, 468). In all of these courses students self-reflect on their own values, beliefs, and reactions to various client populations and issues related to their development of ethical and effective social work practice. They then apply their knowledge to different areas or issues in each course. In HBSE II (SW 386) students demonstrate self-reflection in applying developmental theory and life course information to their own lives. In Field Practicum courses 432 and 434 students apply and further develop knowledge and skills of self-reflection and correction as they interact with clients and discuss their own values, judgments, habitual styles of relating, blocks to empathy with supervisors; Field Seminars 451 and 452 also offer students opportunities to discuss how to identify blocks to awareness and how to build more self-awareness. In SW 485 HBSE III, Human Diversity and Multicultural Theory, self-awareness and critical reflection are demonstrated in exercises, assignments, and discussions.

EP 2.1.1(c) Identify and practice within professional roles and boundaries.

Students begin to identify professional roles and boundaries in their first semester course, SW 333, where they interview agency social workers and develop knowledge about a range of roles, settings, and boundary issues with aging populations. Professional roles in child welfare practice (investigator, advocate, case manager) are the focus for knowledge development in SW 345. In SW 365 they learn about professional norms in the social worker-client relationship and the importance of establishing healthy boundaries with clients; in practicing interviewing skills with clients in SW 366 they learn about how to operationalize professional norms that guide the helping process. Their first field practicum, SW 432, gives students an opportunity to take on the role of student intern and learn about role expectations and associated professional boundaries; their roles expand in their second field practicum, SW 434, as they develop skills related to advocate, broker, case manager. Knowledge, values, and skills that are emphasized in their other classes are further developed in practicum observations, interactions, and supervision.

The two field seminars, SW 451 and 452, provide further opportunities to discuss and receive feedback related to various professional roles and boundaries in different settings. SW

465 offers students opportunities to demonstrate skills related to various social work roles in family and group work.

EP 2.1.1(d) Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication.

Students develop knowledge of professional demeanor from interviewing social workers (SW 333) and through learning how norms pertaining to dress and communication shape the social work helping process (SW 366). Practice in organization and presentation of social work testimony in court (SW 433) allows them to develop knowledge and demonstrate skills related to professional demeanor in a specific setting. Students demonstrate this practice behavior in a more concentrated way in the context of field education, Field Practicum I and II (SW 432 and 434) and the Field Seminars 451 and 452, where they discuss and practice behaviors and communication styles that are consistent with the social work profession's values. In SW 465 students practice developing a professional relationship with attention to communication patterns and styles, focus, and use of self. Effective and respectful communication is reinforced through class discussions, feedback, group projects, and written assignments in all courses across the curriculum.

EP 2.1.1(e) Develop a commitment to engage in career long learning.

All courses in the BSW curriculum emphasize reading relevant literature and becoming informed about historical and evolving issues in areas of practice, human behavior and the social environment, policy, and research. This discipline supports the development of a commitment to career long learning that becomes more relevant as students move into field education. Various senior level classes (SW 465, 466, 468) emphasize developing habits of using research based information to inform practice at different levels and settings and contribute to students' continuing professional development. Field Practicum I and II (SW 432 and 434) and Field Seminars (SW 451 and 452) offer students opportunities to develop consistent patterns that support career long learning as they observe social workers in action, research literature pertinent to agency policy and practice, and attend staff meetings, trainings and conferences which support professional social work identity and development.

EP 2.1.1(f) Effectively use of supervision and consultation.

Students begin the process of learning about the role of supervision in their first practice class, SW 365. Giving and receiving feedback on interviewing skills in SW 366 also moves them toward understanding the process of supervision and consultation. In SW 465 students learn about professional standards for group workers and skills of giving and receiving feedback. Students then learn how to use supervision and consultation through discussions and exercises in Field Seminars 432 and 434. They have multiple opportunities to practice this skill in Field Practicum I and II (SW 451 and 452) where they receive oral and written feedback and evaluation on ways to improve their practice effectiveness.

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

Knowledge, values, and skills related to ethical conduct and ethical decision making are integral to the practice of social work. This competency is operationalized as students learn about and behave in ways that reflect the practice behaviors for this competency.

EP 2.1.2(a) Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice.

Developing awareness of both personal and professional social work values is woven throughout the curriculum, but is more explicitly addressed in a number of courses at both junior and senior levels. Initially, in SW 333, 365 and 366 students explore their own values, beliefs, and stereotypes related to social work practice and vulnerable groups; they also compare their values with those of the social work profession and learn how to begin to manage and integrate their personal values with those of the profession. Assignments in SW 465 ask students to demonstrate understanding of core social work values and the NASW Code of Ethics. In field education practicum courses and field seminars (SW 451 and 452, 432 and 434) students develop and demonstrate knowledge and skills in understanding their own values and working with clients in accordance with professional values. SW 468 students integrate knowledge of social work theories with values of justice, non-abusiveness, and caring connection.

EP 2.1.2(b) Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the NASW and other social work codes of ethics.

Students develop knowledge of issues and practices that contribute to both ethical and unethical research and review ethical issues relevant to research in SW 330, the junior level research course, and build upon that base in SW 430, Research Methods II as they develop research skills they can apply related to protection of human subjects. In case analyses, discussion, and other assignments in SW 333, 365, 366, and 468 students develop knowledge of the importance of ethical codes in guiding decisions and social workers' responsibilities to adhere to the NASW Code of Ethics. In the Law and Ethics course (SW 433) students identify the purpose and function of codes of ethics in social work and other human services. Practicum courses (SW 432 and 434) and Practicum Seminars (SW 451 and 452) give students opportunities to reflect on and apply professionally guided ethical standards to their field experiences.

EP 2.1(c) Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts.

As they explore case situations, students develop both knowledge and problem solving skills related to the role of uncertainty in ethical conflicts in SW 333, 365 and 366; these are linked with an understanding of the need for ongoing supervision and consultation in approaching complex and ambiguous practice situations. In their senior year, they then apply their knowledge and acquire skills in these areas as they recognize, discuss, and work with ethical complexities in field practicum courses (SW 432 and 434); the field seminars 451 and 452 provide forums for discussion and information sharing on ways to approach ethical conflicts. They further develop knowledge of multiple perspectives related to ethical issues in both the

Diversity course SW 485 and in SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, and apply knowledge of problem solving processes to address unclear ethical conflicts with families and groups in SW 465, Generalist Practice III.

EP 2.1.2(d) Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions.

Students learn about ethical decision making protocols in case situations that present ethical dilemmas and challenges in their first practice course, SW 365. They develop knowledge of the tensions between family autonomy, child safety, and mandatory reporting in applying ethical reasoning to child welfare work in SW 345 Children's Services, and explore ways of applying this knowledge. During their senior year in the Law and Ethics course (SW 433), they work with identifying the purpose and function of codes of ethics in informing decision making for practice dilemmas. Field education courses SW 432 and 434 coupled with field seminars 451 and 452 offer opportunities to practice the application of this practice behavior as students develop skills in recognizing ethical issues, gathering relevant information, and making decisions guided by ethical considerations. Students expand their knowledge of ethical reasoning to include principles of caring and connection in SW 468, and develop understanding of ways to deal with special ethical and legal issues in family and group work (SW 465).

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

Social workers understand principles of reasoning, scientific inquiry, and critical thinking. They gather, synthesize and apply relevant information in their professional work. The competency of critical thinking is addressed through various practice behaviors in every course in the BSW curriculum and is a basic building block for the curriculum.

EP 2.1.3(a) Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge and practice wisdom.

Every course in the BSW curriculum addresses this practice behavior; individual courses focus on highlighting different sources of knowledge, as well as ways of evaluating and integrating them into social work practice. During the junior year, courses in research (SW 330), aging (SW 333), social policy (SW 341), child welfare (SW 345), practice (SW 365 and 366), and human behavior and the social environment (SW 385 and 386) highlight various sources of knowledge: research reports, information on social programs and policies, professional literature and practice wisdom related to aging, child welfare, practice, and human development. These courses offer students opportunities to understand the strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of knowledge, so that this knowledge can later be applied in practicum settings. Senior level courses examine sources of knowledge in a more critical way; as examples, students examine quantitative and qualitative approaches to knowing in Research Methods II (SW 430) and gain knowledge of interdisciplinary contributions in the area of multiculturalism/diversity in SW 485, and do legal research in SW 433 Law and Ethics. Generalist Practice IV (SW 466), a macro practice course, familiarizes students with a range of culturally and regionally relevant social work community based interventions. Students integrate knowledge of various practice theories with information on families, groups, and individuals (SW 465, 468). Field practicum courses (SW 423 and 434) and field seminars (SW 451 and 452) give students opportunities to

demonstrate awareness and skills in dealing with discrepancies between classroom knowledge and agency practices, and integrate knowledge of professional literature with practice wisdom.

EP 2.1.3(b) Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation.

Students develop knowledge of these four areas during the junior year as they focus on issues of aging (SW 333) and child welfare (SW 345); in the latter course, students learn about voluntary services, foster care and adoption as institutional responses to child abuse, as well as assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation models used in child welfare services. In Social Policy and Services (SW 341), students analyze the efficacy and efficiency of programs derived from various policy models. Practice I (SW 365) and HBSE I and II (SW 385 and 386) help students develop critical knowledge of multiple theoretical models useful in the planned change process and in understanding human behavior at various system levels and over the life course. Other practice courses at the senior level have students explore individual, family, group, and community models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation (SW 468, 465, and 466). In Law and Ethics (SW 433), students learn and apply legal/ethical decision making models, as well as do analysis of their legal research. The diversity course, SW 485, focuses on critical theory and critical multiculturalism as guiding models for social work practice. Field Practicum courses (SW 432 and 434), as well as Field Seminars (SW 451 and 452), help students develop awareness of and analyze theory influenced processes of engagement, assessment, intervention, prevention, and evaluation in the agency setting.

EP 2.1.3(c) Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.

In numerous course assignments and activities throughout the BSW curriculum, students have opportunities to demonstrate effective oral and written communication with a variety of groups. Sample courses noted in the BSW Curriculum Matrix/Table offer many examples (Refer to appendix 2A). Presentations, exercises, role plays, and discussions are typical examples of oral communication found in courses such as SW 333, 345, 366, 433, 465, 468, 485. Written assignments such as psychosocial history and agency assessment (SW 333), policy analysis (SW 341), interviewing skills assessment (SW 366), HBSE theories related to a range of social systems and human life course development (SW 385 and 386), organization of social work legal testimony (SW 433), and critical self-examination related to diversity (SW 485) help students analyze, integrate, and apply theoretical material to social work practice.

EP 2.1.4 Engage diversity and difference in practice.

Social workers recognize how diversity shapes life experience and understand the interrelationship of multiple factors in contributing to oppression or privilege. This competency is basic to the mission of the School of Social Work and is addressed through various practice behaviors in many courses in the BSW curriculum.

EP 2.1.4(a) Recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create and enhance privilege and power.

Beginning in the junior year, many courses focus on diversity and its relationship to oppression, power and privilege. In the course on aging (SW 333), students learn how ageism, racism, sexism, and class differences relate to societal values and practices with older populations, while Children's Services (SW 345) addresses issues of child care, medical care, and child abuse within these contexts. The social policy class (SW 341) examines the legacy of discrimination in the United States, structural causes of social problems, and the influence of diverse values shaping social welfare policy. In practice classes such as SW 365 students learn about culturally sensitive practices and values in working with vulnerable populations. HBSE courses (SW385 and 386) offer opportunities for students to develop knowledge of how poverty, oppression and structural inequalities influence human development over the life course at various system levels and in different contexts. Strengths focused and culturally sensitive assessment and engagement knowledge for practice is explored in SW468. Generalist Practice III (SW465) incorporates knowledge of culturally sensitive assessments and practice skills in work with families and groups, while SW 466, a macro practice course, addresses community planning and assessment of problems in Hispanic and Native American communities. Human Diversity and Multicultural Theory course (SW 485) addresses multicultural theory, faces of oppression, and a critical multicultural approach to examining the history and legacy of conquest and colonization of the Southwest. In field practicum and field seminar courses (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students apply knowledge of oppression and diversity issues in their work with clients, and develop awareness of how agencies deal with power issues and imbalances.

EP 2.1.4(b) Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups.

Students gain knowledge of and address their biases and values conflicts in working with older adults in SW 333, and further analyze personal values and biases impacting the helping relationship and process in Practice I, SW 365. Self-awareness of personal values and biases is also developed as students develop interviewing skills and receive feedback in SW 366. Further practice classes such as SW 465 allow students to understand the complexities of developing self-awareness in work with diverse families and groups. In SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, students explore the conscious use of self when working with diverse clients in various assignments; students also draw on this awareness in a critical self-examination paper focused on diversity in SW 485 (Human Diversity and Multicultural Theory). Students in practicum courses (SW 432, 434) use supervision and field seminars (SW 451, 452) to recognize and correct biases in their work with diverse clients.

EP 2.1.4(c) Recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences.

Students develop understanding of the impact of culture/ethnicity, gender, class, and sexual orientation on the experiences and functioning of older adults in SW 333, and focus on variations in family structures, beliefs, and practices related to child welfare in SW 345, Children's Services. Practice I (SW 365) develops knowledge of the strengths of diversity in

client systems and how diversity impacts the helping process. The HBSE courses (SW 385 and 386) offer content that helps students understand how diverse sociocultural locations, experiences, and historical contexts shape human lives at various system levels (individual, family, group, organization, and community) and across the life course. Students learn how diversity shapes life experiences in family life and group functioning in SW 465 Practice II, and extend their understanding of difference in learning about cultural strengths and cultural factors in ecological assessments (SW 468). The diversity course, SW 485, aids students in understanding the impact of different sociopolitical and historical contexts and the intersection of differences (class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, disability) in shaping people's experiences and views. Students bring this knowledge into their practicum experiences (SW 432, 434) as they develop skills in recognizing, understanding and working with clients whose lives have been shaped by oppression and marginalization. Field seminars (SW 451, 452) give students opportunities to learn how to recognize oppression and work more skillfully with these issues in social work practice settings.

EP 2.1.4(d) View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.

Students develop knowledge of how to listen, create a client-centered environment, and understand client self-determination in the context of learning from elders in SW 333 (Aspects of Aging). Practice I (SW 365) students view the role of social workers as learners in relation to client systems and demonstrate knowledge of the importance of the client/worker relationship; they practice interviewing skills in SW 366 that embody empathy and curiosity about clients' perspectives and experiences. In Practice III (SW 465), they learn client centered perspectives that honor self-determination in family and group work. SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, further helps students develop an orientation toward clients as experts in their own lives. SW 466, Generalist Practice IV, engages students in learning about community empowerment, rural communities' economic and social policy development, and the role of spirituality in minority/rural communities. In the diversity course (SW 485) students analyze and listen to personal diversity narratives as they engage in self-examination related to diversity. Practicum courses (SW 432, 434) help students develop skills in learning from clients and supervisors in order to establish a relationship and work collaboratively with client systems. Field seminars (SW 451, 452) give students opportunities to discuss and develop knowledge of how to develop collaborative work skills.

EP 2.1.5 Advance human rights and social and economic justice.

Knowledge, values and skills related to human rights and social and economic justice are integral to the practice of social work. This competency is also basic to the mission of the School of Social Work and is addressed through various practice behaviors in many courses in the BSW curriculum.

EP 2.1.5(a) Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination.

This competency is reflected in many courses that span the sequences. Practice Courses (SW 333,345,365,465,466,468) all address concepts related to micro, mezzo and macro levels and forms of oppression and discrimination. In each of these Practice Courses, students are asked to reflect upon and/or write about personal and structural mechanisms of oppression related to the course focus. The HBSE courses (385, 386, 485) examine knowledge pertinent to power and structural inequalities as well as risk and protective factors and the effects of structural inequalities over the life span. The Law and Ethics (433) course examines the legal system's role in promoting social and economic justice. In Fieldwork Courses (432, 434) students are asked to use classroom knowledge to critically reflect on their Field Agency's stance toward social justice and the Field Seminar Courses (451, 452) each include an assignment on the ways in which the Field Agency addresses social justice.

EP 2.1.5(b) Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice.

Students begin to examine advocacy for human rights and social and economic justice in their first practice classes. In SW 365 and SW 333, Generalist Practice I, students learn the concept of advocacy and in discussion and written assignments learn that advocacy for human rights and social justice are core values of the profession. In SW 341, Social Policy, students examine mechanisms for advocacy in terms of access to lawmakers and the media and how to communicate informatively. In SW 465, Social Work Practice III, students examine advocacy and social justice core values in working with families and groups. In SW 466, Social Work Practice IV, students address advocacy techniques for community organization in rural areas. In SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, students examine local and global community paradigms as well as the concept of global social justice. Students prepare for advocacy work through developing knowledge of social and economic justice issues relevant to diverse populations, with a focus on New Mexico and the Southwest. In the Fieldwork Courses (SW 431,432) students use supervision to identify social justice issues related to agency's purpose and mission. In the Field Seminar Classes (SW 451, 452) students discuss how to advocate for social and economic justice with their agency's purpose and mission.

EP 2.1.5(c) Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.

Students learn about practices that advance social justice in the classroom and engage in social justice practice in the field. Practice courses that examine social justice practices include SW 333,345,465,466, & 468. SW 333, Aspects of Aging, builds knowledge of community resources for elders to facilitate student engagement in practices that advance social justice. In SW 345, Child Welfare, students learn about voluntary services for children and families dealing with child abuse and neglect and also examines the notion of legal advocacy for struggling families. In SW 465, Social Work Practice III, students examine family and group direct ecosystem practices that advance social justice and diminish oppression. In SW 466, Social Work Practice IV, students learn ways to build rural communities in ways that advance social justice. In the diversity course (SW 485) students demonstrate knowledge of specific social and economic justice strategies and movements related to diverse populations. In SW 341, Social Policy, students learn and practice ways to use campaigns, coalition building, and voting to help

shape social policies that promote justice. In the Fieldwork Courses (SW 432, 434) coupled with Field Seminar Classes (SW 451, 452), students first prepare to engage and then engage in advocacy practices to increase social and economic justice in ways that are related to the field agency's mission and purpose.

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

Social workers use practice experience to inform research-based inquiry. Social workers evaluate and use evidenced-based research, evaluate their own practice, and draw upon qualitative and qualitative research findings to improve client services, service delivery and policy.

EP 2.1.6(a) Use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry.

Several practice courses, (SW 333,345,366,465,466,468), the Research Methods II course (SW 430) and the field courses (SW 432, 434) and field seminars address this practice (SW 451, 452) and explore the ways in which practice knowledge and practice experience are integral to the research process. In SW 333, Aspects of Aging, students learn to recognize that knowledge of the developmental and behavioral changes related to aging is crucial to the scientific research process in the field of gerontology. In SW 345, Child Welfare, the students examine research-based treatment programs for working with families and children in the child welfare system that integrate decades of practice wisdom. In SW 366, SW Practice II-Interviewing and Assessment students engage in classroom role-play interviews and assessments and study direct interviewing skills and assessment processes that are derived from practice wisdom and evidence-based practice. In SW 465, Social Work Practice III, students learn multiple models of family and group assessment/practice and critically examine the ways in which both practice wisdom and evidenced-based data are integrated in the development of practice models and the critical evaluation of their use. In SW 466, Social Work Practice IV, the students collect information about community history and lives to develop strategies for community problem assessment. In SW 468, the art (intuition, practice wisdom) and science (evidence-based practice, research findings) of assessment is examined through the study of the practice application of the four forces in psychology (psychodynamic, cognitive-behavioral, experiential, transpersonal). In the Research Methods II course (SW 430) students are asked to use practice to develop research questions that are informed by practice and useful to practice advancement. In the Fieldwork Courses (SW 432,434) and the Field Seminar Courses (SW 451, 452), students are asked to integrate practice wisdom and evidence based practice into the assessment, treatment and evaluation aspects of the field agency.

EP 2.1.6(b) Use research evidence to inform practice.

Many courses across the sequences in the BSW curriculum address the ways in which quantitative and qualitative research are used to build knowledge and improve practice, policy, and service delivery. Social Work practice courses (SW 333,345,365,366,465,466 & 468) all examine the ways in which social work knowledge is derived from research. SW 333, Aspects of Aging, students utilize research evidence to inform practice in the field or gerontology. In SW 345, Child Welfare, students study the ways in which research findings inform child welfare

practice and contribute to innovative program development and service delivery. In SW 365, Social Work Practice I, students study the utilization of research in the planned change process. In SW 366, SW Practice II-Interviewing and Assessment, students build social work skills and examine their derivation in practice wisdom and evidence-based practice. In SW 465, Social Work Practice III, students integrate research-based literature in their family and group assessments. In SW 466, Social Work Practice IV, students use research literature to develop strategies for community-based assessment. In SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, students examine research literature on multiple practice models. In Research Methods I & II (SW 330 & 440), students examine the four objectives of research, review the five steps of evidence based practice, and use research evidence to inform practice. In SW 341, Social Policy, students use scholarly research to study the correlates of social problems and to inform the development of successful social policy. In SW 385 & 386, HBSE, students examine human behavior theories and their foundation in evidence based practice as well as the research that addresses their use with diverse populations. In the Fieldwork Courses (SW 432, 434) and in the Field Seminar courses (SW 451&452), students move from achieving an understanding of evidence-based practice to doing research on best practices related to agency clientele.

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

Social workers are knowledgeable about life course human behavior, and the ways in which social systems support and/or undermine health and well being.

EP 2.1.7(a) Use conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation.

The Human Behavior and the Social Environment sequence courses (SW 385, 386, 485) examine various theoretical systems levels through the lens of multiple substantive theories/frameworks/models that examine dimensions of human functioning. SW 485, Diversity, examines the five faces of oppression, historical theory and immigration theory in the context of human development and human behavior. Practice courses (SW 333, 345, 365, 465, 466, & 468) all examine conceptual frameworks at various system levels (micro to macro) to guide the social work processes of engagement, assessment, planning, intervention, evaluation and termination. The Fieldwork Courses (SW 432, 434) and the Field Seminars (SW 451,452) help students to move from understanding the use of conceptual frameworks to guide practice to utilizing multidimensional frameworks for social work practice with various modalities.

EP 2.1.7(b) Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.

In the Human Behavior and Social Environment sequence (SW 385, 386, 485), students critique and apply knowledge of person in environment. In HBSE I & II (SW 385,386), students critically analyze theories of human behavior while understanding the importance of context and diversity factors when applying person-in-environment knowledge. In SW 485, Diversity, students critically examine social class and immigration issues. In the practice sequence (SW 333,365,465,466,468) students critically examine the interface between social work practice theory and theories of human behavior and the social environment and apply this knowledge in case analyses, in-class interviews and community-oriented practice strategies. In the Fieldwork

Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452), students first identify specific person-in-environment issues that affect the lives of field agency clients, and then critically apply this knowledge to assist clients at the field agency.

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

Social workers understand the history of the development of social policies and services, understand the effects of social policy on people's lives and engage in policy practice.

EP 2.1.8(a) Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being.

In SW 341 (Social Policy), students employ a policy analysis model to critically evaluate an existing social policy. In SW 433, Law and Ethics, students demonstrate familiarity with the legal system's role in protecting the interests of the diverse, at-risk populations of New Mexico in promoting social and economic justice and in addressing major contemporary social problems. In the practice sequence (SW 333, 345, 365, 465, 466) students examine the effects of social policy history as it relates to current social work practice, examine ways in which social policies augment or limit advocacy practice with clients, and learn ways of advocating for systemic change. In the Fieldwork Courses (SW 432, 434) and Field Seminar Classes (SW 451, 452), students review agency policy, understand how agency policies connect to agency mission, programs, and services and develop knowledge of social welfare policies at the local, state and federal levels that impact client well-being.

EP 2.1.8(b) Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.

In SW 341, Social Policy, students develop knowledge of community allies in order to collaborate to develop an integrated policy action. In SW 466, Social Work Practice IV, students work to identify and assess community problems in rural and Hispanic/Native American communities. In the Fieldwork Courses (SW 432, 434) and Field Seminar course (SW 451,452), students identify and participate in a specific agency policy action for its client base.

EP 2.1.9 Respond to contexts that shape practice.

Social workers respond to the evolving nature of the practice context. Social workers use knowledge and skills to respond to context changes at every level of practice and to promote changes that improve the quality of social services.

EP 2.1.9(a) Continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services.

In SW 385 and 386, HBSE I and II, students demonstrate knowledge of local, regional, and global sociocultural, political and economic contexts in evaluating various HBSE theories and develop awareness of technological changes and globalization trends that impact people in their environments. In practice classes (SW 333, 345, 366, 465, 468) students examine changing

populations, current social trends, and ethical requirements related to technological developments to provide relevant services to clients. In the diversity course (SW 485) students demonstrate knowledge of historical and contemporary changes that impact practice with diverse populations, especially in the Southwest. In Fieldwork and Field Seminar courses (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students examine demographics of agency clients and changing community contexts and work to integrate this knowledge into practice with clients.

EP 2.1.9(b) Provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.

In practice classes (SW 333, SW 465, SW 468) students examine ways of providing leadership in efforts to conceptualize and promote changes to improve service delivery and to improve the quality of social services at the micro, mezzo and macro levels. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students examine agency funding sources at local, state and federal levels, examine client and community input into agency service quality, and contribute ideas about planning and implementing change in agency meetings.

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

Social workers use the social work processes of engagement, assessment, intervention, evaluation and termination to assist individuals, families, groups and communities. Social workers use evidence-based practices to help clients achieve goals.

EP 2.1.10(a) Engagement

2.1.10(a) i. Substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. In the social work practice sequence courses students learn to prepare for action with individual families, groups and communities. In SW 333, Aspects of Aging, students learn how to prepare for action with elders. In SW 365, Social Work Practice I, students learn and demonstrate their knowledge of the planned change process for establishing and maintaining relationships with client systems. In SW 366, Social Work Practice II- Interviewing and Assessment, students learn to consider the client's path to the agency, prepare for the interview with the client, and learn and practice a repertoire of counseling skills that support engagement. In SW 465, Social Work Practice II, students learn and practice a range of engagement skills with families and groups. In SW 466 Social Work Practice IV, students learn to engage with communities in rural areas. In SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, students learn about the art and science of engagement relative to the four forces (psychodynamic, behavioral, experiential, transpersonal) all within a diversity perspective. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students emotionally prepare for work with clients and learn the importance of reading case files to prepare for work with clients.

2.1.10(a) ii. Use empathy and other interpersonal skills. In the social work practice sequence courses, students learn empathy and other interpersonal skills. In SW 333, Aspects of Aging, students demonstrate, in role-play interviews, skills of listening, empathy, respect and rapport

building with elders. In SW 365, students study and practice the use of empathy and use active listening skills to engage with client systems. In SW 366, Social Work Practice II-Interviewing and Assessment, students practice skills of empathy, warmth, genuineness, authenticity, and respect in role-play interviews. In SW 465, Social Work Practice III, students study and demonstrate how to communicate the core relational conditions when working with families and groups. In SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, students study the helping relationship across the four practice dimensions within a diversity perspective. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students use the core conditions in work with clients.

2.1.10(a) iii. Develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes. In social work practice courses, students learn to collaborate with clients to develop a focus for their work. In Social Work 365, Social Work Practice I, students learn about and demonstrate their understanding of collaboration with the client as an integral part of the planned change process. In SW 366, Social Work Practice II-Interviewing and Assessment, students practice interviewing skills to enhance collaborative planning for change. In SW465, Social Work Practice II, students examine ethical factors in planning for change with families and groups and learn planning processes for work with groups and families. In SW 468, Theories of Social Work Practice, students examine the notion that clients are the experts in their own lives regardless of the theoretical approach employed. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students familiarize themselves with the treatment planning used by the field agency, shadow experienced workers to observe the implementation of the planning process, and demonstrate their understanding of how to develop a focus for work.

EP 2.1.10(b) Assessment

2.1.10(b) i. Collect, organize, and interpret client data. In social work practice classes (SW 333, 345, 365,366, 465,466,468) students learn and demonstrate their mastery of the relational processes of the collection, organization, and interpretation of client data in work with elders, children, groups, families, and communities. Through assignments including psychosocial assessments, role-play interviews, and community assessments students are required to demonstrate their ability to assess various system levels. In SW 385, HBSE I, students participate in exercises in family and community assessment and examine theoretical perspectives in relation to lived experience. In SW 386, HBSW II, students present local/regional development assessments and do a developmental self-assessment. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students learn agency practices that guide the collection and organization of client and agency data and learn to critically examine the dimensions of a client's life and experiences relative to the presenting problem.

2.1.10(b) ii. Assess client strengths and limitations. In social work practice classes (SW 333, 345, 365,366, 465,466,468) students learn to assess the strengths and limitations of various client systems including elders, children, families, groups, and communities. In SW 385, HBSE I, students demonstrate knowledge of the strengths and limitations of families and communities. In SW 386, HBSE I, students demonstrate knowledge of risk and protective factors related to specific developmental issues in a developmental self-assessment. In the Fieldwork Courses and

Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students observe and work with client strengths and limitations.

2.1.10(b) iii. Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives. In social work practice classes (SW 333, 345, 365,366, 465,466,468) students learn to collaborate to set goals and objectives with various client systems including elders, children, families, groups and communities. Students learn methods of goal setting congruent with various theoretical approaches and practice skills that facilitate the process of collaborative goals setting. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students familiarize themselves with the treatment planning and goal-setting processes used by the field agency and work with clients to develop mutually agreed-upon intervention plans that include specific goals and objectives.

2.1.10(b) iv. Select appropriate intervention strategies. In social work practice classes (SW 333, 345, 365,366, 465,466,468) students learn intervention strategies for individuals, families, groups and communities. Interviewing skills are practiced, theory-specific intervention strategies are examined, and beginning, middle and ending issues are examined. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students observe the ways in which intervention strategies are implemented in the field agency and, under supervision, assist in the implementation of agency-specific intervention plans.

EP 2.1.10(c) Intervention

2.1.10(c) i. Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals. In social work practice classes (SW 365, 465, 466, 468) students learn intervention strategies for social work with individuals, families, groups and communities to achieve agency goals. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students identify the ways in which the agency mission/purpose is reflected in the intervention process and, with the assistance of the supervisor, work with clients to achieve goals.

2.1.10(c) ii. Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students observe the implementation of prevention strategies at the field agency and, under supervision, initiate a specific intervention plan with a client that focuses on prevention.

2.1.10(c) iii. Help clients resolve problems. In social work practice classes (SW 365,366, 465, 468) students learn to help clients resolve problems. Students develop structured change plans, learn skills for problem resolution, learn to implement change strategies with families and groups and examine various theoretical approaches to supporting client change. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students, under supervision, utilize theories of human behavior and practice theory to help clients resolve problems.

2.1.10(c) iv. Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients. In social work practice classes (SW 365,366, 465, 468) students learn to negotiate, mediate and advocate on behalf of individuals, families, groups and communities. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW

432, 434, 451, 452) students, under supervision, practice mediation, negotiation and advocacy as core skills in work with clients.

2.1.10(c) v. Facilitate transitions and endings. In social work practice classes (SW 365,366, 465, 468) students demonstrate their understanding of ways to facilitate transitions and endings. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students, under supervision, observe and participate in planned endings with clients as they work with clients for maintenance of gains.

EP 2.1.10(d) Evaluation

2.1.10(d) i. Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions. In SW 465 students learn ways to evaluate practice with families and groups. In SW 468, students examine theory-based evaluation strategies. In the Fieldwork Courses and Field Seminar Classes (SW 432, 434, 451, 452) students, under supervision, learn the field agency approach to the measurement and documentation of practice effectiveness and discuss and document the effectiveness of their work with clients.

BSW Course Scheduling Facilitates Integration of Competencies and Practice Behaviors in the Professional Foundation

The School has adopted a uniform course schedule for all BSW courses. Standardization of class schedules facilitates the monitoring of each course offering at all program sites. The revised class schedule also provides the School's Curriculum Committee the opportunity to oversee the implementation of the off-campus programs and allows for monitoring of the approved course syllabi and use of standardized textbooks and course examinations in accordance with committee policies. The BSW class schedule outlines course offerings by semester, and demonstrates that students may complete the entire BSW program in four (4) semesters. This schedule is offered at all program sites.

References

- Anderson, C., & Carter, I. (1990). *Human behavior in the social environment*. NY: De Gruyter.
- Compton, B., & Galaway, B. (1994). *Social work processes*. Pacific Grove, CA.: Brooks-Cole.
- Cross, T. (1988). Cultural competence. *Focal Point*, 3.
- Germain, C., & Gitterman, A. (1996). *The life model of social work practice* (2d ed.). NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hosenfeld, Y. (1987). Power in social work practice. *Social Service Review*, 61, 469-483.
- Kirst-Ashmen, K., & Hull, G. (1993). *Understanding generalist practice*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Kozłowska, K., & Hanney, L. (2002). The network perspective: An integration of attachment and family systems theories. *Family Process*, 41(3), 285-312.
- Lee, M.Y. (2003). A solution-focused approach to cross-cultural clinical social work practice: Utilizing cultural strengths. *Families in Society*, 84(3), 385-395.
- Miley, K, O'Melia, M., & Dubois, B. (1995). *Generalist social work practice an empowering approach*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Montiel, M., & Wong, P. (1982). The minority perspective in social work: Theoretical change. *Social Casework, February*.
- Olsen, M. (1968). *The process of social organization*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of a paradox: a social policy or empowerment over prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*, 1-25.
- Saleeby, D. (Ed.) (1992). *The strengths perspective in social work practice*. NY: Longman.
- Sergeeva, O. (2003). Ethnocultural and sociocultural marginality: Contribution to civilizational transformation. *Social Sciences, 34(2)*, 3-12.
- Specht, H. (1990). Social work and the popular psychotherapies. *Social Service Review, 64*, 345-357.
- Valle, R. (1986). Cross cultural competence in minority communities: a curriculum implementation strategy. In M. Miranda & H. Kitano (Eds.), *Mental health research and practice in minority communities: development of culturally sensitive training programs*. Rockville, MD.: US Dep't of Health and Human Services.

Chapter 2

Explicit Curriculum: Field Education

AS 2.1.1 Field Education

The program discusses how its field education program connects the theoretical and conceptual contribution of the classroom with the practice setting, fostering the implementation of evidence-based practice.

The Field Education Manual and all forms referenced in this section can be accessed from online documents:

www.nmhu.edu/academics/undergraduate/socialwork/fieldeducationforms/index.aspx

It is important to note at the outset that the linkage established by the School's programs between field education and the classroom educational experience is grounded in the School's effort to lend support to field education as a signature pedagogy and the School's corresponding determination to identify student competencies and practice behaviors through the evaluation and assessment of evidence-based performance by students both in the classroom and in field.

The BSW field practicum courses: (SW432 & SW434) and the field seminar courses (SW451 & SW452) are taken during the same semesters. As articulated in the field policy manual, BSW students generally conduct a fall/spring field practicum, concurrently with the field practicum seminars and social work practice courses. Students also have the option of conducting a block practicum after successful completion of all the senior level courses. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 10.0, 11.0.*

The MSW foundation field practicum courses include: (SW532 & SW534). The field seminar course (SW551) is taken during the same semester as the (SW532) field practicum course.

As articulated in the field policy manual, MSW foundation year students generally conduct a fall/spring field practicum, concurrently with the field practicum seminar and social work practice courses. Students also have the option of conducting a block practicum after successful completion of all the First Year MSW level courses. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 13.0, 14.0.*

The MSW concentration field practicum courses include (SW632 & SW634) and are coded for the specific concentration areas: Clinical, Bilingual/Bicultural Clinical, and Government Non Profit Management.

MSW Second Year/Advanced Standing Students generally conduct a fall/spring field practicum, concurrently with the social work practice courses (clinical concentrations only). Students also have the option of conducting a block practicum after successful completion of all the Second Year MSW level courses. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 16.0, 17.0.*

Further evidence of the integration of field education with classroom education is identified in succeeding sections of this document, including AS B2.1.2 and AS M2.1.2, each of which follows.

Field Education Connected to Theoretical and Conceptual Classroom Contributions

The Field Director (based on main campus), and 3 Field Coordinators, (based in Albuquerque, Roswell, Farmington), are actively involved in the field policy committee and meet several times a year. The practice faculty also plays an integral role in the field committee and is involved in the many facets of field program development. Input on field program development is solicited from field consultants and field seminar instructors throughout the year and at least 1-2 mandatory meetings are held yearly to educate everyone on the changes and updates in field practicum and to ensure that they have sufficient knowledge to educate the agency instructors and students as needed during their visits.

In Fall of 2010, the School implemented the Competencies and Practice Behaviors in field and elected to identify the practice behaviors that could easily be met in field practicum. Based on a meeting with Dr. Hoffman later that semester, we decided to allow for agencies to make the determination if they could provide opportunities to meet the practice behaviors. To avoid confusion, all students in a fall/spring concurrent practicum continued to meet only the identified practice behaviors. The new practicum students in spring and summer of 2010 were required to meet all practice behaviors.

Once the full set of competencies and practice behaviors was implemented in Spring 2011, we received feedback from our field practicum agencies that there were too many practice behaviors, making it difficult to meet all of them. Given the limited scope of services provided by a majority of our agencies, particularly those in rural settings, we elected to modify the practice behaviors and created ‘field specific practice behaviors’ for each classification. *Refer to Field Specific Practice Behaviors for each Classification---Appendix 2B.*

To fully implement the use of the competencies in field practicum we ‘progressed’ the practice behaviors for the second semester of practicum. Initially, we discussed progressing the points earned for each practice behavior as the student advanced in skill level. We instead determined that ‘progressing’ the practice behaviors would be the best way to show improvement and mastery. We paid particular attention to ensuring that each field specific practice behavior could be traced back to the original set of practice behaviors to make certain that we held to the original content.

As of Fall 2011, all students in field practicum completed learning contracts with the ‘field specific practice behaviors’ for their classification as the foundation. The change was well received by agency instructors and continuing students and clearly guides the field practicum by anchoring the learning in the competencies and practice behaviors. The field specific practice behaviors for each classification are also outlined in the Field Policy Manual. To provide a theoretical connection with classroom and field practicum, within each competency area courses are listed that contain content areas relevant to that competency. We also created examples of the ‘application’ of each practice behavior so that students understand how to integrate what they learn in the classroom with the field practicum experience. Students

also have the opportunity to use other academic settings—most notably the social work practice courses—to discuss theory and practice. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 12.1, 15.1, 18.1, 18.2, 18.3.*

AS B2.1.2 The program discusses how its field education program provides generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the core competencies.

Field Education: Integration of BSW Core Competencies.

The field practicum is an integral component of the undergraduate foundation social work curriculum. It engages each student in supervised social work practice and provides opportunities to apply social work skills, values and ethics in the field practicum setting.

Field content is supported by the law and ethics course (SW 433), the second and third practice courses (SW 465 and 466), research (SW 430) and HBSE (SW 485), all of which are taken concurrently with field practicum placement or before the block practicum placement during the summer semester. Through this strategy, the field education program provides ongoing generalist practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the BSW program's core competencies.

The framework for the (432/434) field practicum is anchored in the competencies and field specific practice behaviors. The field specific practice behaviors for Field Practicum I (SW432) are further advanced in Field Practicum II (SW434). Field specific practice behaviors for both (SW432 & SW434) are fulfilled in the Block Field Practicum. Students in (SW432) are helped to make the transition from student to intern by demonstrating the ability to request feedback in supervision, the student intern role and other contextual issues. Student generally takes the role of observer and learner during the first semester of practicum. Students in (SW434) are required to play a more active role and demonstrate competence in the field setting by taking the role of active participant in the agency setting and demonstrating effective use of supervision. All field students are expected to grow in self-awareness by gaining openness to feedback through the evaluative process. Students are also expected to take increasing responsibility for their own learning and for the effectiveness of their work by initiating the development of the learning contract with the agency instructor.

Students are exposed to a range of essential skills that can be applied to different problems across a variety of settings and client groups, including Hispanic, Native American and other diverse individuals, families, small groups and the rural/urban communities of New Mexico and the Southwest. The array of skills developed in this sequence include those related to advocacy, establishing roles and boundaries, effective use of supervision, application of professional values, critical thinking in work with clients, effective oral and written communication, recognizing and managing personal biases, recognizing issues of oppression and discrimination and how they factor into clients' lives, integrating relevant research into field practicum, integrating theoretical classroom content into practicum, demonstrating awareness of policy that is relevant to agency, integrating knowledge of changing community contexts that improves services, understanding and demonstrating knowledge of engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation in work with clients.

The field practicum courses are structured in the same way as classroom courses in that they are designed to grade students on a cumulative rating based on completion and implementation of

the learning contract, mastery of the competencies and field specific practice behaviors, attendance, performance and behavior. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 6.0.*

This course sequence is supplemented by the required field seminars (SW451-452), in which students have an opportunity to integrate social work practice and theoretical perspectives with the field practicum for both semesters. An emphasis is placed on the use of applied knowledge in the resolution of practice situations arising in the field setting. Through this approach, the field education program provides ongoing practice opportunities for students to demonstrate the BSW program's competencies.

The weekly or bi-weekly, (depending on the program site), field practicum seminars enable students to process experiences in their agency placements—linking knowledge, skills and values acquired in previous social work foundation courses to experiences and activities in the field. Development and demonstration of professional social work identity through oral and written communication is central to all field seminars. Students in all seminars discuss experiences working with diverse clients and the elements of culturally competent social work practice. Block field practicum seminar students meet several times throughout the semester and cover the same content and meet the same course requirements as students who take field practicum concurrently.

Students are also required to complete activity logs that provide an account of their respective practicum experiences for each week of practicum. In an effort to further incorporate and ensure mastery of the 10 competencies, the activity logs are designed to cover all 10 competency areas by requiring that students complete exercises in the field practicum setting that directly correlate with the competencies. In the second semester of practicum, students must reference the first semester activity logs and complete exercises that further advance the application and mastery of the practice behaviors. The activity log exercises effectively operationalize the 10 competencies and provide a strong link to classroom content as students must rely on classroom learning in order to complete the weekly exercises. *Refer to online activity logs.*

Additionally, in the field seminars, students discuss professional identity at the field agency by integrating the NASW code of ethics, critically reflecting upon and engaging difference, critically reflecting upon the ways in which changing contexts affect social work practice, understanding their role in social justice, understanding how practice informs research and research informs practice, preparing for and participating in engagement, assessment, intervention and evaluation through the development of an acceptable learning contract.

Although students learn to develop their learning contracts in field practicum seminar, they are not graded on the completion of the learning contract. They are graded on attendance, participation and presentation of the practice activity exercises and weekly completion and timely submission of logs and assignments. *Refer to (451 & 452) Field Practicum Seminar Syllabi located in Volume II.*

At the conclusion of Field Practicum, students are expected to be prepared academically, experientially and psychologically for competent and ethical professional social work practice,

and this is demonstrated by the evidence-based evaluative process that takes place within each academic course and in all aspects of the field education program.

AS 2.1.3 The program discusses how its field education program provides a minimum of 400 hours of field education for baccalaureate programs and 900 hours for master's programs.

BSW Program Field Education Hours

BSW students are required 1 full academic year (448 clock hours) of field practicum experience, consistent with Accreditation Standard 2.1.3. These hours commence with each student's selection of a field practicum site and upon the written approval of the Field Director/Coordinator. All students complete a field hours recording form for each semester of practicum that must be signed weekly by the agency instructor. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 6.1 and online Field Hours Recording Forms.*

The 3 types of practicum options are:

- **Concurrent- Fall/Spring Practicum**

BSW students begin their practicum during the third week of the first semester. This delayed entry allows for field seminar instructors to further prepare students for the practicum experience by providing guidelines and direction on the learning contract and activity logs, facilitating discussions about field practicum concerns, and setting the foundation as to expectations and requirements of the School once they begin the practicum.

They complete 208 clock hours in the fall semester, 16 hours a week, and then resume their placements during the first week of the spring semester and complete an additional 240 field hours, 16 hours a week.

- **Concurrent- Spring/Summer Practicum**

All requirements are the same as for students in a fall/spring practicum except that field practicum begins in spring rather than fall. Given that many of our students are non-traditional, this option allows for them to maintain employment in the summer while completing the practicum requirements for two days a week, 16 hours a week.

- **Block -Summer Practicum**

BSW students are also afforded the opportunity to complete a *block placement*, which is completed during a summer session, five days a week 40 hours a week, for approximately 11-12 weeks. Approval is granted based upon a student's ability to demonstrate prior completion of all required coursework and the consistency of the block placement with the School's mission statement, all applicable agency requirements and the student's own educational needs. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 4.0, 5.0, 10.0, 11.0.*

MSW Program Field Hours

Total Required Hours. MSW students are required to complete 2 full years of field practicum, for a total of (928 clock hours), in compliance with Accreditation Standard 2.1.3. These hours commence with each student's selection of a field practicum site and upon the written approval of the Field Director/Coordinator. All students complete a field hours recording form for each semester of practicum that must be signed weekly by the agency instructor. *Refer to online Field Education Manual, Policy 6.1 and online Field Hours Recording Forms.*

The 3 types of practicum options are:

- **Concurrent- Fall/Spring Practicum**

First year (foundation level) MSW students are required to complete 448 field hours during the academic year, and, as with BSW students, enter their practicum site during the third week of the first semester. This delayed entry allows for field seminar instructors to further prepare students for the practicum experience by providing guidelines and direction on the learning contract and activity logs, facilitating discussions about field practicum concerns, and setting the foundation as to expectations and requirements of the School once they begin the practicum. They complete 208 clock hours in the fall semester, 16 hours a week, and then resume their placements during the first week of the spring semester and complete an additional 240 field hours, 16 hours a week.

Second year students and those in the Advanced Standing program must complete 480 field hours during the concentration year, and begin the field practicum during the first week of the first semester. They complete 240 hours in the fall semester, 16 hours a week, and then resume their placements during the first week of the spring semester and complete an additional 240 field hours, 16 hours a week.

- **Concurrent- Spring/Summer Practicum**

All requirements are the same as for students in a fall/spring practicum except that practicum begins in spring rather than fall. Given that many of our students are non-traditional, this option allows for them to maintain employment in the summer while completing the practicum requirements for two days a week, 16 hours a week.

- **Block –Summer Practicum**

MSW students are also afforded the opportunity to complete a *block placement*, which is completed during a summer session, five days a week, 40 hours a week, for approximately 12 weeks. Approval is granted based upon a student's ability to demonstrate prior completion of all required coursework and the consistency of the block placement with the School's mission statement, all applicable agency requirements and the student's own educational needs. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 4.0, 5.0, 13.0, 14.0, 16.0, 17.0.*

AS 2.1.4 The program discusses how its field education program admits only those students who have met the program's specified criteria for field education.

Specified Criteria for Field Education

Administrative Criteria

As a precondition to placement in field practicum, all students at the undergraduate and graduate levels must submit a resume and a Field Practicum Application that includes Felony/Misdemeanor/Disciplinary Disclosure Forms within the specified time frames. *Refer to online Student Field Practicum Application.*

Students who have a background history are required to provide relevant court documentation that clearly outlines the disposition of the charges. As part of the practicum approval process, students must disclose the background history to the proposed agency instructor. The Field Director/Coordinator will confirm with the proposed instructor that the background was

disclosed and whether the agency can accept the student. *Refer to online Field Education Manual, Policies 1.0, 1.1, 2.0.*

Additionally, field policies require that students complete 2 personal interviews with prospective field agencies and provide documentation of these interviews to the Field Director/Coordinator. *Refer to online Agency Interview Form.*

Students must obtain written approval and provide a copy to agency instructor prior to beginning the field practicum. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 1.0. Also refer to Appendix 2C - Field Practicum Approval Form.*

Academic Criteria

BSW Students. Undergraduate students must satisfy certain specific academic and core course requirements prior to eligibility for, or concurrently with, field practicum. These requirements include the following:

- BSW Students must be in their senior year of the undergraduate program;
- BSW Students must have successfully completed all University core curriculum requirements;
- BSW Students must have successfully completed all 300 level coursework with a grade of 'C' or higher;
- Fall Semester BSW Students must be registered for Generalist Social Work Practice II (SW 465) and Field Seminar I (SW 451) concurrently with field practicum;
- Spring Semester BSW Students must be registered for Generalist Practice III (SW 466) and Field Seminar II (SW 452) concurrently with field practicum;
- Block BSW students must complete all required courses prior to entry into field.

MSW Students. Foundation and concentration year graduate students must satisfy the following academic and core course requirements prior to eligibility for, or concurrently with, field practicum:

- Fall Semester Foundation Year MSW students must be registered for Social Work Practice I (SW 565) and Field Seminar I (SW 551) concurrently with field practicum;
- Spring Semester Foundation Year MSW students must be registered for Social Work Practice II (SW 566) concurrently with field practicum;
- Foundation Year MSW students cannot register for second year practicum until all 500 level courses have been successfully completed;
- Fall Semester Second Year/Advanced Standing MSW students must be registered for Social Work Practice Courses (665 or 667) concurrently with field practicum ;
- Spring Semester Second Year/Advanced Standing MSW students must be concurrently registered for Social Work Practice Courses (666 or 668), concurrently with field practicum ;
- Concentration year students, (except for Bilingual), are not required to complete field seminar courses.
- All block placement MSW students must complete all required courses prior to entry into field.

AS 2.1.5 The program discusses how its field education program specifies policies, criteria, and procedures for selecting field settings; placing and monitoring students; maintaining field consultant contacts with field education settings; and evaluating student learning and field setting effectiveness congruent with the program's competencies.

Policies, Criteria and Procedures for Selecting Field Agencies

The University and School mission statements and program competencies and practice behaviors drive all decision making concerning the eligibility of community agencies and

instructors for hosting field practica. Some of the core issues connected with this selection process are outlined in this self-study's discussions of curricular issues.

As identified in the *Field Manual*, the basic preconditions for the School's approval of field agencies are that (a) each agency must have been in operation within the School's geographical community for 1 year or longer, (b) each agency must be able to meet the School's field practicum requirements and (c) each agency must demonstrate the ability to provide educational experiences that complement and support the School's mission and curricular requirements, in accordance with Accreditation Standards 1 and 2. The approval of potential field sites is facilitated by the Field Director/Coordinator's personal visit to each agency. These visits accomplish the aims of (a) assessing the physical environment of each site, (b) evaluating the suitability of each setting for student learning and socialization with agency staff, (c) ensuring each agency's ability to provide the necessary breadth and depth of student experiences claimed in the Agency Field Practicum Application, (d) identifying the role of social work staff within each agency and the level of cross-disciplinary contacts available to students and (e) confirming each agency's commitment to student training.

Policies and criteria outlining the approval process for potential field agencies are specified in the field manual. These criteria are identified additionally in the Agency Field Practicum Application, Agency Instructor Form and Agency Memorandum of Agreement. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 22.0 and on line Agency Field Practicum Application, Agency Instructor Form and Agency Memorandum of Agreement.*

Placement and Monitoring of Students

Field Placement. In an effort to facilitate the placement process, Field Fair is held annually at every program site during which agencies present information concerning their functions and practicum opportunities to prospective students. By attending *Field Fair*, students also have an opportunity to consider the geographical areas and populations they wish to work with, as represented by the agency personnel in attendance. Moreover, they have a chance to meet agency representatives and prospective agency instructors, and, if possible, to complete field interviews with them. As noted earlier, at least 2 interviews with prospective agencies must be completed by all students prior to obtaining written final approval of the placement from the Field Director/Coordinator.

The School adopted the Intern Placement Tracking (IPT) web based system by Alcea Software. Once students submit a field practicum application, they are given a code that allows them to access information on potential field agency sites in all of our catchment areas. This system allows us to maintain a centralized field practicum student data base that keeps field information on every student in our Program, including: contact information, agency and agency instructor assignment, field consultant assignment. The system also allows for us to communicate with agencies, students, agency instructors and field consultants regarding any school updates, changes and expectations of the School. This web based program has helped organize the field program and provides a professional, streamlined process to monitoring and placing our students and eventually we will develop its use to full potential. www.runipt.com

Monitoring Students and maintaining Field Consultant contacts with practicum settings.

Monitoring of student performance in field is primarily the responsibility of the agency instructor, who is required by field policy to provide supervision for 1 hour per week during the academic year a student is placed with the agency (or an equivalent amount of time during block placements). This supervisory time is intended to allow students the opportunity to discuss their cases, (as applicable), receive feedback concerning the field performance and ask questions concerning professional and ethical issues. The role of the agency instructor is defined more fully in: *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 23.2.*

In addition to the agency instructor, each student placed in field is assigned a *field consultant*, who acts as a liaison between the School, the field agency and the agency instructor. With the exception of a few full-time faculty members who also act as field consultants, the school sub-contracts its field consultant responsibilities to community social work practitioners. Pursuant to field policy, each field consultant must be a licensed MSW with a minimum of 2 years social work practice experience. The use of community social workers allows for active involvement in our Program as many of the consultants bring valuable experience and insight to Program development. They are also active in new agency recruitment as they have daily involvement with other community agencies. Depending on our program site location, the consultants tend to live in the communities in which they are providing consulting services. This allows for frequent involvement, confidence building with community agencies, and quick availability to our students that live a good distance from the Program site. The consultant is required by field policy to meet with the student and the agency instructor on-site a minimum of 2 times during the academic semester: at the commencement of the semester for the purpose of approving the student's learning contract; and at the end of the semester to again review the student's progress and assign a final grade. Additionally, the field consultant makes mid-term and on-site visits as needed for consultation on matters of field policy or academic/behavioral issues at the request of any of the parties. Periodic telephone and E-mail contacts are made at the discretion of the field consultant in order to maintain continuous supplemental supervision of the field placement.

In addition to the services provided by the agency instructor and consultant, student progress is also monitored and reported to the Field Director/Coordinator by field seminar instructors. Field seminar provides the opportunity for students to discuss their progress and present practice dilemmas in a classroom setting. Students also have the opportunity to use other academic settings—most notably their social work practice courses—to discuss professional and ethical issues arising during the field practicum. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 20.0.*

Academic and behavioral issues that arise in field are required by field policy to be resolved mutually by the joint efforts of the student, agency instructor and field consultant. Where possible, the *Field Manual* emphasizes informal dispute resolution; however, a formal mechanism for the resolution of academic or behavioral problems in the field setting is also provided for. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies: 6.3, 6.4.*

Evaluation of Student Learning and Agency Effectiveness

Student Learning congruent with Program's Competencies.

The mechanism for evaluating student learning in field education is defined in the *Field Manual* and commences with the construction of a learning contract. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 6.0.*

The framework for each learning contract is defined according to the student's educational level, program of study and, in the graduate program, the student's concentration. Learning contracts are initiated by the students in consultation with their agency instructors and consultants. Students are required to develop learning contracts that incorporate the School's core competencies and field specific practice behaviors. Sample learning contracts for each classification are available online.

The specific content requirements of learning contracts are identified in the Field Manual. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 12.1, 15.1, 18.1, 18.2, 18.3.*

Additionally, students must develop agency specific practice activities that advance their personal aims relative to the field experience. BSW and foundation year MSW students are required to complete the learning contract and obtain approval from the agency instructor and field consultant by the 5th week of the first semester; concentration year MSW and block placement students are required to accomplish the same steps by the 3rd week. Students who fail to accomplish these tasks are required to withdraw from field practicum, and are not permitted to reenroll the following semester. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policies 12.0, 15.0, 18.0.*

Student progress in field practicum is evaluated according to 3 specific criteria: (a) the student's completion and successful execution of the learning contract (b) the student's attendance record in field and (c) the student's compliance with behavioral standards, including the *NASW Code of Ethics*, the School's Uniform Academic/Behavioral Code and the *Field Manual*. As with other academic courses, student performance in field is a cumulative letter grade based on a 500-point scale for each semester of field practicum. *Refer to online Field practicum evaluation forms for each classification.*

The agency instructor evaluates student performance and recommends a midterm and final semester grade to the field consultant who recommends a grade to the Field Director/Coordinator who is the instructor of record. Students in field practicum must receive at least a "C" in order to progress to the next semester. Students receiving a grade of "D" or "F" are not allowed to continue in practicum and, depending on the circumstances, and consistent with policies outlined in the *Field Manual* and Academic/Behavioral Code, may not be permitted to continue in the social work program. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 6.0.*

Agency Effectiveness Congruent with the Program's Competencies.

The essential criteria that prospective agencies must meet are defined in *Field Education Manual, Policy 22.0.*

These are enforced as outlined in preceding sections of this report. The field consultant is the principal agent available during the course of each academic semester to provide feedback to the School reflecting each agency's performance in assisting students' achievement of their educational objectives and learning contracts.

A major component of the evaluative process for gauging agency effectiveness is the field practicum agency evaluation survey, which is attached and discussed in more detail in this self-study's report on assessment, contained in Chapter 4. The agency evaluation survey is completed by each student at the end of every academic year or at the end of a summer block practicum, and is intended to provide feedback to the School regarding (a) the student's perception of his or her agency's overall suitability as a field placement, (b) the assistance provided by all field personnel in the satisfaction of educational objectives, (c) the field experience's consistency with the themes addressed in the School's mission statement, (d) the

quality of field instruction, (e) the agency's capacity to help the student integrate classroom learning and (f) the specific opportunities provided for practice with the diverse populations of New Mexico and the Southwest. The data obtained through the field evaluation are the main source of information relied upon by the School in order to determine whether a continuing partnership should be maintained with each participating agency.

The Field Director/Coordinator also rely on the Field Consultants to report any concerns they have about the field agencies they visit as well as input from the field seminar or other course instructors that may result from student feedback in classes.

AS 2.1.6 The program discusses how its field education program specifies the credentials and practice experience of its agency instructors necessary to design field learning opportunities for students to demonstrate program competencies. Agency instructors for the baccalaureate program hold a baccalaureate or master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. Agency instructors for master's students hold a master's degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program. For cases in which an agency instructor does not hold a CSWE-accredited social work degree, the program assumes responsibility for reinforcing a social work perspective and describes how this is accomplished.

Agency Instructor Approval. Pursuant to the School's form Memorandum of Agency Agreement each prospective field agency must be able to offer the services of an agency instructor who is qualified, experienced and has demonstrable knowledge in a relevant field of social work practice. Qualifications for agency instructors are as set forth in the *Field Manual*. Refer to *Field Education Manual, Policy 23.0*.

As identified in the field manual, the basic preconditions for the School's approval of agency instructors are that:

At minimum, these qualifications include (a) expertise in an area of practice consistent with the School's curriculum, (b) at least 6 months experience with the agency hosting the field practicum student and (c) the ability to model and coach students by identifying and assisting their educational needs.

Agency Instructors ordinarily are expected to be employees of the host agency. If they have earned a BSW from a CSWE-accredited school, have a current bachelors level social work license and have at least 2 years post-BSW experience, they may serve as agency instructors for BSW level students, which means that they are obliged to provide the principal professional supervision of students placed at the field agency. Agency instructors at the MSW level must possess the MSW degree from a CSWE-accredited school, be licensed at the master's level and have at least 2-years post-MSW social work experience. Agency instructors who have not met any of the aforementioned criteria may serve as *co*-agency instructors, however they must work in tandem with the agency instructor who meets the requirements for primary agency instruction. In situations in which an agency does not have a licensed social worker on-site, the School may consider providing field supervision through the services of an off-site individual meeting the criteria for primary agency instructors; on occasion this person may be a member of the School's faculty.

The policies governing the use of faculty agency supervisors are outlined in the *Field Manual* and are most often invoked when a field agency is located in a rural area, has limited access to resources, serves poor and underserved areas or meets other criteria designated by the Field Director/Coordinator. It is to be noted that the provision of faculty agency instructors has been

an invaluable means of providing students educational access to grassroots community organizing interventions. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 23.3.*

AS 2.1.7 The program discusses how its field education program provides orientation, agency instructor training, and continuing dialog with field education settings and agency instructors.

Agency Instructor Orientation and Training

Formal orientation for agency instructors occurs during the School's Field Orientation held at the commencement of each academic year at each program site and every semester that a cohort group of students begins practicum. The purpose of the orientation is to assist returning and new agency instructors to understand and implement the *Field Manual* with particular regard for the requirements and expectations imposed on students and agencies. Participants are provided with current policy updates, documents, forms and other handouts containing pertinent information for agency field instruction. This last year, extensive training in the use of the Competencies and Practice behaviors in the learning contracts and evaluations was done with agency instructors at all program sites. Agency instructors are also invited to attend the School's annual *Field Fair* held at their respective program site. In addition, on an as-needed basis, the Field Director/Coordinator and Field Consultants are available to respond to agency instructors' questions regarding any aspect of field education. In an effort to provide clear direction in the development of practice activities to agency and field seminar instructors and field consultants, the School developed *BSW/First Year MSW Sample Practice Activities*. We decided that if we were going to require that the agency instructors help students create practice activities for the practice behaviors, we would create examples in order for them to see the application and explanation of each practice behavior. These Sample Practice Activities have been well received and have helped us as a field program to fully implement and ground the competencies and practice behaviors in the field learning. *BSW/First Year MSW Sample Practice Activities—Appendix 2D.*

Continuing Dialog With Agencies and Agency Instructors

Field Director/Coordinator often visit established agencies throughout the year in an effort to provide support and demonstrate appreciation for their efforts. The Field Director/Coordinator and field consultants maintain communication with agency instructors through several methods: First, all field forms, field evaluations and field practicum policy and procedures are readily accessible online for all agency instructors to download as needed. This step not only facilitates convenient access to this information, but also provides significant cost-savings benefit to the School. Second, as previously noted, the *Field Manual* requires several mandatory meetings between agency instructors, students and field consultants. Evidence that these meetings have taken place is documented on a contact form which remains a part of each student's academic file. *Refer to online Field Consultant Contact Form.*

Third, as noted elsewhere in this self-study, the School has increasingly relied successfully on internet resources, including *Facebook*, for the purpose of facilitating the maintenance of ongoing dialog with students and agencies, many of whom work many hundreds of miles from the School's main campus in Las Vegas.

This mode of communication has resulted in agencies increasingly relying on our *Facebook* page to post job listings, workshops, open houses for our students and agencies to readily access.

The School is also in the process of developing an Agency Instructor Training Manual to provide agency instructors access to materials relevant to their teaching and supervision needs.

AS 2.1.8 The program discusses how its field education program develops policies regarding field placements in an organization in which the student is also employed. To ensure the role of student as learner, student assignments and field education supervision are not the same as those of the student's employment.

Policies Regarding Employment Based Field Placement

Definition of Employment Based Field Placement. The School defines an employment based practicum as a field placement created at an agency that already employs the student on a full- or part-time basis and financially compensates the student in the form of a salary.

Requirements of Employment Based Field Placements. Policies regarding employment based field placements are set forth in the field manual. *Refer to Field Education Manual, Policy 21.2.*

They require among other things that a student is to be considered for a practicum placement at an employment site only upon a demonstration that the practicum is able to provide educational opportunities consistent with (a) CSWE Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards and (b) the Field Program's practice behaviors.

It is the responsibility of any agency considering hosting an employee/student in a field practicum to demonstrate to the School that the agency is able to meet the educational needs of the student. The agency must also be able to provide the student with the opportunity to perform duties and practicum-related responsibilities that are not normally financially compensated as part of the student's job description.

Not all employment situations qualify as practicum sites. As required by the *Field Manual*, the agency must be approved by the School through the adoption of a Memorandum of Agency Agreement prior to the request for approval of the field placement. If the agency is approved as a field practicum site, a student ordinarily will qualify to complete a field practicum for a single year during the student's academic career with the School.

The agency considering an employment based field practicum must specify that the practice activities established for the placement are to be educational and different in kind from any job responsibilities. These must be appropriate for the student's educational level and program of study. Moreover, field instruction must take place in a different unit or program and be overseen by a qualified field instructor other than the student's regular supervisor. A waiver of this policy is normally granted for a student who has served in an employment position less than 6 months with the agency and that the current employment position meets the educational requirements.

Additionally, any work- and practicum-related requirements an agency wishes to add to those imposed by the School must be identified by the agency at the time the request for approval of the practicum site is made. Finally, a student considering an employment based field practicum must meet with the Field Director/Coordinator in order to assess the consistency of the proposed placement with the School's educational interests. Requests for employment based field practica are subject to the prior approval of the Field Director/Coordinator. *Refer to online Practicum in Place of Employment form.*

Chapter 3

BSW Implicit Curriculum

AS 3.1.1 The program describes the specific and continuous efforts it makes to provide a learning environment in which respect for all persons and understanding of diversity and differences are practiced.

New Mexico Highlands University (NMHU) is recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution and is a member of the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU). The university has strived to promote a diverse student learning environment by ensuring that its student body is ethnically diverse. During the 2010-11 academic year, the student body composition was 31% White, 49% Hispanic, 5% African American, 6.5% Native American and 1% Asian Pacific Islander. The number of Hispanic students mirrors the overall state population which is 46.3% Hispanic according to the 2010 census.

The university has made significant efforts to promote itself as a welcoming university open to all ethnic groups. The university has an open enrollment policy for all undergraduate students.

During the 2010-11 academic year there were a total of 129 international students enrolled in the university representing 34 countries, a demonstration of the commitment by the administration to ensure the campus community promotes and respects cultural and ethnic differences and embraces the importance diversity plays in promoting student learning. The university' non-discrimination policies in hiring, promotion and student admissions help promote an awareness and model for the community and society at large in ensuring that respect for ethnic diversity is an essential value in creating a democratic society.

As of 2010 there were 144 full-time tenured/tenure track faculty, 38 or 26% are Hispanic and 65% white. While the ethnic distribution of faculty could improve to better represent its student body, under the leadership of the President and Vice President, two of the five academic deans are Hispanic and both university Vice President's are Hispanic. In addition, of the 488 full-time university staff, 280, or 57%, are Hispanic. A further analysis of the university staff demographics shows that of the 36% of the total Hispanic staff hold professional and/or administrative positions.

Ten years ago, the university recognized that its campus location in rural northern New Mexico (Las Vegas, NM) was not accessible to a majority of state residents and therefore impeded the ability of the university to compete with other four year educational institutions. In an effort to promote access to higher education among the diverse communities in the state, the university expanded to open five distinct off campus centers in key geographic areas in Northern New Mexico. In its commitment to serve a diverse student body the university opened five off campus centers, each serving a unique geographic and demographic community. The five centers and their geographic location are:

Farmington, New Mexico (Northwest four-corners area)
Albuquerque/Rio Rancho (Central New Mexico)
Roswell (Southeastern, New Mexico)
Raton (North Central, New Mexico)
Santa Fe (Northern New Mexico)

The university offers undergraduate and graduate degree completion programs in education, business and social work at three of the five centers. These three professional degree programs are offered at the centers in Rio Rancho, Farmington and Santa Fe. The center in Raton only offers programs in education and business and some classes in liberal arts. No social work classes are offered.

The center located in Farmington is offered in partnership with San Juan College (SJC), a 2 year community college. All classes are offered on the SJC campus. Located within 35 miles of the Navajo reservation, the demographic of this community affords Navajo and Hopi Indians the opportunity to pursue a four year degree at NMHU. Each of the three professional schools hires its own full time and adjunct faculty and the center is under the supervision of a center director.

The center located in Santa Fe is in partnership with Santa Fe Community College. Again, all classes are offered on the SFCC campus. The location of this center affords residents in north central New Mexico the opportunity to pursue a four year degree within their own community. The Santa Fe area is predominately Hispanic, however there are 8 Indian pueblos located in close proximity within 25 miles of the center. A full time center director oversees all of the classes offered by the schools of business, education and social work. Although both undergraduate and graduate classes are offered in business and education, the school of social work only offers undergraduate classes.

The Rio Rancho and Raton centers are the only two centers not located within the campus of a community college. Rio Rancho, located 9 miles from downtown Albuquerque, offers the same degree programs as the other two centers. As a free standing center, the university has hired administrative staff to complement each of the discipline's faculty resources.

The program located in Roswell, New Mexico only offers the MSW program. No other discipline offers courses/programs in this part of the state. Located on the campus of Eastern New Mexico University-Roswell, a two year community college, classes are offered via ITV from Roswell to Clovis, and Hobbs, New Mexico. The social work program opened in 2002 at the invitation of Eastern New Mexico University, the Children Youth and Families Department and the local NASW chapter as a result of the shortage of licensed social workers within the catchment area. Initially, from 2002-2006 the school also offered the BSW program, however, in 2006 Eastern New Mexico University received CSWE accreditation for a BSW program and NMHU school of social work closed the BSW program so as not to compete with ENMU as agreed to at the time of ENMU implemented its social work program in their catchment area.

The social work programs in Farmington and Roswell are part-time. Social work students complete the MSW program in three academic years. The university's commitment to providing a learning environment that is accessible and affordable to the residents of these five communities and surrounding areas ensures that students from rural parts of the state can pursue a four degree without within their native community. Students attending the Rio Rancho/Albuquerque centers are given the opportunity to choose to attend one of three state four year educational institutions for degree completion in one of the four academic disciplines. The vision the university has followed in expanding into five distinct communities in the state is testament to its commitment to serve the rural populations of New Mexico while maintaining its commitment to diversity.

Commitment to Diversity within the School of Social Work

The School continues to be committed to diversity as is reflected in its curriculum, student body, field agencies and faculty. The school has maintained a vision of ensuring that its programs provide students with academic and applied experiences that reflect and reinforce the community and state context as described in Chapter I.

In 2002 the School along with the chairman of the University Board of Regents lobbied the state legislature for funding to implement a bilingual/bicultural program concentration. The funding was approved and in 2004 the School developed and implemented the bilingual/bicultural clinical concentration. The School responded to a need to develop graduate curricula that would train social workers to work directly with Spanish speaking individuals and families. Like other states and communities who have experienced an increase in Mexican and Latin American immigrants whose primary language is Spanish, the school accepted the increase of these individuals as a challenge that requires the need to have bilingual and culturally aware and sensitive social work practitioners to work directly with these populations. The Bilingual/Bicultural concentration prepares students to become culturally and linguistically competent to work with Spanish Speaking individuals.

Through a program offered within the concentration, a student exchange with La Escuela de Trabajo Social in Chihuahua, Mexico, took place from 2007-10 which provided all of the students in the concentration with a field practicum immersion whereby student from the university conducted a one week immersion practicum in Chihuahua and students from Chihuahua spent a week in field practicum agencies in the community of Las Vegas. In 2011 travel to Mexico did not occur as it was considered too dangerous given the tension that exists in Mexico's battle with illegal drugs. As an alternative students in the concentration spent one week in a field practicum immersion in El Paso, Texas. Students had the opportunity to work directly with the Border Patrol, community health clinic and a mental and substance abuse agency that served Mexican immigrants. Both of these field practicum immersions provided students with the opportunity to immerse themselves in the culture and language of the individuals that they will eventually be working with as practicing social workers.

In 2009 the school implemented a Continuing Education program in response to the state's social work licensing requirements and the need to promote ongoing multicultural training opportunities for licensed social workers. New Mexico is the only state that requires social workers to demonstrate knowledge and competency of the dominant ethnic cultures in the state, Hispanic and Native American, in order to acquire their social work license. Any licensed social worker who moves into New Mexico must complete 15 hours of cultural competency training in order obtain full licensure to practice. In addition, all licensed social workers must complete 3 of 15 required Continuing Education Units in cultural related training per year. Graduates from the school meet the cultural competency licensing requirement and therefore are eligible for licensure upon graduation. The Board of Social Work Examiners has approved 12 credit units/4 classes in the graduate curriculum and 9 credit units/3 classes in the undergraduate curriculum as meeting the cultural competency licensing requirement.

The CE program offered a total of 30 individual workshops during 2010-11. The topics focused on a variety of subjects in the areas of mental health, substance abuse, aging, GLBT, and other subjects appropriate for practitioners in the state. A brief sampling of some of the workshops include:

- 2/04/11 Valuing Culture & Demonstrating Sensitivity in the Work Place
- 2/25/11 Cultural Sensitivity: The Myth of Cultural Competency
- 3/18/11 Feminist Multicultural Counseling
- 5/06/11 Working with Gay & Lesbians Adults in Treatment
- 6/17/11 Native American Culture: What you need to know
- 9/30/11 Cross Cultural Healing: Indigenous Teachings
- 10/28/11 Cultural Competency in Clinical Supervision

In addition, the CE program was also developed to provide affordable and accessible CEU workshops for social workers. This program is intended as a way for the School to be responsive to the needs of the community and the profession. This program has helped in bringing down the barriers and perceptions the community has of academia by inviting practitioners to participate as trainees or trainers. A \$10.00 per credit unit is the basic charge for each workshop. Presenters are selected from among the faculty and community practitioners who have demonstrated expertise in a specific area. Most of the workshops have been offered at Las Vegas, Rio Rancho, Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Roswell and Farmington utilizing the university/school facilities in these communities. Due to the rural nature of the state, as with the university centers, the workshops are offered within a geographic area that is accessible by many social workers and therefore affordable. During these hard economic times it is important to support and provide lifelong learning to members of our profession.

Another program implemented within the school that also promotes diversity is the recently adopted certificate program in substance abuse. The certificate program was developed in 2010 as part of the school Community Clinical Treatment Program. In November 2006 the School was awarded funding to provide counseling services for all first time DWI offenders by the county of Bernalillo, (Albuquerque). The funds were awarded to the school in a non-competitive award.

The School was selected by the county based on its commitment to multiculturalism, bilingualism and expertise in bilingual social work practice. The program serves as a field practicum site for all of the students in the substance abuse certificate program. An average of 9 students per year are admitted into the program. In 2009, the program received accreditation by the Matrix Institute at the University of California Los Angeles. The diversity of the clients served by this program has led to the implementation of counseling/therapy groups specifically for Spanish Speakers and a women's group. Recognizing that the issue of alcohol abuse differs between men and women and recognizing the importance of ensuring that the services are linguistically appropriate, this program reinforces the School's commitment to diversity and the need to provide community based services that can be integrated into the academic programs.

Diversity among students and faculty within the School

An important aspect of putting the school's mission statement into action is the School's commitment to having a diverse faculty, students and a curriculum that complements the area served by school and the setting where the majority of the graduating students will be practicing. The school values the importance of ethnic identity and language differences and considers these differences as strengths that influence the school's mission and curriculum.

Faculty/Staff

The School follows the university employment practices and adheres to established Affirmative Action requirements in all hiring decisions (Refer to Appendix 3A). As of 2011-12 the school has a total of fifteen full time faculty; 11 tenured and four are full-time retain term faculty, seven are located at the main campus and eight are located at the Albuquerque center. In addition, the main campus has full-time visiting professor. The term “retained-term” is for those faculty who do not have a Ph.D., as required for tenure but who have the practice experience that will help complement the tenured faculty and curriculum. The retained term status ensures that the faculty member has all the rights of a tenure track faculty member with the same responsibilities but is not required to be tenured. Termination of employment must be for cause and the employee is given a one year advance notice of intent not to renew his/her contract. This practice has promoted and ensured stability of having a cadre of full time faculty to deliver the curriculum. The ethnic distribution of ALL full time faculty at the main campus and Albuquerque center is as follows:

	Main Campus	Albuquerque
Hispanic	5	2
White	3	5
African American		1

The School has a total of 16 FTE faculty; 11 tenured, and five full-time non-tenured (4W, 1H). 7 female (4 tenured) and 9 males (7 tenured). All of the faculty teach BSW and MSW courses. In addition, the Farmington program has one full time faculty member, a .50 FTE faculty who is also the field/program coordinator. The program in Roswell has a .50 faculty member that also has responsibility as field education coordinator.

Achieving a diverse faculty is of paramount importance to the school. During the current academic year 2011-12, the school is actively recruiting to fill two tenure track positions to be located at the Albuquerque program. One is to replace one of the full time retain term positions and the other is a new positions to help meet the increased student enrollments.

In addition to the full time faculty, the school’s Director of Field Education located at the main campus is a Hispanic female who has held this position for 16 years. The field coordinator located at the Albuquerque center is a Hispanic male who has been in this position for 10 years.

Complementing the diverse faculty and administrative staff are the full time academic advisor located at the Albuquerque center, she is a Native American female and has been with the school for over 8 years. The School’s Admissions Coordinator is also Hispanic/male and the school’s coordinator of continuing education is Hispanic Female. The School Dean also is Hispanic. All four clerical personnel at the main campus and Albuquerque are Hispanic/female. Of 22 faculty and administrative staff working for the school at the main campus and Albuquerque, 14/67% are Hispanic. This ethnic distribution is well representative of a state that as of 2010 is considered to be a minority/majority state.

Student Diversity

Tables 1 & 2 display the ethnicity of Full-time and Part-time BSW students enrolled for Fall semester 2011 at each program location.

Table 1 Full-time BSW Students Enrolled Fall 2011

	Main Campus	Albuquerque	Farmington	SFCC	Total	
White	2	21	4	10	37	
Hispanic	29	32	1	18	80	
Native American	2	6	3	3	17	
African American	1	3	0	0	4	
Other	5	8	5	3	21	
Totals	39	70	13	34	156	

Table 2 Part-time BSW Students Enrolled Fall 2011

	Main Campus	Albuquerque	Farmington	SFCC	Total	
White	1	23	7	2	33	
Hispanic	2	22	4	5	33	
Native American	0	3	13	0	16	
African American	0	7	0	1	8	
Other	0	4	0	0	4	
Totals	3	59	24	8	94	

Of the total enrolled students (N= 250), 63.6 percent are ethnic minority, Hispanics make up 48.4% of the total student enrollment and the highest number of Native American students are attending the Farmington program, which is within 30 miles of the Navajo Nation.

Diversity in the Curriculum

The School's mission statement guides the School's curriculum. The BSW curriculum addressing Hispanic and Native American cultures is infused throughout. The school will be revisiting its undergraduate curriculum in 2012-13 to determine the appropriateness of developing a certificate program in gerontology. It appears that interest in working with the elderly is more prominent among undergraduate students.

The School's explicit curriculum requires SW 346 SW Practice with Diverse Populations of all undergraduate students. This course has been specifically designed to focus on Hispanic and Native American cultures in New Mexico and the southwest. In addition, the curriculum includes two population specific courses in Aging (SW 333) and Children's Services (SW 345). Both of these courses focus on working with Hispanic populations.

In addition, two faculty members participated in the Gero-Ed initiative in 2009-10 to infuse gerontology content in the undergraduate and graduate curriculums.

The school revised its course evaluations in 2010-11 and requires students to complete on-line Student Course Evaluations. The survey is comprised of 15 items using a four-point response. The evaluation asks students to rate their educational experience in five areas:

1) Classroom environment 2) Professor characteristics 3) Course content 4) Grading and Assignments 5) Impact course had on student's learning. The classroom environment specifically addresses four items:

1. The extent to which the professor allows student an equal opportunity to participate in class.
2. The professor's ability to promote a learning environment where the student feels safe to express her/his views and opinions.
3. Extent to which professor acknowledge student's strengths.
4. Extent to which professor treated you as a valuable person.

A detailed discussion is included in Chapter IV (Assessment). Students complete the on-line evaluation for each course at the end of each semester in order to access their course grade(s). The School is the only program within the university that has developed its own on line course evaluations.

Diversity in Field Education

All students have an opportunity to experience working with the two predominant minority ethnic groups in New Mexico. Since the adoption of the School's mission statement in 1998, focusing on Hispanic and Native American populations, the School only approves community agencies that provide students the opportunity to work with diverse clientele. In 1998, the school terminated all agreements with private practice agencies that did not serve a diverse clientele. To date, the School will only consider community agencies that demonstrate servicing a diverse clientele and that will provide students the opportunity to experience working with these populations. In addition to servicing a diverse clientele in the selection of field practicum agencies, the School also promotes the need to have diverse field practicum placements settings. For example, according to the 2009 Annual CSWE report, the School provides students the opportunity to conduct their field practicum in health, mental health, schools, substance abuse and other critical fields of practice. All of the placement agencies are community based public/nonprofit or government agencies. A partial list of the populations served by these agencies include: children and families, aging, GLBT, monolingual/Spanish speakers, public school, medical/hospital based and health care providers. As discussed earlier, the student exchange program with Chihuahua, Mexico as part of the bilingual concentration reinforced the School's commitment to its mission and the importance of providing en vivo practice experiences for students.

The school's five center locations provide students the opportunity to experience working with rural and urban populations.

Commitment to Diversity within the Implicit Curriculum

The School has made great strides in bringing to life its mission statement and providing opportunities for its student body to experience various activities and events that focus on promoting diversity. A key example of the school and university commitment to Hispanic culture is the support in securing funding and implementing the bilingual/bicultural clinical concentration and the student exchange/field practicum experience with Chihuahua, Mexico. In addition, from 2005-2010, the school sponsored a "Latina Colloquium" in celebration of National Women's month (March). Organized as part of the bilingual program, this yearly

initiative provided an opportunity for students to gain exposure to leading Hispanic/Latina women in New Mexico who have been role models to others in their respective fields. Other initiatives have included students working with the elderly population to help clean their yards and homes to ensure a safe environment.

Three years ago a faculty member at the Albuquerque program began a “Spanish Conversation Group” for faculty, staff and students to practice their Spanish speaking skills. The group meets twice per week during the lunch hour. The School is in the process of planning a regional multi-cultural substance abuse conference scheduled for May 2012. The theme of the conference is working with Hispanic and Native American families in a diverse society. For the past seven years the school has participated in the NASW legislative day, providing students an opportunity to observe and lobby the New Mexico legislature. This experience affords students the opportunity to observe the legislative process in action. In the past two years, NASW/New Mexico has allowed 15 students to participate free of charge in the annual state NASW conference.

Research Activities

Faculty actively engaged in research activities that focus on diverse populations and have involved the participation of our students. Dr. Rey Martinez is actively working on two research grants; one funded by the National Institutes of Health, Center of Minority Health evaluating the health and developmental impact of methamphetamine exposure of New Mexico children taken into protective custody. The second funded research involves the UNM Center for Rural & Community Behavioral Health and focuses on evaluating the efficacy of the Total Community Approach to substance abuse assessment in Northern New Mexico. In addition, one funded research actively funded by Gulf Coast Addiction Technology Center is to provide substance abuse training and workforce development. This activity has been integrated in the School’s Continuing Education Program and the Community Clinical Treatment Program/substance Abuse Certificate Program. In 2010 Dr. Martinez along with two other faculty members (Drs. Rodriguez and Baca) and twenty-two BSW and 2 MSW students participated in a 3 day Latino Student Social Work Conference sponsored by the University of Chicago, Jane Adams SSW. Students presented their research studies on methamphetamine along with Dr. Martinez, who mentored this group throughout the academic year culminating in a formal conference presentation.

Dr. Mark Dyke has been actively involved in community survey research, working with state and community based agencies. His work has included evaluation of the statewide Citizen Review Board, conducting a statewide survey of the state loan forgiveness program, and conducting a county survey for Torrance County of bilingual therapist assessment survey. The university and School encourage faculty research and publications and support faculty involvement with community agencies and organizations.

Resources

The School provides opportunities for BSW students to apply for child welfare stipends under Title IVE. In addition to having access to Pell Grants and other loan programs through the university, undergraduate students who graduate from a New Mexico high school are eligible for the New Mexico Lottery Scholarship. If a student enrolls immediately upon graduation from

high school in a 2 year or 4 year academic institution, he/she qualifies for tuition scholarship under the NM Lottery. The scholarship pays for the student's tuition for five years or 128 credit units. Other sources of assistance include work study. The School makes every effort to hire 1-3 student work study positions at each program location.

AS 3.1.2 The program describes how its learning environment models affirmation and respect for diversity and difference

The School has undertaken various activities that model respect for diversity. As discussed in AS 3.1.1 the implementation of the bilingual program, the School's Continuing Education program and workshops focus on cultural diversity, the School's ethnically diverse student body and faculty, faculty research activities and publications all are factors that promote an awareness of and respect for cultural, ethnic and gender and age differences. All of the faculty strive to create a safe and open classroom environment that supports and affords students, to an opportunity openly to discuss and share their views on given subjects. Course assignments that focus on diversity and individual differences are infused throughout the curriculum. The specific course assignments are described in detail in Chapter 2 and outlined in the Curriculum Matrix. These assignments reinforce and promote a respect for diversity and difference. In 2009, students were involved in a fund raiser for Haiti Relief Project, raising over \$2,500.

During the spring semester 2011, 75 of the 84 first year and 90 of the 116 second year MSW students completed the Field Practicum Evaluation on line form. Students were asked to reflect on the opportunity their practicum placement afforded in working with diverse populations. 90% of the students responded "a lot", and "a great amount of opportunity to work with diverse populations in terms of ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientation and disability. Ninety-two percent had the opportunity to work with Hispanics, 72% with Native Americans, 65% with African Americans and 53% with other diverse populations such as Chinese, Vietnamese, Nigerians and East Asian. Overall students rated their opportunity to work with diverse populations between excellent and very good. This data reflects the school's diligence in recruiting field practicum agencies that serve diverse populations and through the field experiences offered compliment the school curriculum.

AS 3.1.3 The program discusses specific plans to improve the learning environment to affirm and support persons with diverse identities.

The School has made significant progress in promoting a diverse learning environment and continues to affirm the values and commitment to diversity in all facets of the School and university. While progress in the area have been positive, the School recognizes the need and importance for due diligence in making sure that it continues to improve and recognizes the importance of promoting a learning environment that is supportive, open and academically relevant to the communities that students will be working in upon completion of their program.

During spring, 2012 the program in Farmington will be implementing a special topics course on Navajo for Social Workers. Given the number of Navajo speakers in this part of the state the School can improve upon its commitment to this cultural group and infuse content into the curriculum that reflects Native Americans.

Student involvement in school committees, curriculum and school policy has decreased in the past three years. Students at the main campus and Albuquerque center had an active

student association up until three years ago. Since then, a formal association has ceased to be active and it has been very difficult to get students to participate in a formal association. The School utilizes *FACEBOOK* as a medium for communicating with students throughout all program locations. A relatively new medium, the School foresees a need to prioritize getting more student involvement in school policy and school committees. Students have been very passive in volunteering to participate in any formal association. A concerted effort needs to be made to include student participation from all sites that will have ongoing input and provide feedback on various operations of the School and university.

Student involvement consists of ethnically diverse representatives from all program locations, and from over 12 distinct rural and urban communities. The participation of this broad base will help promote sharing of experiences and knowledge among the broader student body. Coordination of all students to participate in a student organization from each site has been a challenge. The use of ITV, distance learning technology, will be explored to help bring students together.

Another mechanism that will be explored to promote and improve diverse identities is to have each program location develop course electives that will compliment the curriculum and more importantly reflect the community and population. Given the diverse populations in the state, each geographic area served by the school program is unique. Elective courses can be a mechanism of having each program develop curricula that are relevant to their respective indigenous community.

Another plan is to conduct a statewide assessment of community agencies to help identify skills and knowledge they see as necessary among practicing social workers. The results of such assessment would help inform the school's curriculum and/or would be topic areas for providing continuing education opportunities. Each site is unique and different and will continue to ensure these diverse communities inform our school curriculum, School policy and future programmatic direction.

AS B 3.2 STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

B 3.2.1 The program identifies the criteria it uses for admission.

The university has an open enrollment policy for first time freshmen applicants. The criteria for application for admission include: 1. Completed application 2. Official high school transcripts or confirmation of GED 3. Results of ACT or SAT scores. If students have not taken the ACT or SAT they will be required to take the Compass Placement Examination administered by the university during student orientation. Students are admitted into regular, probationary or non-degree status. Regular admission is for students with a 2.0 GPA or with a GED average score of 450 or higher. Probationary admission is for students who do not meet the criteria for regular admission, or whose GPA is below 2.0. Probationary students are expected to earn a satisfactory GPA or 1.75 in the first semester of their study. Non-degree status is for students who wish to pursue courses for personal interest without meeting the admission and academic requirements. A detailed description of the university admission policies can be found in the undergraduate catalog (pp. 13-20), university website and the student handbook.

AS 3.2.4 The program describes its policies and procedures concerning the transfer of credits.

There are two types of transfer of credits accepted by the university: 1. Transfer from out of state institutions of higher learning. Credits are accepted for transfer from regionally accredited institutions on a course by course basis. The university does not accept vocational, technical or remedial courses or credits awarded for life experience (catalog p. 16). 2. Transfer among New Mexico Educational Institutions: In accordance with state statute 21-1B, NMSA 1978 public institutions of higher education are required to accept transfer courses taken within the approved transfer modules agreed upon for each institution. In 2005 the New Mexico Legislature (SB 161) further enhanced and facilitated the articulation of a “general education core” among New Mexico colleges and universities. The New Mexico general education core classes includes completion of a “liberal arts” core with specific credits in five academic areas:

Communications (9 hrs.)
Mathematics (3hrs.)
Lab Science (8)
Social & Behavioral Health (6-9 hrs.)
Humanities/Fine Arts (6-9 hrs.)

Over the past six years, the university has entered into articulation agreements with all of the two year colleges identifying specific course matrices for accepted transfer. Undergraduate students attending any New Mexico institution must complete a minimum of 128 credits for degree completion of a bachelor’s degree; this includes combined credits from two year and four year institutions. (For a detailed discussion of the Transfer policy refer to the undergraduate catalog pp. 15-18.)

AS 3.2.5 The program submits its written policy indicating that it does not grant social work course credit for life experience or previous work experience. The program documents how it informs applicants and other constituents of this policy.

No academic credit is given for life experiences or previous work experience. The policy is documented in the undergraduate catalog (p. 16) and in the Field Education Manual.

AS 3.2.6 The program describes its academic and professional advising policies and procedures. Professional advising is provided by the social work program faculty, staff or both.

All full time faculty are required to provide academic and professional advisement. Students are assigned a faculty adviser upon admission. Faculty at the main campus and Albuquerque center provide all of the student advisement, students at the centers are advised by the program coordinators. A full time academic advisor at the Albuquerque program provides most of the academic advisement for new undergraduate students and meets with students interested in pursuing a BSW degree.

The school conducts a new student orientation for all juniors during the first week of classes in the Fall semester. Students are provided with information on the School’s Uniform

Academic/Behavioral Policy and Disciplinary Code, (Refer to Appendix 3B) academic expectations, field practicum requirements, curriculum and course matrix/models for full-time and part-time attendance. Students also are asked to complete the MAJOR Form as required by the university office of the registrar. The School's Uniform Code is given to all social work students and they are requested to sign the form stating that they have received a copy of the code. The code is specific to the School and outlines the academic and behavioral expectations for all students in the program.

AS 3.2.7 The program spells out how it informs students of its criteria for evaluating their academic and professional performance, including policies and procedures for grievance.

Academic Performance

The university grading system is on a 4.0 scale. Academic performance is considered on a semester to semester basis. Freshmen must earn a 1.75 GPA, other undergraduates must earn at least a 2.0 GPA. Failure to meet these requirements results in students placed on probation for one semester. To be removed from probationary status, students must earn a satisfactory GPA. The university issues midterm grades as a means of providing each student with a score of their performance at the mid-point of each semester. During the mid-term, faculty will meet to share information about student performance. If warranted, faculty will work students identified below acceptable performance to attempt to have the student(s) improve and successfully complete the semester.

In addition to the university GPA requirements, ALL social work course syllabi include the specific grading criteria for each assignment and overall class performance. All course syllabi are approved by the school Curriculum Committee and address grading on assignments/examinations, attendance, academic dishonesty, code of conduct and participation. All BSW courses require a mid-term and final examination in addition to other assignments i.e., papers, presentations etc., as developed by the sequence faculty. For all courses the student must earn a grade of C or higher and an overall GPA of 2.5. Failure to have a 2.5 GPA will require students to re-take any course where he/she earned less than a grade of C.

Students can appeal any course grade or action taken by the school that affects their academic standing. To appeal a course grade the student must complete a "Grade Appeal Form" and he/she must state the reasons for the appeal. Students are asked to meet with the faculty member in question and attempt to resolve it. If there is not agreement, the petition is forwarded to the Dean for review. The Dean, working with the faculty member may either accept or reject. If the petition is rejected by the Dean, the student may appeal the Dean's decision and petition the University Academic Affairs Committee. The committee decision is final. Students have up to one full year to petition any course grade.

The Field Education admission and performance expectations are outlined in detail in the Field Manual. The field manual is very explicit in defining the academic and behavioral expectations. Students may appeal any decision/grade in field practicum. The process for grade appeal is made to the Field Education Director who may or may not forward the appeal to the Field Advisory Committee. The committee's/Director recommendation is forwarded to the Dean who may accept or reject the appeal. As with any other course grade appeal, the student may appeal the school/Dean decision to the university Academic Affairs Committee.

Students are also informed of performance expectations and academic performance in all course syllabi. Among these expectations are grading criteria, attendance, participation and plagiarism.

Professional Performance

Professional expectations are addressed in the Uniform Behavioral Code of Conduct. All students are expected to adhere to the Code of Conduct to include adherence to the NASW code of ethics. Professional performance expectations in field practicum are outlined in the field education manual. The manual addresses the performance expectations of students in field practicum and compliance with the NASW code of ethics.

AS 3.2.8 The program submits its policies and procedures for terminating a student's enrollment in the social work program for reasons of academic and professional performance.

The School adheres to the university policies for terminating students from the program. BSW students may be terminated for academic non performance i.e., failure to maintain a cumulative 2.5 GPA in two consecutive semesters, or may be terminated due for failure to meet the behavioral expectations as defined in the NASW Code of Ethics or the School's Uniform Code or the behavioral expectations as outlined in the Field Policy Manual.

Academic policies are addressed in detail in the university undergraduate catalog, school field policy manual and course specific syllabi. Professional performance is expected of all students. Specifically, as outlined in the field education manual, and the student handbook, students may be terminated due to behavioral misconduct. For example, failure to comply with the Uniform Behavioral Code and NASW Code of Ethics may be reason(s) for termination. These policies are included in the appendix.

AS 3.2.9 The program describes its policies and procedures specifying students rights and responsibilities to participate in formulating and modifying policies affecting academic and student affairs.

The school encourages students to participate in the school's Curriculum committee. A student representative is a member of the committee. Currently, a student is participating on the Faculty Search and Screen committee to fill two tenure track positions for the Albuquerque center. In the past two years, this committee has been focused on completing the self study and therefore, curricular decisions have been limited to compliance with the EPAS. Student input in course evaluations is given serious consideration for post tenure review and promotion. During 2009-10 a faculty member received negative course evaluations by students and as a result was referred to the University Faculty Affairs Committee for post tenure review.

Input from students is encouraged and solicited. For example, the Dean, Associate Dean and Field Director visit each site a minimum of twice per academic year. During these visits they meet with all of the on-site faculty, field consultants and student body. The purpose is to solicit input into school and field policy, maintain open lines of communication and ensure that both faculty and students feel supported by the main campus and the school administration. Each program coordinator meets with students as necessary.

During the 2010-11 academic year the school opened its own FACEBOOK account as a means of affording students the opportunity for ongoing input and dialogue among students, alumni and other interested groups and individuals. Although it has been successful, this medium is not intended to replace face to face dialogue with the students or limit direct access to the school administration.

Student input in relocating the BSW and MSW programs from their previous location in Rio Rancho to Albuquerque was determined from the results of a student survey. The university approved the School's relocation of the social work program after the school surveyed its student body and determined that 90% of the students preferred to have the program relocate to Albuquerque where most of the students reside. Since the relocation in 2008-09, student enrollments have increased.

AS 3.2.10 The program demonstrates how it provides opportunities and encourages student to organize in their interests.

Over the years the School has had a undergraduate student association at the main campus and at Albuquerque/Rancho center. Unfortunately, over the past three years interest among students in participating in such organization has decreased. During the time the organization existed, students organized fund raisers, holiday food drives and also sponsored a speaker's luncheon series. A faculty member acted as the organization's sponsor, however, due to the lack of interest in a formal organization, the association has not been functional in the past three years. Several attempts by the School have been made to reinstitute the organization. The School has assigned graduate assistants to help organize the students, and faculty have encouraged students to organize, however this effort has not been too successful in providing a long sustaining and viable process for forming a student organization.

The School will continue to work with students providing an opportunity to organize and will continue to encourage students to organize and have a more formalized process for student input/governance. While an organization provides a formal forum/body for students to meet and share ideas as a group, input from individual students is encouraged. A strength of the School is the student's accessibility to the faculty, Associate Dean and Dean. Students have been very diligent to communicate with the Dean in person and via e-mail. This practice is encouraged and students have come to expect to be able to meet with the appropriate administrative staff. As mentioned earlier in this section, the School dean, associate dean, field coordinator and the center directors meet with students on a regular basis.

EP 3.3 FACULTY

AS 3.3.1 The program identifies each full and part-time social work faculty member and discusses her/his qualifications, competence, expertise in social work education and practice, years of service to the program. Faculty who teach social work practice courses have a master's degree in social work from a CSWE accredited program and at least two years of social work practice experience.

Refer to Appendix 3C Faculty biographies. All full-time and part-time faculty identify themselves as professional social workers. Faculty who teach practice or field education are required to be licensed social workers in accordance with the state social work examiners board, hence, all faculty who teach practice have an MSW and are licensed social workers. All but one

full time faculty members are licensed however the unlicensed individual does have an MSW degree.

The following narrative provides a brief summary of the competence and expertise of the faculty in relation to core competencies as demonstrated by experience and service. Examples of demonstrated competence with **EP 2.1.1, (professional identity)** include: Dr. J. Harrington, Professor James, Barnas, Arguello and Dyke are all active members of NM- NASW Chapter. The Dean is the current chair of the state Social Work Examiners Board and has been for the past three years. This is his second term and he is appointed by the governor. The dean and two other faculty members are members of the New Mexico Behavioral Health Collaborative focusing in the development of training curricula for social work practitioners in multicultural mental health and substance abuse.

Additionally, one faculty member, Professor Andrew Israel has two published books on law, ethics and behavioral health and has provided training to licensed social workers, attorneys and other behavioral health professions in legal and ethical issues in practice as part of the school's CEU program **E2.1.2, (ethics)**.

Faculty expertise and compliance with competency **2.1.3, (critical thinking)** is documented by the number of faculty involved in community presentations and research activities. As a teaching university, this competency is further measured by the written and verbal feedback on student assignments by faculty. The faculty's role is to challenge students to think critically in class, demonstrating faculty effectiveness in promoting critical thinking. Effectiveness is reflected in the course evaluations. Meeting competency in **2.1.4 (diversity)** is a strength as evidenced by the School's mission, faculty, student body and diversity of field practicum agencies. Dr. Cristina Duran has conducted training and lectures on such topics as Mexicanizing New Mexico, Race and Barack Obama, Interdisciplinary research on Mexican Immigrant communities in New Mexico to name a few. Dr. Dolores Ortega conference presentations have included Embracing non-traditional Healing Techniques in Behavioral Health, "La Educacion de los Jovenes Rurales: Encontrando la manera de mantener su cultura e idioma. "While not all diversity interests focus on Hispanics, Dr. J. Harrington's interest and experience in low birth weight and race, specifically among African Americans, has been presented at over three annual NASW conferences and workshops. Dr. Arguello's participation in the Taos Valle Acequia Association for over 15 years provides a culturally rich experience on water and the impact and importance of this resource to Northern New Mexico farming communities. He infuses this content and experience in his class(es) on diversity. The work by these faculty address both 2.1.4 diversity and **2.1.5 (social justice)** as these activities help empower unique groups.

Meeting competency **2.1.6, (research informs practice)** is evidenced by the faculty research activities as discussed in 3.1.1 Research Activities. Competency **2.1.7, (applying knowledge of HBSE)** is an area that can best be described as a product of faculty involvement with community agencies, and presentations. The research conducted by Drs. Dyke and Martinez is an example of how research is used to inform practice, as their research activities are applied research projects used to improve practice. Competence with HBSE is an ongoing by-product of the faculty's involvement with numerous community based agencies, through their presentations. Dr. Martinez is provides child & family therapy and is clinical consultant to a community based counseling agency; Dr. Duran's membership in the Asian Family Services and Enlace Comunitario provide the experience and knowledge of human behavior contextual

issues among two distinct, diverse populations. The list of similar examples is quite extensive and are included in each faculty member's biography.

Policy advocacy has been a yearly activity by a few members of the faculty and students. Participation in the NASW Legislative Day or SLADE (Student Legislative Advocacy Day). Faculty and students from all program locations participate in policy advocacy and state, county and city elected officials routinely are invited as class guest speakers. Key faculty members are active in policy advocacy; Dr. Arguello has addressed the legislature on issues related to Acequias and as a policy instructor shares his knowledge of this process with his students. He also presented to the NM Legislature on "legal ambiguities and issues for NM Land Grants. The policy faculty: Drs. Harrington, Barnstone and Arguello have all incorporated analysis of current social policy into the policy courses **2.1.8, (policy advocacy)**. The numerous examples of the faculty's response to context competency **2.1.9, (responding to context that shape practice)** is evidenced by the involvement of individual members in NASW, CSWE, the social work licensing board, issues related to acequias, memberships with ALSWE, and various other community based agencies and professional organizations. The involvement through research, and presentations help reinforce and document the faculty's response to the school's context that helps shape their practice via-a-vis teaching.

Competency **2.1.10, (engage, assess, intervene and evaluate with individuals, families, organizations and communities.)** Our faculty are actively engaged through their involvement in community agencies, organizations and research. The Community Clinical Treatment Program is a clinic that is actively engaged with families, individuals and groups. Faculty involved with this clinic through the substance abuse certificate program supervise students as part of the processes. Professor Israel's two textbooks on social work law and ethics discuss ethical dilemmas in various contexts. The challenges presented by cross-cultural practice and its impact on ethical issues are also presented in these books and ethnic differences and how it affects ethical issues. The adjunct faculty at all locations are social work practitioners who bring years of experience. The diverse practice experience of these faculty compliment the school's curriculum and help provide current knowledge with working with individuals families, and communities.

AS 3.3.2 The program discusses how faculty size is commensurate with the number and type of curricular offerings in class and field; class size, number of students; and the faculty teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities. To carry out the ongoing functions of the program the fulltime equivalent faculty-to-student-ratio is usually 1:25 for BASW programs and 1:12 for MSW programs.

Table 4A – 4D are the BSW faculty- student ratios calculated using the actual data of the fall 2011 semester teaching assignments for each program location.

FALL 2011 FTE FACULTY FOR BSW PROGRAM

TABLE 4A ALBUQUERQUE CAMPUS

INSTRUCTOR	INSTRUCTOR CLASSIFICATION BASED	COURSE TITLE	FACULTY FTE
*Arguello, D.	Full-Time/Tenure Faculty	SW 341 Social Policy & Services 1	0.25
*Barnas, K.	Full-Time/Retained Faculty	SW 365 Gen. SW Practice 1	0.25
*Barnstone, J.	Full-Time/Visiting Faculty	SW 341 Social Policy & Services 1	0.25
Bartee, R.	Graduate Assistant	SW 430 Research Methods 2	0.25
Brock, C.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 385 Human Behavior & Social Environment I	0.25
Crouse, A.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 451 Field Seminar 1 SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.50
Delgado, H.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 365 Gen. SW Practice 1 SW 366 Gen. SW Practice 2	0.50
*Dyke, J. M.	Full-Time/Tenure Faculty	SW 430 Research Methods 2	0.25
Eisberg, G.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 385 Human Behavior & Social Environment I	0.25
Giles, K.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 451 Field Seminar 1 SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.50
*Harrington, J.	Full-Time/Tenure Faculty	SW 341 Social Policy & Services 1	0.25
Hausner, A.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 465 Gen. SW Practice III SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.50
*James, S.	Full-Time/Retained Faculty	SW 465 Gen. SW Practice III	0.25
*Mercer, G.	Full-Time/Retained Faculty	SW 465 Gen. SW Practice III	0.25
Mims-Dowling, M.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 451 Field Seminar 1	0.25
Padilla, J.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 333 Aspects of Aging	0.25
Ramirez, G.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.25
*Sanchez, I.	Full-Time/Visiting Faculty	SW 333 Aspects of Aging	0.25
Sidoli, A.	Graduate Assistant	SW 430 Research Methods 2	0.25
*Sisneros, J.	Full-Time/Tenure Faculty	SW 485 Human Behavior & Social Environment 3	0.75
Trujillo, P.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	Field Seminar 1	0.25
Valles-Pedroza, V.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 385 Human Behavior & Social Environment I	0.25
Full-time faculty = *bold		TOTAL FTE	7.00

Total BSW FTE faculty = 7.0

Total FTE BSW students = 67

Total FTE Part-time BSW = 54 x 0.500 (part time is considered 6 credits or 50% FT BSW course load)

FTE Faculty 7.0 FTE students = 94 13:1 ratio

The FTE faculty to FTE students is less than the standard of 25:1

TABLE 4B

LAS VEGAS CAMPUS

INSTRUCTOR	INSTRUCTOR CLASSIFICATION BASED	COURSE TITLE	FACULTY FTE
*Arguello, D.	Full-Time/Tenured Faculty	SW 341 Social Policy and Services I	0.25
Baca, G.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.25
Chavez, A.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.25
*Gorman, J.	Full-Time/Tenured Faculty	SW 465 Gen. SW Practice III	0.25
*Martinez, R.	Full-Time/Tenured Faculty	SW 430 Research Methods 2	0.25
*Ortega, D.	Full-Time/Tenured Faculty	SW 365 Gen. SW Practice 1 SW 385 HBSE I	0.50
*Sanchez, I.	Full-Time/Visiting Faculty	SW 333 Aspects of Aging SW 485 HBSE 3 SW 451 Field Seminar 1	0.75
Full-time faculty = *bold		TOTAL FTE	2.50

Total BSW FTE faculty = 2.5

Total FTE BSW students = 38

Total FTE Part-time BSW = 10 x 0.500 (part time is considered 6 credits or 50% FT BSW course load)

FTE Faculty 7.0 FTE students = 43 17:1 ratio

The FTE faculty to FTE students is less than the standard of 25:1

TABLE 4C

FARMINGTON CAMPUS

INSTRUCTOR	INSTRUCTOR CLASSIFICATION BASED	COURSE TITLE	FACULTY FTE
Demko, M.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 485 HBSE 3	0.25
*Eldridge, F.	Full-Time/Visiting Faculty	SW 451 Field Seminar 1 SW 452 Field Seminar 2 SW 465 Gen. SW Practice III	0.75
Gonsalves, M.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 341 Social Policy & Services 1	0.25
Manning, S.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 432 Field Practicum I	0.25
McKeon, W.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 365 Gen. SW Practice 1	0.25
*Stern, C.	Full-Time/Visiting Faculty	SW 385 HBSE I SW 430 Research Methods 2	0.50
Full-time faculty = *bold		TOTAL FTE	2.25

Total BSW FTE faculty = 2.25

Total FTE BSW students = 10

Total FTE Part-time BSW = 20 x 0.500 (part time is considered 6 credits or 50% FT BSW course load)

FTE Faculty 7.0 FTE students = 20 9:1 ratio

The FTE faculty to FTE students is less than the standard of 25:1

TABLE 4D**SANTA FE CAMPUS**

INSTRUCTOR	INSTRUCTOR CLASSIFICATION BASED	COURSE TITLE	FACULTY FTE
Arguello, D.	Full-Time/Tenure Faculty	SW 341 Social Policy & Services 1 SW 430 Research Methods 2	0.50
Baca, J.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 465 Gen. SW Practice III SW 451 Field Seminar 1	.50
Davidson- Arellano, E.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 385 HBSE I	.25
Esquivel, M.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 365 Gen. SW Practice I	.25
Santa-Maria, M.	Part-Time Instructor (Adjunct)	SW 485 HBSE 3	.25
TOTAL FTE			1.75

Total BSW FTE faculty =1.75

Total FTE BSW students = 25

Total FTE Part-time BSW = 5 x 0.500 (part time is considered 6 credits or 50% FT BSW course load)

FTE Faculty 7.0 FTE students = 27 15:1 ratio

The FTE faculty to FTE students is less than the standard of 25:1

B3.3.3 The baccalaureate social work program identifies no fewer than two full-time faculty assigned to the program with full-time appointment in social work and whose principal assignment is to the baccalaureate program. The majority and no fewer than two of the full-time faculty has either a master’s degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program, with a doctoral degree preferred or a baccalaureate degree in social work from a CSWE accredited program and a doctoral degree preferably in social work.

As discussed in AS 3.3.2 above, all full-time social work faculty teach at the BSW and MSW levels and all but one faculty member have an MSW one faculty member lacks an MSW but holds a DSW. Every effort is made to hire part-time faculty who have an MSW degree. All faculty who teach practice or are field consultants must have an MSW and be licensed to practice social work in accordance with the New Mexico Social Work Practice Act.

AS 3.3.4 The program describes its faculty workload policy and discusses how the policy supports the achievement of the institutional priorities and the program’s mission and goals

The university workload policy requires full time faculty to teach 12 credit units per semester. Teaching four classes per semester is considered 1.0 FTE. Unlike R-1 universities that emphasize research and scholarship as part of the teaching load, New Mexico Highlands University is a “teaching” institution and emphasis on teaching is the highest priority. Although research is strongly encouraged, faculty are given opportunities to pursue scholarly research interests, however, teaching remains the cornerstone for excellence at the university. Within the School of Social Work, all full-time faculty teach 12 units or four (4) classes per semester. Field supervision/consulting is performed by part-time/adjunct faculty, and community social work practitioners. Only one tenured FT faculty member supervises students in field practicum as part of their regular teaching load. All other faculty teach four classes. In order to reduce the number

of class preparations, most of the faculty teach at least two sections of the same course, having only three class preps per semester. Some faculty have two separate preps per semester.

As the university has expanded to five off campus centers/locations, the university has supported funding for hiring part-time faculty. The school is currently recruiting to fill two tenure track faculty positions at the Albuquerque center for academic year 2012-13. One of the tenure track positions is held by a full-time non-tenure track visiting professor; this will result in a net increase of FTE = 1.0.

Ideally, all program locations should have a compliment of full-time faculty however, university funding has been reduced in the past five years and new faculty positions have not been funded. The schools of Education and Business that offer degree programs at the five off campus centers have chosen to deliver many of their classes via distance/ITV, with classes originating from any one of the five sites as a means of maximizing their faculty resources. The School of Social Work has not fully embraced this medium. The school hires part-time faculty at each site to deliver the curriculum. The value the School places on face to face instruction is of paramount importance and is supported by the university administration. Although additional faculty resources would complement the current faculty, the school has been able to continue with its mission and goals. The ability to be able to serve a broader and ethnically diverse student body has afforded the school and university an opportunity to meet its mission and program goals.

AS 3.3.5 Faculty demonstrate ongoing professional development as teachers, scholars, and practitioners through dissemination of research and scholarship exchanges with external constituencies such as practitioners and agencies and through other professionally relevant creative activities that support the achievement of the institutional priorities and the programs mission and goals.

As documented in the Faculty Biographies, professional development among the faculty and participation with external constituencies is strongly encouraged. As discussed under section 3.1.1 Research Activities and 3.3.1. faculty involvement with community based agencies through research activities and personal and professional interests varies. Because all of the social work faculty are licensed social worker, as part of the CEU licensure requirements all must have documented 15 CEU hours per year. This requirement must include 3 CEU's specifically in culturally relevant content. These workshops provide the knowledge that helps supports the program mission and goals.

As part of the graduate bilingual/bicultural concentration, faculty have accompanied students to Chihuahua, Mexico as part of the student exchange program for the field practicum immersion. Faculty have also presented CEU workshops and at state conferences reinforcing the role of faculty engaging with the practice community.

AS 3.3.6 The program describes how its faculty models the behavior and values of the profession in the program's educational environment.

Modeling of the behavior and values of the profession by the faculty occurs on a daily basis in the classroom. Respect for ethnic and gender difference, the importance of human interaction and establishing relationships, treating individuals with dignity and promoting social justice are values that each faculty member espouses and models as she/he interacts and works

with the student body. Faculty are cognizant of the importance to “set an example” for professional conduct and role modeling for our students. The full-time faculty involvement in the community, attendance of and presentation at conferences are aspects of modeling positive behavior. The role that adjunct/part-time faculty play in modeling professional conduct is crucial for our students to observe and learn from professional social work practitioners.

Involving students in various research projects by our research faculty is part of the learning and modeling process. Students are asked to work with the research faculty and participate in on-going data collection as part of the learning process. Mentoring of these students occurs on a regular basis.

As a “teaching university” modeling of professional behavior and reinforcing the professions values occurs in day to day interactions with students. Faculty are keenly aware of capitalizing on “teaching moments” where they can use their interaction with a student as a learning opportunity to further their professional identity as a future social worker. Participation at the NASW conference and Student Advocacy Legislative Day also provide opportunities for mentoring and modeling.

EP 3.4 Administrative Structure

AS 3.4.1 The program describes its administrative structure and shows how it provides the necessary autonomy to achieve the program’s mission and goals.

The School of Social Work is one of four freestanding independent units of the university and one of three professional schools within the university. The Dean of the School reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and is a member of the President’s Administrative Cabinet. The administrative structure has served to promote autonomy and achieve the schools’ goals and mission. The following are the key positions/personnel that are involved in the school’s administration:

1. Dean as Administrator (office located at the Albuquerque center)
2. Associate Dean (main campus)
3. Director, Field Education (main campus)
4. Coordinator, Admissions and Recruitment (main campus)
5. Coordinator, Continuing Education (main campus)
6. Coordinator, Field Education (Albuquerque center)
7. Program/Coordinator, Field Education (Farmington Program)
8. Program/Coordinator, Field Education (Roswell)

In addition, faculty and administrative staff are active participants in the administration of the school. The organizational charts for the school and university are located in Appendix 3D.

AS 3.4.2 The program describes how the social work faculty has responsibility for defining program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies.

The School has complete autonomy to change and modify its academic curriculum. All curriculum decisions are made by the school’s Curriculum Committee comprised of faculty and

site coordinators. Any and all changes to the curriculum, to include changing course syllabi, textbooks, adding new electives or offering courses as “special topics” must be reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee (AA). Any substantive changes made to the curriculum i.e., new courses, concentrations, changes in academic policy, must also be approved by the university Academic Affairs Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA). The School has been able to gain the support of the AA committee and the VPAA, to develop a curriculum that meets EPAS and addresses the School’s mission.

AS 3.4.3 The program describes how the administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion and tenure of program personnel.

The policies governing recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion and tenure are governed by the University Handbook and the Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). The CBA outlines specific procedures and timelines that must be adhered in all of these processes.

- a. Procedures for hiring of tenured faculty begins with the appointment of a faculty search committee.
- b. The Dean charges the committee to recruit, interview and recommend the top candidate(s) for the position. (The Dean in consultation with the VPAA may or may not accept the committee’s recommendations after interviewing the final candidate(s).)

Tenure & Promotion

Non-tenured faculty are required to be reviewed by their peers once per year leading up to tenure. Only Tenured faculty are allowed to evaluate their peers for tenure and promotion. If the faculty member receives favorable evaluations from his/her peers and if the independent evaluation by the Dean is also positive, the individual member will be recommended for tenure to the VPAA. The VPAA can support or reject the recommendation. The VPAA will then forward his/her recommendations along with the recommendations of peers and school dean to the university president for final approval.

Annual Faculty Evaluations

In accordance with the CBA all full-time tenured, tenure track and retained term faculty are evaluated by their peers once per academic year. Faculty are required to develop an annual faculty development plan outlining the specific activities they wish to accomplish during the academic year. These activities are the basis for their evaluation along with feedback on student course evaluations. The three areas reviewed are research, teaching and service. If a member receives the majority of negative evaluations she/he will automatically be referred to the university Faculty Affairs Committee for Tenure review.

Appointment and hiring of temporary, part-time faculty are made by the Associate Dean and Dean in consultation with members of the faculty who teach the course(s) for which the individual is being considered to teach.

B 3.4.4 The program identifies the program director.

The Associate Dean, Jill Baker, Ph.D. is also the BSW program director. As associate dean she receives 50% release time to oversee the BSW program and provide administrative oversight of the program at the main campus. The other 50% is devoted to teaching two classes per semester.

B 3.4.4 (a) (b) The program describes the BSW program Director's leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience and other academic and professional activities in social work. The program documents that the director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE accredited program with a doctoral degree preferred.

Dr. Baker has a Ph.D., in social work and has been on the faculty since 1994. Prior to coming to NMHU she held faculty positions at two previous schools of social work and was a BSW director at one institution. She has chaired the School's Curriculum Committee and has participated in two previous CSWE accreditation/self study process.

B 3.4.4 (c) The program describes the procedures for determining the program director's assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership to the program. To carry out the administrative functions of the program, a minimum of 25% assigned time is required by the CSWE at the baccalaureate level. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

The release time of 50% given to the Associate Dean for administrative duties, to include 25% as director of the BSW program, is sufficient to meet the needs of the program.

AS 3.4.5 The program identifies the field education director.

The Director of Field Education is Julia D. Lucero, MSW. Ms. Lucero received her MSW from NMHU-School of Social Work and when she assumed this position she had more than two years minimum post MSW work experience.

B 3.4.5 (a & b) The program describes the field director's ability to provide leadership in the field education program through practice experience, field instruction experience, and administrative and other relevant academic and professional activities in social work. The field director has a master's degree in social work from a CSWE accredited institution and at least 2 years post baccalaureate or postmaster's social work practice experience.

The Field Director has been the director since 1996. Her extensive knowledge of community resources and her long tenure in the position have contributed to the stability and continuity of the program. Prior to her appointment she worked for 8 years with the Department of Children Youth and Families as an Adult Protective services social worker and supervisor. During 2002-2005 she taught in the BSW program. The teaching experience she brought to her role as director helped create the field seminars courses required of undergraduate and first year/semester graduate students. In addition, due to her knowledge and experience she has the respect of the faculty and field instructors. Having earned her social work degree from New

Mexico Highlands University and having been a agency instructor prior to her appointment, she has made significant contributions to field education. Her experience and knowledge of the various communities are strengths have allowed her to assume a leadership role in directing and improving the field education curriculum. As a member of the school's Curriculum Committee she is an active participant in developing the School's curriculum in ensuring the integration of classroom knowledge in field education.

B 3.4.5 (c) The program describes the procedures for determining the field directors assigned time to provide educational and administrative leadership for field education. To carry out the administrative function of the field at least 25% assigned time is required for baccalaureate programs. The program demonstrates this time is sufficient.

The director of field education is 100% time assigned to oversee the school's field education program. This time is equally shared between the BSW and MSW programs. In addition to the director, the program at the Albuquerque center also has a full time Field Education coordinator who is devoted 100% to the field education program at the center. The programs in Roswell and Farmington each have individuals who are assigned .25 FTE as Field Education coordinators for their respective part-time programs. The FTE field directors/coordinators for all programs is 2.5 FTE. All field education coordinators have an MSW degree and have at least 2 years post master's experience. Each field education office is supported by an administrative assistant.

The field education program at each program location is responsible for approving all student field placements, agencies as field practicum sites, providing ongoing training to the agency instructors and field consultants who oversee and supervise field placement students.

The Field Director provides oversight of all field education policies and participates in the annual agency instructor training at each site. In addition to these duties, the Field Director also oversees the school Title IVE student stipend program.

EP 3.5 Resources

3.5.1 The program describes the procedures for budget development and administration it uses to achieve its mission and goals. The program submits the budget form to demonstrate sufficient and stable financial support that permits program planning and faculty development.

The university Board of Regents approves all annual operating budgets. During the past six years the university budget has been decreased due to a decrease in state funding. However, the school's budget has remained flat, with no substantive increases and more importantly no funding decreases.

The development of the annual operating budget occurs during the month of April. Any requests for increased funding must support and compliment the university Strategic Plan. Each professional school is required to develop its own strategic plan and ensure any new programs that require additional funding are part of the plan. The school dean in consultation with the center coordinators, faculty and staff, develops the budget and submits it to the Vice President for Finance and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Upon submission of the budget, the

Dean meets with the two Vice Presidents and reviews previous year's expenditures. If funding is available, the Dean considers any new program initiatives or new personnel/staff or faculty. The Dean oversees the expenditures of all operating budgets.

In addition to state funding, the school also utilizes Title IVE funds to support 45% of the school's expenses. The high percentage of federal funds supporting the school's programs is an issue that the university is well aware of and will address as the economy and funding to the university increases. The university is prepared to seek state funding to continue should Title IVE funds be reduced to a level where programs will be adversely affected. While the over-dependence on federal funding is not ideal for ensuring long term support for a program, the percentage of state funding required to match Title IVE funds has ensured that level of state funding support to the school is sufficient to match the Title IVE funding as required, hence no budget decreases have been made to the School's operating budget.

Although the overall budget from state funds has remained constant over the past five years, it has not affected the School's program planning and faculty development activities. (Refer to Budget Form, Appendix 3E).

3.5.2 The program describes how it uses resources to continuously improve the program and address challenges in the program's context.

Approximately 80% of the School operating budget is for personnel costs. While the budget has not been increased, the School has been able to improve its programs. For example, although the School suspended its student exchange/practicum immersion with Chihuahua, Mexico (discussed under 3.1), funding has continued to support students in the bilingual program to travel to El Paso, Texas as an alternative. The university's continued support of the School's mission and programs is evidenced by the additional funding allocated by the university for moving the social work program from Rio Rancho to Albuquerque. In 2008 the school moved half of its faculty and classes to Albuquerque. In 2009, the university increased funding for leasing additional office and classroom space to move all of the social work program from Rio Rancho to Albuquerque.

During these austere financial times, many academic unit's budgets have experienced decreases. As a result, some have expanded the use of distance technology to deliver their respective curriculum. The School has not had to embrace distance education/ITV as a medium for delivering its programs, instead the university has maintained the same level of funding for part-time faculty to deliver the curriculum face to face. The school is in the process of recruiting to fill two tenure track faculty positions at the Albuquerque center. Given the austere funding to the university, the school is fortunate to be able to hire new faculty. Funding for student recruitment, as well as funding to support faculty attend once at state workshops and conferences have continued. Although out of state travel has been curtailed, in-state travel is supported and is ongoing.

As discussed previously the School receives funding from county government to operate the Community Clinical Treatment Program. The county has approved the School's request to use a portion of these funds to host and sponsor a regional multicultural substance abuse conference. The planning for this conference is underway, and it will be held in May, 2012. The university continues to fund and support faculty sabbaticals and funds for specific faculty research activities.

3.5.3 The program demonstrates sufficient support staff, other personnel and technological resources to support itself.

The School has sufficient support staff to deliver all of its programs. The following is the distribution of support staff by program location:

Main Campus 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant assigned to Director, Field Education
1.0 FTE Coordinator, Admissions & Recruitment
1.0 FTE Coordinator, Continuing Education
1.0 FTE Secretary/Receptionist
4.0 FTE

Albuquerque 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant - Field Education
1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant – Dean and Faculty
1.0 FTE Academic Advisor
1.0 FTE Evening Coordinator
4.0 FTE

Roswell 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant

Farmington 1.0 FTE Administrative Assistant assigned to program coordinator and faculty

The number of support staff is sufficient to manage the program. In addition to the support staff the Farmington center also has a 1 FTE administrative assistant that works for the Center director and provides back up support for social work, education and business administrative assistants. All off campus centers, with the exception of the program in Roswell have university administrative personnel to support the three professional schools. In addition to these administrative staff, other school administrative personnel include:

Dean The dean’s office is located at the Albuquerque Center and the Dean oversees the day to day administration of the program as well as provide oversight of all off campus centers.

Associate Dean The associate dean receives 50% release time for administrative duties. This position is located at the main campus and provides day to day administration of the program in addition to being the BSW coordinator.

Field Education Director This position is located at the main campus. 100% of this position is for program. Administration of the BSW and MSW field practicum.

Field Coordinator Albuquerque A full-time field education coordinator position is located at the Albuquerque campus and is responsible for BSW and MSW field practicum placements, administrative oversight of field consultants, and field placement agencies.

The staff at the Roswell program also includes a .50 FTE MSW Field/ Program Education Coordinator who oversees the administration of the field practicum and overall program administration. As a part-time MSW program the administrative staff are sufficient to meet the program and academic needs.

The program in Farmington also has a 1.0 FTE staff position assigned at .25 field education and .25 administration. The individual, Ms. Faith Eldridge, also teaches two courses per semester in addition to the administrative duties.

3.5.4 The program submits the library form to demonstrate comprehensive library holdings and/or electronic assess and other informational and educational resources necessary for achieving its mission and goals

Thomas C. Donnelly Library provides research resources to our main campus as well as the clientele at our various centers. Our online resources are available remotely to meet the research needs of our faculty and students no matter where they reside. Cooperative agreements with academic institutions' libraries in other cities enable NMHU students to have access to library resources and services. *Refer to Appendix 3F.*

(1) Holdings

The main collection of resources at New Mexico Highlands University is located at the Thomas C. Donnelly Library on the main campus in Las Vegas. The secondary collection is located at the NMHU Rio Rancho campus. Items with call number HV-social and public welfare total more than 2,900 volumes at Las Vegas and 240 volumes at Rio Rancho. Related resources under call numbers BF-psychology, KF-health law, RA-public medicine, RC-internal medicine, and RJ-pediatrics total over 7,500 volumes at the Las Vegas campus and over 350 at Rio Rancho. More than 275 electronic books under the subject headings of social work, social welfare, public health, and counseling are available online to all students.

Donnelly is a full repository for state documents in print and a 40% repository of print federal documents. In addition, we have full-text access to 70% of federal documents and over 50% of state documents which are available through the Internet.

The library currently subscribes to 40 social work journals in print and print + online formats at the main campus and 10 journals at the Rio Rancho campus, at a cost of \$22,244 for the current fiscal year. Through various full-text and index databases, we provide online access to 1,220 journals on social welfare and social work, 530 journals on sociology and social history, 560 journals on psychology, 750 journals on public health, and 360 general social science journals, for a total of 3,420 titles online relevant to social work.

The library subscribes to 3 electronic databases specific to social work: EBSCO's PsycArticles, PsycInfo, and SocIndex. Other relevant databases are EBSCO's Academic Search Premier, CINAHL, and WilsonWeb; JSTOR Arts and Sciences I, II, III; ProQuest Research Library, and ScienceDirect. On and off-campus students have unlimited online access.

(2) Staffing

We do not have designated library staff for social work faculty and students. However, in addition to the library director, the library employs 5 full-time equivalent (FTE) professional librarians with MLS degrees, who provide research assistance on a regular basis. Eight library associates with Bachelor’s degrees and 3 support personnel (technicians and clerks) comprise the remainder of the library staff. Social work patrons interact with library staff in a variety of areas: research assistance, library instruction, interlibrary loan, collection development and acquisitions, and instruction in the use of electronic resources. The reference desk is staffed all hours that the library is open, and we have recently implemented an online helpdesk, which is available during regular library hours.

(3) Budget for social work resources

	<i>2010-11</i>	<i>2011-12</i>	<i>2012-13</i>
Books	\$ 5,216	\$ 5,390	\$ 5,390
Periodicals	\$22,769	\$22,244	\$22,244
Online databases*	<u>\$17,695</u>	<u>\$20,290</u>	<u>\$20,290</u>
Annual Totals	\$45,680	\$47,924	\$47,924

* PsycArticles, PsycInfo, SocIndex

The library uses the Clapp/Jordan academic library collection formula as a general model to maintain an appropriate rate of collection development in fields pertinent to the curriculum. In recent years there has been a trend towards providing more online resources.

Every two years, we have been fortunate to receive additional funds for book and audio-visual purchases from the State of New Mexico’s educational GO Bond. The bond in 2008 enabled us to allocate \$5,750 for social work purchases over and above our regular book budget.

(4) Circulation data

In fiscal year 2010/2011 the main campus library circulated more than 900 titles relevant to social work; Rio Rancho circulated approximately 80 titles. *Refer to Appendix 3F.*

(5) Equipment

In Donnelly Library there are 52 public computers, 3 photocopiers, 1 scanner, and 1 printer available to social work students and faculty. The Rio Rancho library has 7 computers, 1 printer, and 1 photocopier. Students have access to Microsoft Office products, the Internet, and Blackboard on all computers.

(6) Circulation policy

Patrons must present a valid NMHU identification card to borrow items. NMHU faculty and graduate students may checkout a maximum of 30 items for the semester; undergraduates, 20 items. Books that have been checked out may be recalled by another patron. Library Passport Certificates grant borrowing privileges at libraries belonging to the New Mexico Consortium of Academic Libraries. Students enrolled at external sites are granted full library

services at the external site institution's library. Further details on circulation policies and procedures are available upon request.

(7) Online services

The Internet and email are available from all library computers. Library resources are accessible online from the Donnelly Library homepage at <http://donnelly.nmhu.edu>. These resources are the library's online catalogue LIBROS, which includes access to the catalogues of all member institution libraries of the New Mexico Consortium of Academic Libraries; full-text and index databases; document delivery services, non-fee Interlibrary Loan service through ILLiad; and electronic course reserves. To keep abreast of electronic resource needs for social work students and faculty, we regularly offer database trials and review monthly database usage statistics.

(8) Reference

Reference staff is available to provide service to our social work clientele all hours that Donnelly Library is open. Donnelly has extended hours during the weeks of midterms and final exams. Donnelly Library is regularly open:

Mon-Thu	7:30 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
Friday	7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Saturday	1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Sunday	1:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.

The Rio Rancho Library has reference staff for a majority of the hours that the library is open, except for 8:00 a.m. -10:00 a.m. Mondays through Fridays and 7:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m. on Monday evenings. When faculty and students are in need of assistance, they may also contact the main library's information desk. The Rio Rancho Library is regularly open:

Mon-Fri	8:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
Saturday	8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Sunday	Closed

To better assist off-campus students, we now have an online reference helpdesk which is staffed during library hours. Electronic reference service is also offered through the "E-mail a Librarian" link on the homepage which connects patrons to the library email address, libinfo@nmhu.edu.

(9) (10) Social work liaison

A librarian at the Las Vegas campus and the librarian at Rio Rancho are assigned the collection development responsibilities for social work at the respective campuses. These librarians are not formally designated liaisons to the School of Social Work, but they are the primary staff members responsible for seeing to faculty acquisition or instruction needs.

The Rio Rancho librarian, as Head of External Programs Division, is responsible for the Satellite Programs which entails providing distance education instruction to social work students.

(11) Faculty input

An elected social work faculty member serves on the Faculty Senate Library Committee, a group that facilitates communication between faculty and the librarians. Individual social work professors are encouraged to recommend books, audio-visual materials, journals, and electronic databases for purchase by the library. Recommendations are made to the collection development librarian and also through any of the other librarians and reference staff. Faculty requests are given high priority. Social work faculty is given the opportunity to review items selected for withdrawal from the collection.

(12) New acquisitions

Library staff will notify faculty when newly purchased social work material is ready for check-out. This generally occurs about once a month. Professors also receive notification when items they have requested for purchase are placed on hold at the Circulation desk.

(13) Usage statistics

We track monthly usage of all the electronic databases. Database usage for FY 2010/2011 was high for the social work databases: 13,248 searches in SocIndex; 17,226 searches in PsycArticles; and 7,794 searches in the PsycInfo database. In the past fiscal year, over 900 print titles relevant to social work were checked out from the main campus library; Rio Rancho circulated approximately 80 titles.

(14) Instruction

Every semester librarians teach 3 undergraduate sections and 1 advanced section of the Library Research Course. It is one-credit hour, 5-week class in which students learn how to do effective research, perform successful searches, learn how to use library services, discuss scholarly publication and plagiarism, learn the components of a literature review, and create bibliographies. In the 2010/2011 fall and spring semesters, 61 students enrolled in the Library Research Course.

In addition, faculty is encouraged to request one-time instruction for specific classes. The number of individual instructions have increased due to our outreach and to the fact that faculty have been supportive of our goals. During FY 2010/2011, librarians at Donnelly Library (not including Rio Rancho) gave 46 library instruction sessions to 624 students in all. Instructions to social work classes at Donnelly totaled 4, with 63 participants.

(15) Social Work collection location

	<u>Main campus</u>	<u>Rio Rancho campus</u>	<u>External sites</u>
Books	7,500	350	N/A*
Journals	40	10	N/A*
E-Books	275	275	275
E-Journals	3,420	3,420	3,420

*Numbers unavailable at external library sites. These libraries join in partnership with us to provide services to NMHU faculty and students.

(16) Library semester hours*

<u>Thomas C. Donnelly</u>		<u>Rio Rancho</u>	
Mon-Thu	7:30 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.	Mon-Fri	8:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
Friday	7:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Saturday	8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Saturday	1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Sunday	Closed
Sunday	1:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.		

*We have extended hours during midterm and final exam weeks. There has been little demand for extended hours. Electronic resources are available 24/7.

(17) Assessment surveys

The biannual assessment of library services is conducted during the fall and spring semesters. The main campus and Rio Rancho libraries' assessment surveys are made available via print and/or electronically. Library Assessment Reports are accessible through the university's Online Documents webpage. In our most recent assessment, nearly two-thirds of respondents consider library services to be good or excellent.

In addition, the Public Services staff responds to comments submitted via the suggestion boxes on all three floors of Donnelly Library and the online form on the library's website.

(18)

(a) Strengths

- Interlibrary loan service, which we recently upgraded to ILLiad.
- Electronic resources (journals, books, article databases, e-reserves).
- Use of consortia for expanding resources and cost effectiveness. Belonging to the NMLA Consortium, in particular, greatly increases resource-sharing and gives patrons and staff access to New Mexico libraries' catalogues.
- Library instruction serves more students every year.
- A standing advisory committee, the Faculty Library Committee, with a social work faculty as a regular member.
- The legislative GO Bond for libraries helps with inflationary increases.

(b) Areas of concern

- Additional funding for staffing and travel to better support external sites.
- Finding additional ways to support our off-campus students. Because our print material is only accessible to on-campus students, we need to purchase more electronic resources.
- Enhancing services by keeping up with technological changes.
- Maintaining accuracy and timeliness of library's webpage and OPAC.
- Flat budgets have reduced our ability to expand our collections and services.

(c) Projections

- Continue updating and enlarging the audio-visual collection.
- Build the existing e-book and e-journal collections. The trend is towards online format for the purpose of reaching out to the external site clientele.

- Subscribe to additional specialized databases that support the subject area of social work.
- Increase staffing at the external sites, which are growing at an extreme rate. The predominant increase in Highland's enrollment is occurring in the Albuquerque/Rio Rancho area.
- Continue working with faculty to maintain a quality collection.
- Review the use of Elluminate, Blackboard, and ITV technologies to provide instruction to distance-education students; having received requests for online classes from the School of Social Work and other departments, we plan to offer two sections of the Library Research course in an online format beginning in the fall semester of 2012.

(d) Assessment plan

We plan to continue assessing the social work collection by utilizing the following evaluation tools: World Cat, Millennium software, *Choice* magazine, the ILLiad collection development component, and R.R. Bowker RCL Analysis program in conjunction with Books-In-Print, which has been successful in the past for comparing our collection to ACRL standards. In our opinion, all of the above have been extremely helpful in maintaining an assessment plan for a quality collection.

3.5.5 *The program describes and demonstrates sufficient office and classroom space and/or computer mediated access to achieve its mission and goals.*

The School has sufficient office, classroom and computer labs to meet the School's mission and goals. The office and classroom space at each site is as follows:

Main Campus: The school is located in the Lora Shields building. Remodeled in 2009, the building houses the School of Social Work and the Department of Behavioral Sciences. There are 14 classrooms and one of two computer labs in the building is specifically dedicated for use by the school. Each faculty member and staff member have their own private office and there are sufficient vacant offices for use by visiting faculty and graduate assistants. Additionally, there is one classroom with ITV technology for use for faculty/staff meetings and for ITV classes if necessary.

Albuquerque: The program in Albuquerque occupies leased office space at 5041 Indian School Rd. NE. The total square footage is 10,500 ft. and accommodates seven (7) classrooms, one computer lab and 17 faculty and staff offices. Four of the seven classrooms are equipped with ITV equipment and are used for faculty meetings and for delivery of ITV classes as necessary.

Santa Fe/SFCC: The program is located on the campus of the Santa Fe Community College. As of 2011, the college dedicated 5 classrooms to be used by the university for its programs. Additional classrooms on their campus are available if necessary. New Mexico Highlands students have complete access to SFCC computer labs, library services and sports complex. There is sufficient office space for all of the part-time faculty teaching at this campus.

Farmington: the social work program is housed two blocks from the campus of San Juan College (SJC). The school utilizes the classrooms at SJC. As NMHU students, they have access to all student services offered by SJC to include: library, computer labs, recreational facilities etc. The university is considering expanded space for better accommodate the faculty and staff.

AS 3.5.6 The program describes its access to assistive technology, including materials and alternative formats (e.g. Braille, large print, books on tape, assistive learning systems).

Students with a documented disability are eligible to receive appropriate and reasonable academic accommodations or auxiliary aids in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA amendments of 2008, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1974 and all laws governing accessibility. Accessibility Services also adheres to the professional code of conduct promulgated by the Association of Higher Education and Disability (AHEAD). The university office of disability services oversees compliance with all rules and regulations for all university students at all program locations.

The Office of Disability Services oversees all requests for accommodations and provides assistive services as appropriate.

The process for students to access these services begins at the time of application for admission and requests that applicants declare if they intend to seek academic accommodations. Upon admission, a student must complete a request for accommodations to the University Office of Disabilities (ODS) who will determine the specific accommodation. The range of accommodations may include: in class note takers, Assistive Technology equipment for visually impaired, sign language etc., determined by the ODS as reasonable. Once a determination is made, the student's faculty members are informed of the specific accommodations. All student accommodations are honored and addressed regardless of program location.

If a student requires specific computer software or any special equipment, the ODS will coordinate with the university IT department for installing the necessary equipment at the specific location where the student is attending.

Chapter 4

BSW Assessment

4.0.1 The program presents its plan to assess the attainment of its competencies. The plan specifies procedures, multiple measures, and benchmarks to assess the attainment of each of the program's competencies.

The purpose of the BSW program assessment is to determine if individual students have developed the knowledge, values and skills necessary to meet the competencies and their respective practice behaviors as defined by CSWE's Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (2008). In this section we will describe the 1) three measures used to assess student learning; 2) benchmarks for each measure and how they were determined; 3) procedures for collecting data and a description of data analysis; and 4) evidence of ongoing data collection and use of data to improve curriculum.

Program Measures and Data Analysis

In order to collect the data needed to evaluate the extent to which our students' learning meets the EPAS and practice behaviors, we have implemented three measures. The first is the Field Practicum Evaluation, which is completed by the agency instructor and field consultant. This measurement tool encompasses all ten Competencies and utilizes the practice behaviors recommended by CSWE EPAS's (2008) as indicators. The second measure is Signature Assignments, which are comprehensive embedded assignments developed by faculty to test a student's knowledge and ability to apply that knowledge in a classroom setting. Third, we developed a Self-Efficacy Scale for the BSW graduation year. The Self-Efficacy Scale was designed to tell us how confident students were of their knowledge and ability to meet the practice behaviors and consequently the competencies. What follows is a detailed description of each measure.

Program Measures

Agency Instructor Evaluation of Student Learning in Practicum Setting

The Field Practicum assessment instrument was designed to correlate directly with CSWE's core competencies, which are operationally defined through the practice behaviors. The evaluation tool is divided into ten competency sections. Agency instructors score students on each practice behavior, then compute the average of the practice behaviors to arrive at the competency score. Each practice behavior is weighted equally and is scored using a five-point Likert scale described below. In the event the student did not have an opportunity to practice a particular behavior they receive a zero, but are not penalized and the zero is not added into the competency score. The ten core competency scores are averaged to arrive at a summative grade. Students are evaluated twice each semester, during midterm week and again during finals week. In order to increase rater reliability Field Coordinators met with agency instructors and field consultants on numerous occasions to train them on the use of the instrument. Data reported in the results section were gathered for the fall 2010 and spring 2011 semesters. A copy of the BSW Field Practicum Final Evaluation can be found in the appendices as Appendix 4A.

Practice Performance Scale

N/O—no opportunity to observe/demonstrate practice behavior

1=NO PROGRESS-fails to meet basic requirements of practice behavior

2=INSUFFICIENT PROGRESS-Rarely meets basic requirements of practice behavior

3=PROGRESS-sometimes meets basic requirements of practice behavior

4=PROFICIENCY=consistently meets basic requirements of practice behavior

5=ADVANCED PROFICIENCY=always meets and exceeds basic requirements of practice behavior

Signature Assignments

We have chosen to use Signature Assignments as a second measure of students' learning. Faculty from each sequence reviewed curriculum to determine which of the CSWE competencies and practice behaviors were covered by course content. Based on the connection between curriculum and practice behaviors, faculty developed Signature Assignment. All students completed the same Signature Assignment in required classes. For example, all 96 students attending SW 465 Generalist Practice III completed the same signature assignment. This embedded measure provides students an opportunity to demonstrate their learning in the context of a class. Many but not all of the items on the grading rubrics are directly related to practice behaviors. Signature assignments are graded utilizing a traditional 100 to 150 point scale, which is transformed into a percentage (i.e. 84%, 7%, 94 %, etc.). Scores between 90 and 100 = an A, 80 to 89=B, 70 to 79= C, and so on.

In order to bolster the consistency of instructor's grading practices faculty collaborated on the creation of rubrics and engaged in discussion regarding the use of the rubric during faculty week, Curriculum Committee meetings and via email. We recognize that increasing the reliability of instructors' grading practices is an ongoing process. We intend to hold formal discussions regarding the use of rubrics during faculty development week, and research instructors are designing a study to measure the reliability of grading practices. Research faculty will conduct this study during the spring 2012 semester. As described we developed Signature Assignments and scoring rubrics to measure practice behaviors, however, we did not parcel out aspects of the assignment to measure discrete practice behaviors. For this reason we use the overall grade on a Signature Assignment to evaluate a number of practice behaviors. Practically speaking this means that the average score of a Signature Assignment is used as the score for all relevant practice behaviors. We realize this is a weakness in our measurement procedures. A sample Signature Assignment and grading rubric can be found in the Appendix 4B.

Self-Efficacy Scale

The Self-Efficacy Scale is completed by students at the conclusion of their foundational year and again at the end of their concentration year. The Self-Efficacy Scale consists of one demographic item (primary campus) and 39 items blocked into ten competencies taken directly from CSWE's EPAS and practice behaviors. The instrument uses a four-point scale with

response categories ranging from Not Confident to Somewhat Confident to Confident to Very Confident. All students completing the second year of the BSW program are invited to complete the electronic survey during class time. In instances involving instructors not comfortable with or do not have access to electronic surveys, students are given the option to complete a paper version of the survey. Regardless of the format used to complete the survey, students are informed that their answers were both confidential and anonymous and that data will be reported in aggregate form. Thirty-seven graduating BSW students from the Las Vegas, and Albuquerque campuses completed the Self-Efficacy measure. The Self-Efficacy Scales can be found in Appendix 4C.

Program Benchmarks

Field Practicum Evaluations

The Field Practicum Evaluation form covers the ten competencies delineated by CSWE (2008) and is comprised of 31 items taken directly from CSWE practice behaviors. The instrument uses a five-point scale, with an additional score of zero used to indicate No Opportunity. The five-point scale ranges from: No Progress =1; Insufficient Progress=2; Progress=3; Proficiency=4; and Advanced Proficiency=5. During midterm and finals week, agency instructors and supervisors meet with students to complete the evaluation and provide them with feedback regarding their performance. The benchmark for all ten core competencies is set at 4, which indicates Proficiency. We selected this benchmark because Social Work students work with vulnerable populations, and it is incumbent upon them to meet a high standard (Proficient) of knowledge and skill. Scores from Field Practicum Evaluations contributes 40% toward the mean score of the competency.

Signature Assignment

These course-specific assignments are embedded comprehensive examinations of a student's learning. Signature Assignments are graded by faculty at the end of the semester. A rubric was developed for each assignment in order to improve inter-grader reliability. Signature Assignments are graded by instructors using a standardized scoring rubric. In order to pass the State of New Mexico BSW licensing exam students must score a 70% or higher. We have adopted a slightly higher score of 80% as a benchmark for these capstone-like assignments. This benchmark provides is in line with traditional grading procedures, in which a score of 80% represents a B. One of the weaknesses of the use of Signature assignments is that grading is not parceled by practice behavior. For this reason if a student receives a score of 92%, we use 92% to indicate the student's learning for all practice behaviors linked to the assignment. This weakness will be corrected for the fall 2011 grading procedures. In order to facilitate comparison, percentage scores were mathematically transformed to a five-point scale. Scores from Signature Assignments contribute 40% toward the mean score for the competency.

Self-Efficacy Scale

This instrument covers the ten competencies and is composed of 39 items taken directly from CSWE's practice behaviors. The Self-Efficacy Scale is given to BSW students at the conclusion of their first year, and again at the conclusion of their concentration year. The concentration year Self-Efficacy scales have items based on CSWE's EPAS and practice behaviors and additional advanced practice behaviors designed by sequence chairs and faculty teaching courses within the sequence. The instrument uses a four-point Likert-like scale. Not

Confident=1, Somewhat Confident =2, Confident = 3, and Very Confident = 4. Using the four-point scale we set the benchmark at 3, which indicates the student feels Confident to perform the practice behavior. In order to facilitate comparison with the Field Practicum Evaluation and the Signature Assignment all scores were mathematically transformed to a five-point scale. We did not use the transformed scale for the purposes of identifying students falling below the benchmark. Transformed scores were only used in Tables 3 through 15 in order to facilitate comparison between Self-Efficacy Scale scores, Field Evaluation scores and Signature Assignment scores. Table 2 presents the benchmark for individual student scores for each of the three measures described above.

Table 2 Benchmarks set for Field Evaluation, Signature Assignment and Self-Efficacy Scale.

	Below Benchmark			Benchmark or Above	
Field Evaluation	No Progress	Insufficient Progress	Progress	Proficiency	Advanced Proficiency
Signature Assignment	50-59	60-69	70 – 79	80 – 89%	90 – 100 %
Self-Efficacy		Not Confidential	Somewhat Confident	Confident	Very Confident

While it is anticipated that the majority of student’s would achieve scores in the 4 to 5 range, the benchmark is perceived as the minimum passing score commensurate with competent practice. This benchmark is above the passing score of 70% required by the New Mexico Social Work Licensing Board.

Additional Quantitative Data

Student evaluation of Field Practicum

During the spring 2011 semester BSW students were invited to evaluate their field agencies, instructors, and consultants as well as their perception of learning in the field setting. Our purpose for conducting this assessment was to give students a voice, and to gather information that can be used to develop and strengthen our practicum setting. A total of 45 BSW students completed the Field Practicum Evaluation Form. The evaluation form consists of six demographic items, six items related to the agency instructor, four items regarding field agency setting, four items related to the field consultant, five items asking students about their opportunity to work with diverse populations at the field agency, and six items asking them to rate the NMHU field placement program. In addition, students were provided with an opportunity to make comments regarding the agency, the instruction and supervision received, and field experiences over all. A copy of the Field Evaluation Practicum Form and samples of student comments can be found in the Appendices 4D and 4E.

Course Evaluation

In addition to the Field Practicum Evaluation, Signature Assignments, Self-Efficacy Scale and Student Evaluation of Field Practicum, we revised the end of semester classroom evaluations to assess student’s perceptions of the learning environment. Revisions were made during the fall 2009 semester and are informed by CSWE’s EPAS. Results of the spring 2011 Course Evaluations will be presented after the results of the other three measures because the

items although informed by CSWE's EPAS are not directly related to practice behaviors. A copy of the Course Evaluation instrument can be found in Appendix 4F.

Additional Qualitative Data

The Field Practicum Evaluation, Self-Efficacy Scale, Student Evaluation of Field Practicum and the Course evaluation include an invitation for students to comment on their educational process. While the Field Practicum Evaluation and Student Evaluation of Practicum are confidential, the Self-Efficacy Scale and Course evaluation offers students a format for making comments anonymously.

These comments have not been formally analyzed; however, they are made available to each instructor and sequence chairs and inform curriculum revision and program and instructor improvement.

Data Analysis Plan

Three types of data were analyzed to determine the extent to which student learning met the benchmark for core competencies. The analysis of data collected via the Field Practicum Evaluations involved the calculation of mean scores for each practice behavior, followed by the calculation for the mean score for each competency. In addition, the number of students falling below the benchmark compared to the total number of students included in the field evaluations, expressed as a fraction and a percent, was calculated. Similar calculations were performed on data collected via Signature Assignments, with the additional conversion of a percentage score, such as 84% to a five point scale. Scores collected through the Self-Efficacy scale also received similar analysis, with the additional conversion of data on a four-point scale converted to a five-point scale. We believe that measures of competence, such as the instructor evaluation of students learning in the field and the instructor evaluation of student learning in the classroom are more valid measures of learning than is the student's own assessment of their self-efficacy. For this reason Field Evaluation and Signature Assignment scores contributed 40% respectively to the mean score for the competency, and the Self-Efficacy scores contributed 20%. Presentations of results for each competency are presented in tabular form in Tables 3 through 15.

Limitations of our analysis plan

Our analysis plan has several limitations. We consider these limitations as opportunities for growth, which can be ameliorated to some extent during future data collection. One of the limitations involves the number of instruments used to measure student learning as regards individual practice behaviors. For the vast majority of practice behaviors we collected data on student learning through the three instruments. However, only two instruments were used to collect data on student learning for practice behaviors included under Competencies 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.9 and 2.1.10. Another limitation is our use of Signature Assignment scores to indicate student learning on more than one practice behavior. Although the Signature Assignments were designed to test student learning on practice behaviors, we did not organize the scoring rubrics so that we could collect scores pertaining to single practice behaviors. In other words, we are using an aggregate score as if it were a score pertaining to the specific practice behavior, applying each overall score to each practice behavior for each signature assignment graded. While this is seen as an obvious weakness, the scores we report on Signature Assignments are consistent with

scores student's scores on Field Evaluation and Self-Efficacy instruments. A similar weakness can be found with the Field Evaluations and self-efficacy data. We reported scores for these competency areas, rather than individual practice behaviors. The limitations resulted in refinement of the field evaluation instruments and the development of field specific practice behaviors implemented in Fall 2011.

4.0.2 The program provides evidence of ongoing data collection and analysis and discusses how it uses assessment data to affirm and/or make changes in the explicit and implicit curriculum to enhance student performance.

In this standard, procedures for data collection are described and the results of data analysis of Field Practicum Evaluations, Signature Assignments and Self-Efficacy Scale are presented in table format along with a brief narrative. In addition, we describe the procedures and discuss the results for the Student Evaluation Field Practicum Form, and the Classroom evaluations, both of which gather information regarding student's perception of the implicit and explicit learning environment. Lastly, we discuss the organizational review mechanism through which data is presented to faculty and informs programmatic change.

Evidence of Ongoing Data Collection

Dating back to the fall of 2005, the NMHU School of Social Work embraced the notion that data can help us to understand our current status in the areas of instruction, student, learning, student perception of the learning environment and instructor's perception of the learning environment, and data can be used to help guide our efforts toward improvement. Some of our efforts include surveying students to gather information regarding types of elective classes needed, preference for day, night and weekend classes, preference regarding instructional site, and general needs assessment. In 2008-2009 we conducted an evaluation of our use of Interactive Television to provide instruction. In 2010 the School of Social Work at NMHU surveyed alumni and members of the community regarding the types of CEU workshops that would most benefit their practice. In addition, in 2009 NMHU students and faculty conducted the New Mexico Human Service Labor Survey, which examined the need for social workers in the state of New Mexico. Results were presented to the Interim Legislative Health and Human Services Committee for the state of New Mexico.

In addition to the above mentioned data collection activities, we collect data through the Course Evaluations at the end of each semester, Field Practicum Evaluations at the end of each semester, Signature Assignment grades at the end of each semester on specified courses, and Self-efficacy Scales for graduating BSW students, MSW students completing their first year and MSW students graduating from the program This schedule will be followed into the foreseeable future. Sample copies of NMHU-School of Social Work Program Evaluations can be found in the Appendices.

Data from these four measures are presented to faculty at the annual faculty development week, during the school year to members of the Curriculum Committee, sequence chairs and the Dean and are accessible by individual instructors. In addition we report the results of our data collection efforts to all faculty during Faculty Development week. It is our intention to continue

using all four measurement instruments, or revised versions of these instruments throughout the foreseeable future.

Summary of Program Assessment Data

The data reported in this section was collected between the Fall 2010 semester and Spring 2011 semester and analyzed according to the plan described in ES 4.0.1. During the Fall 2010 semester our student body consisted of approximately 114 BSW first year students enrolled in classes and field practicum, and 101 second year BSW students enrolled in classes and field practicum. Included in this evaluation are Field Practicum Evaluations on 53 students for Fall 2010 and 58 students for Spring 2011 and 31 BSW students enrolled in summer block, 2011. We have not included 100% of the evaluations due to missing data and field evaluations not completed correctly. In a very few cases instructors only grade competencies instead of practice behaviors. The number of Signature Assignment grades included in this evaluation range from 72 to 102. This fluctuation is due to a very few instructors not sending in their grades and in rare cases students not completing the course. In the event that the student did not complete the course, their Signature Assignment grade is not included because in the event they retake the course they will have to once again complete the Signature Assignment. Participation in our Self-efficacy scale is voluntary. Thirty-nine graduating BSW students out of 101 (39%) completed the Self-Efficacy scale.

Summary of Results

- BSW mean scores on student learning as measured by Field Practicum instructors exceeded the benchmark (4.0) on all 10 competencies.
- BSW mean scores on student learning as measured by classroom instructors (Signature Assignments) exceeded the benchmark (4.0) on all 10 competencies.
- The average percentage of students meeting or exceeding the benchmark for all ten competencies, on all three measures is 94 %. Which means 6% of students fell below the benchmark of 4.0.
- Student's scores on the Self-Efficacy scale were lower than Field Practicum and Classroom instructors on all competencies, except 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide practice.
- BSW student learning on Core competencies ranked from best mean score to poorest mean scores on all three measures combined are as follows:
 - Identify oneself as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly (4.62)
 - Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgment (4.56)
 - Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment (4.55)
 - Engage diversity and difference in practice (4.55)
 - Respond to contexts that shape practice (4.54)
 - Engage with Individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities (4.50)
 - Apply social work ethical principles to guide practice (4.49)
 - Assess with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (4.46)
 - Advance human rights and social and economic justice (4.41)
 - Intervene with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (4.40)

- Evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities (4.34)
 - Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research (4.22)
 - Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services (4.09).
- Student's scores on the Self-Efficacy scale were lower than Field Practicum and Classroom instructors on all competencies, except 2.1.2 Apply social work ethical principles to guide practice.

Results by Competencies and Practice Behaviors

Tables 3 through 15 present the results of BSW student learning as evaluated through Field Evaluations, Signature Assignments, and student self-report concerning Self-Efficacy. Each table presents: the mean score and number of students falling below the benchmark for each practice behavior, followed by the mean score for combined practice behaviors for each of the three measures. Next, the table presents the total number of student scores falling below the benchmark (4.0) as compared to the total number of scores for the competency. This information is followed by a row presenting the percentage of students falling below the benchmark for each measure. Lastly we present the mean score for the Competency and the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the benchmark. Field Evaluation and Signature Assignment scores each contribute 40% to the Competency mean score, while the Self-Efficacy scores contributes 20%. Data is presented in this manner for Tables 3 through 15.

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

As can be seen in Table 3 student scores are well above the benchmark on Field evaluation, Signature assignments and Self-efficacy. Advocating for client access to the services of social work and demonstrating professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication, and using supervision and consultation were evaluated through the Field Evaluation and not Signature assignments, which are classroom assignments. Approximately 96% of all scores were above the benchmark.

Table 3 Identify oneself as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly

Note that the asterisks indicate there was no measurement for that PB for that instrument

Practice Behaviors	Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self- Efficacy	
	Mean	Students below	Class	Mean	Students Below	Mean	Students below benchmark
	Fall Spring Summer	Total					
a. advocate for client access to the services of social work;	4.67 4.82 4.86	2/53 1/58 0/31	*	*	*	4.39	0/39
b. practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development;	4.64 4.80 4.81	1/53 2/59 1/31	386 485	4.65 4.40	2/102 7/72	4.31	0/38
c. attend to professional roles and boundaries;	4.73 4.76 4.74	3/53 2/59 1/31	*	*	*	4.47	0/39
d. demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication;	4.74 4.83 4.9	1/53 1/59 3/31	*	*	*	4.49	1/39
e. engage in career long learning;	4.75 4.81 4.81	1/53 1/59 1/31	*	*	*	4.45	1/39
f. use supervision and consultation.	4.77 4.85 4.84	4/53 1/59 1/31	*	*	*	4.65	0/38
Competency mean scores		4.78	4.55			4.46	
Scores Below Benchmark	below total	27		9		2	
		857		174		232	
	%	3.15%		5.17%		0.43%	
Results for Competency 2.1.1	Benchmark		Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark		
	4		4.62		97.%		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.2 Apply Social Work Ethical Principles to Guide Practice.

NMHU curriculum focuses a great deal of instruction on ethical principles. This effort is reflected in the high scores students received on this competency. The mean score for this competency is 4.54. Students scored their own level of Self-Efficacy as high on all practice behaviors.

Table 4 Apply Social Work Ethical Principles to Guide Practice

Practice Behaviors	Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
	Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice	4.66 4.78 4.77	2/53 1/58 7/31	465 485	4.23 4.40	2/72 7/72	4.43	1/39
b. make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and as applicable, of the International Federation of Social Workers...	4.47 4.72 4.68	1/53 1/58 10/31	430	4.31	11/98	4.60	0/39
c. tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts	4.49 4.60 4.55	1/53 1/58 1/31	*	*	*	4.61	1/39
d. apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions	4.67 4.66 4.58	1/53 1/58 1/31	*	*	*	4.65	0/39
Competency mean scores		4.64		4.3		4.57	
Scores Below Benchmark	<i>below</i>	19		20		2	
	<i>total</i>	568		242		156	
	%	3.35%		8.26%		1.28%	
Results for Competency 2.1.2	Benchmark		Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark		
	4		4.49		95%		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.3 Apply Critical Thinking to Inform and Communicate Professional Judgments.

The ability to think critically, use multiple sources of knowledge, and communicate is critical to serving the populations of New Mexico. Mean scores are well above the benchmark of 4, however, nearly 12% of students fell below the benchmark on the Field Evaluation measure. and only a handful of students received scores below the benchmark. Students evaluated their level of Self-Efficacy as high in this area.

Table 5 Apply Critical Thinking to Inform and Communicate Professional Judgments.

Practice Behaviors	Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
	Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. <i>distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom;</i>	*	*	341	4.38	9/93	4.45	1/38
	5.0	2/57	386	4.65	2/76		
			430	4.31	11/98		
			465	4.23	2/72		
			485	4.40	7/72		
b. <i>analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation;</i>	*	*	341	4.38	9/93	4.12	7/38
	5.0	2/57	386	4.65	2/76		
			465	4.23	2/72		
			468				
c. <i>demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues.</i>	4.55	2/53	341	4.38	9/93	4.45	1/38
	4.73	1/59	386	4.65	2/76		
	4.74	8/31	465	4.23	2/72		
Competency mean scores		4.81	4.41			4.34	
Scores Below Benchmark	<i>below</i>	15	57			9	
	<i>total</i>	257	893			114	
	%	5.84%	6.38%			7.89%	
Results for Competency 2.1.3	The Benchmark is:		Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark		
	4.0		4.56		94%		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence, 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.4 Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice.

New Mexico is a state of great diversity with a rich cultural heritage. Social workers are expected to work with a variety of cultures, oppressed and marginalized peoples. Both Field and Classroom instructor’s evaluated student’s learning with a mean score of 4.41. All mean scores are well above the benchmark, with only 6% of the scores falling below the benchmark of 4.0.

Table 6 Engage Diversity and Difference in Practice

Practice Behaviors	Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
	Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power;	* 5.0	* 0/58	386 465 485	4.65 4.23 4.40	2/76 2/72 7/72	4.15	3/39
b. gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups;	4.66 4.73 4.77	2/53 1/59 1/31	386 465 485	4.65 4.23 4.40	2/76 2/72 7/72	4.24	1/39
c. recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences;	* 5.0	* 0/59	341 386 465 485	4.38 4.65 4.23 4.40	9/93 2/76 2/72 7/72	4.20	1/39
d. view themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.	4.84 4.83 4.83	9/53 0/59 5/31	465 485	4.23 4.40	2/72 7/72	4.49	1/39
Competency mean scores		4.84		4.41		4.27	
Scores Below Benchmark	below	18	51			6	
	total	403	897			156	
	%	4.47%	5.69%			3.85%	
Results for Competency 2.1.4	Benchmark		Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark		
	4		4.55		95%		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.5 Advance Human Rights and Social and Economic Justice.

Our students are strong advocates for human rights and social justice as can be seen in scores reported Table 7. Student self-assessment (Self-Efficacy) is in line with their instructor’s assessment of their ability. The mean score is 4.42, with 94% of the scores meeting or exceeding the benchmark.

Table 7 Advance Human Rights and Social and Economic Justice

<i>Practice Behaviors</i>		<i>Field Evaluation</i>		<i>Signature Assignment</i>			<i>Student Self-Efficacy</i>	
		<i>Mean Fall Spring Summer</i>	<i>Students Below Benchmark</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Students Below Benchmark</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Students Below Benchmark</i>
<i>a. understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination;</i>		*	*					
		5.0	0/58	386 465	4.65 4.23	2/76 2/72	4.46	2/39
<i>b. advocate for human rights and social and economic justice;</i>		4.30	3/53	485	4.40	7/72	4.51	4/39
		4.60	1/58					
		4.53	1/31					
<i>c. engage in practice that advance social and economic justice.</i>		4.33	2/53	485	4.40	7/72	4.26	3/38
		4.74	0/58					
		4.73	8/31					
<i>Competency mean scores</i>		4.39		4.42			4.41	
<i>Scores Below Benchmark</i>	<i>below</i>	15		18			9	
	<i>total</i>	342		292			116	
	<i>%</i>	4.39%		6.16%			7.76%	
<i>Results for Competency 2.1.5</i>		<i>Benchmark</i>			<i>Mean Score</i>		<i>Percent above Benchmark</i>	
		4.0			4.41		94%	

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.6 Engage in Research-Informed Practice and Practice-Informed Research.

Students find research to be a challenging. Classes involve a great deal of learning to read research, and apply it to practice. The majority of students express that research is intimidating and they are not comfortable with statistical analysis. Student’s lack of confidence in this area is reflected in their lower scores on the Self-Efficacy measure. On average instructors in the field practicum and classroom score students above the benchmark, but these scores are also lower than most other competencies. Student confidence in this area is an area requiring improvement. The mean score for all measures combined is 4.35 and ranks near the bottom of the list of CSWE competencies. The majority of scores below the benchmark derive from the Self-Efficacy measure, and 16% of student scored were below benchmark on average, across the 3 measures.

Table 8 Engage in Research-Informed Practice and Practice-Informed Research

Practice Behaviors		Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
		Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a.	use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry;	* 4.0	* 0/58	430	4.31	11/98	3.71	11/39
b.	use research evidence to inform practice.	4.40 4.55 4.63	2/53 2/58 11/31	330 341 430 465 468	4.23 4.38 4.31 4.23	14/58 9/93 11/98 2/72	3.85	8/39
Competency mean scores		4.36		4.30			3.78	
Scores Below Benchmark	below	15		47			19	
	total	200		419			78	
	%	7.5%		11.22%			24.36%	
Results for Competency 2.1.6		Benchmark			Mean Score	Percent above Benchmark		
		4			4.22	88%		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.7 Apply Knowledge of Human Behavior and the Social Environment.

Scores on this competency's practice behaviors are above the benchmark of 4.0.

Table 9 Apply Knowledge of Human Behavior and the Social Environment

Practice Behaviors		Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
		Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a.	utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, evaluation;	* 5.0 *	* 0/57 *	386 485	4.65 4.40	2/76 7/72	3.92	8/38
b.	critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment.	4.75 4.83 4.90	0/53 2/59 1/31	341 386 485	4.38 4.65 4.40	9/93 2/76 7/72	4.15	4/38
Competency mean scores		4.87		4.49			4.04	
Scores Below Benchmark	below	3		27			12	
	total	200		389			76	
	%	1.50%		6.94%			15.79%	
Results for Competency 2.1.7		Benchmark			Mean Score	Percent above Benchmark		
		4			4.55	93.68 %		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.8 Engage in Policy Practice to Advance Social and Economic Well-Being and to Deliver Effective Social Work Services.

Agency instructors and classroom instructors assessed student’s learning well above the benchmark for these practice behaviors. However, students rated themselves comparatively low on analyzing, formulating, and advocating for policies that advance social well-being, indicating this is an area needing improvement. The mean score for this competency is 4.21.

Table 10 Engage in Policy Practice to Advance Social and Economic Well-Being and to Deliver Effective Social Work Services

Practice Behaviors		Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
		Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being;		*	*	341	4.38	9/93	3.95	6/39
		2.5	1/57	465	4.23	2/72		
b. collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.		4.35	3/50	465	4.23	2/72	4.18	3/39
		4.54	2/56					
		4.63	11/31					
Competency mean scores		3.91		4.29			4.07	
Scores Below Benchmark	below	17		13			9	
	total	194		237			78	
	%	8.76%		5.49%			11.54%	
Results for Competency 2.1.8		Benchmark			Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark	
		4			4.09		92.34%	

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.9 Respond to Contexts That Shape Practice.

Students received scores well above the benchmark of 4.0. and less than 6% of the students fell below the benchmark.

Table 11 Respond to Contexts That Shape Practice

Practice Behaviors	Field Evaluation		Signature Assignment			Student Self-Efficacy	
	Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, population, scientific technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services;	4.40	1/51	386	4.65	2/76	4.26	3/38
	4.70 4.69	0/57 9/31		4.40	7/72		
b. provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services.	* 5.0	* 0/58		*	*	4.19	4/38
Competency mean scores		4.71		4.53		4.23	
Scores Below Benchmark	below	10		9		7	
	total	197		148		76	
	%	5.08%		6.08%		9.21%	
Results for Competency 2.1.9	Benchmark			Mean Score	Percent above Benchmark		
	4			4.54	93.82%		

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.10 Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

This competency is divided into four areas, with each area having its own practice behaviors. Field evaluation scores are currently collected by area, rather than practice behaviors. The Field Evaluation tool used by the field instructor to assess students, lists the practice behaviors under each area as an operational definition. Field staff chose to collapse these practice behaviors due to the excessive amount of time and effort that would be required by field agency supervisors, who are volunteers, to score each of the practice behaviors.

The next four tables present the results for each of the areas listed for EP 2.2.10. The aggregate mean score for all four areas is 4.30 and the average percentage of students above the benchmark is 94 %.

EP 2.1.10 (a) Engage, with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

Table 12 Engage, with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Practice Behaviors		Instructor Evaluation of student in field		Instructor Evaluation of student in classroom			Student self-evaluation Self-Efficacy	
		Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. Substantively and affectively prepare for action with clients...		4.80	2/53	465	4.32	2/72	3.85	7/39
b. Use empathy and other interpersonal skills		4.83	1/58					
c. Develop mutually agreed upon focus of work and desired outcomes		4.87	1/31					
Competency mean scores		4.83		4.32			4.21	
Scores Below Benchmark	below total	4		6			9	
		142		216			117	
	%	2.82%		2.78%			7.69%	
Results for Competency 2.1.10(a) Engage		Benchmark			Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark	
		4			4.50		96%	

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

EP 2.1.10 (b) Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

BSW students scored high in Field Practicum Evaluation and Self efficacy scores. A low percentage (2.78%) of students scored below the 4.0 benchmark. The mean score for this area of the competency is 4.35.

Table 13 Assess with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Practice Behaviors		Instructor Evaluation of student in field		Instructor Evaluation of student in classroom			Student self-evaluation Self-Efficacy	
		Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. Collect, organize, and interpret client data		4.64	3/53	465	4.32	2/72	4.20	3/39
b. Assess client strengths and limitations		4.74	3/58					
c. Develop mutually agreed upon intervention goals and objectives		4.74	2/31					
Competency mean scores		4.70		4.32			4.25	
Scores Below Benchmark	below total	8		6			6	
		142		216			78	
	%	5.63%		2.78%			7.69%	
Results for Competency 2.1.10(b) Assessment		Benchmark			Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark	
		4			4.46		95.41%	

EP 2.1.10 (c) Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

Our evaluation of student learning in this area needs improvement. Results suggest that student learning is above the benchmark of 4.0 and Self-Efficacy scores suggest students feel confident in their ability to apply knowledge in this area.

Table 14 Intervene with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities

Practice Behaviors		Instructor Evaluation of student in field		Instructor Evaluation of student in classroom			Student self-evaluation Self-Efficacy	
		Mean Fall Spring Summer	Students Below Benchmark	Class	Mean	Students Below Benchmark	Mean	Students Below Benchmark
a. <i>Initiate actions to achieve organizational goals</i>		4.60	3/53		*	*	4.27	2/39
b. <i>Implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities</i>		4.71	2/58		*	*	4.12	3/39
c. <i>Help clients resolve problems</i>		4.65	1/31	465	4.23	2/72	4.27	3/39
d. <i>Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients</i>					*	*	4.36	2/39
e. <i>Facilitate transitions and endings</i>					*	*	4.03	6/39
Competency mean scores		4.66		4.23			4.21	
Scores Below Benchmark	<i>below</i>	6		2			16	
	<i>total</i>	142		72			195	
	<i>%</i>	4.23%		2.78%			8.21%	
Results for Competency 2.1.10(c) Intervene		Benchmark			Mean Score		Percent above Benchmark	
		4			4.40%		94.13%	

Five Point Scale: 1= poor performance or low confidence; 5 = excellent performance and high confidence.

P 2.1.10 (d) Evaluate with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

Results suggest that the majority (94%) of student’s learning met or exceeded the benchmark of 4.0 on this area of competency 10.

Table 15 Evaluate with Individuals, Families, Groups, Organizations, and Communities.

<i>Practice Behaviors</i>		<i>Instructor Evaluation of student in field</i>		<i>Instructor Evaluation of student in classroom</i>			<i>Student self-evaluation Self-Efficacy</i>	
		<i>Mean Fall</i>	<i>Students Below Benchmark</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Students Below Benchmark</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Students Below Benchmark</i>
<i>a. Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions</i>		4.62 4.57 4.48	3/53 3/58 1/31	465	4.23	2/72	4.12	5/39
<i>Competency mean scores</i>		4.57		4.23			4.12	
<i>Scores Below Benchmark</i>	<i>below</i>	7		2			5	
	<i>total</i>	142		72			39	
	<i>%</i>	4.93%		2.78%			12.82%	
<i>Results for Competency 2.1.10 Evaluation</i>		<i>Benchmark</i>			<i>Mean Score</i>		<i>Percent above Benchmark</i>	
		4			4.34		94.47%	

Explicit and Implicit Curriculum

Student Evaluation Field Practicum

During the spring 2011 semester 45 BSW students completed the Student Evaluation Field Practicum Form online. Participation in this evaluation was voluntary, anonymous and confidential. The twenty-six items used a five-point Likert like scale. A score of 5 represented labels such as, *to a great extent, always, and more than four times*, lower scores denote labels such as, *not at all, never, or very poor*.

The Student Online Field Evaluation assessed five areas: 1) student’s practicum experience with their agency instructor; 2) student’s assessment of the field agency setting; 3) student’s opportunity to work with diverse populations at the field agency; 4) student’s assessment of the NMHU field placement program, and 5) student’s overall field practicum experience. Table 16 presents the scores for BSW students during the Spring 2011 semester.

Table 16 BSW Student Evaluation of Field Practicum Program

		BSW Student Evaluation of Field Practicum Program					
Count	Response categories	Excellent	Very Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor	Total
		5 factors on survey	Experience with agency instructor	54%	28%	10%	7%
	Assessment of field agency setting	17%	40%	15%	22%	6%	100%
	Support from field consultant	22%	47%	20%	6%	5%	100%
	Work with diverse populations	55%	5%	12%	5%	23%	100%
	Engaging in practice behaviors	64%	27%	8%	1%	0%	100%

Students were asked to reflect upon their opportunity to work with diverse populations at their field agency. The results suggest that approximately 60% of the responses range from Excellent to Very Good opportunity to work with diverse populations. Eighty-nine percent of BSW students had an opportunity to work with Hispanic individuals, while 70% had an opportunity to work with American Indians, 63% had an opportunity to work with African Americans, and 51% had an opportunity to work with other diverse ethnicities, such as Chinese, Vietnamese, East Asian, and Nigerian. Students rated their opportunity to work with diverse populations from “Excellent” to “Very good.”

Student comments regarding their opportunity to work with diverse populations at their field agency also suggest they value the experience. The following presents a representative list of student comments regarding their work with diverse populations.

Diversity comments, Field Practicum BSW Students

- For anyone who has a desire to spend time in a prison, this is a great practicum.
- We work with a wide range of clients and local agencies, so it is a great way to get to know the available resources here in Las Vegas.
- Working with inmates in a detention setting, one is able to see many of the issues that corrections has, such as attitudes towards detainees by staff, security issues that must take priority. Corrections is a world of its own.
- The agency served a wide variety of clients and when applying concepts of cultural diversity in interventions learned in my coursework, the setting proved to be a great educational setting.
- I learned quite a lot about diverse population and myself.
- It is very hard for some people to walk in and not understand the culture and population that we are working with and that is different then most agencies. It was nice to work with Gilbert and not have to defend my thinking about what I recognized as the culture and subcultures of the population that I worked with.

In addition, students identified the following racial or ethnic groups that their field placement provided an opportunity to work with: Hispanic, Native American, Lesbians, Asian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, Latino(a) immigrants & undocumented immigrants, Islanders, Vietnamese, professionals from all over the world, Nigerian, East Indian, Mexican, middle-eastern, clients who were identified with multiple racial or ethnic groups, Russian, Asian American population.

Course Evaluations

Beginning with the Fall 2009 semester and continuing into the Spring 2011 semester, we invited students to evaluate their learning environment. The evaluation is designed to gather data on both the explicit and implicit classroom and includes items examining five educational areas: 1) Class Room Environment; 2) Professor Characteristics; 3) Course Content; 4) Grading/Examinations; and 5) Impact on Student. Near the end of each semester student's wishing to view their grade for a course on line are required to complete the classroom evaluation form.

The Course Evaluation survey is composed of 13 positively worded items using a four-point response set: Excellent, Good, Average, and Poor. The 14th item provided students with an opportunity to make comments on any aspect of the class. A sample copy of the Course Evaluation Results, and a sample of student comments, both of which are available to instructors can be found in the Appendices.

Table 17 reports the scores collected for the Spring 2011 semester. It compares the mean scores on five educational areas. The sample size N represents the number of responses for each area and reflects the number of items on the survey multiplied by the number of students completing the item, times the number of courses for which the student completed the survey. This means N does not represent the number of students. Some educational areas have a higher number of responses because the Educational Area has a greater number of items. Seventy-two students completed the survey out of a 100 students. Results suggest that students believe the School of Social Work is doing a *Good to Excellent* job in all five Educational Areas. The median score of 1 indicate a higher proportion of Excellent scores than scores of Good, Average and Poor combined. A copy of the Fall 2010 Classroom Evaluation report for the Albuquerque/Rio Rancho campus can be found in the Appendices.

Table 17 Mean and Median Scores for Educational Areas Spring 2011

Bachelor of Social Work Scores on Educational Areas Spring 2011

Scores				
Educational Areas	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Median
Classroom Environment	1.3867	1306	.68466	1.0000
Professor Characteristics	1.5710	2611	.80172	1.0000
Course Content	1.5340	1942	.75050	1.0000
Grading/Examinations	1.5966	647	.79833	1.0000
Impact on Student	1.4633	641	.75352	1.0000
CSWE Competencies & Practice Behaviors	1.5466	644	.74784	1.0000
Total	1.5221	7791	.76458	1.0000

1=Excellent 2= Good 3=Average 4=Poor

Note: N = number of items related to Educational area times the number of students completing the survey.

Qualitative Data Summary

A great deal of data is collected informally through faculty meetings with students, field instructors, agency representatives, and constituents. In addition, the Field Practicum Evaluation, the course Evaluation and the Self-Efficacy instruments all include qualitative items, providing students with a confidential (Field Evaluations) and anonymous (Course Evaluations, Self-Efficacy Instrument) venue to make comments regarding their education. These comments have been reported to faculty informally and will be the subject of qualitative analysis during the spring 2012 semester. See Appendix 4G for a sample of student comments.

Organizational Review Mechanism

Program assessment data is routinely generated to meet the needs of faculty and Dean. During the fall 2005 semester research, faculty and students developed a Needs Assessment survey to determine the needs of students attending the Rio Rancho and Albuquerque campus. Results of this survey led to the NMHU offering more social work classes at the Albuquerque site and fewer classes at the Rio Rancho site. In 2008 we conducted a survey to gather student and faculty attitudes toward offering instruction through Interactive Television. We found students in distant sites appreciated the use of ITV, while the majority of students at the main campus, Albuquerque and Rio Rancho sites preferred the traditional face-to-face instruction. Subsequent to this survey, the School of Social Work's use of ITV has dropped significantly. In addition, assessment data collected through the Course Evaluations, Signature Grade assignments, Field Evaluations and Self-Efficacy scales are presented to faculty and the Dean attending the Curriculum Committee and during Faculty Development Week. These venues provide faculty with an opportunity to review and revise the data collection instruments, review the data that applies to their particular school site and sequence and discuss possible uses of the data, and helps us uncover new directions for programming.

4.0.3 The program identifies any changes in the explicit and implicit curriculum based on the analysis of the assessment data.

The consensus among faculty is that reflection on CSWE's EPAS and the collection of data regarding students' learning has made us more mindful of our curriculum and instructional methodologies. While some of the implications for the findings were presented in standard 4.0.2, this section will further explore the implications of the assessment data, how the data suggests area of improvement and/or affirms that our curriculum and program are working to achieve student learning. As noted under 4.0.1 limitation of Analysis Plan, the field practicum evaluation tools were revised and implemented in Fall 2011. Field Specific Practice behaviors were created for every classification. For the most part, the changes have been well received and refinement of the instruments will be an ongoing process and data will be presented and reviewed by the School's Curriculum Committee.

4.0.4 The program describes how it makes its constituencies aware of its assessment outcomes.

Program assessment outcome data are distributed and discussed with the Curriculum committee and all faculty members during Faculty Development Week, Faculty Meetings and Faculty Work Groups. The structure for reviewing program assessment data and making programmatic changes have been discussed previously in this chapter. In addition, program assessment data is available to sequence and statewide centers as needed. The School of Social Work's webpage is under development and plans are underway to make assessment data available to constituencies, alumni, faculty, and current students through the Schools website.

The Field Director and Field Coordinators hold yearly appreciation luncheon for all agency instructors at all program sites. During this meeting field assessment data is shared. The long range plan for use of this data is to work consciously as a field committee to identify field practicum sites that are not meeting the minimum standards and work with them individually to try to create more opportunities for implementation of the competencies. By sharing the data, it prompts agency instructors to recognize areas for improvement and work toward that end.

In addition, the Dean shares program assessment findings with the President of the University, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Board of Regents.

4.0.5 The program appends the summary data for each measure used to assess the attainment of each competency for at least one academic year prior to the submission of the self study.

Program assessment findings are described in AS 4.0.2 and the findings are presented in Tables 3 through 15. Samples of the Field Evaluation, Signature Assignment Scoring Rubrics, Self-Efficacy scales and Course Evaluation survey are appended at the end of this chapter.