ABSTRACT

        A study was made of the way part-time students are
served by the four graduate schools of social work in Texas:
University of Texas in Austin (UT), University of Texas at Arlington
(UTA), University of Houston, and the Worden School of Social Service
of Our Lady of the Lake University (OLLU). Each school offers at
least one type of part-time program, but while the University of
Houston has only the part-time, on-campus model, each of the other
three schools has satellite model programs also. Both UT and UTA
utilize other colleges as their off-campus instructional sites, and
OLLU utilizes training facilities. The number of students admitted
each year ranges from a low of about 15 students (OLLU) to a high of
about 30 students at UT's off-site program. All three schools have
the same admissions criteria for both programs. However, both OLLU
and UTA require a period of residence on the main campus that ranges
from 15 weeks at OLLU to 32 weeks for UTA students. The UT program is
completely off-site, with no Austin residence requirements.
Information was also obtained on: the academic rank of faculty
involved in off-site, part-time master's of social work programs;
academic advising for students; course sequencing by semester; field
placements; and grading systems. (SW)

ED260667

PART TIME ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM GRADUATE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN TEXAS: Nibblers at
the Feast of Learning

Peggy Pittman-Munke, M.Ed, MLS, MSW, PhD
Dept. of Sociology and Social Work
Concordia College
Moorhead, Minn. 56569

Part-time education on the post-secondary level has existed since before the turn of the century, particularly in professional schools such as law, medicine, and social work. However, the literature does not reflect this, and the model chosen by the American educational community was that of the traditional full-time student for whom attending college or professional school was his/her life work.

However, in the mid-1970s, the part-time undergraduate student began to achieve at least a modicum of attention from sectors of the post-secondary educational world other than the community college. Some of this push to serve the part-time, nontraditional student on the part of the educational establishment was the result of the woman's movement, the War on Poverty, and the pressure from the federal government to bring minority group members into partnership with the more affluent (Carneige Commission, 1983). Further, this federal drive to open college attendance to minority groups and women as well as the push towards affirmative action, which also impacted women and minority groups, probably also influenced the formal opening of college and post-graduate admissions to the part-time student, and forced some recognition of this student's special life situation and unique needs. Additionally, the proliferation of colleges and universities during the 1960s and 1970s and the need of these institutions for students may have been instrumental in drawing the administration's attention to the part-time student as a relatively profitable market to be tapped. Other factors affecting the acceptance of the part-time student role were the higher cost of tuition and declining federal support

for traineeships.

Cross (1975, p. 58) pointed out that by 1972 "the number of part-time students began to exceed the number of full-time students in institutions of higher education." By 1978, the growing impact of Reaganomics signalled that federal dollars would no longer be freely available for the needs of higher education. The part-time student thus became a vital component of the educational marketplace. In spite of this fact, there is a dearth of material specifically devoted to the part-time student, especially the graduate or professional school part-time student. Graduate social work education follows this trend, barely admitting the existence of the part-time graduate student.

PART-TIME GRADUATE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

Part-time social work education is often represented as a fairly recent entry into the field of social work education. Boynton (1981, p. 60) states:

> Our awareness of the emerging change in Social Work Education has come slowly. In fact, some universities have only recently begun to provide services to a "new" type of student.

Bragg (1981) presents a plausible rationale for Boynton's statement:

> In our era when graduate school enrollments are dropping and competition for students within the helping profession is heating up, graduate social work education has remained an anachronism.
>
> . . . .
>
> Establishing programs for part-time students would appear to be the answer to several . . . problems. In a time of shrinking enrollments, this may be the most effective way of reaching new groups of potential students. (p. 8)

Historical Foundations

However, the roots of part-time education on the graduate level are woven deep into the professional history of social work. The prestigious New York School of Social Work, now the Columbia University School of Social Work, has a long history of service to part-time students.

Meier (1950) stated that when the School of Philanthropy (an early name for the New York School of Social Work) opened in the fall of 1904, a program of part-time courses in the winter months had already been in operation for two years. These part-time students, who numbered about 150 per year, met once or twice a week between October and April and came from New York City. Each winter school session included about 40 lectures and some agency visits and observational trips. This course of study was intended to serve the needs of three classes of persons:

> (1) those who are professionally engaged in work for charitable societies, and agencies for social uplift, and who desire to know more about the sources of aid they are required to use, (2) those who are employed as helpers in institutions, and wish broader knowledge of ideals and methods, (3) the 'charitable laity' who are actively supporting with money and personal service, such societies, agencies and institutions, and desire to know how they can help most wisely. (Meier, 1950, p. 18)

The New York School continued to grow, and part-time students also continued to seek admission. It was thought necessary to place some restriction on the enrollment of part-time students in order to strengthen the program for full-time students, because the discussion method of teaching then used required that the class size be limited. By 1932, part-time students were permitted to enroll only in certain designated

sections of some courses.

> Nevertheless, the School felt a responsibility to provide opportunities for partial training; in 1929, 859 students enrolled for individual courses, and in 1938, there were 1,086 such students. (Meier, 1950, p.81)

It seems clear that part-time students in relatively large numbers were a part of the history of the New York School.

The school established by the Chicago Commons which became a part of the University of Chicago in 1920 similarly educated part-time social workers in its early years. However, Julia Lathrop and Edith Abbott ended the school's connection with part-time graduate education when they assumed the reins of the school in 1920 (Taylor, 1936). Thus, part-time graduate social work education figured in the history of two very prominent schools, among others. In the early days, the enrollment of the part-time student was encouraged to serve the need of the profession, that is, the need for trained workers, without losing workers to graduate study when they could not be spared from their professional duties.

The statistics on social work education which were published in the Social Service Review, beginning with the 1934-35 school year, and later by the Council on Social Work Education beginning in 1954, also reflected consistently a good percentage of part-time students. The number ebbed and flowed with the needs of the profession for workers, but was always a factor in the education of social workers.

Recent Developments

A major impetus to the development of formal programs designed for the needs of part-time students came about in the 1970s. During this decade, the need of rural areas for

professional social workers was, recognized, and parapro-
fessionals were encouraged to gain professional standing.
Some of this incentive was generated by social justice issues
raised during the preceding decade, but the burgeoning federal
deficit and "Reagonomics" also provided their own special in-
centive. Much of the federal money previously allocated to the
education of social workers ceased to flow by the end of the
1970s; shifting federal priorities favored competing disciplines,
engineering, computer science, business, journalism, and law,
and the defense establishment.

Many schools of social work had expanded during the
late 1960s and early 1970s and new programs had been accredited
to meet the needs of both social work students with federal
traineeships, and underserved areas, including child welfare,
community mental health, and rural areas. Although by the end
of the 1970s, the federal traineeships had for the most part
ceased to exist, an even greater proportion of the population
was underserved by the social work community as a result of
widespread unemployment and its attendant conditions in some
areas of the country. Many graduate schools of social work
rose to the challenge and either broadened existing programs
or established new programs to meet both the needs of working
students and their own need for survival.

The Case of Texas

By the late 1970s and the early 1980s, Texas, like the
rest of the nation, had problems with an underserved population
in many parts of the state. The problems of the state were
exacerbated by a large population of disadvantaged Mexican-

Americans, a red-neck dominated legislature, unemployment in the formerly booming oil-dependent East Texas area, economic pressures on the Texas-Mexico border stemming from Mexico's internal problems, and a huge influx of unskilled workers from other parts of the country. Added to these circumstances was the poverty of the huge rural areas (Caro, 1983).

The situation in the state was such that the graduate schools in Texas were open to the resurgence of part-time students in social work education. Texas, roughly analogous in area to New England plus the Middle Atlantic states (Caro, 1983), housed only four graduate schools of social work within the state. These were the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake University, dating from the early 1940s; the School of Social Work at the University of Texas in Austin, established in the early 1950s, the oldest and most prestigious of the state schools; the school at the University of Houston, serving East Texas; and finally, the School at the University of Texas at Arlington, a suburb of Dallas/Fort Worth, serving the north central portion of the state. Compared to the Northeast and Middle Atlantic portion of the United States, a great deal of the state was still unserved, including the border areas and most of the rural counties. Thus, the need for innovative programming was very great, for many human service employees were unable to attend full-time for personal and financial reasons, and because they simply could not be spared from their professional duties. In order to determine the pattern of part-time graduate social work educational programs in Texas, the deans of the four schools (or their designated representatives) were surveyed.

National Models and Issues

Program models in Texas were presumed to be little different than those available nationally. Leuenberger et al (1983) identified three general program models in use nationally to serve part-time students. These are:

1. the permanent "satellite model" in which course instruction is provided at specific and permanent off campus locations;

2. the transient "satellite model" in which the school of social work does not maintain a permanent off campus learning site; and

3. a part-time on-campus program in which students attend classes during evening hours or on weekends.

Another model, not discussed by Leuenberger et al (1983), would allow part-time students to participate in regular classes with full-time students.

Issues facing the Texas programs and models of part-time education were assumed to be little different than those facing other programs nationally. Leuenberger et al (1983) identify admissions requirements as a frequently express source of concern; and faculty deployment, course content, field placement, socialization and educational resources as potential problems in the establishment of part-time programs. Thus, Leuenberger questionnaire which addressed these areas specifically was administered to the designated respondents in each of the four Texas graduate schools of social work.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire was mailed to the four deans of graduate schools of social work in Texas. They were asked

9

to complete the questionnaire or to route it to the person in charge of the part-time program. They were advised that a follow-up telephone call would be made about two weeks after the reception of the instrument in October 1983. At the time of the phone call, if the deans preferred, the answers could be given orally to the interviewer. However, all respondents chose to complete the questionnaire. In addition, an interview was set up so that any other problems or concerns about the part-time programs could be aired. If the deans chose, the phone call could be routed to the person in charge of the part-time program. The dean at Houston, Dan Jennings, was the only dean to respond personally to the questionnaire and the phone call. The assistant dean of the Worden school who is in charge of the part-time program, and the associate dean at the University of Texas at Arlington responded to the questionnaire and phone call. (In the case of the assistant dean at Worden, discussion took place in a face-to-face interview.) The person responsible for screening admissions at the graduate level at the University of Texas at Austin responded to the questionnaire and also took part in a face-to-face interview. In addition, the associate dean at the University of Texas at Austin also responded to questions dealing with his perception of the part-time program.

SURVEY RESULTS

All four graduate schools offer at least one type of part-time program, according to the criteria identified by Leuenberger. Only one school, the University of Houston, has only the part-time on campus model. Dean Dan Jennings stated that the criteria

for admissions, course requirements, faculty, advising, sequencing, and field practicum are identical with the full-time master's program. He also stated that students in the full-time program were free to convert to the part-time program and vice versa. He observed a good integration of students in the part-time program with the full-time program students, probably as a result of shared classes and shared facilities. Dean Jennings, in common with the other Texas graduate school deans or their representatives, was very pleased with the maturity, scholarship, and motivation of the part-time students, as well as the dimension of richness added to the classroom as a result of these students' experience and maturity.

The University of Texas at Austin (UT), and University of Texas at Arlington (UTA), and the Worden School of Social Service of Our Lady of the Lake University (OLLU) all have satellite model programs. The satellite program at UT is based in El Paso, and is in the second year of its first cohort of students. OLLU has sponsored satellite programs at El Paso, Abilene, and Midland, and is currently sponsoring a second cohort of students at Midland. UTA formerly presented programs in Canyon, Nacogdoches, and Dallas, and is presently offering satellite programs in both Lubbock and Commerce.

Both UT and UTA utilize other colleges or universities as their off-campus instructional sites, and OLLU utilizes training facilities. The number of students admitted each year ranges from a low of approximately 15 students (OLLU) to a high of approximately 30 students at UT's off site program. Both OLLU and UTA have a specific administrator who is responsible for the

alternative MSW program on a part-time basis and in addition to other duties.

All three schools have the same admissions criteria for both programs. However, both OLLU and UTA require a period of residence on the main campus which ranges from 15 weeks at OLLU to 32 weeks for UTA students. The UT program is completely off-site, with no Austin residence requirement. However, faculty involved in the three alternative MSW programs did show some variation. See Table I below.

TABLE I

Faculty Rank of Faculty Involved in Off Site Part-Time MSW Programs

	UT	UTA	OLLU
Full Professor	1	2	3
Assoc. Profession	4	2	1
Asst. Professor			1
Instructor			
Lecturer	1		
Training Specialist	1		
Adjunct Assistant Professor	1		

UT showed the widest variety of faculty members by rank teaching in the program, and the fewest full professors. However, half their faculty in the alternative MSW program are associate professors. UTA had four faculty members assigned to the alternative MSW program, which was the fewest number of faculty committed to the off-site program; however, two are full professors and the other two are associate professors. OLLU has three full professors teaching in the alternative MSW program, one associate professor, and one assistant professor. Although superficially, there seems to be quite a bit of variety, all three schools heavily commit senior faculty to the program. In addition, only UTA

states that the number of course offerings in the alternative MSW program is fewer than those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program.

Academic advising for these students is provided in both the UT and the UTA programs by both off campus and on campus faculty advisors, where as in the OLLU program it is provided by the program director, who is also the assistant dean of the school. In terms of perception of the adequacy of instructional materials, library resources, and academic advising, there is considerable variation between the schools. UT views all three areas as in need of improvement, UTA views all three areas as adequate, while OLLU considers the academic advising and the availability of instructional materials as more than adequate, and library resources as adequate. This differential in resource adequacy perception may be a function of the length of time the programs have been in operation however.

Course sequencing does vary at all three schools between the full-time MSW and the part-time MSW programs. However; in all the programs, students must complete the basic, foundation level courses before moving into the advanced courses. UT offers only its interpersonal helping sequence off site, although the addition of the administration/planning sequence is under discussion. At both UTA and at OLLU, students complete basic foundation courses off site, and then come to the main campus for advanced courses. UT's model differs substantially from this model, since no course work must be taken at the Austin campus, and a complete program is brought to the El Paso satellite location.

The table below (Table II) shows the variation in course sequencing among the schools.

TABLE II

MSW Course Sequencing by Semester and by Program

University of Texas-Austin	Full Time	Part Time
Basic Dynam. of Behavior	Sem. I	Sem. I
Basic Dynam. of Behavior (organ. & Comm.)	Sem. I	Sem. II
Soc. Prob. and Soc. Wel. Policy	Sem. I	Sem. I
Field Ins. I	Sem. I	Summer I (bwn. Sem. II & III)
Research Methods	Sem. II	Sem. II
Field Inst.	Sem. II	Sem. III
Interp. Help. Methods	Sem. II	Sem. III
Res.- Sp. Top.	Sem. III	Summer II (post Sem. IV)
Prob. & Policy II	Sem. III	Sem. IV
Adv. Inter. Per. Methods	Sem. III	Summer II
Sem. in Interp. Help.	Sem. III	Summer II
Admin. Processes in Inter. Prac.	Sem. III	Sem. IV
Field Ins. II (2 courses)	Sem. IV	Sem. V
Sem. in Inter. Help.	Sem. IV	Sem. V

University of Texas - Arlington	Full Time	Part Time
Admin	Sem. I	Sem. III
Policy	Sem. I	Sem. I
HBSE	Sem. I	Sem. I
Dir. Prac.	Sem. I	Sem. III
Research	Sem. I	Sem. II
HBSE	Sem. II	Sem. II
Research	Sem. II	Sem. IV
Field	Sem. II	Summer (post sem. II)
Racism	Sem. II	Sem. IV

At this point, the remainder of the course work must be completed in compliance with University residence requirements; the two programs merge

Our Lady of the Lake University- Worden School	Full Time	Part Time
HBSE	Sem. I	Sem. I
Policy	Sem. I	Sem. I
Practice I	Sem. I	Sem. II
Research	Sem. I	Summer (post Sem. II)
Administration	Sem. I	Sem. I

At this point, the remainder of the required course work must be completed in compliance with University residence requirements. This students are free, as are all students, to do their block field off-site, and to take two electives concurrently with the field (1000 hours yielding 14 semester hours credit)

The field placement varies among the three programs, and follows the model of the regular on-site MSW program. OLLU utilizes the block model while UT and UTA utilize both block and concurrent field placement models in their alternative MSW programs. The schools also follow the same policy with the alternative MSW programs in terms of field placement in an agency where the student has been previously employed or is presently employed as they do with their regular on campus MSW program. OLLU allows placement in agency of employment for both groups; UTA generally does not for both groups; and UT allows one of the two placements in an employing or prior employing agency for both groups.

All three schools utilize the same methods to identify and specify the learning goals and objectives of the alternative MSW students in their field placements as are used in the regular MSW program. OLLU and UTA utilize individual written learning contracts developed by the school, the agency, and the student, while UT sets the goals and objectives in all placements and utilizes individual learning contracts as well.

Field placements in both programs are monitored in both programs by a combination of telephone visits, mail, and field visits by faculty, with written feedback to the director of practicum. UTA evaluates field placements in both programs through at least two field visits per semester with written comment submitted to the Director of Field Instruction. Students at UT are monitored through attendance at field seminars while their alternative MSW program is monitored by three instructors who serve as faculty liasions responsible for holding three

on site evaluation conferences for each of two semesters.
This serves the same purpose as the field seminars in the
regular on site MSW program.

Although students in the alternative MSW program at OLLU
are required to participate in on campus classes, however at
neither UTA nor UT are they required to do so. Neither UTA nor
OLLU specifically plan any activities besides classes for the
alternative MSW students, while UT offers orientation, advisory
board meetings and lectures by visiting professors for its alter-
native MSW program students. UT may feel that the geographic
distance from Austin of its El Paso satellite program and the
fact that alternative program MSW students do not attend classes
on the main campus at any time makes it necessary to enrich
the educational opportunities for these students.

All three schools utilize the same grading system to
evaluate students in both programs and have formal policies
requiring evaluation of classroom teaching in which the same
evaluation procedure, formal student evaluation is utilized in
both programs. In addition, UTA also utilizes a review within
sequence. All three schools consider their full time/ tenure
track faculty very supportive of the alternative MSW program.

SUMMARY

All four Texas graduate schools of social work have at
least one type of part-time program as identified by Leuenberger's
criteria. However, the University of Houston has only the
part-time on campus model which is virtually indistinguishable
from the full time MSW program. In the other three schools, all
of which have a part time satellite model program, admissions

criteria, course requirements, sequencing, faculty, advising,
and field practicum are conducted in a fashion nearly identical
to the regular on campus MSW program. Those interviewed
believe that students attending the satellite programs can
be assured of an education virtually identical with the one at
the regular site, and employers can be assured that the
quality of education received is similar to that of the regular
MSW program.

REFERENCES

Boynton, C. W. (ed.) (1981) Moving Ahead in the 80s: Issues for Part-Time Social Work Education. Proceedings of the First Annual Part-time Social Work Education Colloquium. West Virginia College of Graduate Studies Foundation.

Boynton, G. W. Summary of Issues and Recommendation for Action Plans. In Boynton (ed.) (1981). Moving Ahead in the 80s, 59-63.

Bragg, J.J. Problems of Part-Time Students. In Boynton (ed.) (1981). Moving Ahead in the 80s, 7-10.

The Carneige Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education: A Summary of Reports and Recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980.

Caro, R. (1983). The Year of Lyndon Johnson: The Path to Power. New York: Vintage Books.

Cross, K. P. et al. (1974). Planning Non-Traditional Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Elias, J. L. & Merriam, S. (1980). Philosophical Foundations of Adult Education. Malabar, Florida: Krieger.

Leuenberger, P. et al. (1983) Quality of Alternative or Part-Time Social Work Education Programs: Myths and Realities. Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 2, (no. 2), 11-15.

Mayhew, L. B. (1977). Legacy of the Seventies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meier, E. G. (1954). A History of the New York School of Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Taylor, G. (1936). Chicago Commons Through Forty Years. Chicago.

Vermilye, D. W. (1975). Learner-Centered Reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Veysey, L. (1965). The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

18

An alternative MSW degree program is defined as one in which all or part of the curriculum is offered to a specifically designated group of students (e.g., individuals with baccalaureate degrees employed in human services, etc.) who are essentially separated at least for part of their studies, from other students in the regular full-time on-campus program. For the purpose of this study, alternative programs are not those where part-time students enroll in the regular on-campus program and take courses over an extended period of time.

Q1. According to the preceding definition, does your school offer an alternative education program leading to the Master of Social Work degree?

         1. ____ Yes (Skip to Q3)

         2. ____ No (Go to Q2)   5

Q2. Do you plan to implement an alternative MSW program within the next two years?

         1. ____ Yes (Go to Q2a)

         2. ____ No Thank you. Please   6
                    return this question-
                    naire in the enclosed
                    stamped self-addressed
                    envelope.

Q2a. Excluding the field work component, will students in your alternative MSW program enroll

         1. ____ Part-time

         2. ____ Full-time

         3. ____ Full and Part-time Combination

         4. ____ Don't know

Q2b. Excluding the field work component, will instruction in your alternative MSW program be provided

1. _____ On-campus

2. _____ Off-campus

3. _____ Both on and off-campus

4. _____ Don't know

Q2c. Excluding the field work component, where will the courses be taught in your alternative MSW program? (Circle all that apply)

1. _____ Regular on-campus facilities   9

2. _____ Off-campus learning centers   10
(defined as sites designated
by the school that provide
classroom space as well as
other basic services - e.g.
admissions, advising, etc. -
and are administratively
accountable to the on-campus
school of social work.)

3. _____ Other universities/colleges   11

4. _____ Community colleges/junior   12
colleges

5. _____ High schools, social agencies,   13
or other community facilities

6. _____ Other   14

7. _____ Don't know   15

Q2d. Will the field work component in your alternative MSW program require a

1. _____ Block placement   16

2. _____ Concurrent placement

3. _____ Either block or concurrent
placement

4. _____ Other: Please specify _____
_____

5. _____ Don't know

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION. PLEASE RETURN THIS
QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED-SELF ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.

Q3. How long has your alternative MSW program been in operation?   17 - 18

_____ years

Q4. Excluding the field work component, are students enrolled in your

alternative MSW program

        1. ____ Part-time   19

        2. ____ Full-time

        3. ____ Other: please specify

        _____

        _____

Q5. Excluding the field work component, what kinds of teaching facilities

are used in your alternative MSW program? (Check all that apply.)

        1. ____ Regular on-campus university   20
            facilities

        2. ____ Off-campus learning centers   21
            (defined as sites designated
            by the school that provide
            classroom space as well as
            other basic services, e.g.
            admission, advising, etc. and
            are administratively account-
            able to the on-campus school
            of social work.)

        3. ____ Other universities/colleges   22

        4. ____ Community college/junior   23
            college

        5. ____ High schools, social agen-   24
            cies, other community
            facilities

        6. ____ Other: please specify   25

        _____

        _____

Q6. On the average, how many students are admitted each year to your alter-

native MSW education program?

        Approximately _____ students   26 - 28

Q7. Do you have a specific person administratively responsible for your

alternative MSW program?

        1. _____ Yes (Go to Q7a and 7b)   29

        2. _____ No (Skip to Q8)

Q7a. (Please indicate the persons' title)

        Title: _____ (Go to Q7b)

Q7b. Is the position full or part-time?

        1. _____ Full-time   30

        2. _____ Part-time

Q8. Please indicate which of the following criteria you use in admitting

students to your regular on-campus and alternative MSW program. (Check

all that apply)

CRITERIA Do you use?	REGULAR MSW PROGRAM		ALTERNATIVE MSW PROGRAM	
Undergraduate grade point average	Yes	No 31	Yes	No 38
Miller Analogies Test	Yes	No 32	Yes	No 39
Graduate Record Exam	Yes	No 33	Yes	No 40
Faculty Interviews	Yes	No 34	Yes	No 41
Reference Letters	Yes	No 35	Yes	No 42
Employment Experience in Social Agencies	Yes	No 36	Yes	No 43
Other: Please Specify _____	Yes	No 37	Yes	No 44

Q9. After the first registration in your alternative MSW program, within how

many years must a student complete all degree requirements?

        _____ years   45

Q10. Does your alternative MSW program require students to be in residence

on the main campus at anytime during the program?

1.	___	Yes (Go to Q10a)	46
2.	___	No (Skip to Q11)	

Q10a. How many weeks residence are required?

___ weeks   47 - 48

Q11. Excluding field work instructors how many persons in the following

categories are currently employed by your school to teach courses in

the regular MSW Program. (Please indicate whether the person is full

or part-time)

	Full Time Indicate Number	Part Time Indicate Number
Full Professors	___ 49 - 50	___ 51 - 52 ___ 53 - 54
Associate Professors	___ 55 - 56	___ 57 - 58 ___ 59 - 60
Assistant Professors	___ 61 - 62	___ 63 - 64 ___ 65 - 66
Instructors	___ 67 - 68	___ 69 - 70 ___ 71 - 72
Lecturers	___ 73 - 74	___ 75 - 76 ___ 77 - 78 1 - 3 4
PhD/DSW Students	___ 5 - 6	7 - 8 ___ 9 - 10
Community Professionals	___ 11 - 12	___ 13 - 14 ___ 15 - 16
Faculty from Other Universities/Colleges	___ 17 - 18	___ 19 - 20 ___ 21 - 22
Other: Please Indicate Title: ___	___ 23 - 24	___ 25 - 26 ___ 27 - 28

Q12. How many persons in the following categories have taught or will teach one or more courses in your alternative MSW Program during the current 1982/83 academic year?

    Full Professors   _____ 29 - 30

    Associate Professors   _____ 31 - 32

    Assistant Professors   _____ 33 - 34

    Instructors   _____ 35 - 36

    Lecturers   _____ 37 - 38

    PhD/DSW Students   _____ 39 - 40

    Community Professional   _____ 41 - 42

    Faculty from Other Universities/Colleges   _____ 43 - 44

    Other - Please Indicate   _____ 45 - 46

        Title: _____

        _____

Q13. Is the number of courses that can be selected by students in the alternative MSW program   47

1) _____ More than those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program

2) _____ About the same as those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program

3) _____ Fewer than those available to students in the regular on-campus MSW program

Q14. Who provides academic advising to students enrolled in your alternative MSW program?   48

                            1. _____ On-campus faculty advisor(s)

                            2. _____ Off-campus faculty advisor(s)

                            3. _____ Both off and on-campus faculty

                            4. _____ Other; Please Specify

                            _____

                            _____

Q15. To what extent are the following resources adequate to meet the educational needs of the students enrolled in your alternative MSW program?

	More than Adequate	Adequate	Needs Improvement	
Library Resources				49
Academic Advising				50
Availability of Instructional Materials (Audio-Visual equipment, etc.)				51

Q16. What field work placement model is used in your regular on-campus MSW program? 52

1. ____ Block Placement

2. ____ Concurrent Placement

3. ____ Other: Please specify

_____

_____

Q17. What field work placement model is used in your alternative MSW program? 53

1. ____ Block Placement

2. ____ Concurrent Placement

3. ____ Other: Please specify

_____

_____

Q18. Are students in your regular on-campus MSW program permitted field placement in an agency where they are either presently or have been previously employed? 54

1. ____ Yes

2. ____ Generally not, but exceptions are made

3. ____ No

Q19. Are students in your alternative MSW program permitted field placement in an agency where they are either presently or have been previously employed?   55

    1. _____ Yes

    2. _____ Generally not, but exceptions are made

    3. _____ No

Q20. What methods are used in your regular on-campus MSW program to identify and specify the learning goals and objectives of students in their field placements?   56

    1. _____ Individual written learning contracts developed by the school, agency and student

    2. _____ The school sets the goals and objectives in all placements

    3. _____ Other: Please specify

    _____

    _____

Q21. Are the same methods used to identify and specify the learning goals and objectives of alternative MSW students in their field placement?   57

    1. _____ Yes   (Go to Q21a)

    2. _____ No   (Skip to Q22).

Q21a. Please indicate how the methods are different.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____