Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1976

Social work continuing education needs assessment study

Mary Lou Timme

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Education Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Timme, Mary Lou, "Social work continuing education needs assessment study" (1976). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2111.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2109>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

SOCIAL WORK CONTINUING EDUCATION
NEEDS ASSESSMENT STUDY

by
MARY LOU TIMME

A practicum report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University
1976

APPROVED BY:

Gerald A. Frey, PhD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Selecting the Target Groups	
Determining Information-Gathering Methods	
Designing the Questionnaire	
Implementing A Pre-Test	
Distribution of Questionnaires	
Summary.....	8
II CSD SURVEY FINDINGS.....	9
Demographic Characteristics.....	9
Preferences on Educational Content.....	10
Preferences on Course Credit.....	20
Preferences on Scheduling.....	22
Preferences on Tuition Costs.....	23
Summary.....	24
III N.A.S.W. SURVEY FINDINGS.....	26
Demographic Characteristics.....	26
Preferences on Continuing Education.....	28
Preferences on Specific Content.....	33
Preferences on Format.....	39
Preferences on Credit and Tuition.....	41
Summary.....	43
IV CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS.....	45

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Years of Formal Education.....	9
2	General CSD Educational Content Preferences.....	13
3	Preferences of CSD Caseworkers Compared with Total CSD Responses.....	15
4	Preferences of Casework Supervisors Compared with Total CSD Responses.....	17
5	Comparison of Educational Preferences of CSD Caseworkers and Casework Supervisors.....	20
6	Education Content Preferences.....	20
7	Preferences on Course Credit.....	20
8	Credit Preferences of Caseworkers & Casework Supervisors.....	21
9	Preferences on Time Scheduling.....	22
10	Preferences on Course Format.....	22
11	Preferences on Tuition Costs.....	24
12	NASW Demographic Characteristics.....	26
13	Types of Professional Education Used in Past.....	28
14	Type of Education Used Compared with Method Specialization.....	29
15	NASW Future Professional Education Preferences....	30
16	Preferences on General Professional Education Areas	31
17	General Professional Education Area Preferences Compared with Method Specialization.....	32
18	NASW Respondent Preferences on Specific Content	34

TABLE		PAGE
19	Content Preferences Compared with Method Area Specialization.....	37
20	Ranking of Content Categories by Method Specialization.....	38
21	Time Scheduling Preferences.....	40
22	Content Presentation Preference Ranking.....	41
23	Credit Option Preferences.....	42
24	Tuition Preferences.....	42
25	Tuition Preferences Compared with Method Specialization.....	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the needs assessment study was to obtain current, accurate, concrete information on the continuing education needs and preferences of selected social service practitioners. In addition, the intention was to gather information that could actually be used in planning continuing education offerings by the Portland State University School of Social Work Continuing Education Coordinator.

Several developments made the undertaking of a needs assessment study timely. First, the Oregon Legislature discontinued state funding of the Division of Continuing Education several years ago. Now, DCE classes must be self-supporting, which means that each class must attract enough students to cover the costs of offering the class. Second, Congress recently made available through Title XX of the Social Security Act funds for the training of persons involved with Title XX social service programs. Social Work Continuing Education has traditionally served persons in social service agencies that are now receiving Title XX funds. Third, the Oregon chapter of the National Association of Social Workers has been lobbying for passage of a licensing bill in the Oregon Legislature which would require that social workers applying for a license demonstrate that they have been participating in continuing education opportunities. And finally, social work-related fields, such as child care and day care, have been experiencing a demand for "professionalism" and increased training opportunities. Hence, the information gathered from a needs assessment project could serve several distinct but complementary functions.

METHODOLOGY

SELECTING THE TARGET GROUPS

Historically, the following groups constituted the major consumers of Social Work Continuing Education (SWCE) courses and training programs; Children's Services Division and Public Welfare Division caseworkers, members of the National Association of Social Workers, juvenile court counselors, nurses, public school social workers, child care workers, and day care workers. In order to facilitate information-gathering, it seemed reasonable to identify SWCE consumers who were members of professional or functional groups, rather than consumers who were employed by the numerous social service agencies scattered throughout the metropolitan area. The major reasoning behind this decision was the thought that it would be difficult to design a measuring tool that could be used with groups composed of various professionals performing different functions.

Upon further study it appeared that several SWCE consumer groups could or should be eliminated from the needs assessment study. The juvenile court counselors and nurses, many of whom were employed by Multnomah County, were in the midst of budget cutbacks and had little interest at the time of the study in continuing education opportunities. The day care workers, who were also in the midst of budget cutbacks, had an active planning mechanism to meet their continuing education needs. In fact, various day care agencies were already submitting requests for Title XX training funds at the time of this study. An interested person was never identified within the Public Welfare Division, hence the needs assessment study did not survey PWD caseworkers. And finally, it was determined that most of the public

school social workers were also members of NASW. Consequently, this needs assessment study focuses on the continuing education needs and preferences of CSD caseworkers and NASW members within the Portland metropolitan area.

DETERMINING INFORMATION-GATHERING METHODS

The largest area of discussion encountered in this project concerned the methods to be used to gather information. The Coordinator of Social Work Continuing Education and the Coordinator of the NASW Education Committee expressed a preference for personal interviews with staff members of various social service agencies. There appeared to be several drawbacks to use of this method of information gathering. First, it would be very time-consuming and expensive to arrange personal interviews, especially since no funds were available to cover traveling expenses. Second, it would be difficult to structure interviews so that the information gathered would be consistent across interviews. Third, it was anticipated that it would be difficult to schedule sufficient interview time to insure specific answers from individuals on their educational needs and preferences and financial resources.

The decision was made to use a questionnaire which could be mailed or personally distributed to members of the various target groups. There were several advantages in using this method. First, closed-ended and open-ended questions could be asked and respondents would have to record in writing their preferences, hence simplifying the task of collating information. Second, the questionnaire could be adapted to the general interests of each target group without sacrificing the basic framework of the questionnaire. Third, use

of a questionnaire is less expensive in terms of time and money than reliance on interviews. Finally, use of a questionnaire minimizes the influence of the researcher. The major drawback however, was that the response rate from members of the target groups would be significantly lower than through reliance on interviews.

A book published by the National Institute for Mental Health, Planning for Change: Needs Assessment Approaches, was very helpful in weighing the pros and cons of each approach. Its authors suggested that in addition to considering the type of information that could be gathered, depending on the method used, the researcher should consider time and financial resources available for the project. Since no financial resources were initially available for the project, the less expensive method (i.e. use of questionnaire) was ultimately selected.

DESIGNING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This aspect of the project involved three activities: researching relevant examples of questionnaires, determining the specific information to be obtained, and designing a brief, concise questionnaire format. In researching the types of questionnaires used by other researchers, numerous schools of social work were contacted and asked to send samples of questionnaires used in their continuing education planning. While six schools responded, only three schools sent samples of their questionnaires.

Four types of information seemed most relevant to obtain:

- 1) course preferences -- collated by the total number of respondents interested in specific content areas.
- 2) financial resources of the respondents -- specifically, how much

could they afford to pay for tuition.

3) credit preferences -- whether respondents wanted transferrable credit or not.

4) scheduling and course format preferences.

In addition, some basic demographic information needed to be obtained on the respondents. In deciding which demographic questions to include in the questionnaire, each question was measured against a criteria of how useful the information would be to course design. As a result, few demographic questions seemed relevant. The only demographic questions included related to the job function of the respondents and their background of formal education. Demographic questions pertaining to the sex, age and place of employment of the respondents were discarded because they did not seem directly relevant in projecting which courses a respondent might take.

The final task involved design of the questionnaire format. First, the questionnaire needed to be as brief as possible; otherwise respondents would be hesitant to complete it. Second, the questionnaire wording needed to be as clear and concise as possible. This was particularly important in describing the various educational content areas; the responses relating to course content areas would be meaningless if the respondents assumed different word meanings than was intended. Third, the directions for answering the questions needed to be clear and concise so that all respondents would answer the questions in the same way. Finally, the questionnaire needed to include sufficient opportunity and space for respondents to make additional comments.

After designing the questionnaire, the decision had to be made

concerning how the questionnaire would be distributed. The three choices that seemed most feasible were, (1) to distribute the questionnaire at conferences, (2) to mail it out with a return envelope enclosed or, (3) to utilize an agency's internal communication and mail system. All three approaches were subsequently tried, with differing results.

In addition, it seemed that a greater response rate would be assured if the questionnaire was co-sponsored by Social Work Continuing Education and the professional or functional group (eg. NASW, OACCW, CSD) which was being asked to give information. In asking each group to co-sponsor the questionnaire, a new dimension entered into the process -- negotiating the questionnaire's content to meet the professional organization's preferences. While this new dimension extended the time spent on designing the questionnaire, input from the professional organization increased the relevance of the questionnaire to the organization's members. However, as a result of this arrangement, the same questions were not necessarily asked in both surveys.

The most obvious example was the inclusion of two questions in the NASW questionnaire related to the type of professional education used by the respondents (eg. workshops, personal reading, consultation); these questions were not asked of CSD respondents. Another difference was the inclusion of a question in the CSD questionnaire pertaining to the amount of formal education of each respondent; it was assumed in the NASW survey that most respondents either had a master's degree or were interested in graduate credit for continuing education courses. Finally, the suggested content

7

areas varied on the two questionnaires. The variation in content areas was a direct result of the questionnaire "negotiations;" while the CSD questionnaire content areas were suggested to the NASW Education Committee members for inclusion in the NASW questionnaire, the Education Committee members expressed a strong preference for different and/or additional content areas. It will be possible, however, to compare the continuing education preference patterns which appeared between the two groups of respondents.

IMPLEMENTING A PRE-TEST

A pre-test of the questionnaire was conducted at the annual conference of the Oregon Association of Child Care Workers in November. The results were disappointing. Out of 150 people registered for the conference, only 20 people filled out and returned the questionnaire. Part of the reason for the poor response rate was the fact that time was not allowed within the conference workshops for the participants to fill out the questionnaire. It appeared from the questionnaire responses, however, that the questions and directions seemed to be clear.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CSD AND NASW QUESTIONNAIRES

The Staff Development Supervisors in Region I of the Children's Service Division distributed 300 copies of the CSD-SWCE questionnaire to members of the casework staff in Regions I and VIII of CSD in the Portland metropolitan area. Ninety-nine staff members returned the questionnaire through the CSD inter-office mail. Hence, the response rate on the CSD questionnaire was 33%.

The NASW questionnaire was included in the April issue of the NASW Newsletter with a stamped return envelope. Approximately 500

copies of the questionnaire were mailed. Seventy-five persons returned the questionnaire. Hence the response rate on the NASW questionnaire was approximately 15%.

Due to the low response rate for both the CSD and NASW questionnaires, the responses and preference patterns indicated by the respondents cannot be considered representative of all of the casework staff of CSD and NASW members. However, the CSD and NASW responses were collated and analyzed because it was assumed that the respondents were more likely to avail themselves of continuing education opportunities than the non-respondents.

SUMMARY

In brief, the purpose of this needs assessment study was to obtain current, concrete information on the continuing education needs and preferences of selected social service practitioners. The practitioners selected for the study included Children's Services Division caseworkers and members of the National Association of Social Workers. A questionnaire was used to obtain the information. The questionnaire requested information pertaining to course preferences, financial resources, and the credit, scheduling, and course format preferences of the respondents. The questionnaire was pretested at the Oregon Association of Child Care Workers annual conference, and then distributed to CSD caseworkers and NASW members. Because the questionnaire was sponsored jointly by Social Work Continuing Education and the organization being surveyed, some of the information gathered varied between the two groups of respondents. In addition, due to the low response rate for both CSD and NASW questionnaires, the information gathered in the study cannot be considered representative of all CSD caseworkers and NASW members.

CHAPTER II

CSD SURVEY FINDINGS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Of the 99 persons who responded to the CSD questionnaire, 69 respondents (70%) were caseworkers, 13 respondents (13%) were casework supervisors, 2 respondents (2%) were social service assistants, and 1 respondent (1%) was a resource consultant (other). Fourteen persons (14%) did not indicate the function they performed.

In comparing the functions performed by the respondents with the amount of formal education of each respondents, the following information was gathered:

Table 1: Years of Formal Education

<u>Function</u>	1-8	9-12	13-16	17+	No Response	Total
Social Service Assistant		2				2
Caseworker	1	2	33	32	1	69
Caseworker Supervisor			3	9	1	13
Administrator						0
Other				1		1

Among the caseworkers who responded to the question on their years of formal education, 33 caseworkers (48%) indicated that they had taken some or completed their undergraduate education; 32 caseworkers (48%) indicated they had finished some graduate coursework; two caseworkers (2%) indicated they had a high school level of education and one caseworker (1%) indicated he/she had a grade school level of education.

Among the casework supervisors, three respondents (23%) indicated they had taken some or completed their undergraduate education; nine respondents (69%) indicated they had finished some graduate level

coursework.

The two social service assistants indicated they had some amount of high school education while the resource consultant (other) indicated he/she had completed some graduate level education.

PREFERENCES ON EDUCATIONAL CONTENT

CSD respondents were asked to indicate their preference for various educational content areas by checking if they were very interested, interested, or not interested in 24 different suggested educational content areas. Most respondents marked only one category of interest. Hence, some content areas received a high degree of response in one category of interest but not in another. Therefore, it is important that the CSD respondents' educational content preferences be discussed in relation to the degree of interest (very interested or interested) indicated on the questionnaire. Due to the fact that most of the content areas did not receive strong preference marks from the majority of respondents, the CSD survey findings on educational content preferences will be discussed in a general way by describing the content areas preferred by over one-half, one-third to one-half, and less than one-third of the respondents.

A majority of CSD staff respondents (over 50%) indicated they were very interested in only two content areas, family counseling techniques and casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents. Between one-third to one-half of the total CSD respondents indicated that they were very interested in six content areas, marriage counseling techniques, casework techniques with disturbed preschool and school-age children, casework techniques with abusive parents, parenting skills, crisis intervention and legal rights of youth. Less than one-third

of the CSD respondents indicated that they were very interested in the remaining sixteen content areas, with day care and pregnancy counseling registering the least amount of interest (less than ten percent).

In relation to the total CSD responses indicating some interest in the educational content areas, a majority of the respondents (over 50%) indicated interest in only one content area, mental and emotional illness. Between one-third to one-half of the respondents indicated interest in seventeen content areas. For the sake of brevity, the six remaining content areas receiving preference by less than one-third of the respondents included, in decreasing order of response rates, detention, evaluation, Gestalt and Transactional Analysis, casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents, supervision skills, and day care.

Several content areas were consistently preferred by less than one-third of the respondents in the categories of very interested and interested. These low-ranking content areas included, in order of decreasing response rate, Gestalt and Transactional Analysis, supervision skills, evaluation, detention and day care.

TRENDS INDICATED BY THE TOTAL CSD RESPONSES

The educational content areas listed on the CSD questionnaire can be generally grouped into three categories: casework skills development, supervisory and administrative skills development, and knowledge base development. The two content areas in which a majority of the respondents were very interested, family counseling techniques and casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents can be included in the category of casework skills development. The

content area in which a majority of the respondents were interested, mental and emotional illness, fall within the category of knowledge base development. Of the six content areas in which one-third to one-half of the respondents indicated they were very interested, five out of six content areas fall into the category of casework skills development. Finally, of those five low-ranking content areas in which less than one-third of the respondents indicated that they were neither very interested or interested, two content areas can be categorized as supervisory and administrative development, two content areas fall into the category of knowledge base development and one content area can be categorized as casework skills development. It is important to note that the questionnaire contained only two content areas, evaluation and supervision skills, which fall into the category of supervisory and administrative skills development; hence, considering the CSD respondents as a whole, lowest preference was given to education content focussing on supervisory and administrative skills development. In comparison, considering the CSD respondents as a whole, highest preference was indicated for educational content focussing on casework skills development. These findings are shown in Table 2.

DETAILING THE EDUCATIONAL PREFERENCE RESPONSES

The educational content area preferences indicated by the CSD respondents can be detailed according to the function performed by the respondents. Specifically, the responses of the CSD caseworkers and casework supervisors will be examined. The number of respondents who indicated they performed other functions was so small that a separate analysis of their responses would have little predictive

Table 2: General CSD Educational Content Preferences

Degree of Responses	Casework Skills Development	Supervisory & Administrative Skills Development	Knowledge Base Development
Over half	Family Counseling Techniques Casework Techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents		Mental & Emotional Illness
One-third to One-half	Marriage Counseling Techniques Casework Techniques with disturbed preschool and school-age children Casework Techniques with Abusive Parents Parenting Skills Crisis Intervention		
Less than One-third	Gestalt and Transactional Analysis	Supervision Skills Evaluation	Detention Day Care

value. However, it can be noted that the two social service assistants indicated education content preferences similar, if not identical, to those expressed by the caseworkers, while the resource consultant indicated educational content preferences similar to those expressed by the casework supervisors.

THE PREFERENCES OF CSD CASEWORKERS

Sixty nine respondents (or 70% of the total respondents) to the CSD questionnaire indicated that they function as caseworkers within the Children's Services Division. In comparing the preference responses indicated by the CSD caseworkers with the preference responses of the total group of CSD respondents, there appears to be no significant differences in the responses (see Table 3). For example, the majority of CSD caseworkers indicated they were very interested in the content areas of family counseling techniques and casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents and interested in the content area of mental and emotional illness. In addition, the content areas which were least preferred by the total group of CSD respondents were also least preferred by the CSD caseworkers.

In explaining the similarity between the two sets of content area preference lists, it should be remembered that the CSD caseworkers comprised 70% of the total CSD respondents, hence the similarity can be expected. A more marked difference in preference appears when the responses of the CSD casework supervisors are compared with the responses of the caseworkers and of the total group.

Table 3: Preferences of CSD Caseworkers Compared With Total CSD Responses

<u>Content Area</u>	<u>CSD Total Group</u>		<u>CSD Caseworkers</u>	
	<u>Very</u> <u>Interested</u>	<u>Interested</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Interested</u>	<u>Interested</u>
Family Counseling	54 (54%)	33 (33%)	37 (54%)	25 (36%)
Marriage Counseling	37 (37%)	41 (41%)	24 (35%)	31 (45%)
Gestalt & TA	28 (28%)	28 (28%)	19 (28%)	22 (32%)
Communication Skills	22 (22%)	40 (40%)	16 (23%)	29 (42%)
Interviewing Skills	23 (23%)	43 (43%)	18 (26%)	27 (39%)
Casework Techniques Adolescents	51 (51%)	27 (27%)	35 (51%)	21 (30%)
Casework Techniques Preschool	42 (42%)	37 (37%)	34 (49%)	23 (33%)
Casework Techniques Abusive Parents	36 (36%)	37 (37%)	25 (36%)	27 (39%)
Case Planning	28 (28%)	39 (39%)	21 (30%)	28 (41%)
Crisis Intervention	36 (36%)	37 (37%)	27 (39%)	27 (39%)
Foster Care	29 (29%)	34 (34%)	21 (30%)	25 (36%)
Day Care	6 (6%)	19 (19%)	4 (4%)	16 (23%)
Parenting Skills	36 (36%)	39 (39%)	25 (36%)	27 (39%)
Pregnancy Counseling	9 (9%)	36 (36%)	5 (7%)	30 (43%)
Human Development	11 (11%)	35 (35%)	6 (9%)	24 (35%)
Medical Information	18 (18%)	41 (41%)	11 (16%)	30 (43%)
Mental & Emotional Illness	25 (25%)	51 (51%)	18 (26%)	37 (54%)
Alcohol & Drugs	16 (16%)	39 (39%)	13 (19%)	28 (41%)
Cultural & Racial Differences	20 (20%)	36 (36%)	14 (20%)	29 (42%)
Community Resources	28 (28%)	39 (39%)	19 (28%)	29 (42%)
Detention	16 (16%)	31 (31%)	11 (16%)	21 (30%)
Evaluation	19 (19%)	28 (28%)	9 (13%)	22 (32%)
Supervision Skills	29 (29%)	24 (24%)	15 (22%)	19 (28%)
Legal Rights of Youth	34 (34%)	37 (37%)	20 (29%)	27 (39%)

The same trends noted in the previous section describing trends indicated by the total CSD responses can be restated. Briefly, CSD caseworkers expressed a high preference for content areas pertaining to casework skills development, and as one might expect, a low preference for content areas pertaining to supervisory and administrative skills development with a mixed preference for content areas pertaining to knowledge base development. Thus, their educational content preferences appear related to job duties.

THE PREFERENCES OF THE CASEWORK SUPERVISORS

The remaining groups of respondents, which comprised 13% of the total number of respondents, are the CSD casework supervisors. Their preferences on educational content are detailed in Table 4. As Table 4 indicates, a majority of the casework supervisors (over 50%) indicated that they were very interested in the educational content areas of supervision skills, legal rights of youth, evaluation, and casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents. Between one-third to one-half of the casework supervisors indicated they were very interested in the content areas of case planning, family counseling, Gestalt and Transactional Analysis, communication skills, casework techniques with abusive parents, and foster care.

A majority of the casework supervisors indicated they were interested in crisis intervention, mental and emotional illness and interviewing skills. Between one-third to one-half of the casework supervisors indicated interest in nine content areas including family counseling, marriage counseling, casework techniques with abusive parents, case planning, alcohol and drugs, detention, casework techniques with preschool and school-age children, cultural and racial

Table 4: Preferences of Casework Supervisors Compared With Total
CSD Responses

<u>Content Area</u>	<u>CSD Total Group</u>		<u>Casework Supervisors</u>	
	<u>Very</u> <u>Interested</u>	<u>Interested</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Interested</u>	<u>Interested</u>
Family Counseling	54 (54%)	33 (33%)	5 (38%)	6 (46%)
Marriage Counseling	37 (37%)	41 (41%)	3 (23%)	6 (46%)
Gestalt & TA	28 (28%)	28 (28%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)
Communication Skills	22 (22%)	40 (40%)	5 (38%)	4 (31%)
Interviewing Skills	23 (23%)	43 (43%)	3 (23%)	7 (54%)
Casework Techniques Adolescents	51 (51%)	27 (27%)	9 (69%)	3 (23%)
Casework Techniques Preschool	42 (42%)	37 (37%)	4 (31%)	5 (38%)
Casework Techniques Abusive Parents	36 (36%)	37 (37%)	5 (38%)	6 (46%)
Case Planning	28 (28%)	39 (39%)	6 (46%)	6 (46%)
Crisis Intervention	36 (36%)	37 (37%)	3 (23%)	9 (69%)
Foster Care	29 (29%)	34 (34%)	5 (38%)	4 (31%)
Day Care	6 (6%)	19 (19%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)
Parenting Skills	36 (36%)	39 (39%)	4 (31%)	7 (54%)
Pregnancy Counseling	9 (9%)	36 (36%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)
Human Development	11 (11%)	35 (35%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)
Medical Information	18 (18%)	41 (41%)	4 (31%)	4 (31%)
Mental & Emotional Illness	25 (25%)	51 (51%)	3 (23%)	8 (26%)
Alcohol & Drugs	16 (16%)	39 (39%)	0 (0)	6 (46%)
Cultural & Racial Differences	20 (20%)	36 (36%)	3 (23%)	5 (38%)
Community Resources	28 (28%)	39 (39%)	4 (31%)	5 (38%)
Detention	16 (16%)	31 (31%)	4 (31%)	6 (46%)
Evaluation	19 (19%)	28 (28%)	7 (54%)	4 (31%)
Supervision Skills	29 (29%)	24 (24%)	9 (69%)	3 (23%)
Legal Rights of Youth	34 (34%)	37 (37%)	8 (62%)	3 (23%)

differences and community resources. Those content areas which were consistently indicated by less than one-third of the casework supervisors were medical information for social workers, human development, pregnancy counseling and day care.

TRENDS INDICATED BY RESPONSES OF THE CASEWORK SUPERVISORS

Sixty nine percent of the casework supervisors indicated they were very interested in the content area of supervision skills while 54% indicated they were very interested in evaluation. These two content areas fall into the category of supervisory and administrative skills development. The other two content areas rated high by the majority of casework supervisors fall into the other two categories of casework skills development and knowledge base development. The content areas in which one-third to one-half of the casework supervisors indicated they were very interested fall into the category of casework skills development.

Two of the three content areas in which a majority of the casework supervisors indicated they were interested fall into the category of casework skills development with one content area falling into the category of knowledge base development. Finally, three of the four content areas in which less than one-third of the casework supervisors consistently expressed little interest fall into the category of knowledge base development with the fourth content area falling into the category of casework skills development.

Stating the trends indicated by the responses of the casework supervisors in general terms, the casework supervisors indicated highest preference for educational content areas pertaining to

supervisory and administrative skills development, mixed preference for content areas pertaining to casework skills development and lower preference for content areas pertaining to knowledge base development.

COMPARISON OF CASEWORKER AND CASEWORK SUPERVISOR RESPONSES

Table 5 details the responses indicated by the CSD caseworkers and casework supervisors pertaining to educational content. In comparing the educational content areas in which a majority of the caseworkers and casework supervisors indicated they were very interested, casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents was rated high by both groups while family counseling was rated high by the caseworkers and supervision skills, legal rights of youth and evaluation were rated high by the casework supervisors. In comparing the educational content areas in which one-third to one-half of both groups indicated they were very interested, the only content area ranked in common by both groups was casework techniques with abusive parents.

In comparing the educational content areas in which a majority of the caseworkers and casework supervisors indicated they were interested, both groups rated mental and emotional illness high. In comparing the educational content areas in which one-third to one-half of both groups indicated they were interested, detention was the only content area rated by at least one-third of the casework supervisors but not by at least one-third of the caseworkers.

In comparing those educational content areas in which less than one-third of both groups consistently indicated little interest, day care was the only content area receiving low response from both groups.

In comparing the trends indicated by the responses of the caseworkers and casework supervisors, the caseworkers indicated highest

Table 5: Comparison of Educational Preferences of CSD Caseworkers
And Casework Supervisors

<u>Content Area</u>	<u>Caseworkers</u>		<u>Casework Supervisors</u>	
	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Interested</u>	<u>Very Interested</u>	<u>Interested</u>
Family Counseling	37 (54%)	25 (36%)	5 (38%)	6 (46%)
Marriage Counseling	24 (35%)	31 (45%)	3 (23%)	6 (46%)
Gestalt & TA	19 (28%)	22 (32%)	5 (38%)	2 (15%)
Communication Skills	16 (23%)	29 (42%)	5 (38%)	4 (31%)
Interviewing Skills	18 (26%)	27 (39%)	3 (23%)	7 (54%)
Casework Techniques Adolescents	35 (51%)	21 (30%)	9 (69%)	3 (23%)
Casework Techniques Preschool	34 (49%)	23 (33%)	4 (31%)	5 (38%)
Casework Techniques Abusive Parents	25 (36%)	27 (39%)	5 (38%)	6 (46%)
Case Planning	21 (30%)	28 (41%)	6 (46%)	6 (46%)
Crisis Intervention	27 (39%)	27 (39%)	3 (23%)	9 (69%)
Foster Care	21 (30%)	25 (36%)	5 (38%)	4 (31%)
Day Care	4 (6%)	16 (23%)	2 (15%)	2 (15%)
Parenting Skills	25 (36%)	27 (39%)	4 (31%)	7 (54%)
Pregnancy Counseling	5 (7%)	30 (43%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)
Human Development	6 (9%)	24 (35%)	3 (23%)	4 (31%)
Medical Information	11 (16%)	30 (43%)	4 (31%)	4 (31%)
Mental & Emotional Illness	18 (26%)	37 (54%)	3 (23%)	8 (62%)
Alcohol & Drugs	13 (19%)	28 (41%)	0 (0)	6 (46%)
Cultural & Racial Differences	14 (20%)	29 (42%)	3 (23%)	5 (38%)
Community Resources	19 (28%)	29 (42%)	4 (31%)	5 (38%)
Detention	11 (16%)	21 (30%)	4 (31%)	6 (46%)
Evaluation	9 (13%)	22 (32%)	7 (54%)	4 (31%)
Supervision Skills	15 (22%)	19 (28%)	9 (69%)	3 (23%)
Legal Rights of Youth	20 (29%)	27 (39%)	8 (62%)	3 (23%)

preference for content areas pertaining to casework skills development while the casework supervisors indicated highest preference for content areas pertaining to supervisory and administrative skills development. The caseworkers indicated lowest preference for content pertaining to supervisory and administrative skills development while the casework supervisors indicated lowest preference for content pertaining to knowledge base development.

In a very broad sense, the educational content preferences of the CSD respondents can be shown through use of the following table:

Table 6: Education Content Preferences

<u>Category of Content</u>	<u>Caseworkers</u>	<u>Casework Supervisors</u>	<u>Total</u>
casework skills	high	mixed	high
supervisory skills	low	high	low
knowledge base	mixed	low	mixed

As Table 6 illustrates, the CSD respondents tended to prefer educational content which related directly to their job responsibilities.

PREFERENCES ON COURSE CREDIT

CSD staff were asked to rank three credit options in order of their preference. Table 7 details their responses:

Table 7: Preferences on Course Credit

<u>Credit Option</u>	<u>First Pref.</u>	<u>Second Pref.</u>	<u>Third Pref.</u>	<u>checked but not ranked</u>
Transferrable	25 (27%)	8 (9%)	13 (14%)	16 (17%)
Continuing Education Unit	15 (16%)	28 (30%)	3 (3%)	8 (9%)
No Credit	6 (6%)	12 (13%)	27 (29%)	22 (24%)

Note: The totals vary for each credit option because respondents did not always indicate a ranking preference for each option. In addition, six respondents did not indicate a preference for any option. To determine percentages, a total number of 93 responses was used (n=93).

Based on the above information, transferrable credit was ranked as the first preference by CSD respondents, continuing education unit credit was ranked as the second preference and no credit was ranked as the third preference. Of those respondents who checked one or more credit option, instead of ranking the credit options, 16 respondents (17%) preferred transferrable credit, 8 respondents (9%) preferred continuing education unit credit and 22 respondents (24%) preferred no credit.

Table 8 details the credit option preferences indicated by the CSD caseworkers and casework supervisors. To simplify the table, only the first preference responses and checked, but not ranked, responses are shown.

Table 8: Credit Preferences of Caseworkers & Casework Supervisors

<u>Credit Option</u>	<u>Caseworker</u>		<u>Casework Supervisor</u>	
	<u>First Preference</u>	<u>Checked</u>	<u>First Preference</u>	<u>Checked</u>
Transferrable Credit	21 (31%)	9 (13%)	2 (17%)	
Continuing Education Unit	11 (16%)	6 (9%)	2 (17%)	2 (17%)
No Credit	4 (6%)	12 (18%)	1 (8%)	4 (33%)

As the table illustrates, the credit option preferences indicated by the caseworker respondents correspond directly to the preferences of the total group of respondents. The casework supervisors indicated a preference for no credit or continuing education unit credit.

In summary, more CSD respondents indicated that their first preference was for transferrable credit, with no credit having second preference and continuing education unit credit having third preference.

PREFERENCES ON SCHEDULING

CSD staff were asked to rank three time scheduling options in order of their preference. The following table details their responses:

Table 9: Preferences on Time Scheduling

<u>Time Option</u>	<u>First Pref.</u>	<u>Second Pref.</u>	<u>Third Pref.</u>	<u>checked but not ranked</u>
Day Time	20 (24%)		1 (1%)	49 (60%)
Evening	2 (2%)	18 (22%)	2 (2%)	16 (20%)
Weekend		3 (4%)	17 (21%)	3 (4%)

Note: The totals vary for each time scheduling option because respondents did not always indicate a ranking preference for each option. Seventeen respondents did not indicate a preference for any option. Hence, a total number of 82 responses was used to determine percentages ($n = 82$).

As the above table shows, the vast majority of respondents indicated that their first preference was for day-time course scheduling. Evening course scheduling was ranked as a distant second preference. No significant variations appeared when the responses on time scheduling were reviewed in relation to the function of the respondents (see Appendix C).

The CSD staff was also asked to rank four course format options in order of their preferences. The following table details their response:

Table 10: Preferences on Course Format

<u>Format Options</u>	<u>First Pref.</u>	<u>Second Pref.</u>	<u>Third Pref.</u>	<u>Fourth Pref.</u>	<u>checked but not ranked</u>
Weekly Class	26 (32%)	9 (11%)	2 (2%)		26 (32%)
Biweekly Class		16 (20%)	11 (13%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)
Saturday Class		1 (1%)	6 (7%)	19 (23%)	1 (1%)
Workshop	11 (13%)	9 (11%)	13 (16%)	3 (4%)	22 (27%)

Note: Seventeen respondents did not indicate a preference on course format, hence percentages were determined by using a total number of 82, ($n = 82$).

By adding the number of responses indicating a first preference to the number of non-ranked responses (from the column of "checked but not ranked") we can conclude that a majority of the respondents (63%) indicated a first preference for weekly classes. Forty percent of the respondents indicated a first preference for a workshop format. No respondents indicated a first preference response for either biweekly or Saturday classes and the non-ranked responses for these two options was extremely small. No significant variations appeared when the responses on format were reviewed in relation to the function of the respondents (see Appendix D).

In summary, CSD staff expressed a clear preference for day-time classes. In relation to course format, weekly classes were ranked as the first preference and workshops were ranked as the second preference. One justification for these preferences appears to be an expectation or desire on the part of the respondents to receive paid release time from their jobs to attend weekly classes or workshops. While weekly classes have not been the usual format used by Social Work Continuing Education, the findings of the CSD survey are not expected to create any difficulties because Social Work Continuing Education has the capacity to arrange courses in response to the needs of individual consumer groups.

PREFERENCES ON TUITION COSTS

In reviewing the responses of the total groups, 47 respondents (48%) indicated that they would pay half the tuition costs, 26 respondents (26%) could not afford to pay any tuition amount, 10 respondents (10%) would pay full tuition and the remaining 16 respondents (16%) did not answer the question. The responses given by the CSD caseworkers and casework supervisors are detailed in Table 11.

Table 11: Preferences on Tuition Costs

<u>Function</u>	<u>Full Tuition</u>	<u>Half Tuition</u>	<u>No Tuition</u>	<u>Total</u>
Caseworker	8 (12%)	35 (52%)	24 (36%)	67
Casework Supervisor	2 (15%)	10 (77%)	1 (8%)	13

In comparing the responses of the caseworkers and casework supervisors on tuition costs to the responses of the whole group, it appears that the caseworker supervisors expressed a slightly higher preference for paying half the tuition costs than the group as a whole. The responses of the caseworkers paralleled the responses of the total group.

The responses of the CSD staff concerning tuition costs come as no surprise. The Staff Development Supervisor in Region I of the Children's Services Division has consistently maintained that the tuition costs for SWCE classes are too high for CSD staff to pay. In order for Social Work Continuing Education to serve CSD staff, new sources of tuition subsidies, such as Title XX, must be found or new avenues of offering classes must be arranged. One suggestion is to offer classes without credit for a basic charge, with the option that class participants may pay an additional amount to obtain credit for the course.

SUMMARY OF CSD SURVEY

1. The vast majority of CSD staff who responded to the questionnaire were caseworkers. The only other major group of CSD respondents were casework supervisors.
2. Approximately half of the respondents had either some undergraduate education or some graduate education.

3. The CSD caseworkers indicated greater preference for educational content pertaining to casework skills development while the casework supervisors indicated greater preference for educational content pertaining to supervisory skills development.

4. CSD respondents ranked transferrable credit as their first preference on credit; no credit was their second preference and continuing education unit credit was their third preference.

5. Day-time scheduling was the first preference of over 80% of the CSD respondents with evening course scheduling a distant second preference.

6. Over half of the CSD respondents indicated a first preference for weekly classes with another one-third of the respondents expressing first preference for workshops.

7. Over half of the CSD respondents indicated a willingness to pay half of the tuition costs. Another one-third of the respondents indicated that they could not afford to pay any tuition costs.

CHAPTER III

N.A.S.W. SURVEY FINDINGS

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS:

NASW members were asked to indicate the method area in which they primarily worked. The NASW respondents indicated the following:

Table 12: NASW Demographic Characteristics

<u>Method Area</u>	<u>Exclusive Method Area</u>	<u>One of Several Method Areas</u>
casework	28 (56%)	21 (34%)
group work		14 (23%)
community organization	1 (2%)	3 (5%)
administration or supervision	14 (28%)	14 (23%)
field supervision teaching/consultation	<u>7</u> (14%)	<u>10</u> (16%)
Total	50	62

Note: The percentages were determined based on the total number of respondents who indicated an exclusive method area or one of several method areas.

As the above table shows, the largest group of NASW respondents (56%) working exclusively in one method area indicated casework as their exclusive method area. Another group of the NASW respondents indicated they combined casework with one or more other method areas (34% of the group with more than one method area). The second largest group of NASW respondents (28%) working exclusively in one method area indicated that area was administration or supervision. The remaining group of NASW respondents (14%) worked exclusively in field supervision, teaching, or consultation. The method areas of group work and community organization were usually combined with other method areas, according to the NASW responses.

Since other NASW questionnaire responses will be discussed in relation to the method orientation of the NASW respondents, three method area categories have been arbitrarily selected based on the responses to this first question:

- 1) casework-oriented respondents, including those respondents who work exclusively in a casework capacity or combine casework with other method areas; the number of casework-oriented respondents total 41.
- 2) administration or supervision-oriented respondents, including those respondents working exclusively in this method area or combining it with community organization; the number of respondents in this category total 16.
- 3) field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents, including those respondents working exclusively in these areas or in combination with other method areas; the number of respondents in this category total 17.

Briefly, the rationale behind the selection of these three categories was an assumption that the NASW respondents within each category would tend to respond in similar ways. For example, it was assumed that administration or supervision-oriented respondents would tend to prefer administratively-oriented continuing education options and that respondents who indicated that they combined casework with one or more other method areas would tend to prefer casework-oriented continuing education options. Finally, it was assumed that field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents would tend to be more favorably disposed to all continuing education opportunities.

The questionnaire did not include any question pertaining to the amount of formal education of the NASW respondents. Due to the professional nature of NASW and the fact that Bachelor's of Social Work were not issued prior to the 1975-76 school year, the assumption was made that all of the NASW questionnaire respondents were either completing a MSW program or had already completed a MSW program.

PREFERENCES ON TYPES OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

NASW members were asked to identify the types of continuing professional education they had used in the past two years. It was anticipated that the responses indicated on this question could be compared with their responses concerning future continuing education preferences. In addition, their responses given in reference to past and future continuing education preferences could be compared with their responses given in reference to educational content areas and format preferences.

First, NASW members were asked to check the types of professional education they had used in the past two years. The NASW respondents indicated the following:

Table 13: Types of Professional Education Used in Past by NASW Respondents

<u>Type of Professional Education Used:</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Workshops	61	81%
Personal Reading	60	80%
Conferences	48	64%
Classes	32	43%
In-Service Training	32	43%
Consultation	28	37%

The majority of NASW respondents had utilized workshops, personal reading and conferences to meet their continuing education needs with

workshops and personal reading utilized most frequently. In addition, one-third to nearly one-half of the respondents had utilized classes, in-service training and consultation to meet their continuing education needs.

In comparing the types of professional education used by respondents within the three method area categories, the following information was gathered:

Table 14: Type of Education Used Compared With Method Specialization

<u>Type of Education Used</u>	<u>Casework-Oriented</u>	<u>Administration/Supervision</u>	<u>Field Supervision Teaching/Consult.</u>
classes	21 (51%)	1 (6%)	9 (53%)
workshops	32 (78%)	13 (81%)	15 (88%)
conferences	23 (56%)	10 (63%)	15 (88%)
in-service training	18 (44%)	5 (31%)	9 (53%)
personal reading	31 (76%)	12 (75%)	16 (94%)
consultation	16 (39%)	4 (25%)	8 (47%)

Based on the above information, the casework-oriented respondents made slightly less use of workshops, personal reading and conferences, slightly more use of classes and the same use of consultation and in-service training as did the total group of respondents. The administration or supervision-oriented respondents made slightly less use of consultation and in-service training and significantly less use of classes. The field supervision, teaching or consultation-oriented respondents made higher use of all types of continuing education in comparison with the total group of respondents.

PREFERENCES ON FUTURE CONTINUING EDUCATION

NASW members were then asked to rank the types of professional education they planned to use in the future in order of their preferences. Their responses are detailed in Appendix E. In reviewing

the responses of the total groups of NASW respondents, the following preference ranking can be drawn by combining the respondents' first preferences with the type of education which other respondents checked but did not rank:

Table 15: NASW Future Professional Education Preference

<u>Type of Education Preferred</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Workshops	45	60%
Personal Reading	44	59%
Conferences	26	35%
In-Service Training	23	31%
Consultation	18	24%
Classes	15	20%

This preference ranking is only approximate and hence the percentage of responses in this ranking should not be compared with the response percentages obtained on the types of education respondents used in the past. The value of the above ranking is only in highlighting how the types of education are generally rated in comparison to each other.

The above preference ranking suggested that NASW respondents would continue to make high use of workshops and personal reading to meet their continuing education needs in the future. Conferences ranked third as a preference among those respondents who checked the types of education they would use but did not rank their preferences; among respondents who ranked their preferences, conferences rated the highest as a second preference to workshops. The respondents inferred through their responses that they would make greater use of in-service training and consultation but less use of class.

Due to the range of possible responses to this question, the

small population size, and the great number of respondents who did not rank their preferences, a detailed analysis of the future education preferences made by members of the three method area categories will not be done because the responses identified would be too small in number to support any conclusions.

In summary, the majority of NASW respondents indicated they would make high use of workshops, personal reading and conferences to meet their continuing education needs. It appeared that a much smaller number of NASW respondents would utilize in-service training, consultation and classes to meet their continuing education needs.

PREFERENCES ON GENERAL PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AREAS

NASW respondents were asked to indicate which area of professional education was of primary interest to them. Although they were instructed to check only one area, a number of respondents checked more than one area. The following general information was gathered:

Table 16: Preferences on General Professional Education Areas

<u>Professional Education Area</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
clinical techniques	36	48%
relating to particular target groups	18	24%
relating to work in special setting	17	23%
relating to administrative/ planning/evaluation functions	24	32%

Note: The percentages were figured using a total population of 75.

The general information was then detailed according to the method area specialization of the respondents:

Table 17: General Professional Education Area Preferences Compared With Method Specialization

<u>Professional Education Area</u>	<u>Casework</u> (n=41)	<u>Administration/ Supervision</u> (n=16)	<u>Field Supervision/ Teaching/Consult.</u> (n=17)
clinical techniques	37 (90%)	4 (25%)	6 (35%)
relating to target groups	19 (46%)	3 (19%)	7 (41%)
relating to special setting	21 (51%)	4 (25%)	8 (47%)
relating to administration/ planning/evaluation	19 (46%)	11 (69%)	6 (35%)

The data revealed a fairly even distribution of interest between the four professional education areas. When the general information was detailed according to the respondents' method area specialization, however, several patterns were revealed. The casework-oriented respondents indicated an overwhelming interest (90% of the casework-oriented respondents) in clinical techniques. A majority of the administration or supervision oriented respondents indicated their primary interest related to administration/planning/evaluation functions. The field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents, however, indicated no one primary professional education interest area; instead, their responses were fairly evenly divided among all four areas.

In summary, casework-oriented NASW respondents preferred professional education related to clinical techniques. Administration or supervision oriented respondents preferred education related to administration, planning and/or evaluation. Field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents revealed no strong preferences for one particular area of professional education.

PREFERENCES ON SPECIFIC CONTINUING EDUCATION CONTENT

NASW respondents were asked to identify the specific continuing education content areas which really interested them and specify whether they preferred a course or workshop format in relation to the content areas they identified. Table 18 details their responses. If a respondent indicated both course and workshop format for a particular content area, his/her response was attributed to one format based on the pattern of his/her responses. Some respondents indicated an interest in a particular content area but did not specify one format; their responses were included in a separate column. Hence, by adding the responses made by respondents who specified course, workshop, or general interest, a general preference pattern developed.

The NASW respondents were very selective in their responses and it is reflected in the general preference pattern. First, no one content area was specified by a majority of the respondents. The most frequent content area identified was mental health, which 49% of the respondents specified. Between one-third to one-half of the respondents specified, in addition to mental health, four other content areas, listed in decreasing order of preference: program evaluation, clinical techniques, supervision and personnel management, and legal information for social workers. The content areas selected by less than 10% of the respondents included corrections, juvenile delinquency, racism and affirmative action, detention and case planning and management.

The content areas were grouped into four categories on the questionnaire: skills development, service systems, social concern,

Table 18: NASW Respondent Preferences on Specific Content Areas

<u>Content Area</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Interested but did not specify format</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rank</u>
<u>Skills Development:</u>					
Clinical techniques	9	11	9	29 (39%)	3
Group Process	4	12	2	18 (24%)	7
Comm. & interviewing	4	8	5	17 (23%)	8
Case planning	3	3		6 (8%)	17
Medical information	6	10	5	21 (28%)	6
Legal information	6	13	6	25 (33%)	5
Team functioning	2	11	4	17 (23%)	8
Crisis intervention	3	11	3	17 (23%)	8
Political action	1	7	2	10 (13%)	14
Consultation	4	8	6	18 (24%)	7
<u>Service Systems:</u>					
Foster care	1	5	2	8 (11%)	16
Prot. services- adults	3	4	4	11 (15%)	13
Residential care	1	8	2	11 (15%)	13
Detention	3	1		4 (5%)	18
Institutional placement	1	6	2	9 (12%)	15
<u>Social Concerns:</u>					
Racism	1	3		4 (5%)	18
Feminism	2	6		8 (11%)	16
Drug Abuse	4	5	4	13 (17%)	11
Sexual Dysfunctioning	3	9	4	16 (21%)	9
Child Abuse	4	10	2	16 (21%)	9
Juv. Delinquency	1	3		4 (5%)	18
Aging	2	6	4	12 (16%)	12
Mental Health	4	19	14	37 (49%)	1
Corrections	1			1 (1%)	19

Table 18 continued

<u>Content Area</u>	<u>Class</u>	<u>Workshop</u>	<u>Interested but did not specify format</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Rank</u>
<u>Administration:</u>					
Supervision	10	7	9	26 (35%)	4
Volunteers	2	6	2	10 (13%)	14
Man. Info. Systems	2	5	3	10 (13%)	14
Program Evaluation	9	15	10	34 (45%)	2
Social Planning	6	5	4	15 (20%)	10

and administration. By averaging the number of responses within each category, the following category preference pattern emerges: administration, skills development, social concerns, and service systems (listed in decreasing order of preference).

Table 19 details the responses given by the respondents within the three method area categories in relation to their preferences on specific content areas. The preferences of the casework-oriented respondents paralleled the total population responses. A majority of respondents expressed their preference for content pertaining to comparative clinical techniques, a marked increase over the responses of the total population. Between one-third to one-half of the casework-oriented respondents indicated preference for three other content areas: mental health, legal information for social workers and program evaluation.

The administration or supervision oriented respondents showed a greater preference for content pertaining to program evaluation, management information systems, and supervision and personnel management. Their preference response for mental health paralleled the total population's response rate while their preference response for comparative clinical techniques was substantially lower than the total populations response rate.

The field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents showed a significantly higher preference response for content pertaining to team functioning, consultation, residential care and feminism than did the total population. Their preference response for content pertaining to mental health, clinical techniques, super-

Table 19: Content Preferences Compared with Method Area Specialization

<u>Content Area</u>	<u>Casework</u> n=41	<u>Administration</u> n=16	<u>Field Supervision</u> n=17
<u>Skills Development:</u>			
Clinical techniques	21 (51%)	3 (19%)	7 (41%)
Group process	11 (27%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)
Communication	9 (22%)	4 (25%)	3 (18%)
Case planning	4 (10%)	0	2 (12%)
Medical Information	11 (27%)	5 (31%)	4 (24%)
Legal Information	16 (39%)	4 (25%)	4 (24%)
Team functioning	8 (20%)	2 (13%)	7 (41%)
Crisis Intervention	11 (27%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)
Political action	3 (7%)	4 (25%)	2 (12%)
Consultation	6 (15%)	4 (25%)	8 (47%)
<u>Service Systems:</u>			
Foster care	4 (10%)	1 (6%)	3 (18%)
Prot. services - adults	4 (10%)	3 (19%)	4 (24%)
Residential care	5 (12%)	0	6 (35%)
Detention	3 (7%)	1 (6%)	0
Institutional placement	4 (10%)	2 (13%)	3 (18%)
<u>Social Concerns:</u>			
Racism	1 (2%)	1 (6%)	2 (12%)
Feminism	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	5 (29%)
Drug Abuse	9 (22%)	2 (13%)	2 (12%)
Sexual Dysfunctioning	10 (24%)	1 (6%)	5 (29%)
Child Abuse	11 (27%)	2 (13%)	2 (12%)
Juvenile Delinquency	2 (5%)	0	2 (12%)
Aging	5 (12%)	2 (13%)	4 (24%)
Mental Health	20 (49%)	8 (50%)	8 (47%)
Corrections	0	0	1 (6%)
<u>Administration:</u>			
Supervision	11 (27%)	7 (44%)	7 (41%)
Volunteers	6 (15%)	1 (6%)	3 (18%)
Information systems	3 (7%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)
Program evaluation	15 (37%)	11 (69%)	8 (47%)
Social Planning	5 (12%)	5 (31%)	4 (24%)

vision, and program evaluation paralleled the total population responses.

In comparing the preferences of respondents according to their category of method area specialization with the four general categories of content, the following patterns emerge:

Table 20: Ranking of Content Categories by Method Specialization

<u>Content Category</u>	<u>Casework</u>	<u>Administration</u>	<u>Field Supervision</u>
skills development	1	2	2
service systems	4	4	4
social concerns	3	3	3
administration	2	1	1

Note: The content categories were ranked on a scale of one to four, with one denoting highest preference.

As the table shows, the casework-oriented respondents indicated highest preference for content related to skills development, while the remaining respondents indicated highest preference for content related to administration. Content related to social concerns and service systems received lowest preference by all respondents.

The information gathered on NASW respondents' preferences concerning specific educational content correlate directly to their general educational content preferences. The casework oriented respondents preferred both general and specific content related to clinical skills development; the administration or supervision oriented respondents preferred both general and specific content related to administration; and the field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents preferred both general and specific content related to administration and skills development.

In brief, five specific content areas were selected by between

one-third to one-half of the NASW respondents. The content areas included mental health, program evaluation, comparative clinical techniques, supervision and personnel management, and legal information for social workers (listed in decreasing order of preference). The responses of individual casework-oriented respondents paralleled these preferences, while administration or supervision oriented respondents placed less preference for clinical techniques and greater preference for content pertaining to management information systems. The field supervision, teaching, or consultation oriented respondents placed greater preference on team functioning, consultation, residential care and feminism than did the total population of respondents.

The casework oriented respondents indicated a general preference for content related to clinical skills development; the administration or supervision oriented respondents indicated a general preference for content related to administrative function; and the field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents indicated general preference for all types of content.

PREFERENCES CONCERNING THE FORMAT FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION OFFERINGS

In indicating their preferences on specific educational content areas, NASW respondents were also asked to indicate whether they preferred to have the content offered through a course or workshop. Because their responses concerning most of the educational content areas were so small in number, with many respondents indicating no preference between a course or workshop, no definite conclusions will be drawn concerning their preferences for course or workshop offering from their responses on specific educational content areas.

However, a scanning of Table 18 will reveal that the NASW respondents preferred a workshop over a course for 26 out of the 29 content areas. This general trend correlates directly with their responses given in relation to the types of continuing education respondents had used in the past two years or planned to use in the future. In those responses, NASW respondents indicated a strong preference for workshops and a very low preference for classes.

TIME SCHEDULING

NASW respondents indicated the following preferences related to time scheduling of continuing education offerings:

Table 21: Time Scheduling Preferences

<u>Time Option</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>	<u>Checked but not ranked</u>
day time	22 (29%)	5 (7%)	6 (8%)	14 (19%)
evening	12 (16%)	21 (28%)	4 (5%)	17 (23%)
weekend	6 (8%)	11 (15%)	19 (25%)	6 (8%)

Note: In determining percentages, the total population was 75.

As the information reveals, of those respondents who ranked the three time scheduling options in order of their preference, day-time scheduling was most preferred, with evening scheduling a second preference. Of those respondents who did not rank the three options, evening scheduling was preferred over day-time scheduling. Combining the responses for first preference with the non-ranked responses, daytime scheduling was preferred over evening scheduling.

CONTENT PRESENTATION

NASW respondents were asked to rank their preferences concerning content presentation. Their responses reveal:

Table 22: Content Presentation Preference Ranking

<u>Content Presentation</u>	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>	<u>Fourth</u>	<u>Checked but not ranked</u>
theory emphasis	7 (9%)	16 (21%)	12 (16%)	5 (7%)	5 (7%)
technique emphasis	25 (33%)	17 (23%)	5 (7%)		7 (9%)
experiential emphasis	11 (15%)	10 (13%)	10 (13%)	4 (5%)	4 (5%)
combination	6 (8%)	5 (7%)	8 (11%)	1 (1%)	20 (27%)

Note: Percentages were determined using a total population of 75.

Of those respondents who ranked the four content presentation options, the largest percentage indicated a preference for content emphasizing technique. Of those respondents who did not rank their responses, the largest percentage indicated a preference for content that combined theory, techniques and experiential learning.

Considered as a whole, the NASW respondents preferred workshops over courses, day-time scheduling over evening or weekend scheduling and content that emphasized techniques or that combined technique, theory and experiential learning over content placing sole emphasis on theory or experiential learning.

PREFERENCES ON CREDIT AND TUITION

The NASW respondents were asked to indicate their preferences on credit. Some respondents checked more than one option and some respondents did not answer the question. The following preference pattern emerged:

Table 23: Credit Option Preferences

<u>Credit Option</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Transferrable	14	19%
Continuing Education Unit	32	43%
No Credit	25	33%

Note: The percentages were determined using a total population of 75.

The largest percentage of respondents (43%) indicated a preference for continuing education unit credit. The next largest percentage of respondents (33%) indicated a preference for no credit, with the remaining respondents preferring transferrable credit. The preference pattern is not surprising since most, if not all, of the respondents have already completed their master's degree.

PREFERENCE ON TUITION

In response to the question of preferable tuition options, the respondents indicated the following:

Table 24: Tuition Preferences

<u>Tuition Option</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Pay full tuition	17	23%
Pay half tuition	43	57%
Pay no tuition	5	7%

Note: Percentages were figured using a total population of 75. Ten respondents (13%) did not answer this question.

The majority of NASW respondents (57%) indicated they were willing to pay half of the tuition costs for continuing education courses. The next largest percentage (23%) indicated they were willing to pay full tuition costs.

Breaking down the responses on tuition by the respondents method area specialization, the following information was obtained:

Table 25: Tuition Preferences Compared With Method Specialization

<u>Method Area</u>	<u>Tuition Options</u>		
	<u>Full</u>	<u>Half</u>	<u>None</u>
Casework (n=41)	9 (22%)	25 (61%)	1 (1%)
Administration (n=16)	2 (13%)	7 (54%)	4 (25%)
Field Supervision (n=17)	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	0

Note: Some respondents did not answer the question.

According to this information, the casework oriented respondents expressed tuition preferences that paralleled those preferences of the total population. The administration or supervision oriented respondents expressed a greater reluctance to pay any tuition while the field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents expressed a greater willingness to pay full tuition costs.

In summary, the NASW respondents expressed a preference for continuing education unit credit and a willingness to pay half of the tuition costs for continuing education courses.

SUMMARY OF NASW SURVEY:

1. Over half of the persons who responded to the NASW questionnaire indicated a specialization in casework-oriented activities. One quarter of the NASW respondents concentrated on administration or supervision and the remaining respondents concentrated on field supervision, teaching or consultation.
2. The NASW respondents indicated a high preference for using workshops, personal reading and conferences to meet their continuing education needs. In addition, they expressed a much lower preference for using in-service training, consultation and classes to meet their

continuing education needs.

3. Based on the responses given, casework-oriented NASW respondents preferred professional education related to clinical techniques.

Administration or supervision oriented respondents preferred education related to administration, planning and/or evaluation. Field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents revealed no strong preferences for one particular area of professional education.

4. Considered as a whole, the NASW respondents indicated a preference for educational content pertaining to mental health, program evaluation, comparative clinical techniques, supervision and personnel management, and legal information for social workers. The casework-oriented respondents preferred educational content pertaining to clinical skills development. The administration or supervision oriented respondents preferred education content pertaining to administrative functions. The field supervision, teaching or consultation oriented respondents indicated no strong preferences related to any one type of educational content; instead, they showed greater than average interest in all types of education content.

5. Considered as a whole, the NASW respondents preferred workshops over courses, day-time scheduling over evening or weekend scheduling and content that emphasized techniques or that combined technique, theory and experiential learning over content placing sole emphasis on theory or experiential learning.

3. In general, the NASW respondents expressed a preference for continuing education unit credit and a willingness to pay half of the tuition costs for continuing education courses.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

For the purposes of this study, the respondents in each survey were categorized into functional groups. The following percentage of respondents from each group fell into comparable functional groups:

<u>Functional Group</u>	<u>CSD</u>	<u>NASW</u>
case-work oriented	72%	56%
administration/supervision	13%	21%
field supervision/teaching consultation	1%	23%

As the percentages reveal, the predominant number of respondents in each survey group indicated a casework orientation. The percentage of casework-oriented respondents was greater among CSD respondents, but this was due in large part to the fact that the questionnaire was primarily circulated among the CSD casework staff, whereas the NASW questionnaire was sent to all NASW members.

The amount of formal education was higher among NASW members, primarily due to the professional nature of NASW. This fact seems pertinent in relation to the types of educational content preferred by the two survey groups and to the type of credit preferred.

GENERAL CONTENT PREFERENCE PATTERNS

In both survey groups the predominant preference was for educational content pertaining to skills development (for CSD staff, the skills related to casework, while for NASW members, the skills related to clinical techniques). A closer look at the CSD questionnaire reveals that many of the content areas preferred by the respondents would be included in a master's of social work program. Many

of the preferences expressed by the majority of NASW members, while still related to their direct service to clients, represent education content which direct service social work students tend not to take while students but which becomes relevant after several years of practice. Program evaluation, supervision skills and legal information for social workers are examples.

When the general preference patterns of both survey groups were analyzed in relation to the functional orientation of the respondents, similar patterns appeared. The casework-oriented respondents from both groups preferred casework-oriented educational content while the administration or supervision oriented respondents preferred educational content pertaining to administrative functions.

In general, this study does not offer any new information that is not already known to the staff of Social Work Continuing Education. However, this study could be used to support the assumptions about consumer demands upon which the SWCE staff are presently operating. It is possible, however, that social service practitioners desire new ideas and techniques within existing skill categories. Unfortunately, this study was not structured in such a way as to ascertain those desires.

SPECIFIC CONTENT PREFERENCES

A majority of the CSD respondents indicated that they were very interested in only two specific content areas: family counseling techniques and casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents. A majority of the CSD respondents also indicated that they were interested in content pertaining to mental and emotional illness.

The most popular content area indicated by the NASW respondents was mental health, but no specific content area was preferred by a majority of the NASW respondents.

Two content areas appeared to be popular with both groups of respondents: mental health/mental and emotional illness and legal information for social workers/legal rights of youth. The other specific content area preferences differed between the two groups of respondents. Considered separately, the administration or supervision oriented respondents in both groups expressed similar preferences for educational content related to supervision and evaluation. Detention was the only content area for which less than 10% of each group expressed a preference.

SCHEDULING PREFERENCES

The majority of CSD respondents indicated a preference for weekly classes during the day. One logical explanation for this preference appears to be the fact that CSD staff would be paid for the time they are in classes.

On the other hand, the majority of NASW respondents expressed a strong preference for workshops and a very low preference for classes. The majority of NASW respondents also indicated a preference for day-time scheduling of continuing education offerings. This preference appears logical in view of their preference for workshops. If the comments made by several members of the NASW Education Committee at a recent meeting are representative, however, the preference for day-time scheduling does not appear to be tied to a desire for employer reimbursement for time spent in continuing

education activities; instead, it appeared that some members of the Education Committee felt that it was the responsibility of social work professionals to participate in professional or educational activities outside of their normal work hours. Hence, we can tentatively conclude that the majority of NASW respondents expressed a preference for day-time scheduling because they also indicated a preference for workshops, which tend to be scheduled during the day.

CREDIT AND TUITION PREFERENCES

When asked to rank their preferences concerning three credit options, the two survey groups expressed two different priority rankings:

<u>Credit Option:</u>	<u>CSD</u>	<u>NASW</u>
transferrable credit	1	3
continuing education unit	3	1
no credit	2	2

The differences in rankings can be explained in terms of the amount of formal education held by members of each group. Only half of the CSD respondents indicated that they had completed their undergraduate education and were taking graduate level courses. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that many of the CSD respondents hope to apply credit for their continuing education coursework towards their undergraduate or graduate degree. The vast majority of NASW respondents, on the other hand, had already completed their graduate degree and did not really need transferrable credit.

When the two survey groups were asked to indicate their preferences on tuition, the responses were more comparable:

<u>Tuition Option:</u>	<u>CSD</u>	<u>NASW</u>
pay full tuition	3	2
pay half tuition	1	1
pay no tuition	2	3

Neither group of respondents indicated a strong willingness to pay full tuition costs; instead, the majority of respondents from each group indicated a preference to pay half of the tuition costs. More NASW respondents indicated they would pay full tuition costs than did CSD respondents, but the NASW respondents also indicated that the continuing education offerings would have to feature very competent instructors before they would pay the full costs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information gathered from the CSD and NASW surveys, several recommendations can be offered to the staff of Social Work Continuing Education and the Children's Services Division and to the NASW Education Committee concerning future programming for continuing education activities:

1. Based on the responses from the CSD and NASW questionnaire, there appears to be sufficient consumer demand for the following continuing education offerings: family counseling techniques, casework techniques with disturbed/delinquent adolescents, mental health, comparative clinical techniques, casework techniques with disturbed preschool and school age children, casework techniques with abusive parents, supervision, crisis intervention, legal information for social workers, and program evaluation.
2. Since the majority of social service practitioners continue to be casework oriented, continuing education offerings should continue

to emphasize clinical skills development, although not to the total exclusion of offerings related to administration or base knowledge development.

3. Social Work Continuing Education staff should experiment with offering day-time classes for social service practitioners; one possibility would be to schedule classes early in the morning for practitioners who must go on to work.
4. This study confirms the need for tuition subsidies. One possibility might be to develop contract courses which a number of social service agencies could buy into, with class participants having to pay the difference between the basic contract rate and the regular Division of Continuing Education tuition rate if they wish credit.

CSD REGION 1 QUESTIONNAIRE ON TRAINING NEEDS

The division of Continuing Education and P.S.U. School of Social Work are interested in receiving feedback from members of the general social work community concerning specific training needs. Your answers to this questionnaire, which was designed to be as specific as possible, will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your assistance.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO: GRACE LEHMAN, CSD CENTRAL OFFICE, WEATHERLY BLDG., BY NOVEMBER 24, 1975. THANK YOU.

1. Please read through the list of content areas. Indicate your priority training needs by using the following rating system:

1. I am most interested.
2. I am interested.
3. I am not interested.

CONTENT AREASRATING
(mark one)

Family Counseling Techniques	1	2	3
Marriage Counseling Techniques	1	2	3
Gestalt & Transactional Analysis	1	2	3
Communication Skills	1	2	3
Interviewing Skills	1	2	3
Casework Techniques with Disturbed/Delinquent Adolescents..	1	2	3
Casework Techniques with Disturbed Preschool & School Age Children	1	2	3
Casework Techniques with Abusive Parents	1	2	3
Case Planning: Diagnosis & Treatment	1	2	3
Crisis Intervention	1	2	3
Foster Care: effects on children & families	1	2	3
Day Care: supportive service to families	1	2	3
Parenting Skills	1	2	3
Pregnancy Counseling	1	2	3
Human Development	1	2	3
Medical Information for Social Workers	1	2	3
Mental & Emotional Illness	1	2	3
Alcohol & Drugs	1	2	3
Cultural & Racial Differences of Clients	1	2	3
Community Resources	1	2	3
Detention: Philosophy & Use	1	2	3
Evaluation of Applied Practice	1	2	3
Supervision Skills	1	2	3
Legal Rights of Children & Youth	1	2	3
Other:	1	2	3

2. What is your preference on credit? Number in order of preference.
- Transferrable
- Continuing Education Unit (CEU): Way of documenting participation in continuing education non-credit classes.
- None Credit

3. What time scheduling would you prefer?
- ☐ day time
☐ evening
☐ weekend
4. Do you have a preference on how the material should be presented?
Number in order of preference.
- ☐ Weekly class for eleven weeks
☐ Biweekly class for eleven weeks
☐ Class sessions on Saturdays
☐ Material concentrated into one or two sessions (workshop)
☐ Other: _____
5. Would you prefer to see some content areas listed in question #1 included in a conference? List areas.
6. How many years of formal education have you had?
- ☐ 1-8
☐ 9-12
☐ 13-16
☐ 17 & over (graduate level)
7. What function do you presently perform?
- ☐ social service assistant
☐ caseworker
☐ casework supervisor
☐ administrator
☐ other: _____
8. If agency funds are not available for your training needs, how much would you be willing to pay for training yourself? Fees for DCE 2 credit hour classes range from \$42. for undergraduate to \$66. for graduate; fees for 3 credit hour classes range from \$63. to \$99.
- ☐ would pay full tuition
☐ would pay half tuition
☐ cannot afford to pay any amount

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

If you are interested in being on the DCE mailing list, please indicate your name and mailing address.

NAME _____
ADDRESS _____
ZIP _____

Appendix B

Page (1)

The following questionnaire will be used by the NASW Education Committee and P.S.U. Social Work Continuing Education to plan and provide what you want in courses, workshops, and conferences. Please return this questionnaire by April 30th to the NASW office in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided. Thank you for your participation.

1. In which method area do you primarily work?

- ☐ casework
- ☐ group work
- ☐ community organization
- ☐ administration or supervision
- ☐ field supervision, teaching or consultation
- ☐ other: _____

2. Check the types of professional education that you have used in the last two years and indicate the sources and general content.

- ☐ classes: _____
- ☐ workshops: _____
- ☐ conferences: _____
- ☐ in-service training: _____
- ☐ personal reading: _____
- ☐ consultation: _____
- ☐ other: _____

3. What type of professional education do you plan to utilize in the future? Rank in order of preference.

- ☐ classes
- ☐ workshops
- ☐ conferences
- ☐ consultation
- ☐ in-service training
- ☐ personal reading
- ☐ other: _____

4. What type of content are you most interested in? Rank in order of preference.

- ☐ theory
- ☐ technique
- ☐ experiential
- ☐ combination of _____

5. Which area of professional education is of primary interest to you? Check one.

- ☐ clinical techniques
- ☒ relating to particular target groups; specify: _____
- ☐ relating to work in special setting; specify: _____
- ☐ relating to administrative/planning/evaluation functions; specify: _____
- ☐ other; specify: _____

6. Are there persons that you would like to invite to Oregon for a conference or workshop? Please name _____

7. Where would you like to meet for courses or workshops? _____

8. Social Work Continuing Education can offer courses covering the following content areas. Tuition costs are \$66.-99. per course depending on whether the course is 2 or 3 credit hours. If agency funds are not available for your professional education needs, how much would you be willing to pay per course yourself?

- ☐ full tuition
- ☐ half tuition
- ☐ none

(cont'd)

9. The following content areas could be presented in a course or workshop. Please ;
check only the content areas which really interest you and mark your preference
on format (course or workshop). If you have suggestions on possible instructors,
please indicate them opposite the appropriate content area.

<u>CONTENT AREA</u>	<u>COURSE</u> or <u>WORKSHOP</u>	<u>INSTRUC</u>
<u>Skills development:</u>		
_____ Comparative Clinical Techniques.....	_____	_____
_____ Group Process.....	_____	_____
_____ Communication & Interviewing.....	_____	_____
_____ Case Planning & Management.....	_____	_____
_____ Medical Information for Social Workers.....	_____	_____
_____ Legal Information for Social Workers.....	_____	_____
_____ Team Functioning.....	_____	_____
_____ Crisis Intervention.....	_____	_____
_____ Political Action.....	_____	_____
_____ Consultation.....	_____	_____
_____ Other: _____	_____	_____
_____ _____	_____	_____
<u>Service Systems:</u>		
_____ Foster Care.....	_____	_____
_____ Protective Services for Adults.....	_____	_____
_____ Residential Care: Philosophy & Use.....	_____	_____
_____ Detention: Philosophy & Use.....	_____	_____
_____ Institutional Placement & Treatment.....	_____	_____
_____ Other: _____	_____	_____
_____ _____	_____	_____
<u>Social Concerns:</u>		
_____ Racism & Affirmative Action.....	_____	_____
_____ Feminism.....	_____	_____
_____ Drug & Alcohol Abuse.....	_____	_____
_____ Sexual Dysfunctioning.....	_____	_____
_____ Child Abuse.....	_____	_____
_____ Juvenile Delinquency.....	_____	_____
_____ Aging.....	_____	_____
_____ Mental Health.....	_____	_____
_____ Corrections.....	_____	_____
_____ Other: _____	_____	_____
<u>Administration:</u>		
_____ Supervision & Personnel Management.....	_____	_____
_____ Volunteers: Use & Training.....	_____	_____
_____ Management Information Systems.....	_____	_____
_____ Program Evaluation.....	_____	_____
_____ Social Planning & Policy Formulation.....	_____	_____
_____ Other: _____	_____	_____
_____ _____	_____	_____
_____ _____	_____	_____
10. What type of credit would you prefer for continuing education courses?		
_____ Transferrable		
_____ Continuing Education Unit (CEU): Way of documenting participation		
_____ in continuing education non-credit courses.		
_____ No Credit		
11. What time scheduling would you prefer for courses? Number in order of		
_____ preference.		
_____ day time		
_____ evening		
_____ weekend		
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:		

Appendix C

CSD Preferences on Time Scheduling Compared with Respondent Function

Time Option	First Preference		Second Preference		Third Preference		Checked But Not Ranked	
	Caseworkers	Casework Supervisor	Caseworkers	Casework Supervisors	Caseworkers	Casework Supervisors	Caseworkers	Casework Supervisors
Day Time	17 (26%)	3 (23%)			1 (2%)		38 (58%)	6 (46%)
Evening	2 (3%)		15 (23%)	3 (23%)	1 (2%)		11 (17%)	4 (31%)
Weekend			3 (5%)		14 (21%)	3 (23%)	1 (2%)	

Appendix D

CSD Preferences on Course Format Compared with Respondent Function

Format Option	First Preference	Second Preference	Third Preference	Fourth Preference	Checked but Not Ranked
	Case-Workers Supervisors	Case-Workers Supervisors	Case-Workers Supervisors	Case-Workers Supervisors	Case-Workers Supervisors
Weekly Class	21 (32%) 4 (31%)	8 (12%) 1 (8%)	1 (2%) 1 (8%)	19 (29%) 4 (31%)	4 (31%)
Biweekly Class		14 (21%) 2 (15%)	9 (14%) 1 (8%)	1 (2%) 2 (3%)	
Saturday Class		1 (8%) 5 (8%)	1 (8%) 17 (26%)	2 (15%) 1 (2%)	
Workshop	10 (15%) 2 (15%)	7 (11%) 1 (8%)	12 (18%) 1 (8%)	2 (3%) 1 (8%)	3 (23%)

Appendix E

Future Continuing Education Preferences

<u>Type of Education</u>	<u>Preference Ranking</u>						<u>checked but not ranked</u>
	<u>First</u>	<u>Second</u>	<u>Third</u>	<u>Fourth</u>	<u>Fifth</u>	<u>Sixth</u>	
classes	4 (5%)	8 (11%)	6 (8%)		6 (8%)	4 (5%)	11 (15%)
workshops	16 (21%)	13 (17%)	5 (7%)	3 (4%)		1 (1%)	29 (39%)
conferences		15 (20%)	8 (11%)	8 (11%)		3 (4%)	26 (35%)
consultation	4 (5%)	4 (5%)	7 (9%)	1 (1%)	8 (11%)	2 (3%)	14 (19%)
in-service training	3 (4%)	3 (4%)	7 (9%)	4 (5%)	4 (5%)	5 (7%)	20 (27%)
personal reading	14 (19%)	2 (3%)	9 (12%)	11 (15%)	2 (3%)		30 (40%)

n=75 in determining percentages