ABSTRACT

        An overview of activities of the Project on Achieving
Equity for Women in Social Work Education between July 1979 and June
1981 is presented. The main objective was to seek information about
alternative strategies to achieve educational equity, and to
construct a frame of reference that could be used universally to
organize efforts to improve the quality of educational programs as
they relate to female administrators, faculty, and students, and to
curriculum content that addresses distinctive needs of women. After
briefly providing a historical perspective, a summary is presented of
226 responses to the first part of a questionnaire seeking
information from social work programs about curriculum content on
women in required and elective courses, and about extracurricular
activities that pertain to women's concerns. A summary is also
presented of 131 anonymous responses to the second part of the
questionnaire, which sought information about barriers to achieving
equity for women. Barriers that were reported include barriers in
curriculum planning and teaching, and noncurriculum barriers that
relate to the profession, to the institution, to administrators and
faculty, and to students. The development of five specific plans to
achieve educational equity are institutional factors, consultant's
relationship to program, organization of work group, focus of change
efforts, selection of strategies for change, projected outcomes,
monitoring and evaluation, and institutionalizing the gains.
Limitations and problems encountered at program sites, and guidelines
for achieving equity are examined. (SW)

Toward Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education:

A Conceptual Frame of Reference and Guidelines for Organizing Equity Efforts

By

Nancy Coleman, DSW

Developed by Project on Achieving Equity

for Women in Social Work Education

Council on Social Work Education

New York

FOREWORD

While women constitute a majority of social work practitioners
and a large proportion of social work's clientele, the issue
of women as students, faculty, and administrators, and the
curriculum content on the subject of women only recently have
been given sufficient attention in social work education.

This monograph is one of a number of continued efforts by the
Council on Social Work Education to focus on issues related
to women in social work education.

Soon after the establishment of the Council's Commission on
the Role and Status of Women in Social Work Education in 1974,
a need was identified for a special project to address the
inequities experienced by women. Major issues were identified
by the commission. Subsequently, a proposal was developed and
a two-year project was initiated with support from the U.S.
Department of Education, Women's Educational Equity Act Program.
This publication is a report on the project.

Barriers to the recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, and
remuneration concerning women are identified. Attention is
given to issues related to student admissions, field placement,
and financial aid. The need for clear course objectives,
outlines, and content respecting the role and status of women
throughout the curriculum is clearly delineated in this mono-
graph.

Finally, the report outlines five specific strategies to over-
come the barriers identified in social work education.

The Council is gratified to present this valuable document as
an extremely useful contribution in its own right, and as a
basis for continuing efforts to achieve equity for women in
social work education.

CSWE wishes to thank Nancy Coleman and the many social work
educators and practitioners who participated in this most
successful project.

New York City
November 1981

ARTHUR J. KATZ
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

4

PREFACE

In 1974 the United States Congress established the Women's Educational Equity Act which authorizes the U.S. Education Department to award grants and contracts "to provide educational equity for women in the United States and to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972." The following words marked the establishment of the Act:

> The Congress hereby finds and declares that educational programs in the United States...as presently conducted, are inequitable, as such programs relate to women and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society. It is the purpose of this section to provide educational equity for all women in the United States.

The Council on Social Work Education's Commission on the Role and Status of Women in Social Work Education agreed that efforts were needed to achieve equity for women in professional education and submitted a proposal for a two year project to and received funding from the Women's Educational Equity Act Program for the period July 1979 to June 1981. This publication reports on efforts of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education.

The project gathered information from accredited social work programs about alternative strategies and barriers to achieving equity for women and provided consultation to five programs in different Federal regions to test out unique approaches to achieving equity for women. These efforts led to the construction of a conceptual frame of reference and guidelines for organizing educational equity efforts for women.

The project consultants worked closely with the project director in setting up project objectives and in constructing a conceptual tool that could be adapted to various educational settings. They also worked closely with administrators and work groups in five social work educational programs to develop unique approaches to achieving equity for women. I am indebted to them for their willingness to share their expertise and wisdom.

This publication represents the efforts of a great many persons, all committed to the goal of equality in higher education. It is hoped that the recommendations set forth here will stimulate others to make similar efforts to work for equity for persons in their own educational settings.

5

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Listed below are some of the many people in social work education and practice who contributed their time and expertise to project efforts to achieve educational equity for women. The sustaining interest and commitment of all who were involved are gratefully acknowledged.

Advisory Group/ Project Consultants

Jeanne Giovannoni
Naomi Gottlieb
Mary Gay Harm
Anne Jones
Juliette Silva

Project Secretary

Lillian Lent.

Project Associate

Kathleen Powell

Deans and Directors

Raymond H. Clark
William H. Gilbertson
Isaiah Lee
Kate Mullins
Bernard Pendleton
Ethelyn Strong

Members of Work Groups

John Austin
Elsie Brevik
Katherine Briar
Charlene Cheston
Carolyn Dryzcimski
Kay Evans
Vern Hansen
Georgia Henson
Jim Kelly
Joanne Kurfiss

Robin Landry
Claire Lowry
Dorothy McCadd
Pam Miller
Mark Mimich
Thelma Payne
Rosemary Phillips
Neila Seshachari
Malrie Shelton
Nellie Tate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION ADDRESSES THE NEED TO ACHIEVE EQUITY FOR WOMEN

Council on Social Work Education Adopts Affirmative Action Accreditation Standard

Efforts to meet requirements of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Executive Order 11246 for affirmative action, Equal Employment Opportunity Legislation, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and to respond to questions of inequity generated by the Women's Movement, led the Board of Directors of the Council on Social Work Education (on the recommendation of its Accreditation Commission) to approve the adoption in 1977 of an affirmative action accreditation standard for women.[1]

Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women went further than a statement of policy against discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, ethnic or national origin, handicap, age or sex. The standard states that, if any social work educational program at the baccalaureate or master's level seeks accredited status (initial or reaccredited), the program must make "specific continuous efforts to assure enrichment by the presence of women in all categories of persons related to the program, and by content on women's issues in the curriculum." The standard elaborates on three ways equity for women must be achieved if social work programs are to maintain accredited status. These are:

1. Equity shall be assured to women in faculty and staff recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure assignment, and remuneration.
2. Equity shall be assured to women in student admissions, field placement, and financial aid.
3. The program shall provide clear course objectives, outline and content respecting the role and status of women throughout the curriculum.[2]

The profession of social work is the first profession to develop an affirmative action accreditation standard for women. The profession had earlier established a precedent when it enacted a similar accreditation standard for members of ethnic minority groups.

Once accreditation standard 1234B-Women was enacted, the focus shifted to accredited social work educational programs which

had the responsibility of finding ways to implement the man-
dates of the standard. Administrators of many of these programs
expressed uncertainty about the most effective approaches to
achieving equity for women (i.e. meeting the requirements of
the standard).

<div align="center">

U.S. Education Department Funds
Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education

</div>

The Council on Social Work Education's Commission on the Role
and Status of Women in Social Work Education, whose role it
is to monitor and recommend policy regarding women's issues
to the Council's Board of Directors, decided that a special
project was needed to assess the state of the art of curriculum
focused on distinctive needs of women, to identify barriers to
achieving equity for women, and to explore alternative strategies
to quality improvement in the ways that social work programs
address distinctive needs of women. A subcommittee of the Women's
Commission developed a proposal idea. The proposal was developed
in written form by staff, who submitted it to the U.S. Education
Department, Women's Educational Equity Act Program. Funding was
approved for a two-year project beginning July 1, 1979. It is
important to note at the outset that this project focused on the
three areas identified in Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women
(women faculty, women students, and curriculum content on women),
but it in no way intruded upon or became a part of the official
accreditation process of the Council on Social Work Education.
The project agreed that at the end of the two years, it would
report to social work educational programs regarding what it
had learned about alternative approaches to achieving educational
equity for women.

During the two-year period, the project carried out two differ-
ent phases. Phase I involved a survey of all accredited social
work educational programs to learn about the "state of the art"
in curriculum content on women, and to collect information about
barriers to achieving educational equity for women. Phase II
focused on the selection of five program sites, and the develop-
ment of different models of achieving equity for women. The
project provided consultation to these sites and asked that they
develop unique plans of action to achieve equity for women.

<div align="center">

Project Reports and Makes Recommendations
to Social Work Educators

</div>

It was the intention of the project from its inception to share
information about its activities with social work educational

programs at the baccalureate and master's levels. It was hoped
that ideas about alternative strategies to achieve educational
equity for women learned through project efforts might be
transferrable to other social work programs striving to update
curriculum content on women, and to provide greater advancement
opportunities for female faculty and students.

This publication has been prepared by the project director in
collaboration with an advisory group of consultants. The docu-
ment draws upon statements in a manual developed during the
first project year with the assistance of a project associate
(doctoral intern), upon written reports of consultants summar-
izing professional activities at program sites and upon written
statements from administrators and work groups at the project
sites. These written materials were used by the project direc-
tor and consultants as the foundation for the construction of a
conceptual frame of reference for organizing equity efforts in
professional education.

The project had two main goals: one, to learn from social work
educators about alternative strategies being used to achieve
educational equity for women and about barriers impeding equity
efforts and two, to develop a frame of reference and guidelines
which could be used by persons involved in equity efforts through-
out the country.

This document reports on project activities related to goal one
in the first three chapters. The project presents an histori-
cal orientation(Chapter I) and an overview of the "state of the
art" in curriculum content on women(Chapter II). Ideas about
barriers to achieving educational equity for women are summar-
ized(Chapter III). Content in Chapters Two and Three is based
on responses to a questionnaire mailed to all accredited social
work programs in 1980 and on responses to a follow-up ques-
tionnaire in 1981.

Chapters IV through VI address project goal two. A statement
of how the project organized efforts to select and to provide
consultation to five program sites during 1980 to 1981 is given
(Chapter IV). The end result of project efforts in five pro-
gram sites is presented in a conceptual frame of reference con-
structed by the project director and consultants to organize
ideas about approaches to achieving educational equity for
women(Chapter V). A summary of project accomplishments is
followed by a set of guidelines for using the frame of refer-
ence(Chapter VI).

CHAPTER II

ACHIEVING EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN THE SOCIAL WORK CURRICULUM

Focus of Survey: Part I

In January 1980 a two-part questionnaire was mailed by the
Project to the administrators of all accredited social work
educational programs at the baccalaureate and master's
levels.   Part I of the questionnaire sought information
about "curriculum content in which women's distinctive needs
and problems are addressed." The administrators were asked
to respond to questions in the time frame of 1978
to 1979. If administrators asked other persons to assist
them in completing the questionnaires, they were told to list
their names and titles below their own signatures. Part I of
the questionnaire was not designed to elicit detailed responses
but rather to provide information which would give an overview
of what was being taught about women and how it was being
organized in the curriculum. One hundred eighty-one baccalaureate
administrators and forty-five master's level administrators
responded to Part I of the questionnaire. A follow-up question-
naire was mailed to these administrators in 1981 asking them to
report any changes in curriculum content between academic year
1978 to 1979 and academic year 1980 to 1981. One hundred eighty-
five responses to the follow-up questionnaire were received
(82% of those responding to first questionnaire).

Content on Women in Required Courses: Human Behavior and Social Environment, Social Welfare Policies and Services, Social Work Practice or Methods and Research

Question A in Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents
to give the number of required social work courses (except
field or practicum), and to list the catalog numbers and titles
of required courses which contain content on women. Since the
project was primarily concerned about seeking ideas about
achieving equity to incorporate into a conceptual frame of ref-
erence, it did not ask respondents to give detailed information
about the nature of content on women in these required courses.
Responses to Question A provided a "broad brush" overview of
how many and which required courses contained content on women.

The responses of baccalaureate administrators who answered
Part I of the questionnaire showed that the majority of bacca-
laureate programs reporting concentrate content on women in
at least one-half of courses offered in Social Welfare Policy

12

and Services and in one-half of the courses in Social
Work Practice or Methods. The majority reported that content
on women in Human Behavior and Social Environment courses is
concentrated in at least one-third of the required courses.
A number of baccalaureate administrators pointed out that these
courses are often taught by faculty from other departments.
They reported that content on women is not usually incorporated
into baccalaureate research courses except through opportunities
to write about special topics. Two-thirds of the baccalaureate
programs responding reported that there were additional required
courses with content on women. These included Introduction
to Social Work, Senior Seminars, Intercultural Relationships
and Minority Concerns, the Family, and Special Topics.

The majority of master's program respondents reported that
at least half of the courses required in Social Welfare Policy
and Services, in Human Behavior and Social Environment, and in
Research contain content on women. Master's program respondents
reported a larger number of required courses in Social Work
Practice or Methods, with one-fourth to one-third of these
courses reported to contain content on women. Required master's
courses in the "other" category which include content on women
were focused on discrimination and ethnicity.

Follow-up responses to the questionnaire showed that the
majority of programs reporting had no major changes in required
courses. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents indicated
that content on women was added to Human Behavior and Social
Environment courses during the 1980-1981 academic year.

Responses to Question A provided only general information about
content on women in required courses. These responses also
provided a base upon which to analyze responses to later ques-
tions pertaining to specific content on women in field, in
electives and in extracurricular learning opportunities.

Content on Women in Required Courses: Field or Practicum

Question B in Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to
list the names of organizations which teach field students to
work with and for women, and to describe briefly the types of
field assignments. The project recognized that most field
placements provide the opportunity to relate to some women
clients. The purpose of Question B was to gather information
about the types of assignments which specifically address dis-
tinctive needs of women.

Seventy-one percent of the baccalaureate and master's program
responding to the questionnaire reported field assignments

which address special concerns of women, many of which deal with crisis situations. These include battered women shelters, women's information and referral centers, "hot lines," rape and abuse centers, services for Lesbians and divorced women, centers for single parents and displaced homemakers. The types of field placements reported which focus on distinctive needs of women are listed in Table 1 in descending order of percentages of programs reporting their use.

There was no observable difference in the types of field assignments reported by baccalaureate and master's programs. A higher percentage of master's program respondents did state that all of their field placements focus on distinctive needs of women. A higher percentage of baccalaureate programs provided greater detail about the specific focus of learning opportunities which address distinctive needs of women in field settings.

Follow-up responses to the questionnaire revealed a continuation of the same types of setting. Several settings added to the lists provided field opportunities for preemployment and employment counseling (such as Urban League Program) in 1980-1981.

Content on Women in Elective Courses

Question C of Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to give the total number of elective courses offered in their programs during academic year 1978-1979. In addition, they were asked to list the catalog numbers and titles of elective courses offered during that year which contained content on women.

Ninety percent of baccalaureate and master's respondents reported that their programs offered one or more electives with content on women. One-tenth of these reported that there was a Women's Studies program available in the parent institution. Electives with content on women fell into two categories: 1. electives with the word "woman" or "female" in their titles, and 2. electives whose titles did not contain the word "woman" or "female."

14

TABLE 1

Types of Field Assignments and Percentages of Respondents Reporting Their Use

Types of Field Assignments with Content on Women	% Respondents Reporting Use
Women's Special Concerns (i.e. crisis centers, shelters, hot lines, rape and abuse centers, YWCA programs for pregnant adolescents, single parent and displaced homemaker counseling, etc.)	71%
Children and Adolescents (i.e. runaway houses, special care, group homes, schools, child guidance, Head Start, day care, Big Sister and Brothers, YWCA, Girls' Club, Girl Scouts, Salvation Army, etc.)	59%
Health (i.e. public departments, nursing, early infant care, clinics, general and V.A. hospitals, women's health programs, etc.)	43%
Public Social Services (i.e. housing, public welfare, human resources, welfare rights, etc.)	40%
Voluntary Family Services (i.e. under auspices that are Jewish, Catholic, Lutheran, Salvation Army, American Red Cross, etc.)	33%
Corrections (i.e. Family and Juvenile Court, retention centers, Sheriff's Department, victim witness programs, probation, etc.)	31%
Mental Health (i.e. community, psychiatric hospitals, etc.)	29%
Planned Parenthood, Family Planning, Genetic Counseling	25%
Legal Aid, Advocacy, Community Organization (i.e. Legal Aid Society, Feminist Union, Advocacy Task Forces, Community Action Corps, United Way, etc.)	20%
Aging (i.e. nursing homes, retirement villages, RSVP, day care centers, community centers, Area Agency on Aging, etc.)	20%
Physical Impairment and Handicaps (i.e. Easter Seal, developmentally disabled, rehabilitation, etc.)	14%
Other (i.e. immigration services, university testing and counseling, employment counseling, neighborhood centers, etc.)	12%

Only fifteen percent of electives with content on women had "women" or "female" in the titles. These were reported by less than half of the baccalaureate and master's programs responding to the questionnaire.

Electives with "women" in their titles most frequently offered by baccalaureate programs were courses that began "Women in...." These focused on women in history, art, society, literature, religion, psychology, and philosophy. Electives with "woman" in their titles most frequently reported by master's programs began "Women and....". These focused on policy, health, mental health, management, work, social work, and leadership. A higher percentage of master's programs reported that they offered electives focused on social work practice with women.

Other electives with "woman" in their titles reported by both baccalaureate and master's respondents included Women and Social Change Movements, Changing Male and Female Roles, Women in Corrections, Working-Class Women, Female Victims of Abuse, Aging Women, The Black Woman, La Chicana, and Asian-American Women.

Eighty-five percent of electives reported to have content on women by baccalaureate and master's programs did not contain the word "woman" or "female" in their titles. The topics most frequently addressed by over half of the respondents include health and mental health, substance abuse, Social Work and the Family, Child Welfare and Day Care, Law and Corrections, sexuality and sexism, ethnicity and racism, and gerontology.

The majority of follow-up responses to Part I of the questionnaire showed no change in electives. Approximately fifteen percent of those responding added one or two electives which focused on Women in Crisis, Aging Women, Religion and Women's Issues, Health, Women's Issues and the Family, Women and Minorities in the Work Force, and Women's Educational and Professional Development during the academic year 1980-1981.

Curriculum Decisionmakers

Question E of Part I of the questionnaire reads as follows:

> Put a check (✓) beside one or more categories of persons who made recommendations (Column B) and/or decisions (Column C) re inclusion or revision of content on women during academic year 1978-1979:

Academic Year 1978-1979: Persons or Groups Making Recommendations* and/or Decisions* re Inclusion or Revision of Curriculum Content on Women		
A Person or Group	B Made Recommendations Please Check (✓)	C Made Decisions Please Check (✓)
General Curriculum Committee	( )	( )
Specific Curriculum Committee (Give Name)	( )	( )
Women's Caucus or Committee	( )	( )
Faculty Group	( )	( )
Student Group	( )	( )
Administrative Head of Program	( )	( )
Faculty Administratively Assigned to Women's Studies	( )	( )
Faculty Teaching Course	( )	( )
Other (Please Specify)	( )	( )

*Recommendation is a suggestion; decision is suggestion that is implemented.

The majority of respondents checked more than one category. The five sources of recommendations checked most frequently by baccalaureate respondents were faculty teaching course (58%), curriculum committee (55%), administrative head (50%), faculty as a group (50%) and student group (41%). The same order was given for sources of decisions, as shown in Table 2. These were faculty teaching course (61%), curriculum committees (51%), administrative head (45%), faculty as a group (40%) and student group (10%).

The five sources of recommendations most frequently checked by master's respondents were curriculum committee (99%), faculty teaching course (63%), administrative head (43%), student group (37%) and faculty as a group (36%). There was a change in the order of sources of decisions checked most frequently by master's respondents, as shown in Table 2. These were curriculum committee (71%), faculty teaching course (50%), faculty as a group (32%), administrative head (22%) and student group (7%).

In addition less than ten percent of baccalaureate and master's respondents checked the following sources for recommendations: women's caucus, faculty administratively assigned to subject area,

affirmative action officer, field faculty, and faculty senate
or campus-wide group.

TABLE 2		
Categories of Persons Making Curriculum Recommendations and Decisions (In Descending Order of Numbers Reported)		
Baccalaureate Level	Master's Level	
Persons Reported to Make Both Recommendations AND Decisions	Persons Reported to Make Recommendations	Persons Reported to Make Decisions
-Faculty Teaching Course(s) -Curriculum Committee -Administrative Head -Faculty as a Group -Student Group	-Curriculum Committee -Faculty Teaching Course(s) -Administrative Head -Student Group -Faculty as a Group	-Curriculum Committee -Faculty Teaching Course(s) -Faculty as a Group -Administrative Head -Student Group

Follow-up responses to the questionnaire showed that the same
categories of persons recommended and made decisions about
curriculum content on women as were reported in 1980. Several
programs reported that they were also using input from an alumni
council into curriculum recommendations during academic year 1980-1981.

Extracurricular Opportunities Re Women's Concerns

Question D of Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents to
describe briefly special assignments or learning opportunities
regarding women's concerns offered by their programs in academic
year 1978 to 1979. Eighty-five percent of respondents listed
extracurricular opportunities. The activities listed were wide-
ranging. They included special programs focused on women's con-
cerns organized into one-day conferences, colloquia, workshops,
lectures, conferences, "brown bag" lunches, symposia, weekend
retreats, and "Common Day" programs. Opportunities were provided
for students to meet women in prisons, women who were rape
victims, women in special service settings, and women involved
in preretirement planning. Many of these activities were offered
in the parent institution or in the community. Similar activities
were reported by baccalaureate and master's respondents.

Responses to the follow-up questionnaire in 1981 showed that
most programs were continuing with the above activities. Additional

extracurricular activities reported in follow-up questionnaires
included an outreach program for women in rural areas, a Women's
Resource Fair, and advocacy programs for abused women.

Plans for Revision of Curriculum

Question F of Part I of the questionnaire asked respondents
to list any plans their programs had for improvement/revision
of curriculum content on women.

Twenty-eight percent of respondents from both levels reported
that they had no plans for revision of curriculum content on
women. Forty-three percent reported that a general review
of curriculum content would be undertaken but no revision
activities were anticipated. The remaining twenty-nine per-
cent anticipated that the following activities would take
place during the next academic year (listed in descending
order of numbers of programs reporting): add special interest
elective (i.e.family therapy, alternate life styles, aging,
family violence, feminist human services, child welfare,
human sexuality), add to core content (i.e. content on sexism,
middle years, ethnicity, Lesbians, child welfare, sexuality),
encourage students to enroll in university women's studies
programs, construct mechanisms to monitor curricula, add to
library resources, develop video-tapes, construct and introduce
conceptual frameworks, plan conferences on an annual basis,
set up weekly discussion groups.

Responses to follow-up questionnaires indicated that most
programs were continuing with plans to review content on women
in their programs. Twenty percent of the respondents reported
efforts directed toward faculty such as recruitment of more
female faculty (especially ethnic), provision of more role
models through use of part-time faculty and lecturers, setting
up of a women's support group of faculty and staff to pressure
the administration of the university for more equitable policies
and procedures, and conducting a faculty development seminar on
sexism. In addition, many respondents reported that they
were reviewing new Federal policies to see how they will impact
on women. Several respondents reported on a continuing search
for unbiased textbooks.

CHAPTER III

BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING EQUITY FOR WOMEN IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Focus of Survey: Part II

One of the major objectives of the project was to construct
a conceptual frame of reference for achieving equity for
women in social work education. In order to build this
frame of reference, the project sought information about
two topics: 1. how to achieve equity for women faculty
and students and curricula, and 2. what were existing
barriers to achieving equity for women. Two major sources
of information were used. They were data gathered from
questionnaires mailed to accredited social work programs and
data gathered from five program sites selected to develop
specific plans or models to achieve equity.

Chapter III summarizes barriers reported in responses to
Part II of the questionnaire mailed to accredited social work
programs. In the introduction to Part II of the questionnaire,
the following statements were made:

> The project seeks to deepen its understanding of
> problems and issues in achieving educational equity
> for women. It hopes that you will be willing to
> recommend ways to improve educational programs
> and to overcome barriers to achieving equity for
> women. While this questionnaire is focused on women,
> it is believed that the information you give can be
> used in improving educational programs for all
> persons.

> If you wish your responses to be anonymous, please
> return the form unsigned.

One hundred thirty-one baccalaureate and master's programs
responded to Part II of the questionnaire. This questionnaire
consisted of four sections, as follows: Section I--Curriculum
Planning, Section II--Educational Planning for Female Students
and Strategies for Improvement, Section III--Status of Female
Faculty and Staff and Strategies for Improvement, and
Section IV--Definition of Educational Equity in Social Work
Education.

Barriers to achieving equity for women in social work education
are reported in this chapter as ideas expressed by one or more
respondents. No attempt is made to add up numbers of similar
responses or to estimate how many social work programs are faced
with the barriers identified. This summary of responses
presented with the assumption that those working to achieve

20

equity for women in social work education recognize that
some barriers exist in all programs, all barriers reported
do not exist in all programs, and that more effective
strategies can be developed if barriers are understood.

Barriers in Curriculum Planning and Teaching

In Chapter I it was noted that an affirmative action accredita-
tion standard had been passed in 1977 by the Council on Social
Work Education's Board of Directors at the recommendation of
their Accreditation Commission. One of the areas addressed
in Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women was curriculum. The
1977 version of the standard stated that an accredited social
work program "must provide clear course objectives, outline
and content respecting the role and status of women through-
out the curriculum.[4]

In Part II of the questionnaire, respondents were asked if
there were any concerns regarding planning or teaching about
distinctive needs of women in relation to the following
aspects of curriculum planning and teaching:

1. How content on women relates to the objectives
    and mission of the educational program.
2. How the program reorganizes to update curriculum
    content.
3. What the sequence and emphasis in teaching about
    women should be.
4. What the rationale for inclusion of content on
    women is in:
    a. required courses
    b. elective courses
    c. women's studies programs or interdepart-
        mental offerings.
5. Resources relevant to women which exist outside the
    social work educational program in:
    a. the total university
    b. the community
6. The use of the advising process in helping women
    to develop educational and career plans.
7. The integration of content in class and field.
8. The role of curriculum committees, caucuses, faculty,
    and student groups.
9. The quality of curriculum materials and teaching
    technology.
10. The establishment of a non-sexist learning environment.

Statements which are representative of the kinds of responses given
to Part II of the questionnaire are presented under each
aspect of curriculum planning and teaching.

Barriers re Objectives and Mission of Program

Many respondents reported that knowledge about distinctive
needs of women is not usually designated as central to an
educational program even though the majority of professional
social workers and clients are women. Seldom does a program
state that it is concerned with gender equality. Programs
do not usually spell out their missions regarding specific
population groups, but even when they do it is hard to find
references to women in these groups through the curriculum.

Barriers re Curriculum Reorganization

It was noted by a number of respondents that initiators of
change in curriculum differ throughout social work education.
In many graduate schools of social work an "anchorperson" or
faculty member administratively assigned to a curriculum area
initiates proposed changes or a curriculum committee consents
to changes. In many small baccalaureate programs the director
or the total faculty initiates changes. Wherever the setting,
respondents identified a need for developing more effective
mechanisms for periodic review, evaluation, and updating of
curriculum.

Barriers re Sequence and Emphasis in Content

The major barrier to achieving expertise in sequencing and
emphasizing content on women was cited as insufficient testing
of alternative approaches to curriculum organization. Respondents
reported that often content is "tacked" on without considering
the nature of the student body and faculty, the mission of
the program, and "the state of the art."

Barriers re Rationale for Inclusion of Content

In required courses respondents indicated that sufficient
attention is not given to the fact that all curriculum areas
touch on concerns of women. The nature of the content will
determine its placement in required courses. Degrees of commit-
ment of faculty and students to teaching about women in required
courses vary greatly.

22

In elective courses, respondents thought that problems seem
to lie in a lack of understanding of the role of elective
courses in the curriculum in regard to supplementing knowledge,
offering new knowledge, and focusing in-depth on topics of
special interest.

Respondents believed that the rationale for presenting content
on women in university-wide women's studies programs or in
interdepartmental offerings reveals ambivalence on the part
of curriculum planners. While there is recognition of the
potential of enhanced learning opportunities, there is a
tendency in some programs to route all learning about women
to courses offered in the broad university, and to evade the
responsibility of addressing distinctive needs of women in
the professional curriculum.

Barrier re Use of Resources Outside the Social Work Program

Respondents complained that many administrators and faculty
have worn "blinders"and have not been alert to learning
opportunities and resources pertaining to women which exist
in the total university or in the surrounding community.
These include women's institutes, centers, caucuses, affirmative
action offices, shelters, women's leadership programs, etc.

Barriers re Advising Process

Problems cited by respondents which occur in the advising
process revolve around the failure of the advisor to help
a woman to set objectives relevant to her potential and
talents, to advise her of the availability of all concentrations,
and to offer help in dealing with sex role stereotyping, which
is common in institutional life. Respondents expressed the
belief that faculty who serve as advisors are often unaware
of their own stereotypic stances. A "typical" stance cited was
that of the advisor counseling a man toward an administrative
track of learning and a woman toward a direct service track.

Barriers re Integration of Class and Field

One major barrier cited by respondents was that individual
faculty members and coordinators of field placements do not
always set a priority on integration of class and field con-
tent. In addition issues related to content on women are
not often placed on the agendas of either curriculum committees
or of field planning committees. Many examples were cited of

students being assigned to field learning at women's crisis
centers without any attempt to address the meaning of crisis
for women in class content. Some respondents blamed admin-
istrators for not assigning a faculty member to coordinate
class and field planning. Even if a program has conducted
an ongoing faculty development program to orient faculty to
contemporary issues concerning women and men, field instructors
and part-time faculty are usually not included and are not
aware of the faculty's commitment.

Barriers re Role of Curriculum Committees and Caucuses

Respondents indicated that a problem arises when groups con-
vene in universities to discuss concerns of women. The problem
seems to lie in the fact that these are often well-meaning
groups which are regarded as hostile to planning carried out
by traditional curriculum committees. Administrators are not
always aware that they can set the climate for mutual respect
and for coordination of efforts of these groups with efforts
of the curriculum committees.

Barriers re Quality of Curriculum Materials and Teaching Technology

Respondents indicated that there is a general lack of recogni-
tion that it is impossible for a single faculty member to
monitor teaching approaches, to review theories and textbooks
for stereotypic views, and to keep up to date on new areas of
knowledge. Faculty who have expertise often do not articulate
what they are teaching in syllabi and in course outlines that
can be shared with others. The major barrier is the tendency
of many faculty to work alone rather than to organize a group
effort to improve the quality of curriculum materials and
teaching technology.

Barriers re Establishment of Non-sexist Learning Environment

A handful of respondents thought that this is not achievable.
Those who thought it to be a worthwhile goal blamed administrators
for lack of visible support for equality in education, and
for lack of effort in hiring administrators and faculty free of
sexist biases. Respondents referred to the lack of a climate
which supports free expression of ideas and feelings by men
and women throughout the educational process. There is lack
of awareness by faculty and students of the variety of ways
sexism is expressed in an institution. A major problem is
"tolerating" differences rather than encouraging innovation
and creativity.

Non-Curriculum Barriers to Achieving Equity for Women

When Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women was proposed, its
authors recognized that if equity is to be achieved for
women in social work education, special efforts must be
made in non-curriculum areas as well as in curriculum
content. The 1977 version of Standard 1234B-Women stated
that:

1. Equity shall be assured to women in faculty and
   staff recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure,
   assignment, and remuneration.

2. Equity shall be assured to women in student
   admissions, field placement, and financial aid.5

The questions in Part II of the project questionnaire asked
respondents whether there were barriers to achieving equity
for women in non-curriculum areas. Statements which are
representative of the kinds of responses given to Part II are
presented in categories of barriers in the profession,
barriers in the institution, barriers affecting administrators
and faculty, and barriers affecting students. As stated
earlier, respondents were not required to sign Part II of
the questionnaire. Responses were given anonymously.

Barriers in the Profession

A number of respondents pointed out that social work education
operates within the historical traditions and value orienta-
tions of the profession. They thought that professional
organizations should be more visible in their support of
gender equality. An accrediting organization should maintain
strong guidelines re equity for women, create task forces
to monitor educational policies and practices, and set up
workshops to sensitize educators to the concerns of women
in the profession, and in higher education.

Barriers in the Institution

Barriers in the institution were explained by respondents as
resulting from holding on to old values and traditions which
view women as "second-class citizens." Those concerned about
these barriers pointed to a lack of understanding of the per-
vasiveness of institutional sexism. Respondents thought that
there is a lack of flexibility in the educational requirements

of many universities. Some gave examples of a bias against
appointing women to top administrative posts and to "male
dominated" Boards of Regents. Several respondents pointed
out that in some institutions there is "absolute silence"
concerning women's contributions throughout all fields of
study.

Barriers Affecting Administrators and Faculty

Attitudinal Barriers:

Respondents, many of whom are male administrators, identified
attitudes which produce biased behavior toward women. These
include apathy, insensitivity, indifference, self-interest,
a "closed mind," hostility, and resistance. Men and women
possessing these characteristics were said to be tradition
oriented, negative to   affirmative action efforts, and
subtle in the use of discriminating behavior. Male admin-
istrators possessing these attitudes were labeled as
"elitist," uncommitted to being an equal opportunity employer,
and biased toward men as more competent than women. A few
thought that some female administrators had a "Queen Bee
Complex" which they defined as "women who forget other women"
when they "make it to the top."

Responses in this category were given anonymously, and were
accompanied by many examples of incidents in which respondents
thought women had not been treated on an equal footing with men.

Barriers in Employment Practices:

The problems which bar women faculty from receiving treatment
equal to that received by male faculty were said to lie in
policies and procedures pertaining to hiring, promotion,
advancement, retention, tenure, and compensation. Female
faculty were reported by the majority of respondents as hired
for lower salaries, and lower priority (soft money") positions
where there is less responsibility. One-fourth of the respon-
dents reported on situations where there is "harassment" or
"intimidation" of female candidates for positions. Many of
the examples given referred to discrimination against more
"mature" applicants (age 40 and older).

Respondents referred to criteria for retention and advance-
ment as "empirically defined by males." Acceptable behaviors
on the job were reported to be more "constricted" for female faculty.

One example cited was that a man who is assertive shows
"leadership capacity," while an assertive woman is judged
to be "hostile." Respondents thought that the female must
be "scholarly, congenial, and superior" to her male counter-
part if she is to be advanced or granted tenure. Some
respondents believed that there are more opportunities for
male faculty to engage in "extra salary" projects
(i.e. research). Male faculty were viewed as having more
mentors in the administrative structure of the institution.

Barriers Affecting Students

Respondents identified certain groups of female students as
being more vulnerable within higher education. These include
female applicants for doctoral programs, women reentering the
profession after marriage and family experiences, single
parents and heads of households who need an income while in
training for a career, women from lower socioeconomic back-
grounds, minority women, rural women from conservative back-
grounds, physically impaired women, and women who are under
25 or over 40 years of age. Barriers to recruiting members
of these groups were reported to be found in the lack of
supports (fiscal and non-fiscal), and in the rigidity of
institutional requirements (i.e. residence, class hours,
limited number of classes for part-time students, etc.).

Problems in educational planning for students were assessed
by respondents as stemming from stereotyping of women students,
whether it be in the grading of class and field performance,
in the awarding of stipends, in the assigning of field place-
ments, or in counseling toward specific concentrations.
Examples were cited which referred to awarding of higher stipends
and research grants to male heads of households rather than
to females with the same responsibility.

A handful of respondents noted that they knew of no barriers
to equity for physically impaired students. One of these
respondents stated that "my program has no barriers for
physically impaired students; we don't accept any."

Overview of Responses to Part II

Responses to Part II of the questionnaire focused only on
problems or barriers to achieving equity for women. In no
way were respondents suggesting that all university settings
had all of the above barriers or that these barriers prevented

programs from functioning at an effective level. There did
seem to be wide-spread recognition, however, that a quality
curriculum which addresses distinctive needs of women must
be supported by sound practices and policies which respect
the rights and contributions of female and male administra-
tors, faculty, and students.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPING SPECIFIC PLANS OF ACTION TO ACHIEVE EQUITY FOR WOMEN

Selection of Program Sites

Responses to the survey conducted by the project confirmed
that a large number of administrators of baccalaureate and
master's degree programs in social work thought that their
programs would be improved by equity efforts directed toward
women faculty and staff, and toward curriculum content.
Information gathered through the survey showed that many
administrators had ideas about strategies to achieve equity
for women, but were uncertain about the most productive
approaches to organizing efforts within their own programs
to carry out these strategies.

Phase II consisted of a planned effort by the project to
respond to those who were committed to developing individual
plans of achieving equity for women, but who sought the
advice of experts on how to proceed. A question had been asked
in Part I of the project survey as follows:

> During the academic year (1980-1981) project con-
> sultants will be available to five programs in
> Federal regions III, IV, VIII, IX and X. The project
> will select programs with a range of characteristics.
> If you would like your program to be considered as
> one of the five programs, check "yes" below. If your
> program is selected, you will have an opportunity to
> discuss and reconsider your decision.

The five Federal regions had been selected for the project
before the proposal was submitted to the U.S. Education
Department. A review of regions receiving funding from the
Women's Educational Equity Act had shown that the five regions
selected had submitted fewer proposals for funding.

Forty-one of the programs in Federal regions III, IV, VIII, IX
and X were interested, twelve were undecided and eleven were
not interested. Sixty-four of the programs outside of Federal
regions III, IV, VIII, IX and X also expressed interest in
receiving consultation.

Project staff and consultants who acted as an advisory group
to the director developed a set of criteria for selection of
one program site in each of the five predetermined Federal
regions.

Each program site would be invited to develop specific plans
during the 1980 to 1981 academic year to achieve equity for
women in their own programs. Each program site would be
provided a project consultant to assist in its efforts.

Program sites selected were to meet the following criteria:

1. Accredited status
2. Unique combination of characteristics that dis-
   tinguished it from the other programs selected
   (i.e. ethnic representation on faculty or in
   student body, rural or urban location, public
   or private auspices, ratio of male to female
   faculty, mission of program, age of student body,
   etc.)
3. An expressed interest in participating in the project
   by the administrator.

The five programs selected in Federal regions III, IV, VIII,
IX and X did meet these criteria. Time and money limitations
prevented the project from providing consultation to all
programs meeting the same criteria.

Assignment of Consultants to Program Sites

The project invited the five programs to identify barriers
to equity for women in their own settings, and to develop
plans of action to overcome barriers. A consultant was
provided by the project to assist with the development of
strategic models of equity for women during the academic year
1980 to 1981. Each consultant was paid by the project to
make the equivalent of three full day on-site visits. In
cases where consultants traveled only a short distance to
programs, consultation visits were more frequent and were
scheduled for portions of a day.

Although each of the five programs selected to participate
were asked to be self-directed in the choice of a barrier
to equity to be addressed, the project set forth empirical
definitions, principles of operation and working agreements
in a manual which was available to all involved in the project.
The administrator of each program was asked to appoint a work
group of faculty and students whose major task would be to
identify a problem or barrier to achieving equity for women,
and to develop and begin to implement a plan of action to
overcome the agreed upon barrier.

Establishment of Working Agreements and Work Groups
at Program Sites

"Contracts" or working agreements were negotiated at several
levels. The project director and administrator of each of the
five programs agreed upon objectives, time frame, and assign-
ment of a consultant. Each consultant and the dean or director
of the program to which she was assigned agreed upon a general
plan which included the following commitments:

1. The consultant would make up to three
    visits to the program during a six-month period
    for the purpose of sharing expertise and
    facilitating the efforts of the work group.
2. The work group to be appointed by the dean or
    director who sanctioned their use of time on the
    project should include, at the minimum, a represen-
    tative of the program's curriculum planning
    committee and a faculty member and student with
    an orientation and commitment to women's concerns.
    It would be up to the program to decide whether
    additional members should be added. Additional
    members might include the university affirmative
    action officer or a member of the practice community.
3. The work group would agree to select the barrier to
    be addressed, and to develop a specific plan of
    action to overcome the barrier in accordance with
    project deadlines.
4. The consultant would be responsible for a descrip-
    tion of the model developed in the program, and
    would assist the work group with completing a
    written plan of action.
5. The five written plans of action and models would
    be used as the base for a project report and pub-
    lication, to be prepared by the project director
    and the consultants by the end of the second year
    of the project.

Development of Plans of Action by Program Sites

The project set forth guidelines for developing a plan of
action, and asked that the following elements be included in
the written documents:

1. Overall assessment of status of program's curriculum
    re distinctive needs of women.
2. Identification of one problem area or barrier to be
    worked on.

3. Listing of possible strategies to overcome barriers.
4. Selection of specific strategy with discussion of:
    a. What -- description of strategy.
    b. Why -- rationale for selection.
    c. How -- techniques and resources utilized.
    d. When -- timing and sequence of activities.
    e. Where-- location of activities.
    f. Who -- persons involved.
5. Projected products and outcomes.
6. Evaluation of process and procedures.
7. Implications for replication in higher education.

The work group was asked to be responsible for the writing of
this plan to be submitted to the project director through
the consultant. This request was based on recognition that
the document was the program's own plan to be implemented from
within the program. It also gave the project director and
consultants a chance to see the perspectives of the work group
on the objectives of the project.

CHAPTER V

A FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR ACHIEVING EQUITY

During academic year 1980 to 1981 five project consultants
worked with administrators and work group members at five pro-
gram sites to develop unique plans to achieve educational equi-
ty for women. At the end of the academic year, project consul-
tants met with the project director to review the work of the
project and to decide how to share the knowledge gained from
activities at the five program sites with others in social work
education. Although the most logical approach was to report on
experiences at each of the program sites individually, there was
concern about respecting confidentiality. In addition, it be-
came clear that there were common elements in the five experi-
ences.

A decision was made to construct a conceptual frame of refer-
ence which would address eight areas of activity assessed as
central to efforts to achieve educational equity for women.
The frame of reference could be utilized as a base for organ-
izing equity efforts in any social work program whether they
be initiated by administrators, faculty or students.

The eight elements common to the five experiences which were
selected for the frame of reference are institutional factors,
consultant's relationship to the institution and to the social
work program,organization of work group, focus of change efforts,
selection of strategies for change, projected outcomes, moni-
toring and evaluation, and institutionalizing the gains.

Key factors are identified and a brief description of related
activities that took place in the program sites is given in
this chapter. Guidelines for use of each element in the frame
of reference are presented in Chapter VI.

Institutional Factors

Factors in the Institution

There are wide variations in characteristics of colleges and
universities throughout the country which ar; parent institu-
tions to the 359 accredited social work programs.6 In order to
set up an effective working model of educational equity in any
of these programs, it is necessary to understand the nature of
the parent institution and the special characteristics of the
social work program within its walls.

Institutional factors include:

> 1.   Nature of parent institution(i.e., size,facilities,
>   personnel, auspices, hierarchical structure, re-
>   sources, composition of faculty and study body,

regional and sociopolitical considerations).
2. Place of social work program within the parent
   institution (i.e. autonomy, availability of and
   competition for resources, interdepartmental
   relationships).
3. Nature of social work program (i.e. mission,
   degrees awarded, administration, faculty,
   students, resource availability, community and
   regional involvement, alumni, accreditation status).

Nature of Parent Institution

The nature of the parent institution proved to be an important
element in the project in that it provided a frame of reference
or context for activities within the five program sites.
For example, in one program site the mission of the university
to provide educational opportunities for "less privileged
persons" was reflected in the types of project activities
initiated by the work group. In one program site the tradi-
tionally conservative orientation of the university was noted
as a factor to consider, with some assessment that this factor
had less influence on the curriculum than it did in past years.

The parent institutions of the five program sites used in
the project have the following characteristics as a group:[7]

Regions of Country: Pacific Coast--one program; North-
west--one program; Southwest--one program, Southeast--
one program; Mid-Atlantic Coast--one program.

Location: Urban Area--two programs; Suburbs--two
programs; Rural Area--one program.

Auspices: Public-State--four programs; Private-Church
related--one program.

Ethnic/Gender Identification: Non-ethnic coeducational--
four programs; Black coeducational--one program.

Full-time Enrollment: 2,000-4,999--one program;
5,000-9,999--two programs;20,000 and over--two programs.

Place of Social Work Program Within Institution

At all program sites, consideration was given to how the
development of a model of equity would be received within the

parent institution or within the department within which the
social work program was situated. It should be noted that
the five program sites elected to focus on change efforts
within their own social work programs rather than within the
total university, perhaps realizing that they had more control
over projected outcomes. However, in all five program sites
there were efforts to reach out to use resource persons and
materials and to collaborate on projects with faculty from
ther departments.

Within one program site it was reported that "there was
some institutional pressure to cooperate with other depart-
ments," which led the work group in that site to make visible
efforts to "enhance interdepartmental relationships and
shared use of resources." Within two program sites there
was an expressed "sensitivity to fiscal problems" within the
total institution, and "to a constant pressure to prove the
contribution of the social work program" to the institut .
The need for long-term change efforts was directed toward
the parent institution in one program site, as concern was
expressed about equitable advancement, tenure, and salary
opportunities for women. In one program site the activities
of a work group were extended to include faculty of two other
branches with social work programs in the state. In one
program site the administrator of the social work program
purposefully set up a work group which included several faculty
outside of his department who were leaders regarding women's
concerns in the university community.

In all five program sites there was an expressed awareness
of the importance of a dynamic working relationship between
the administrator of the social work program and the hierarchy
within the parent institution.

Nature of Social Work Program

Characteristics of the five social work programs selected to
be program sites for the project include the following:[8]

> Levels of Social Work Education: Graduate only--one
> program; Joint Graduate and Baccalaureate--one program;
> Baccalaureate only--three programs.
>
> Accreditation Status: All programs were accredited by
> the Accreditation Commission of the Council on Social
> Work Education. Three of the five programs were scheduled
> for reaccreditation review during the coming year, which
> meant that they were preparing self-studies showing that
> they had met the requirements of accreditation standards
> (including Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women).

Administration of Social Work Programs: Sex: Male
Administrators--three programs; Female administrators--
two programs. Ethnicity: Caucasian--three programs;
Black American--one program; Asian-American--one program.

Full-time Faculty: Number: Six--three programs; four-
teen--one program; thirty--one program. Ratio of Male
to Female: 50% Male--two programs; 66% Male--two programs;
100% Male--one program. Percentage of Faculty with Tenure:
33%--one program; 40%--two programs;50%--two programs
Ethnicity (Ratio of Ethnic to Non-Ethnic): 12% Ethnic--
two programs; 50% Ethnic--two programs;66% Ethnic--one
program. (Majority of faculty in five program sites
from ethnic backgrounds is Black. Several come from
Asian-American backgrounds).

Full-time Students: Number: 50 to 100--one program;
100-150--one program; 150-200--one program; 200-250--
one program; 400-450--one program. Number to Whom Social
Work Degrees Awarded (1978-1979 Academic Year): 25-50
degrees--two programs; 51-75 degrees-two programs; 76-100
degrees--one program. Ratio of Male to Female Students:
20% Male--one program; 35% Male--two programs; 50% Male--
two programs. Ethnicity (Ratio of Ethnic to Non-Ethnic):
35-45% Ethnic-- four programs; 80% Ethnic--one program.
(The largest number of students from ethnic backgrounds
was black students from a black university. Students
from other programs who were of ethnic backgrounds included
sixteen who were black, nine who were Chicano, six who
were Native American, three who were Puerto Rican, and
one who was Asian-American.)

Consultant's Relationship to the Institution
and to the Social Work Program

Factors in the Consultation Process

The consultant was viewed by the project as a person who would
draw upon her own expertise and skills to facilitate the develop-
ment of a model of equity within the program site. The con-
sultation process was viewed as time limited. Success was
projected by the project to be the initiation of change efforts
to achieve equity for women in social work education that would
become self-perpetuating. The project built its approach to
consultation on the premise that each accredited social work
program site selected had the commitment and adequate resources
to take on self-directed quality improvement efforts.

The process of consultation included the following activities:

1. Exploring varying expectations of the consulta-
   tion process and clarifying reciprocal roles.
2. Establishing a working relationship between the
   consultant and administrator, with work group
   members and with other interested faculty and
   students; meeting individually or in group
   settings.
3. Establishing a working agreement to decide upon
   achievable goals, setting up a manageable
   schedule of work and maintaining focus of project.
4. Installing and using mechanisms for reporting,
   monitoring, and evaluation.
5. Identifying appropriate resources.
6. Helping to institutionalize gains.
7. Terminating the consultation process.

Stages in the Consultation Process

The relationship of the consultant to the social work program
can be described in three stages: initial stage, middle stage,
and termination.

Initial Stage:

The initial stage began with the first telephone contact of
the consultant with the administrator of the social work
program. (This followed the establishment of an overall
agreement between the project director and administrator.)
In each case the consultant made an appointment to meet with
the administrator at the program site.

The administrator of all five program sites had verbalized
to the project director an interest in receiving consultation
from the project, and had confirmed that they were in agree-
ment with project objectives. They appeared to want to become
a part of a national project sponsored by the Council on Social
Work Education, and funded by the U.S. Department of Education.
All administrators seemed to view the project as assisting
them indirectly in updating a part of their programs, which
would be reviewed during the reaccreditation process. There
was an understanding by all of the administrators that the
project was in no way connected with the Council's accreditation
process and did not have access to information gathered in
accreditation self-studies. During this period it was also
important for the consultants to identify themselves as representing
the project rather than their own universities or organizations.

Four of the five administrators indicated that they had not
done extensive work on curriculum planning regarding women
and looked forward to assistance from the consultants. Admin-
istrators and work group members in these four programs looked
to the consultants to move into their programs as "experts"
who would "tell" their faculty what they needed to do to up-
date their programs. The consultants' response to requests
to act as "experts" was to reshift the focus to the program
sites and to tell administrators and work groups that they
were the "experts" on making decisions about what the focus
of equity efforts would be within their own programs. The
consultants pointed out that there were barriers to equity
in all programs of higher education. The consultants would
be glad to act as "facilitators" who had knowledge which
they would share along the way about educational planning
and use of appropriate resources. The fifth program site,
where the administrator was viewed nationally as having
expertise on women's issues, moved more quickly to accept the
role of the consultant as "facilitator" or "catalyst."

In all cases the consultants moved as quickly as possible
to establish working agreements and to involve members of
work groups in the planning process. During the first on-
site consultation visit consultants made contacts with either
the total work group or with one to three members.

During the initial stage of consultation, the consultants
reported that they carried out the following roles:

-gathered information about the program site,
 including a general assessment of resources avail-
 able in the parent institution;
-provided a context for work by defining educational
 equity, by describing a non-sexist learning environ-
 ment, by interpreting project objectives;
-set the stage for organizing efforts and the setting
 of goals by the work group;
-agreed to recommend appropriate resources;
-initiated a time-limited working relationship that was
 supportive of self-directed efforts within the program
 site;
-set up a schedule and working agreement;
-clarified that the consultant was a project representa-
 tive and not a representative of her own institution
 or of the Council's Accreditation Commission.

During the initial stage, consultants indicated that they
made an attempt to understand "where program sites were" in
their efforts to achieve equity for women, and what the varied

expectations of persons within the educational program were. Several consultants sensed that they would play a role in mediating dialogue between special interest groups during later stages of consultation.

There was a difference in the number of on-site visits that each consultant would make. Although a total of up to three one-day on-site visits was promised by each consultant, it later proved to be true that the two consultants who lived within driving distance of their program sites made five to seven on-site visits which were of shorter duration than one day. All consultants made themselves available for telephone contacts from administrators and work group members.

Middle Stage:

The middle stage of the consultation process was essentially a "work" stage. In four of the five program sites, one work group had been assigned specific tasks and had agreed to a tight work schedule. In these program sites, the role of the consultant became that of facilitator and resource person (i.e. helping to maintain the focus of the project, meeting with the work group, providng feedback to reports, raising appropriate questions, making constructive suggestions, recommending and providing resource materials, and reviewing the manageability of the work schedule).

In the fifth program, work assignments had been dispersed according to the interest of subgroups. The consultant played a role here in facilitating interaction between and among these subgroups. In all cases the social work administrators participated along with the work groups and consultants in developing a plan to achieve equity.

Termination:

During the termination stage, the focus of consultation shifted back to the reality of completing project activities and reports, and assisting program sites in establishing ongoing mechanisms for monitoring and updating educational programs. The concern of all consultants became how to assist program sites to institutionalize gains resulting from project activities. Consultant efforts during the termination stage were directed toward assisting programs to continue self-help efforts to achieve equity for women. The stage included a review of what had been accomplished and what needed to be worked on in the short-term and long-term future. As appears to be the case with many time-limited consultation efforts,

the consultants believed that the termination stage came
upon them too quickly, and they wished that there had been
more time to review observable gains from project activities
and to assist program sites to set up mechanisms for ensuring
long-term gains.

Organization of Work Group

Organizing Factors

One of the requirements of the project was that the admin-
istrator of each program site appoint a work group to carry
out project goals during academic year 1980-1981. The
following stipulations regarding the work group were a part
of the agreement established between the administrator of
the program site and the project director or consultant:

    1.   At the minimum, the work group should include
        a representative of the program site's curriculum
        committee (or key decisionmaking group), as well as
        at least one faculty member and at least one
        student with a demonstrated commitment to women's
        concerns. The program would decide if additional
        members should be added to the work group.
        (Other suggested possible work group members
        include field instructors and other representa-
        tives of the practice community, part-time
        instructors, alumni, members of women's caucuses,
        affirmative action officer, faculty outside of
        the social work program, etc.)

    2.   The administrator must approve the use of the
        work group's time on the project.

    3.   The work group should select a barrier to equity
        to be addressed, and should develop, with the
        assistance of the project consultant, a plan of
        action to achieve equity for women in its program
        (to improve one aspect of the program as it
        relates to women).

    4.   The administrator, at his or her discretion, would
        serve as a full or ad hoc member of the work group.

Composition of Work Groups

The five program sites used five different types of work
groups. One graduate program set up an initial work group

40

composed of the administrator, two female faculty members, and two female students. This group later expanded to include interested faculty from different branches of the university.

The three baccalaureate-only program sites chose three other approaches. One work group included all faculty in the program (male and female), plus three students (female). A second work group included two female students, all faculty at the program site (all male), plus four prominent women in the university (associate dean of women, director of instructional development, professor of English, and professor of anthropology). Another work group was composed of two members of the curriculum committee (male and female), a student (who chose not to attend meetings--female), and a prominent member of the practice community (female administrator), who was also a member of the curriculum committee.

A fifth program site encouraged subgroups to work on specific plans according to their interests. One subgroup of three female students developed a research project with the assistance of their research professor (male), and expanded to include additional female students for discussion group purposes. In addition, informal discussions were held by faculty members about the place of issues concerning women and minority group members in the curriculum.

Operational Questions about Work Groups

Work groups set up their own schedules and met regularly. Consultants arranged to meet with work groups when they were making on-site visits. Administrators also met regularly with work groups.

Experiences at the five program sites showed that the following operational questions need to be considered:

1. Is the work group representative of:
   Faculty (full and part-time)?
   Students?
   Practice Community?
   Ethnic Groups?
   Special Interest Groups?

2. Is the functioning of all members of the work group maximal or minimal? What is the rationale for short-term participation of some members?

3. Does the work group have decisionmaking power or have a link to decisionmaking groups within the program site?

4. Is the administrator committed to sanction and
    support the work group?

5. Is the work group an ad hoc structure or an ongoing
    structure?

6. How does the selection of problems to be worked on
    affect the composition of work group? Vice versa?

7. Does the work group have a realistic schedule
    and manageable plan?

8. Does the work group have the respect and support
    of other groups within the system?

9. What is the nature of the contract between the
    work group and the administrator and between the
    work group and the consultant?

10. How are the recommendations of the work group to be
    implemented? If it is an ad hoc group, who will
    monitor gains?

Foci of Change Efforts

Factors in Focusing Change Efforts

The following questions were identified as central to the
focus of change efforts:

1. What is the barrier or problem area to be focused
    on?
        a. What are differing perceptions of this barrier?
        b. What is at the core of the problem?
2. What is the target of change?
        a. Is the target attitudes or behavior?
        b. Is the target policies or procedures or structure?
        c. Is the target a concrete one such as
            curriculum syllabi, outlines, bibliographies?
3. What are the target groups that will benefit from
    the change?

Problem or Barrier to be Addressed

A wide range of questions was considered by administrators
and work groups, with the assistance of consultants. These include:

1. Does the social work curriculum adequately address distinctive needs of women?

2. Are students taught to work with female clients from varying sociocultural and economic backgrounds, all age levels and with differing needs?

3. Are persons in the system supportive of the goal of achieving a non-sexist learning environment?

4. Are teaching technologies and curriculum materials unbiased and up to date?

5. Is there an ongoing program of resource and instructional development?

6. Are institutional policies, practices and structures supportive of equity in opportunity and recognition for men and women?

7. Do faculty and students from varying backgrounds and with differing points of view have opportunities to advance and to be recognized within the program?

8. Are there fiscal and other supports (i.e. advisors) available to students?

There appeared to be recognition by work groups at the five program sites that there are barriers or problems that exist in every institutional setting. There was agreement that the answer to question 1 about whether a social work curriculum adequately addresses distinctive needs of women is universally "no." Every program needs periodic updating and improvement in quality. Two of the five program sites decided that they would begin to review the curriculum to see what should be updated and improved. A third program had begun the process several years before and decided to continue the focus on curriculum in depth. The work groups of these three program sites also decided, with the assistance of administrators and consultants, to proceed to address questions 2,3,4 and 5 (practice teaching, support in environment, teaching technologies and curriculum materials, resource and instructional development).

Question 6 regarding structures, policies and practices was not given priority by program sites, although some problems were recognized in relation to equal pay and advancement for faculty and staff. The five programs decided to give priority to questions where they thought change could be initiated within the time limitations of the project, and within the confines of the social work program. Question 8 regarding

supports available to students was indirectly addressed by
all work groups, with the emphasis on non-fiscal supports.
(It is interesting to note that program sites did not
interpret the objectives of the project as that of urging
program sites to spend large amounts of money on developing
resources. All program sites indicated that they had some
money available for addition of resource materials as needed.)

The work group at the fourth program began with question 3,
which asks whether persons in the system are supportive of
the goal of achieving a non-sexist learning environment.
This group chose to focus on whether administration and
faculty within the social work program were perceived to be
sexist in attitudes or behavior. This program site raised
the question with students and alumni.

The focus of the fifth program was on question 7, which asks,
do faculty and students from varying backgrounds and with
differing points of view have opportunities to advance and
to be recognized within the program? This program focused
its attention on how persons can tap expertise gained from
life experiences so that they can utilize the educational
program to achieve career goals. Basic to their concerns
were issues relating both to women and to members of ethnic
minority groups. It should be noted that this focus is in
line with the stated mission of the parent institution of
that program site.

Targets of Change

Three of the work groups clearly focused on curriculum as
the target. The fourth work group began addressing attitudes
of administration and faculty within the social work program.
The fifth addressed educational needs of learners from varying
backgrounds.

Target Groups

It was clear that all work groups hoped that the primary
group to benefit from project efforts would be the student
group. However, the second target group to benefit from
project efforts was clearly established as social work faculty.
In addition, there was an implicit assumption that clients
in the social work profession would receive the benefit of
enhanced professional functioning. Both men and women in
the social work program (administration, faculty, staff,
students) were perceived as benefiting from the sensitizing
of students and faculty to more effective ways to ensure
equality of opportunity. At one program site, one target group

became the spouses of female students, who pointed out the importance of having the support of "significant others" as one pursues a demanding career.

Selection of Strategies for Change

Factors in Selection of Strategies

The following questions should be considered in selecting strategies or vehicles for change:

1. What is the range of strategies possible?
   a. Are current ones being used effectively?
   b. Are new approaches needed?
2. Who will be the change agent(s), what is the power and capacity of the change agent(s) within the total system, and is networking among change agents and members of target groups needed?
3. What is the most manageable strategy to initiate the process of change within the constraints of personnel, resources, and time?
4. How do alternative strategies affect special interest groups?
5. How can strategies fit into long-range plans to benefit the educational system?

A major assumption made explicit by the project was that there is no perfect strategy to overcome a specific barrier to achieving equity. There are alternative strategies which have varying degrees of effectiveness in different settings. This is an important principle to social work educational programs, which show wide variations throughout the country. It was the hope of the project that each of the five program sites would "shed some light" on what the most effective change strategies are within educational settings with specific kinds of characteristics.

Alternative Strategies Used in Project

Work groups at the five program sites selected a variety of strategies to carry out the plans they developed. These fell into categories of strategies directed toward curriculum content, toward instructional development, toward resource development, and toward meeting educational needs of students. The strategies listed on the following pages were carried out at one or more of the program sites. The wording of the strategies is taken from reports of consultants and of administrators

and members of work groups at the five program sites.

Curriculum Strategies:

-identified content on women as "mainstream" and
 applicable to required course content;
-incorporated content into frame of reference used
 to "mainstream" minority content into core curriculum;
-developed a theoretical frame of reference to organize
 student learnings in every course in curriculum; used
 model to integrate thinking about women and men in
 every radical and ethnic group, every social class,
 and at every critical life situation;
-reviewed and made changes in content in all
 required and elective courses;
-offered new elective courses (such as Women and
 Self Esteem, Women and Career Development, etc.);
-disseminated material to faculty on incorporating
 content on women into basic methods, Human Behavior
 and Social Environment, and social policy courses;
-updated syllabi and bibliographies for each course
-set up an open forum to evaluate curriculum.

Instructional Development Strategies:

-carried out a plan for instructional development
 to improve course presentations, with attention
 to how and when to introduce a non-sexist perspective
 and how to deal with sexism in textbooks;
-incorporated concept of equity at every level of
 teaching;
-asked each faculty member to focus on proposing
 changes in one required course, to be acted on and
 implemented during following academic year;
-held discussions about course content in open
 sessions in which faculty made public commitments
 to change efforts;
-supported ongoing work of individual faculty members
 already involved in individual efforts to update
 curriculum content on women;
-developed an outreach plan to assist women social workers
 in agencies in better use of new content related to
 women; planned collaboration of classroom faculty with
 field faculty to reinforce teaching in each setting;
-developed a questionnaire to evaluate whether sexism
 permeated any aspect of teaching in the social work
 program;
-invited faculty members in the university community
 to share their expertise on women's issues with social
 work faculty.

Resource Development Strategies:

- -provided samples of course outlines, bibliographies, national publications;
- -sought information about resources used in other program sites, in other social work programs, and in the parent institutions;
- -developed list of persons working on similar issues in social work education;
- -explored possible future involvement of professionals in the practice community in change efforts.

Strategies Directed Toward Students:

- -initiated a research project focused on how social work students can draw upon previous knowledge, skills, and experience to advance in educational program and in career development;
- -planned sessions with spouses of female students to gain their support in career advancement;
- -surveyed students and alumni for ideas about improving social work programs as they relate to women;
- -solicited input into curriculum revision from the student body;
- -developed a plan to measure student learning.

Change Agents

The direct change agents in this project were the five administrators and members of work groups at the program sites. The consultants acted as facilitators of the change process.

In addition, program sites directed its efforts through using the assistance of one or more of the following groups of change agents:

1. administrators (associate and assistant deans or directors)
2. curriculum committees and heads of curriculum areas
3. faculty in the social work program (full-time, part-time, class, field)
4. students
5. alumni
6. members of the practice community
7. persons with expertise on women's issues in the total university.

The experience of the project confirmed in practice what is known in theory: that a change agent canrot function

effectively unless he or she has a direct link to those who make decisions within the hierarchy of the university.

Projected Outcomes

Factors in Projecting Outcomes

The following questions should be considered in projecting outcomes of planned change:

1. What are the short-term changes that can be achieved?

2. What are the long-term changes that can be achieved?

3. How can short-term and long-term change be measured?

The following outcomes were projected by project administrators and work groups:

1. A climate for attitudinal change of both men and women, which is demonstrated by concern, optimism, respect for diverse stands on issues, and use of non-sexist language in classrooms and in university.

2. A structure for dialogue on issues related to women which includes consideration of theories taught, roles imposed by society, preparation of women for adminis-trative positions, and diverse stands on issues.

3. A source of educational materials which has been reviewed for sexist language, and which has new and improved documents.

4. A public commitment to long-term institutional change directed at barriers to equal opportunity for women.

5. A plan for ongoing monitoring of curriculum dealing with women's concerns, which is carried out periodically with involvement of faculty and other appropriate persons.

6. A conceptual framework for incorporating content on persons of varying social statuses.

7. A plan for incorporating women's content into social work courses, and for ensuring non-sexist approaches to teaching.

48

8. A plan to test outcomes for all students at
   graduation in general areas of minority content,
   content on women, and sexist bias.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Factors in Monitoring and Evaluation

Questions which should be considered in setting up monitoring
and evaluation mechanisms are:

1. In regard to area to be monitored, what were the
   original goals established, by whom, and when
   were they instituted?
2. What are the most appropriate monitoring mechanisms
   to use?
3. Who will do the monitoring, and to whom are the
   monitors accountable?
4. What will be done with the results of monitoring?
5. Are mechanisms for monitoring permanent or temporary?

Monitoring and Evaluation at Program Sites

The consultant played a role at each site in establishing the
principle that the project was concerned that activities at
the program site be carried out in such a way that there was
a permanent impact of benefit to each program. In order to
accomplish this, it was necessary to build in mechanisms for
monitoring and evaluation which would extend beyond the time-
limited involvement of the project.

The following are experts from reports from the program sites
which demonstrate the kinds of monitoring undertaken by the
work groups:

> The charge to the work group was viewed as including
> the monitoring and evaluation function. The group took
> responsibility for this at every stage of work, and the
> outcomes of the evaluation supported an outreach
> approach to other faculty members. Activities included
> avoiding difficulties encountered, strengthening areas
> of promise, building support among administrators,
> assuring that the program's curriculum committee utilizes
> the learnings from the work group experience.
>
> The work group examined the curriculum to determine the
> validity of its assumption that every curriculum area
> was touched by new perspectives on women, and that the

good that already existed in the curriculum (regarding
equity for women) would be maintained as new dimensions
were built in. They worked to see that supports were
organized for the isolated women working in administra-
tive positions, whether in the university or in a social
work agency, and that the program continue to be sensitive
to students, graduates, and faculty with family respon-
sibilities.

Institutionalizing the Gains

Factors in Institutionalizing Gains

Questions to consider in institutionalizing gains are:

1. How can the work group incorporate planning for
    institutionalizing gains into its efforts from
    the beginning?
2. Who are the key persons outside the work group whose
    support is needed?
3. How can the work group interpret its efforts and
    products so that they will have meaning for the
    broader university community?

Institutionalizing Gains at Program Sites

At the time of completion of this report, program sites will
not have had time to complete plans for institutionalizing
gains from the project. Four out of five work groups initiated
through the project have agreed to continue with plans through
the following academic year. As mentioned earlier in the
report, there was an intention on the part of administrators
to use gains from the project as a way of meeting the require-
ments of Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women. One program site
reported that its work group had joined efforts with others
in the university to make recommendations to benefit women
to the university faculty sanate. Another program site
reported that it would extend its activities to persons at
other branches of the university. If the project had not had
a time-limited period, it would have been possible for con-
sultants to provide more assistance to work groups in their
efforts to institutionalize gains from the project.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND GUIDELINES

This report has presented an overview of activities conducted during two phases of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education between July 1, 1979 and June 30, 1981. The project had as its major objectives the seeking of information about alternative strategies to achieve educational equity, and the construction of a frame of reference which could be used universally to organize efforts to improve the quality of educational programs as they relate to female administrators, faculty and students, and to curriculum content which addresses distinctive needs of women. The ultimate aim of the project was to identify alternative strategies to improve educational programs for both men and women, and to gain a clearer understanding of how a non-sexist learning environment can be achieved. Guidelines for initiating equity efforts are presented here.

Historical Perspective

Chapter I of this report gave a brief history of events leading up to the writing of this report. The events were the adoption of an Affirmative Action Standard for Women (1234B-Women) by the Council on Social Work Education in 1977, and the funding of the Project on Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education by the U.S. Education Department, Women's Educational Equity Act Program in 1979. It has been noted in the report that the project did not become part of the Council's accreditation process, although the focus of the project was on the three areas identified in Accreditation Standard 1234B-Women (i.e. faculty, students, curriculum).

Achieving Equity for Women in Social Work Education: An Overview

Chapter II summarizes 226 responses to Part I of a questionnaire seeking information from social work programs about curriculum content in which women's distinctive needs are addressed. The chapter provides a brief overview of content on women in required courses (class and field), and in elective courses. In addition, it summarizes findings on who makes recommendations and decisions about the curriculum, on extracurricular opportunities regarding women's concerns, and on plans programs have for revision of curriculum.

The project did not obtain any clear picture of the rationale
for inclusion of content on women in required courses or of
the nature of content that is included or excluded in class
and field courses. Programs do appear to be using a wide
range of field placements, including crisis-oriented centers,
which is a relatively new type of service for women. A wide
range of elective courses appears to be offered. Once again
the general nature of the responses did not reveal the rationale
for selection of specific kinds of electives and for explaining
how general courses such as Women and Art or Women and Philosophy
are linked to the objectives of the social work curriculum.

There was some indication from the 226 responses received
that there are different curriculum decisionmakers at the
baccalaureate and master's levels. It would appear that priority
decisions are made more by groups (i.e. curriculum committees)
at the master's level, and by individuals (i.e. faculty member
teaching a course) at the baccalaureate level. This difference,
which could be explained by a larger number of faculty at the
graduate level, may explain why certain kinds of decisions
are made at both levels, and why the pace of the curriculum
revision process is often slow.

Most respondents indicated that their programs conduct extra-
curricular activities that pertain to women's concerns.
These appeared to be sporadic and initiated by special interest
groups. Most plans for revision of curriculum centered around
a review of existing courses. Perhaps these 1980 answers
reflected a general response to the adoption of Accreditation
Standard 1234B-Women several years before. Plans beyond a
review of existing curriculum focused primarily on adding
specific courses. A number did announce plans focused toward
faculty development.

Chapter III summarized 131 anonymous responses to Part II of
the questionnaire which sought information about barriers
to achieving equity for women. Barriers which are reported
to exist in a number of programs include barriers in curriculum
planning and teaching, and non-curriculum barriers which relate
to the profession, to the institution, to administrators and
faculty, and to students.

The first section of Part II of the questionnaire addressed
barriers in curriculum planning and teaching. Underlying
most responses to this part was the thought that many social
work programs have not gone far enough in developing rationales
for inclusion of content on women, in testing the use of
alternative teaching technologies and materials, and in measuring
student learning. In addition, there was a plea for the establish-
ment of a more open climate where differing views can be examined
freely.

The second part of Part II of the questionnaire addressed non-curriculum barriers. Here there was a general recognition that there must be more than just curriculum supports if a non-sexist learning environment is to be achieved. Many respondents believed that sexism is an inherent part of higher education and of the social work profession. If change is to occur there must be a revision in policies and practices, and an improvement in general attitudes. Perhaps because answers to Part II of the questionnaire were given anonymously, the section on barriers affecting administration and faculty evoked responses which were emotionally charged, and which were accompanied by numerous examples of inequities experienced by women in higher education.

Developing Five Specific Plans of Action to Achieve Equity

Chapter IV summarizes activities used to select five program sites to develop unique models or plans of action to achieve equity for women, to assign consultants to program sites, and to establish working agreements and work groups in the program sites. A great deal of time was spent during the first year of the project in developing a manual, orienting persons involved in project activities, and developing a workable plan. These activities were useful in setting directions for the two years. In retrospect the project would have had a greater impact if the time had been extended to three years instead of two. An additional year would have given program sites more time to carry out plans of action, and would have given consultants more time to evaluate the gains with administrators and work group members at program sites.

A Frame of Reference for Achieving Equity

Chapter V presents a conceptual frame of reference which addresses eight areas of activity which were central to project efforts. Key elements to consider in developing models or plans to achieve educational equity are institutional factors, consultant's relationship to program; organization of work group, focus of change efforts, selection of strategies for change, projected outcomes, monitoring and evaluation, and institutionalizing the gains.

The importance of the first element in the frame of reference, institutional factors, should not be underestimated. Any plan for quality improvement in a program must be developed with a clear understanding of the nature of the system it is a part

of. The project learned that quality improvement efforts,
no matter how small, can be made visible in such a way that
the social work program is viewed as striving to improve
the image of the parent institution. This is especially
important during a period when there are extreme fiscal
stresses and a competition for resources. Resource persons
within the parent institution and within the surrounding
region can make valuable contributions to the social work
program. In addition, the size of the social work program
and the background of its administrators, faculty, staff, and
students will influence priority setting. It is important
to understand how special interest groups relate to the
decisionmaking hierarchy.

The second element in the frame of reference, the con-
sultant's relationship to the institution and to the social
work program, was central to the efforts of the project.
The consultant was viewed as a knowledgeable person who
has skills in communication and who is a facilitator in a
process that is self directed. It is suggested that, while
it can be productive to hire a consultant from outside of
the program, if this is not possible there may be one or two
persons with the same type of skills within the educational
setting itself. The role of the consultant or resource
person should be clearly defined as time-limited and as
focused on the objectives determined by the administrator and
work group. The discussion in Chapter V focused primarily
on the roles assumed by the consultant. In addition,
communication and relationship skills are key to the success
of the professional consultant.

Organizing a work group is a third factor in the frame of
reference. The project set down its own value orientation
that stated: 1. a member of the decisionmaking hierarchy
should be a part of the work group (rationale: it is not
helpful to make recommendations unless there is a link to
a decisionmaking group); and 2. at least one faculty member
and student with a commitment to women's issues should be a
part of the work group (rationale: there are faculty and
students in many educational settings with some degree of
expertise on women's concerns who are not a part of the
decisionmaking hierarchy). In this project there was a strong
commitment evident on the part of the majority of work group
members. The success of this project is also due to the
involvement and interest of the deans and directors who met
regularly with the work groups. A conscientious group of
persons was a key factor in the success of project activities.

A fourth element in the frame of reference is the focus of
change efforts. Selection of the focus of change efforts was

54

influenced in this project by the limitation of time. It should be noted again that the targets of change were within the social work program and were focused on curriculum. If the focus had been on non-curriculum barriers, the target range would probably have had to be shifted to the parent institution, and the work groups would have had to be expanded. Since statistics in higher education show that there continues to be an unevenness in the salaries paid to men and women, equity efforts directed toward promotion and reimbursement would have to be targeted outside of the social work program.

A fifth element in the frame of reference is the selection of strategies. Selection of strategies most appropriate for a particular change effort is influenced by the choice of target, target groups, and change agents. While most of the strategies explicated by the project were directed at material things (i.e. syllabi, course outlines, bibliographies, etc.), there was an underlying assumption that attitudes must also be modified if change is to occur. Success in the selection of appropriate strategies is directly related to the extent of knowledge and commitment of work group members and to the sanction of administrative staff. Availability of resources was not a major problem for the five program sites used in the project.

A sixth element in the frame of reference is projected outcomes. Outcomes projected by the program sites included three types: outcomes related to curriculum content, outcomes related to mechanisms put into place to review and monitor curriculum content, and outcomes which related to attitudinal change.

A seventh element is monitoring and evaluation. Basic to the project approach was its belief that monitoring and evaluation must accompany any change effort if change was to become permanent. In all five program sites an attempt was made to evaluate ongoing project efforts and to institute permanent review mechanisms.

The last element in the frame of reference is institutionalizing gains. Program sites reported that this was a goal that they were working to achieve. They reported plans to include more persons in their activities, to use gains to meet the requirements of an ongoing accreditation standard, and to make recommendations to university-wide groups to achieve equity for women.

Limitations and Problems

All quality improvement efforts have strengths and limita-
tions. This summary has focused on what was reported to have
been accomplished at program sites by project consultants,
administrators, and members of work groups. It was evident
that there was a positive climate established at all program
sites that demonstrated their commitment to efforts to achieve
equity for women. At the same time there was a realistic
attitude which recognized that short-term efforts can be
limited in impact.

The following limitations and problems were identified by
those involved in the project:

1. Time and money were major limitations in that they
   determined that consultants would be provided by
   the project for less than an academic year;

2. The program sites targeted their efforts first on
   required classroom courses which are usually taught
   by full-time faculty. Field instructors were not
   included in work groups. It is hoped that work groups
   which continue will recognize this as a limitation
   and will expand their groups to include field instructors
   and part-time faculty.

3. Special attention should be given to address the
   particular concerns of women of color on faculties
   and in student bodies.

4. Outreach to alumni will be essential to pick up the
   slack in curriculum content taught before the new
   frame of reference was introduced.

5. Continuing support should be provided administrators
   as they move to institutionalize outcomes of the
   project.

6. Attention needs to be given to continuing education
   programs.

7. There needs to be continued support of project gains
   by the Council on Social Work Education's Accreditation
   Commission's monitoring of 1234B-Women.

8. The tendency of some programs to label themselves
   as being "no problem" programs needs to be reexamined

in light of current statistics on salaries and
promotion of men and women in higher education.

9. The program sites chose to focus on curriculum.
This focus should not be to the exclusion of other
non-curriculum areas which are needed to support
new directions in curriculum.

10. This summary is based on reports of activities and
future plans. The real test of project gains
will be seen in the everyday efforts at the program
sites.

Guidelines for Use of the
Frame of Reference to Achieve Equity

It is recommended that persons who wish to initiate change
efforts consider the following questions as a guide to use
of the frame of reference developed by the project.

Institutional Factors

What is the nature of the parent institution?
What is the place of the social work program within the parent
     institution?
What is the nature of the social work program?
  -Its mission?
  -Its curriculum?
  -Its faculty?
  -Its student body?
  -Its alumni?
  -Its relationship to the practice community?
How has the parent institution and the social work program
     addressed the need of equity for women in the past?
Have there been recent efforts directed toward achieving equity
     for women?

Consultant's Relationship to the Parent Institution and to
the Social Work Program

Is there someone with expertise in the parent institution or
     social work program who could act as a facilitator of change?
Is there something to be gained from bringing in a consultant
     from outside the program? Are there resources available?
Is the administrator willing to work with a consultant? With a
     facilitator from within the program?

Organization of Work Group

Who would be the best persons to appoint to a work group?
Consider the following factors:

    Nature of problem(s) to be addressed
    Representativeness of potential member
    Authority of potential member
    Commitment of potential member to equity issues
    Expertise of potential member
    Schedule of potential member

Will the administator sanction the efforts and time of the
    work group members?
What will be the linkages of the work group with decisionmaking
    authority?

Focus of Change Efforts

What is the barrier or problem area to be focused on and how
    is it perceived by persons in the program?
What is to be the target for change?
What are the target groups that will benefit from change?

Selection of Strategies for Change

What is the range of strategies possible?
How do alternative strategies impact on special interest groups?
Which strategies are the most manageable?
Who will be the change agent? What is his or her authority
    within the system?
How do strategies fit into long-range planning?

Projected Outcomes

What are short-term changes that can be achieved?
What are long-term changes that can be achieved?
How can short-term and long-term change be measured?

Monitoring and Evaluation

In regard to area to be monitored, what were the original
    goals established, by whom, and when were they instituted?
What are the most appropriate monitoring mechanisms to use?
Who will do the monitoring and to whom are the monitors accountable?
What will be done with the results of monitoring?
Are mechanisms for ronitoring permanent or temporary?

Institutionalizing the Gains

How can the work group incorporate planning for institution-
alizing gains from the beginning?
Who are the key persons outside the work group whose support
is needed?
How can the work group interpret its efforts and products so
that they have meaning for the university community?

Toward A Non-Sexist Learning Environment

The ultimate aim of the project was to explore approaches to
achieving an environment in higher education which respects
and supports equality for men and women in all parts of the
educational system. The project used funding from the U.S.
Education Department, Women's Educational Equity Act Program,
to explore alternative strategies to overcome barriers to
equity for women in social work education. It is the belief
of those involved in the project that quality improvement
efforts directed toward equity for women will ultimately bene-
fit men as well as women. Basic to project efforts was the
belief also that women from differing backgrounds must bene-
fit from equity efforts if they are to be effective.

There must be strong leadership from responsible persons in
higher education to support visible efforts to achieve equity
for persons who, because of ethnic, racial or religious back-
grounds, because of sex, because of age or because of physi-
cal impairment, continue to receive less than equal treatment
within the university system. This sentiment was expressed
by a large number of social work educators in their responses
to questions posed to them by the project. In addition many
expressed the belief that a non-sexist teaching-learning
environment that respects equality for all persons is achiev-
able in social work educational settings.

The following paragraph provides a composite definition of a
non-sexist learning environment which is based on responses of
social work educators to the project questionnaire:

A non-sexist learning environment is an environment
in which teachers have a passion for teaching, schol-
ars have a passion for discovery, students have a
passion for learning, moral leadership is practiced by
those in a position to do so...Men and women are recog-
nized and accepted for the ways in which they are alike
and different, respecting them for the contributions

-52--

they make and ensuring that the perspectives of both
sexes appear as components of a learning environment;
Men and women are free to experience, voice and ex-
press their differences and similarities in the con-
text of their learning to become professional social
workers with a highly developed capacity for profes-
sional use of self in the service of others...sexist
behavior and attitudes are as unacceptable as racism
or ageism or negative attitudes and behaviors toward
persons with handicapping conditions.

It is suggested that readers will want to reflect on whether the
above definition of a non-sexist learning environment describes
the commitment of educational settings with which they have been
identified and whether it describes their own professional and
personal value orientations. This publication is presented with
the hope that it will provide a general frame of reference and
a guide to those committed to ongoing efforts to initiate, main-
tain and monitor educational equity activities in social work
programs throughout the United States.

NOTES

1. Accreditation Division, Council on Social Work Education, Memo to Deans and Directors of Accredited Social Work Programs, December 30, 1977.

2. Ibid.

3. Listings of accredited programs published by the Council on Social Work Education: Colleges and Universities with Accredited Undergraduate Social Work Programs and Schools of Social Work with Accredited Master's Degree Programs, 1979.

4. Accreditation Division memo, op. cit., p. 1.

5. Ibid.

6. Listings, op. cit.

7. Council on Social Work Education. Statistics on Social Work Education in the United States: 1979. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1980.

8. Ibid.