



***International Journal of Humanities & Social Science Studies (IJHSSS)***

*A Peer-Reviewed Bi-monthly Bi-lingual Research Journal*

ISSN: 2349-6959 (Online), ISSN: 2349-6711 (Print)

ISJN: A4372-3142 (Online) ISJN: A4372-3143 (Print)

Volume-X, Issue-V, September 2024, Page No.257-290

Published by Scholar Publications, Karimganj, Assam, India, 788711

Website: <http://www.ijhsss.com>

DOI: 10.29032/ijhsss.vol.10.issue.05W.027

---

## **Texas School Social Workers: Demographics, Work Characteristics**

**A. Gandaria**

*Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, Edinburg, Texas*

**G. Padilla**

*Associate Professor, Organization and School Leadership Department, University of Texas  
Rio Grande Valley, Edinburg, Texas*

**V. Menchaca**

*Professor, Organization and School Leadership Department, University of Texas Rio  
Grande Valley, Edinburg, Texas*

### **Abstract:**

*School social workers have great potential to support schools and student learning. A study was conducted to examine the demographics, job services, and job responsibilities of Texas school social workers. A convergent parallel mixed method design was used to compare and discuss quantitative and qualitative data obtained. A survey was emailed to 476 Texas school social workers (TSSW) identified in an edited official state list. Data was received from 250 TSSWs. The data reveals consistency with existing school social work literature related to demographics and provides novel information on work and education characteristics of TSSWs. The findings on these topics support the importance of aligning social school worker job responsibilities and services to state policies, increasing understanding of the role of school social workers, and supporting legislative definition of TSSW. The implications of this study's findings can create major improvement to job definition, work services, and responsibilities of TSSWs, and, more importantly, the maximum success of all Texas students.*

**Keywords:** Texas, school, social worker, demographics, responsibilities.

---

**School Social Workers in Texas:** Social work has existed in the United States for over two hundred years (Okpych & Yu, 2014). Social work helps people secure needed social services to improve their lives and advocates for people in need by guiding the social environment to support them in their improvement endeavors (Kirst-Ashman & Hull, 2009). Because of the significant impact educational attainment has on a decent life (US Bureau of

Labor Statistics, 2021b), social work was brought into American schools over 100 years ago (Allen-Meares, 1988).

In May 2020, Texas employed the fourth highest number of school social workers (SSWs) among all states (US Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2021a). However, Texas does not legislatively recognize school social workers as school staff members. Legislative bills defining school social work have been developed for the Texas legislative agenda several times; however, none have been approved (National Association of Social Workers [NASW] Texas Chapter, 2021). The most recent Texas legislative bill, in September 2019, was H.B. 239 that sought to add a definition of school social work services into the Texas Education Code. HB 239's intent was to provide clarity and guidance on the vital role school social workers play in assisting students and families. The bill received a unanimous vote in committee but did not reach the floor for a vote because of concerns by conservative state representatives "about the ways social workers engage with students and in the school community" (NASW Texas Chapter, 2021, para. 1). This critical comment by Texas conservative legislators may be due to the role ambiguity a lack of a state definition creates and effects generated by the complexity of the dual role SSWs must provide.

This ambiguity can be seen in Texas school districts that wish to hire school social workers to provide specific counseling services, such as individual and group therapy, which are clinical social work services. Many school districts have a minimum requirement of a bachelor's degree in the field of Social Work and a Valid Texas license as a baccalaureate social worker (LBSW) granted by the Texas State Board of Social Worker Examiners (Texas Administrative Code §781.404, 2020). LBSW allows SSWs to incorporate non-clinical work with individuals, families, groups, communities, and social systems that may involve locating resources, negotiating, and advocating on behalf of clients or client groups, administering programs and agencies, community organizing, teaching, researching, providing employment or professional development, non-clinical supervision, developing and analyzing policy, fund-raising, and other non-clinical activities (Texas Administrative Code §781.302, 2020). However, an LBSW does not include conducting clinical services. Thus, a district's minimum license requirement for a SSW is not aligned to the services expected by the district or needed by students. Thus, districts that wish to provide clinical social work services needed by students must align job descriptions to the state's licensing requirements. Additionally, most SSW job descriptions include responsibilities such as home-school-community liaison and advocates for students and families (Allen-Meares, 1988). For SSWs, serving a dual clinical and non-clinical role can prove to be difficult. Even social workers practicing in the mental health field have expressed concerns that focusing on societal change could compromise efforts toward addressing the individual issues of their clients (McLaughlin, 2009)

Texas includes two specialty recognitions for social workers: Licensed Master Social Worker-Advanced Practitioner (LMSW-AP) and Independent Non-clinical Practice (Texas Administration Code §781.302, 2020). Each specialty requires a specific number of supervised hours conducting social work, and the former also requires an advanced

*Texas School Social Workers: Demographics, Work...* A. Gandaria, G. Padilla and V. Menchaca  
examination (Texas Administration Code §781.404, 2020). However, no specialty exists for SSWs in Texas.

**Texas School Social Worker Research:** It is noteworthy that no research specifically focused on Texas school social workers (TSSWs) was found prior to 2020. The Steve Hicks School of Social Work at the University of Texas at Austin through the Texas Institute for Child and Family Wellbeing created the Texas School Social Work Network (TSSWN) to provide “Texas-specific guidance” (University of Texas, 2021, para. 2), “tools and research” (TSSWN, 2020, p. 26) for school social workers. TSSWN (2020) conducted a survey of Texas school social workers connected to the 2020 Texas School Social Workers conference through a flyer, social media, and newsletters. TSSWN received 212 completed surveys. Through this survey, TSSWN gathered many demographic, educational, and work characteristics of TSSWs.

Texas Education Agency (TEA, 2022) maintains a list of Texas school social workers with personnel information. Padilla et al. (2023) acquired the most current available list from TEA for the 2018-2019 school year and edited it for duplications. With the edited list, school information, and school academic test data, a report was created providing the following information regarding Texas SSWs’ demographics and job environment: Texas region center location, campus type, ethnicity, gender, years of experience, degree earned, salary, community type, number of worksite assignments, district charter status, campus student demographics, campus Title 1 status, campus staff average work experience, campus state academic grade, and state student academic test results (Padilla et al., 2023).

There is still a great need to explore and expand the knowledge and understanding of current TSSW practices such as experienced job barriers, supports, and satisfaction. Continued research on TSSWs may advocate for the adoption of a school social work service definition and other supports at the state level. Effective research and state support will ensure effective school social work that promotes student, staff, family, and community success now and in the future.

**Methodology:** A convergent parallel mixed-method design research was conducted during the 2021-2022 school year that utilized the edited TEA 2018-2019 school social workers list (no duplications) to identify currently available TSSWs’ emails—436 were identified. A survey, adapted with permission from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (2021; Randall, 2015), was developed with multiple-choice and open-ended questions and emailed to these TSSWs to obtain a more complete understanding of their demographics, job services they provide, and job responsibilities they hold. The research questions of the study were:

1. What are the personal and work demographics of Texas school social workers?
2. What are the job responsibilities of and services provided by Texas school social workers?

Padilla, et al.’s (2023) is the best one-year information available related to TSSW personal and work demographics because it included all TSSWs in the TEA 2018-2019 list

without duplications. The data gathered by the study addressing research question 1 reflects similar information and will help estimate the study's data representativeness.

**Results:** Two hundred and fifty school social workers completed the questionnaire anonymously and served as the basis for this study's data analyses: TSSW demographics and education information, school information and supervision, and job responsibilities and services.

**Texas School Social Worker Demographics and Education Information:** Table 1 clearly demonstrates Hispanic Latino is the largest ethnicity represented in Texas school social workers, more than twice the second largest ethnicity, White American, and over six times African American. Without contention, Table 2 suggests females represent an overwhelming majority of school social workers in Texas, with almost 93% representation. Ethnicity and gender findings are consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023).

The results in Table 3 show more than 59% of school social workers in Texas are Licensed Master Social Workers (LMSW) or Licensed Master Social Worker-Advanced Practice (LMSW-AP). Additionally, Table 4 shows over 70% of Texas school social workers earned a Masters degree and just over one-percent earned a doctoral degree, for a total of over 72% earning post-Bachelors degrees. Degree findings are consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023).

Table 5 notes the years of experience in the school social work setting. The two largest percentages were in the highest, 20+ years, and the lowest years of experience, 0-3 years, with the latter reflecting a slightly higher percentage. The data reflect a balance in the distribution of school social workers along the years of experience and are consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023). Table 6 reflects TSSW job titles. The title of "School Social Worker" dominates the different titles utilized for social workers at schools, and only seven respondents (4.4%) were social workers who evaluated or supervised social workers. This is consistent with this study's later findings related to evaluation and supervision. Table 7 shows the type of agency employing TSWWs. Clearly, the data shows over 96% of school social workers are employed at public schools. These findings are consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023), except that the TEA list included six charter schools, or 0.6% of all schools. While very few, still no charter school SSWs chose to participate in this current study.

Table 8 reflects over 70% of participating TSSWs responded having worked or are currently working outside schools. The two social work areas outside schools most worked by respondents were Mental Health/Clinical Practice and Medical/Health/Hospital. These results reflect that most TSSWs have social work experience outside the school environment.

**School Information and Supervision:** Table 9 shows school districts with 2500 student enrollment or larger were highly represented in this study and may tend to hire SSWs more than smaller districts. Table 10 notes Urban (34.84%) and Midsized City (29.03%)

comprised almost 64% of the community types employing school social workers which is consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023). Table 11 reflects Ninth-Twelfth and PreK-Fifth grade schools comprise 43.3-percent of the total grade level assignments identified by the respondents. Table 12 shows TSSW respondents were assigned more to middle or high schools than to elementary schools, consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023). One assigned school had the highest percentage of the number of schools assigned consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023). Table 13 reinforces this finding. Almost eighty percent of TSSW respondents indicated they were the only SSW assigned to the school reinforcing the type of schools assigned results.

Table 14 shows over 62% of the respondent SSWs are supervised by a central office staff member, followed by just over 28% by the school principal. Also, about thirty one percent of the respondents reported having a direct supervisor who is a licensed, certified social worker (Table 15). So, less than one-third of the respondents had a licensed, certified social worker as their direct supervisor. Additionally, Table 16 notes that 59-percent of respondents had a central office staff member serving as their evaluator followed by 30.1-percent evaluated by the school principal. Almost 70-percent of SSW evaluators were not a certified/licensed social worker (Table 17). Thus, a large percentage of Texas SSWs are evaluated by a staff member who is not stationed at their school, and an even higher percentage are evaluated by a staff member who is not a certified or licensed social worker.

Table 18 shows a high percentage of respondents noted all their school assignments were Title 1 schools consistent with the edited TEA list (Padilla et al., 2023).

**Texas School Social Worker Job Responsibilities and Services:** Ninety TSSW respondents appropriately provided the number of students they oversee. A TSSW oversees an average of 2,300 students, ranging from six to 32,000. TSSWs also provide services to an average of 490 students each school year, ranging from ten to 5,000. Clearly, Texas SSWs impact a large number of students each school year.

Table 19 demonstrates Texas SSWs invest 81-100% of their work time more in general education students (50.5%) compared to academically at-risk students (37.9%), behaviorally at-risk students (27.3%), and special education students (6.3%). It is important to note 6.3% of school social worker respondents invest 91-100% of work time with special education students. TSSW respondents rated how much time they spent in specific areas of potential social worker job responsibilities, from Not At All to High Frequency. Table 20 shows job responsibilities rated High/Medium Frequency by 75% or more of the respondents were: emotional problems, children at risk, mental health/illness/trauma, behavior management, crisis, and family trauma/ change. Indubitably, TSSW responsibilities involve addressing serious issues that can hurt student school success and more.

TSSW respondents noted the percent of their time spent on implementing, consulting, coordinating, and facilitating strategies and programs at each Tier in the Response to Intervention (RTI) system or Multi-Level System of Support (MLSS) such as Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). The responses in Table 21 show Texas SSWs

support Tier 1-3, but they do not spend a substantial portion of their work time on them, as noted previously by Phillippo et al. (2017). When asked if they were a PBIS Internal or External Coach, 154 TSSWs responded. Table 22 shows that less than seven percent were PBIS Internal Coaches, and less than three percent were PBIS External Coaches. The data show that a low percentage of school social workers served as PBIS Internal/External Coaches.

TSSW respondents identified the type of home environment they worked with (Table 23). Three hundred and eighteen TSSWs responded. Economically disadvantaged homes were ranked a close second, reflecting Title 1 school status. Over 61% of typical student home environments included single parents, serious economic deprivation, poor child-rearing practices, and English, not the dominant language.

TSSW respondents rated their use of various professional strategies or programs from “Not at All” to “High involvement” (Table 24). Notably, the top three strategies directly involve student support. TSSW respondents also ranked their sources of referrals from 1-Highest to 10-Lowest (Table 25). The highest ranking sources of referrals, with combined one and two rankings, were counselors (55.4%), school administrators (49.4%), teachers (47.0%), parents (22.3%), and student self-referrals (21.6%). School counselors who tend to have the most information about a student are the greatest source of referrals to TSSWs.

Qualitative data was also obtained. Themes generated for each question will be presented, and categories may be discussed.

TSSWs responded to what they considered the most important school social work services they provided to students (Table 26), parents (Table 27), teachers (Table 28), and school administration (Table 29). Counseling was overwhelmingly identified as the topmost important service provided to students by over 60% of the TSSW respondents. The two topmost important services to parents identified were linking to resources and parenting skills training. The top five most important services provided to teachers were emotional support, support student learning, training/advice, teacher-student issue resolution, and resources. The top three most important services provided to school administration identified by 149 TSSW respondents were providing SSW Perspective and support, student support, and liaison.

**Promotion of School Social Work Services:** School social workers were asked if they promoted school social work to students, parents, school, district, and community. As noted in Table 30, 112 participants responded with School receiving the highest percentage affirmation (88.0%), followed by Students (85.5%), Parents (85.1%), District (71.6%), and Community (69.5%). Interestingly, this may reflect TSSWs feel they need to strongly promote school social work within their own work environment—the school. If they answered “Yes,” they were then asked to describe how they promoted school social work. Table 30 also shows the strategies TSSW respondents used to promote school social work among each group. The presence of TSSWs in the classroom and hallways together constituted the greatest strategy by which they promoted their work to students.

**School Social Work Services:** TSSWs were asked to answer four open-ended questions about their services and duties. Responses were evaluated for themes. First, respondents were asked about the service(s) or duty(ies) they currently perform that they wished they could perform more to better support student success. The top four themes noted in Table 31 are direct student services (36.9%), followed by small groups (14.9%), self-professional development (12.8%), and liaison service (12.8%). The highest category in direct student services was individual counseling. Second, respondents were asked about the services they were not providing but wished they could provide. Table 32 notes 14 generated themes, and the five highest include Direct Student Services (29.4%), No/None/NA (19.3%), Liaison (12.6%), and Groups (10.9%), which included over 72% of the responses. Almost one-fifth of respondents chose No/None/NA, suggesting they were satisfied with the services they were providing. Among the categories, No/None/NA constituted the highest percentage with 19.3%. Thus, a high percentage of respondents indicated there were no school social work services that they are not currently providing that they wished they could provide, indicating about one-fifth of the respondents could not identify a new service they wished they could provide. Third, Table 33 notes eleven generated themes, with Non-School Social Work Responsibilities having the highest percentage (65.5%). Among this theme's categories, with a collective percentage of 60%, the top three were Administrative Duties/Covering Class/Front/Clerical Paperwork/Drug Test (20.9%), None/N/A (20.0%), and Duty/Morning/Lunch/Pick-Up (19.1%). Notably, None/NA was the second highest theme and category suggesting that one-fifth of the respondents did not identify a service or duty they wished they did not have to perform.

TSSWs were asked what percentage of professional services they provided as a school social worker in Individual Supportive Counseling and as a Liaison. As noted in Table 34, Individual Supportive Counseling has its highest number responses at 80% while Liaison has its highest number of responses at 20%. Thus, many more TSSWs are providing a high percentage of individual counseling as a service than liaison.

Almost 100% of TSSW respondents indicated their services had an "Extremely High Impact" (16.5%), "High Impact" (58.3%), or "Moderate Impact" (23.6%) on student success (Table 35). Only 1.6% of TSSW respondents indicated their services had a "Slight Impact" on student success. TSSWs consider their work efforts strongly support student success.

Almost 80% of 128 TSSW respondents believed school administrators and schools were "Moderately" to "Extremely" familiar with the services they provided (Table 36). Notably, over one-fifth (21.1%) of 128 TSSW respondents believed school administrators and school staff were "Slightly Familiar" or "Not Familiar at All" with the services they provided. A sizable percentage of TSSWs do not believe school administrators and school staff are relatively unaware of the services they provide to the students, teachers, school, parents, and community.

**Limitations:** This study's limitations include that it focuses only on Texas school social workers. Additionally, not all TSSWs who received an email to complete the survey did so. This could be because the state social worker list was for the year prior to sending the email, so some SSWs may have left their positions. Also, some who received may have chosen not to participate in the study. Nonetheless, many of the study's findings are consistent with the data extracted from the complete state list with only duplications removed (Padilla et al., 2023).

**Summary and Implications:** In summary, the study's findings support Hispanic Latino at 60.25% and females with 92.75% constitute the greater representations among TSSWs. More than 71% of TSSWs have a master's degree. These findings are consistent with the findings in Padilla et al. (2023) summary of the TEA edited list of TSSWs. The high percentage of TSSWs with master's degree demonstrate they follow NASW recommendations for a master's degree in social work as the entry-level qualification for a school social worker, despite the lack of guidance by the TEA regarding school social work practice. The study results show 71% of TSSWs had social work experience outside the school setting supporting the perspective that TSSWs possess broad social work experience beyond the school.

According to the results, school districts with 2,500 or larger student enrollment tend to hire SSWs (85.8%) than smaller districts. Congruently, 69% of TSSW respondents worked for a school district that hired 1-30 social workers. Interestingly, 78.4% of respondents reported they were assigned to one school as the only assigned SSW. These findings are consistent with recent publications addressing school social work settings (Ding et al., 2022; Padilla et al., 2023). The study found TSSWs are assigned more to secondary (75%) than to elementary schools. Additionally, the study showed 64% of community types that employ SSWs are urban (34.84%) and Midsized City (29.03%). TSSWs also tend to be assigned to Title 1 schools (74.7%).

Despite that Texas employs the fourth highest number of school social workers among all states (US Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2021a), the data show a small percentage of school social workers (31.8%) have a direct supervisor who is a licensed social worker. A school social worker may provide great supportive services to student learning if properly supported. Therefore, it is important to consider that without properly licensed guidance, advice, and supervision, Texas school social workers may experience a limitation over the services they provide in schools.

NASW suggests a 1:250 school social worker-student ratio and a 1:150 ratio when students involved have intensive needs (NASW, 2012). This study's findings suggest TSSWs oversee an average of 2,300 students. It appears Texas school districts generally do not follow the NAWS recommendations for the school social worker-student ratio. The data also show school social workers invest 81-100% of their work time serving general education students (50.5%) compared to academically at-risk students (27.9%), behaviorally at-risk students (27.3%), and special education students (6.3%). Notably, special education



took up 91-100% of work time for 6.3% of school social workers. Future studies may explore how much effort at the state level is focused on incorporating school social work as an integral part of the special education process under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004).

TSSWs may support Tier 1-3 but do not invest substantial time in them. Also, a low percentage of TSSWs serve as PBIS Internal/External Coaches. These findings are consistent with the literature that attests the school is a social system driven by a crisis-reactive approach, and the expectation is for school social workers to immediately help students adapt to the school setting while still providing other services mandated by law (Allen-Meares, 1993).

This study's data revealed school social workers are highly involved in three social work responsibilities: emotional problems; children at risk; and mental health, illness, and trauma. They are least involved in working with gifted and talented students, section 504 evaluation and coordination, and sex problems. This data is consistent with a previous study by Ding et al. (2022) who found SSWs appeared to concentrate on providing mental health services and targeting the emotional needs of students.

The study's data indicate school social workers most typically, over 61%, serve challenging student home environments, including single parents, serious economic deprivation, poor child-rearing practices, and English, not the dominant language. The data also show three top strategies that directly involve student support: advocacy for students and families (88.7%), individual student counseling (84.7%), and consultation with teachers and school staff to support individual students' success (83.2%). It appears Texas school social workers might be serving a dual clinical and non-clinical role, which can prove to be difficult. Therefore, in Texas, a legislative definition of school social worker aligned with SSWAA's definition is critically needed to eliminate the ambiguity of school social work practice parameters by licensure level.

Respondents identified the main sources of student referrals. Counselors (38.5%), teachers (25.2%), and school administrators (24.7%) include the highest percentages of student referrals, and student self-referrals have the fourth highest percentage (15.5%). Notably, students trust school social workers sufficiently to report issues to them, including their own.

The study's data indicate the most important school social work service provided to students is counseling, to parents it is linking to resources (45.4%), to teachers it is emotional support and encouragement (25.0%), and to school administrators it is providing school social work perspective and support (44.9%) and student support (25.4%). Clearly, Texas school social workers provide services to all school stakeholders but primarily to students.

TSSW respondents identified the social work service they wished they could provide more—district student services, such as individual counseling, the service they were not

providing but wished they could provide—student prevention services, student assessments, and social justice. Respondents identified administrative duties as a service they were providing but wished they did not have to do so. One fifth of respondents stated they had no service they were providing that they wished they did not have to provide. This latter group may consist of TSSWs who work in a supportive school environment. Almost three-fourths of respondents described the impact their services have on student success as “High” or “Extremely High.” It is noteworthy TSSWs feel the job they do supports student success.

TSSW respondents noted they primarily promote their services to students through classroom presentations and actual services; to parents through meetings, outreach efforts, direct communication; to the school through staff development, parent/community meetings, and outreach efforts; to the district through presentations and meetings; and to the community through presentations, networking, community events, and communication. Over three-fourths of TSSW respondents indicated school administrators and staff were “Moderate” to “Extremely” familiar with the services SSWs provide. However, despite their promotion efforts, 3.9% of TSSW respondents indicated school administrators and staff were not familiar at all with the service they provide. To ensure all students have maximum access to social work services, 100% of school staff and administrators must be “Extremely” familiar with the role of SSWs.

**Conclusion:** This study shows that Texas school social workers follow NASW recommendations for a master’s degree in social work (MSW) as the entry-level qualification for a school social worker, despite the lack of guidance from the Texas Education Agency regarding school social work practice. The data reflect a balance in the distribution of school social workers in their years of experience. The study’s data show the two largest percentages in years of experience among the respondents included the highest and the lowest levels years indicating a solid balance between new and the most experienced school social workers. Data also showed most school social workers have social work experience outside of public education suggesting a work population with rounded work backgrounds. This research study identified that Texas school social workers’ practices are consistent with the SSWAA general areas of school social work services in schools (School Social Work Association of America, 2018). The data show Texas school social workers are concerned with the promotion of their services to students, parents, the school, the district, and the community.

It is important to note that only about 31 percent of the respondents reported having a direct supervisor who is a licensed, certified social worker. Further research is needed to assess the need for proper supervision of Texas school social workers. It will be worth exploring how school social workers navigate the complex public education system in relation to social work ethical standards. In addition, the data revealed that school social workers are highly involved in three social work responsibilities: emotional problems, children at risk, mental health, illness, and trauma. If school social workers are currently providing primarily counseling or supportive counseling services, it will be important to explore the current Texas school social work job descriptions to investigate if school social

workers' job descriptions are aligned with the counseling role that they play and with the Texas Administrative Code §781.302 The Practice of Social Work (2020). A lack of understanding of the school social worker's role might be highly aligned with the lack of a school social work service definition in the Texas Education Code.

Table 1

Participant Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Hispanic Latino	141	60.26
White American	67	28.63
African American	21	8.97
Asian American	2	0.85
Other	2	0.85
Other: Mixed-white	1	0.43
Subtotal	234	100.00
No Response	16	
Total	250	

Table 2

Participant Gender

Gender	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Female	217	92.74
Male	15	6.41
Non-Binary	1	0.43
Chose Not to Disclose	1	0.43
Subtotal	234	100.00
No Response	16	
Total	250	

Table 3

Participant Licensure

License				Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Licensed Worker (LBSW)	Baccalaureate	Social		67	28.63
Licensed Worker Recognition (LBSW-IPR)	Baccalaureate Independent	Social Practice		11	4.70
Licensed (LMSW)	Master	Social Worker		84	35.90
Licensed Independent Practice Recognition	Master	Social Worker		4	1.71

**Table 3**

*Participant Licensure*

License	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
(LMSW-IPR)		
Licensed Master Social Worker – Advanced Practice (LMSW-AP)	55	23.50
Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW)	13	5.56
Subtotal	234	100.00
No Response	16	
Total	250	

**Table 4**

*Participant Highest Academic Degree Earned*

Academic Degree Earned	Number	Percent
Doctoral (Ph.D.)	2	1.28
Masters Degree	111	71.15
Bachelors Degree	36	23.08
Other	7	4.49
Subtotal	156	100.00
No Response	94	
Total	250	

**Table 5**

*Years of Experience in the School Social Work Setting*

Years of Experience	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
20+ Years	33	16.92
16-20 Years	20	10.26
11-15 Years	19	9.74
7-10 Years	18	9.23
4-6 Years	28	14.36
0-3 Years	37	18.97
Subtotal	195	100.00
No Response	95	
Total	250	

**Table 6**

*Social Worker Current Position*

Current Position	Count	Percent
School Social Worker	109	69.9
SW with another title	40	25.6

**Table 6**

*Social Worker Current Position*

Current Position	Count	Percent
Evaluator of School Social Worker(s)	1	0.6
Supervisor of School Social Worker(s)	6	3.8
Subtotal	156	100
No Response	94	
Total	250	

**Table 7**

*Type Agency Employed By*

Type of Agency	Count	Percent
Public school	150	96.2
Private school	5	3.2
Charter school	0	
Contracted Services	0	
School Based Health Clinic	0	
Other	1	0.6
Subtotal	156	100
No Response	94	
Total	250	

**Table 8**

*Have You Worked Or Are You Currently Working In Another Social Work Area*

Count	Percent	Other Social Work Job Area
46	26.0%	Mental Health/Clinical Practice
31	17.5%	Medical/Health/Hospital
26	11.9%	Foster Care/Child Welfare
21	11.3%	Child Protective Services
20	10.7%	Administration/Supervision
19	7.9%	Domestic Violence
15	5.1%	Adoption
14	5.1%	Juvenile Justice
9	4.5%	Adult Education
9	26.0%	Survivors of Sexual Assault
8	17.5%	Corrections
7	11.9%	Consulting
22	11.3%	Other
177	100%	Total

**Table 9***District Student Population Enrollment*

Enrollment	Count	Percent
Less than 300	2	1.3
301-500	4	2.6
501-800	3	1.9
801-1000	1	0.6
1001-1500	2	1.3
1501-2000	6	3.9
2001-2500	4	2.6
More than 2500	133	85.8
Subtotal	155	100
No Response	95	
Total	250	

**Table 10***School District Community Type*

Community Type	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Midsized City	45	29.03
Rural	17	10.97
Small Town	21	13.55
Suburban	18	11.61
Urban	54	34.84
Subtotal	155	100.00
No Response	95	
Total	250	

**Table 11***Grade Level Assignments*

Grade Level Assignment	Count	Percent
PreK-Second Grades	1	0.6
PreK-Fifth Grades	27	17.3
PreK-Eighth Grades	14	9.0
PreK-Twelfth Grades	35	22.4
PreK-Fifth & Ninth-Twelfth Grades	1	0.6
Third-Fifth Grades	1	0.6
Third-Twelfth Grades	2	0.6
Sixth-Eighth Grades	20	12.8
Sixth-Twelfth Grades	22	14.1
Ninth-Twelfth Grades	33	21.2

Subtotal	156	100
No Response	94	
Total	250	

**Table 12**

*Types of Schools Assigned*

Type of School	Number of Type of Schools Assigned					Total Schools
	1	2	3	4	5 or More	
Elementary	21	17	8	4	25	220
Middle	47	14	5	5	9	155
High	50	21	6	1	6	144
	118	52	19	10	40	519

**Table 13**

*Only School Social Worker Assigned to School*

	Yes	No
Count	116	32
Percent	78.4	21.6

**Table 14**

*Social Worker Direct Supervisor*

	Count	Percent
Central Office Staff Member	98	62.8
School Administrators other than the Principal	14	8.9
School Principal	44	28.2
School Staff Member	1	0.6
Total	157	100

**Table 15**

*Direct Supervisor: Certified/Licensed Social Worker*

	Count	Percent
Yes	49	31.2
No	108	68.8
Total	157	100

Table 16

Social Worker Evaluator

Evaluator	Count	Percent
Central Office Staff Member	92	59.0
School Administrator other than Principal	17	10.9
School Principal	46	30.1
Total	156	100

Table 17

Evaluator: Certified/Licensed Social Worker

Yes/No	Count	Percent
Yes	47	30.1
No	109	69.9
Total	156	100

Table 18

Assigned Title 1 Schools

Title 1 School Assignment	Count	Percent
All assigned schools are Title 1	115	74.7
Half assigned schools are Title 1	3	2.0
Less than half assigned schools are Title 1	2	1.3
More than half assigned schools are Title 1	17	11.0
No assigned schools are Title 1	17	11.0
Total	154	100

Table 19

Percent of Work Time on Types of Students

Percent Range	General Education Students		Special Education Students		Behaviorally At-Risk Students		Academically At-Risk Students	
0%	4	3.3%	3	2.4%	1	0.8%	1	0.8%
1-10%	3	2.5%	52	41.3%	7	5.8%	4	3.2%
11-20%	1	0.8%	28	22.2%	3	2.5%	4	3.2%
21-30%	5	4.1%	12	9.5%	13	10.7%	6	4.8%
31-40%	5	4.1%	9	7.1%	7	5.8%	4	3.2%
41-50%	9	7.4%	9	7.1%	20	16.5%	19	15.3%
51-60%	9	7.4%	2	1.6%	9	7.4%	8	6.5%
61-70%	3	2.5%	0	0.0%	6	5.0%	7	5.6%



71-80%	21	17.4%	3	2.4%	22	18.2%	24	19.4%
81-90%	36	29.8%	0	0.0%	11	9.1%	12	9.7%
91-100%	25	20.7%	8	.3%	22	18.2%	35	28.2%
Total:	121	100.0%	126	100.0%	121	100.0%	124	100.0%

**Table 20**

*School Social Worker Responsibilities Levels of Involvement*

Responsibilities	High/ Medium	Low/Infrequent/ Not At All
Emotional Problems	86.8%	13.2%
Children at risk	83.3%	16.7%
Mental health, illness, trauma	81.6%	18.4%
Behavior management	78.4%	28.1%
Crisis	78.3%	21.7%
Family trauma/change	76.5%	23.5%
Basic human needs (housing, food, clothing, health care)	73.9%	26.1%
Attendance, truancy, dropouts	73.2%	26.8%
Conflict resolution, anger management	67.5%	32.5%
Poor social skills by students (social skills development)	65.8%	34.2%
Academic underachievement	64.2%	35.8%
Administrative Task	63.3%	36.7%
Aggressive Behavior	63.3%	36.7%
Parent-child relationships conflict	63.2%	36.8%
Homelessness	60.1%	39.9%
Other issues/ unspecified**	60.0%	40.0%
Peer relations (not bullying)	59.6%	40.4%
Anti-victim education/protective behaviors bullying prevention	55.9%	44.1%
Bullying among students	51.3%	48.7%
Trauma sensitivity	50.7%	49.3%
Child abuse and neglect	50.0%	50.0%
Suicide Prevention	49.7%	57.0%
Self-injury	46.1%	53.9%
Withdrawn behavior	45.4%	54.6%
Wellness	45.0%	55.0%
Resiliency protective assets	44.0%	56.0%
Hyperactivity	42.4%	57.6%

Culturally responsive practices, race issues	37.7%	62.3%
Safety/violence prevention	34.0%	66.0%
Alcohol, Tobacco, and other drug use	33.3%	66.7%
Human growth and development	31.3%	68.7%
School climate and environment	30.7%	69.3%
Students living in out-of-home care	28.2%	71.8%
Juvenile delinquency	27.8%	72.2%
Transition Plans	27.3%	72.7%
Gender issues	27.2%	72.8%
School age parents	26.3%	73.7%
School phobia	24.3%	75.7%
Special Education	23.2%	70.2%
Discipline	23.0%	77.0%
Bilingual, bicultural, ELL	22.5%	77.5%
Test Anxiety	22.4%	77.6%
Comprehensive school health	21.9%	78.1%
Suspension/Expulsion	20.0%	80.0%
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)	17.8%	82.2%
Inclusion	17.1%	82.9%
Eating disorders	15.2%	84.8%
Pregnancy prevention	13.2%	86.8%
Sex Assault Prevention	11.2%	88.8%
Sex problems	9.9%	90.1%
Section 504 Evaluation/ Coordination	7.9%	92.1%
Gifted and talented	6.0%	94.0%

**Table 21***Percent of Time Spent of Tier 1-3*

Percent of Time	Tier 1		Tier 2		Tier 3	
0%	24	27.9%	18	20.7%	20	23.0%
1-10%	21	24.4%	12	13.8%	14	16.1%
11-20%	12	14.0%	7	8.0%	7	8.0%
21-30%	9	10.5%	24	27.6%	13	14.9%
31-40%	6	7.0%	7	8.0%	6	6.9%
41-50%	3	3.5%	6	6.9%	8	9.2%
51-60%	3	3.5%	3	3.4%	0	0.0%
61-70%	2	2.3%	3	3.4%	9	10.3%
71-80%	3	3.5%	5	5.7%	7	8.0%

81-90%	1	1.2%	1	1.1%	3	3.4%
91-100%	2	2.3%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%
Total:	86	100.0%	87	100.0%	87	100.0%

**Table 22**

*PBIS Internal or External Coach Status*

Response	PBIS Internal Coach		PBIS External Coach	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Yes	10	6.5	4	2.6
No	144	93.5	150	97.4
Total	154	100	154	100

**Table 23**

*Typical Student Home Environment*

Home Environment	Count	Percent
Single parent homes	56	17.6%
Homes with serious economic deprivation	51	16.0%
Homes with poor child-rearing practices	45	14.2%
Homes where English is NOT the dominant language spoken	43	13.5%
Homes lacking adequate parental concern for the child	40	12.6%
Homes lacking in educational encouragement	35	11.0%
Homes with considerable marital discord	31	9.7%
Homes that pressure children to achieve	17	5.3%
Other:		
• Homelessness (10)		
• Living with a relative (4)		
• Newcomer families (1)	16	
• Unaccompanied minors (1)		
• Not living with parents or relatives (1)		5.0%
Homes of foreign parentage	14	4.4%
Homes where the family culture is different from the community's culture	13	4.1%
Institutions or group homes which provide substitute care for children (foster homes, state detention centers, halfway house)	8	2.5%
Total:	318	100%

**Table 24**

*Rate of Use of Professional Strategy/Program*

Professional Strategy or Program	H/M	L/I/N
Advocacy for students/families	88.7%	11.3%
Individual student counseling	84.7%	15.3%
Consultation with teachers and school staff to support individual student success	83.2%	16.8%
Casework/management	82.1%	17.9%
Referral & information	75.7%	24.3%
Crisis intervention/coordination	74.3%	25.7%
Assessment of students/progress monitoring	66.2%	33.8%
Multidisciplinary team collaboration	57.4%	42.6%
Abuse/neglect reporting or monitoring	51.0%	49.0%
Parent conferences	49.0%	51.0%
Group work/counseling/student assistance programs	48.3%	51.7%
Consultation with teachers to support teacher success	48.3%	51.7%
School-home liaison/home visits	41.2%	58.8%
Screening students	40.7%	59.3%
Observations of students	40.3%	59.7%
Own professional development	40.3%	59.7%
Community advocacy for parents	35.3%	64.7%
Data-based decision making	33.6%	66.4%
School-community collaborative partnerships	32.6%	67.4%
School/staff professional development (attending)	29.7%	70.3%
Alternative school/program (disciplinary)	29.6%	70.4%
Community advocacy for school social work	28.9%	71.1%
Intra-district collaboration	28.4%	71.6%
Community advocacy for school	27.7%	72.3%
School-community liaison	27.0%	73.0%
Evaluation of your professional practice	25.5%	74.5%
Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS)	24.8%	75.2%
Trauma Sensitive Schools	24.8%	75.2%
School/staff presentations (informational)	23.8%	76.2%
Community advocacy for district	23.3%	76.7%
School leadership activities (school leadership teams/leadership committees, administrative consultation, policy formulation/change)	21.6%	78.4%

Staff development/training/in-services (providing)	20.3%	79.7%
Program coordination	20.1%	79.9%
Mentoring program for students	19.3%	80.7%
Program development	18.7%	81.3%
After school activities and programs	18.5%	81.5%
Supervising school social work students	18.1%	81.9%
Parent group/classes/presentations	18.0%	82.0%
Restorative justice	17.7%	82.3%
Building consultation team	17.4%	82.6%
Family counseling	17.3%	82.7%
Response to Intervention (RtI)	16.8%	83.2%
Professional supervision	16.0%	84.0%
Peer program for students	14.0%	86.0%
School health services	13.4%	86.6%
Supervising school social workers	12.9%	87.1%
Program evaluation	12.8%	87.2%
Professional colleague/peer presentations	12.7%	87.3%
Before/after/summer school program	11.9%	88.1%
Service learning/community service	11.6%	88.4%
Research	10.9%	89.1%
Employee assistance program	8.7%	91.3%
Policy development	8.7%	91.3%
Classroom instruction	7.5%	92.5%
Employee wellness program	7.3%	92.7%
Pupil services teaming	6.8%	93.2%
Boarding homes (placement homes for use by Juvenile Justice Department or Health and Family Services)	5.3%	94.7%
Grant writing/management	2.7%	97.3%

<b>Table 25</b>											
<i>Sources of Student Referrals Percentage Rankings</i>											
	Rank 1-10 Source of Student Referrals (1 Highest, 10 Lowest)										Total
Source	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Students (Self-referrals)	15.5	6.1	8.8	8.1	11.5	10.1	7.4	6.1	10.8	15.5	148
Students (Referrals of other students by students)	4.8	7.5	9.6	6.2	10.3	9.6	8.2	14.4	10.3	28	146
Teachers	25.2	21.8	13.6	10.2	6.8	2.0	5.4	4.8	4.1	6.1	147
Counselors	38.5	16.9	8.1	8.8	6.1	5.4	3.4	4.1	2.0	6.8	148
School Administrators	24.7	24.7	12.0	12.7	2.7	5.3	4.7	5.3	4.0	4.0	150
Parents	11.5	10.8	16.9	7.4	16.9	15.5	6.1	6.1	5.4	3.4	148
Special Education Team	5.4	10.9	9.5	8.8	12.9	6.8	8.2	8.2	9.5	19.7	147
Attendance Officer	9.5	8.1	6.8	6.1	8.1	6.1	7.4	11.5	12.8	23.6	148
School Nurses	7.4	8.7	13.4	10.7	10.1	10.1	9.4	8.7	12.1	9.4	149

**Table 26**

*Most Important School Social Work Service Provided to Students*

Themes	Theme %	Categories	Category %
Counseling	60.1	Individual Counseling	30.0
		Personal Social/Emotional Support and Development	21.5
		Crisis Intervention	6.3
		Conflict Resolution	1.8
		SW Consultation	0.4
Linking to Resources	12.1		
Case Management	6.7		
Group Counseling	4.0		
Academic Support	2.7		
Support for Special Education Students	1.3		
Improving Family Capacity	1.3	Building Capacity of Families	0.9
		Mentoring Skill Development	0.4
Assessment	0.9		
Mentoring	0.9		
Improving Staff Capacity	0.4		
Liaison	0.4		
Dropout Prevention	0.4		
Pregnancy Intervention	0.4		
Total Percent:	100.0		
Total Responses:	223		
Total Respondents:	113		

**Table 27**

*Most Important School Social Work Services Provided to Parents*

Themes/Categories	Percent
Linking to Resources	45.4%
Parenting Skills Training	19.0%
School, Parent, and Community Liaison	9.2%
Parent Psychoeducation Training	6.1%
Personal Emotional/Social Support	5.5%
Case Management	3.7%
Advocacy for Parents	3.7%
Consultation about student behaviors	3.1%
Parent Engagement	1.2%
SPED/RTI/504/ADHD	1.2%
Mentoring Parents	0.6%
Address Homelessness	0.6%
Crisis Intervention	0.6%
Total Percent:	100.0%
Total Responses:	163
Total Respondents:	115



**Table 28**  
*Most Important School Social Work Services Provided to Teachers*

Themes	Theme %	Categories	Category%
Emotional Support	25.0%	Emotional Support and Encouragement	25.0%
Training/Advice	14.8%	Training and Advice	14.8%
Support Student Learning	26.7%	Supporting Student Learning	13.1%
		Classroom Management	10.2%
		Assist with Student Classroom Issues	3.4%
Teacher-Student Issue Resolution	11.9%		
Find/Provide Classroom Resources	10.2%	Finding/Providing Classroom Resources	10.2%
Liaison	4.5%	School, Parent, and Community Liaison	4.5%
Teacher Advocacy	2.3%	Teacher Advocacy	2.3%
Personal Support	1.7%	Personal Support & Counseling	1.7%
Contacting Parents	1.7%	Home Visits	1.1%
		Parent Contact	0.6%
Crisis Intervention & Support	0.6%		
Translating	0.6%		
Total Percent:	100.0%		
Total Responses:	176		
Total Respondents:	113		

**Table 29**

*Most Important School Social Work Services Provided to School Administration*

Theme	Theme %	Category	Category %
Providing SSW Perspective & Support	44.9%	Advice, Support, and Encouragement	27.3%
		SW Perspective on school issues	17.6%
		Attendance/Discipline/ Homeless/ Drop-out Prevention	9.8%
		Student Support	7.8%
		Social Emotional Learning	3.4%
Student Support	25.4%	Home Visits	1.5%
		Student Home Issues	1.0%
		Student Counseling	1.0%
		College Readiness and Testing	0.5%
		Classroom Management for Autistic Students	0.5%
Liaison	8.3%		
Linking to Resources	5.4%		
Education Advocacy	4.9%		
Mental Health Support	3.4%		
Crisis Response Support	2.4%		
Parent Support	2.4%		
None/N/A	1.0%		
Assessment Support/Data	1.0%		
Program Development, Implementation, and Evaluation	1.0%	Program Development and Evaluation	0.5%
		Program implementation	0.5%
Total Percent:	100.0%		
Total Responses:	149		
Total Respondents:	108		

<b>Table 30</b>			
<b>Promote School Social Work to Students, Parents, School, District, and Community</b>			
	Yes	No	# of Respondents
Students	85.5%	14.5%	131
	If yes, how?	Direct Services	36.5%
		Classroom Presence	35.1%
		Marketing Material	12.2%
		Assemblies	9.5%
		Hallway Presence	5.4%
		Casual Conversations	1.4%
Parents	85.1%	14.9%	134
	If yes, how?	Bringing Awareness to School Social Worker Role	27.0%
		Meetings	23.8%
		Outreach Efforts	17.5%
		Direct Communication	12.7%
		Linking to Resources	7.9%
		Online Communication	6.3%
		Case Management	3.2%
		Staff Referrals	1.6%
School	Yes	No	# of Respondents
	88.0%	12.0%	133
	If yes, how?	Staff Development	36.0%
		Communication	9.4%
		Teamwork/Networking	7.8%
		Social Media	6.3%
		Staff Meetings	6.3%
		Visibility	1.6%
		Counselor Support	1.6%
District	Yes	No	# of Respondents
	71.6%	28.4%	134
	If yes, how?	Awareness of School Social Worker Role	33.3%

		Presentations	16.7%
		District Meetings	16.7%
		Communication	11.9%
		School Social Work Services	9.5%
		District Representation	7.1%
		Supervisor's Responsibility	2.4%
Community	Yes	No	# of Respondents
	69.6%	30.4%	135
	If yes, how?	Presentations	36.8%
		Networking	21.1%
		Community Events	15.8%
		Liaison	10.5%
		Supervisor's Responsibility	2.6%

**Table 31**  
*Provide More of What School Social Work Services*

Theme	Theme %	Category	Category %
Direct Student Services	36.9%	Individual Counseling	18.4%
		Direct Student Services	9.2%
		Restorative services	3.5%
		Case Management	2.8%
		Student Behavior	
		Management	1.4%
		Student Mental Health/	
		Crisis	0.7%
		Provide Psychosocial	
		Lessons to Students	0.7%
Small Groups	14.9%		
Self-Professional Development	12.8%		
Liaison Service	12.8%		
Parent Support	7.8%		
Student Follow-Ups	4.3%		
Social Justice	2.8%		
Student Diversity	2.8%		
Student Health Services	0.7%		
Collaboration with Home			
Campus	0.7%		
Teacher Classroom Support	0.7%		
Student/Parent Training on			
Trauma	0.7%		
Assess Parents and Students	0.7%		
None/N/A	1.4%		
Total Percent:		100.0%	
Total Responses:		141	
Total Respondents:		99	

**Table 32**  
*Provide What School Social Services Not Currently Providing*

Theme	Theme %	Category	Category %
Direct Student Services	29.4%	Student Prevention Services	5.9%
		Student Direct service/ Assessments	5.9%
		Social Justice	5.0%
		Support Student Diversity	3.4%
		Intense case management/ consistent services	2.5%
		Addressing Bullying	1.7%
		Direct Services To Students	0.8%
		Post-Graduate Support	0.8%
		Outside college-prep school experiences for students	0.8%
		Restorative Circles between students and staff	0.8%
		Student Enrichment Activities	0.8%
		More evidence-based practices	0.8%
No/None/N/A	19.3%		
Liaison	12.6%	Linking to services	5.9%
		Outreach/community/collaboration	5.9%
		Collaboration with Medical Doctors	0.8%
Groups	10.9%		
Resources	6.7%		
Parent Services	5.0%		
After School Programs	5.9%	School sponsor/after-school support programs	3.4%
		After-school/summer programs	2.5%
		Department of Ed leadership trainings/EBT interventions/	
Staff Development	4.2%	Credit Education Units	3.4%
		Professional Development	0.8%
Self-Harm Policy			
Development	1.7%		
SSW Advocacy	0.8%		
Research	0.8%		

**Table 32**  
*Provide What School Social Services Not Currently Providing*

Online Services	0.8%
SSW Mentoring	0.8%
Awareness of SSW Role	0.8%
Total Percent:	100.0%
Total Responses:	119
Total Respondents:	82

**Table 33**  
*Provide Services Not Currently Providing*

Theme	Theme %	Category	Category %
Non-School Social Work Responsibilities	65.5%	Administrative Duties/Covering Class/Front/Clerical Paperwork/Drug Test	20.9%
		Duty/Morning/Lunch/Pick-Up	19.1%
		Student Discipline	11.8%
		SPED Services	3.6%
		School Counselor Responsibilities	2.7%
		Counseling to Staff	1.8%
		Counseling Related to Discipline Issues	0.9%
		Meetings with no SW connection	0.9%
		Parent Center/Volunteers	0.9%
		Delivering Food Boxes	0.9%
		School Monthly Parent Meetings	0.9%
		School-Wide Lesson Planning	0.9%
		None/N/A	20.0%
		Paperwork	3.6%
		Student Attendance Committee	3.6%
		Counselor Responsibilities Not Related to School	1.8%
		Monthly Reports (Paperwork)	2.7%
		Data Collection and Reports	0.9%

**Table 33**  
*Provide Services Not Currently Providing*

Theme	Theme %	Category	Category %
Social Work			
Group Counseling	0.9%		
External Crisis Response	0.9%		
Deescalate Upset Parent	0.9%		
Traveling to Different Schools	0.9%		
Counselor Responsibilities	0.9%		
Continue Ineffective Approaches	0.9%		
Total Percent:	100.0%		
Total Responses:	110		
Total Respondents:	94		

**Table 34**  
*Percentage of Services Provided in Individual Supportive Counseling & Liaison*

Percent Services	of Count	Individual Supportive Counseling Percent	Liaison Count	Percent
0	2	1.8%	2	1.9%
1	-	-	2	1.9%
10	9	8.1%	12	11.3%
20	3	2.7%	15	14.2%
25	3	2.7%	6	5.7%
30	4	3.6%	13	12.3%
35	1	0.9%	5	4.7%
40	3	2.7%	8	7.5%
50	7	6.3%	1	0.9%
60	7	6.3%	12	11.3%
65	2	1.8%	2	1.9%
70	4	3.6%	5	4.7%
75	4	3.6%	3	2.8%
80	16	14.4%	1	0.9%
85	8	7.2%	5	4.7%



90	13	11.7%	2	1.9%
95	10	9.0%	5	4.7%
99	3	2.7%	4	3.8%
100	12	10.8%	3	2.8%
Grand Total	111	100.0%	106	100.0%

**Table 35**

*Impact of School Social Worker Services on Student Success*

	Count	Percent
Extremely High Impact	21	16.54%
High Impact	74	58.27%
Moderate Impact	30	23.62%
Slight Impact	2	1.57%
Grand Total	127	100.00%

**Table 36**

*Familiarity of School Administrators and Staff With School Social Worker Services Provided*

Response	Count	Percent
Extremely Familiar	14	10.9%
Very Familiar	36	28.1%
Moderately Familiar	51	39.8%
Slightly Familiar	22	17.2%
Not Familiar At All	5	3.9%
Grand Total	128	100.0%

## References:

- 1) Allen-Meares, P. (1988, January 1). Contribution of social workers to sociology: Past and present efforts. *Urban Education*, 22(4), pp. 401-412. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004208598802200402>
- 2) Allen-Meares, P. (1993). Pull and push: Clinical or macro interventions in schools. *Children & Schools*, 15(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cs/15.1.3>
- 3) Ding, X., Faulkner, M., Franklin, C., Gerlach, B., Beer, M., Calbow, E., & Nulu, S. (2022). Assessing Texas School Social Work Practice: Findings from the First Statewide Conference Survey. *International Journal of School Social Work*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.4148/2161-4148.1088>

- 4) Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 (2004).
- 5) Kirst-Ashman, K. K. & Hull, G. H. (2009). *Understanding generalist practice*. Cengage Learning.
- 6) McLaughlin, A. M. (2009, Spring). Clinical Social Workers: Advocates for Social Justice. *Advances in Social Work*, 10(1), 51-68. <https://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/advancesinsocialwork/article/view/209/212>
- 7) National Association of Social Workers. (2021). *Social Work History, Did You Know?* <https://www.socialworkers.org/News/Facts/Social-Work-History>
- 8) National Association of Social Workers. (2012). NASW Standards for School Social Work Services. <https://www.socialworkers.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=1Ze4-9-Os7E%3D&portalid=0>
- 9) Okpych, N. J., & Yu, J. L-H. (2014). A historical analysis of evidence-based practice in social work: The unfinished journey toward an empirically grounded profession. *Social Service Review*, 88(1), 3–58. <https://doi.org/10.1086/674969>
- 10) Padilla, G., Menchaca, V. D., & Gandaria, A. (2023). Texas School Social Workers: Who And Where Are They? *International Journal of Arts Humanities & Social Science*, 04(03), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.56734/ijahss.v4n3a1>
- 11) Phillippo, K. L., Kelly, M. S., Shayman, E. & Frey, A. (2017). School social worker practice decisions: The impact of professional models, training, and school context. *The Journal of Contemporary Social Science*, 98(4), 274-283.
- 12) Randall, C. (2015). *Development of the Professional School Social Work Survey: A Valid and Reliable Tool for Assessment and Planning*. Graduate Theses and Dissertations. <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/5561>
- a. *Reprinted/excerpted from the Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey with permission from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 125 South Webster Street, Madison, WI 53703, 1-800-243-8782*
- 13) *Texas Administration Code §781.404. Recognition as a Council-approved Supervisor and the Supervision Process*. (2020, November 20). Texas Secretary of State. [https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p\\_dir=&p\\_rloc=&p\\_tloc=&p\\_ploc=&pg=1&p\\_tac=&ti=22&pt=34&ch=781&rl=404](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=22&pt=34&ch=781&rl=404)
- 14) *Texas Administrative Code §781.302 The Practice of Social Work*. (2020, November 10). Texas Secretary of State. [https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p\\_dir=&p\\_rloc=&p\\_tloc=&p\\_ploc=&pg=1&p\\_tac=&ti=22&pt=34&ch=781&rl=302](https://texreg.sos.state.tx.us/public/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=22&pt=34&ch=781&rl=302)
- 15) Texas Education Agency. 2022. *2020-21 Statewide Staff Files Data Documentation*.
- 16) Texas School Social Work Network. (2020, June). *Texas School Social Work Survey Results*. University of Texas Austin, Texas Institute for Child & Family Wellbeing, Steve Hicks School of Social Work <https://txicfw.socialwork.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/TSSWN-Survey-Results-FINAL.pdf>
- 17) University of Texas Austin. (2021, November 10). *Texas School Social Network*. Texas Institute for Child & Family Wellbeing, Steve Hicks School of Social Work.

- Texas School Social Workers: Demographics, Work...* A. Gandaria, G. Padilla and V. Menchaca  
<https://txicfw.socialwork.utexas.edu/research/project/texas-school-social-work-network/>
- 18) US Bureau of Labor and Statistics. (2021a, March 31). *Industry profile for Child, Family, and School Social Workers* [https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes\\_tx.htm#21-0000](https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_tx.htm#21-0000)
  - 19) US Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2021b, April 21). *Education Pays: Earnings and unemployment rates by educational attainment, May 2020, Employment of child, family, and social workers by area, May 2020*. <https://www.bls.gov/emp/chart-unemployment-earnings-education.htm>
  - 20) Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2021). *Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey*.