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Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to describe an initiative to improve social work education in Vietnam through an international collaborative including U.S. Aid for International Development (USAID), San José State University, eight universities in Vietnam, Vietnam's government ministries, and Cisco Systems, Inc. The goal of the Social Work Education Enhancement Program (SWEEP) is to strengthen the capacity of Vietnam's higher education social work programs to deliver quality education and prepare trained, job-ready social workers. The SWEEP project aims to improve the administration of social work education, the professional capacity of faculty, social work curriculum, and networking technology to enable centers for excellence in learning and scholarship.

Emerging social problems are challenging Vietnam’s nascent social welfare programs and infrastructure. Despite gains made in the country’s efforts since the 1980s to reduce poverty and increase literacy, the country faces economic disparities in rural areas, high rates of urban migration, and corresponding social problems that also plague more industrialized nations. Data compiled by the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA) in 2008 showed that one-fourth of the Vietnam population are estimated to need social work services (Nguyen, 2009). More recently, these estimates have been updated to show that significant proportions of the population (as many as 1.4 million) need social work services, including elders, households under poverty, people with mental health issues and severe mental illness, children who are orphans, children with HIV/AIDS, children with autism or intellectual disabilities, and those who are victims of natural disasters (Ministry of Labour, Invalids, and Social Affairs (MOLISA), 2014).

Social work services have been provided in one form or another since before the French colonial period (before 1862) (Oanh, 2002), but it was not until the 1990s that efforts were underway to develop social work curricula in higher education (Hugman, Nguyen, & Nguyen, 2007). The Vietnamese government, in partnership with universities and funders (most notably UNICEF), began efforts to bring in international experts to teach and advise on curriculum and program development (Hines, Cohen, Tran, Lee, & Van Phu, 2010). In 2004, the Ministry of Education and Training, which oversees higher education, approved a core curriculum for social work education at the undergraduate level (Vietnam Ministry of Education and Training, 2004). The social work profession was officially recognized by the government in 2010 (Vietnam Office of the Prime Minister, 2010) enabling national efforts to develop the workforce. To date, there are over 40 universities that provide undergraduate social work education to university students as well as those currently working in social work-related fields who do not have social work degrees (MOLISA, 2014).

Despite the rapid expansion of social work education programs, there are significant limitations in the universities’ ability to provide social work education (Nguyen, Hugman, & Briscoe, 2010). Among the challenges are (a) the lack of social workers with advanced degrees to teach in higher education; (b) very few faculty with social work practice, teaching and scholarship experience, since many faculty come from
other disciplines; (c) underdeveloped curriculum addressing core social work content and practice; (d) a lack of Vietnamese language texts and training materials; (e) very few field training opportunities with experienced supervisors; and (f) until only very recently, the lack of a national association of social workers and a central leadership to develop national policy. A recent UNICEF evaluation of implementing the social work profession in Vietnam (United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, 2014) reported that there is an increased number of faculty receiving a masters degree from overseas universities. Most of these faculty, however, have not had much involvement in social work practice, but rather have had more exposure to theory. Social work students still do not have qualified field supervisors at field agencies to learn practice skills. In addition, there is still a lack of authentic curricular materials that are developed to fit with Vietnam’s context.

The SWEEP project was initiated to address these issues. San José State University’s involvement in Vietnam began as part of a UNICEF-funded project which included the transmission of a foundation-level social work curriculum in the areas of policy, human behavior, practice, and research (Hines et al., 2010). San José State University sent faculty to teach 14 courses to Vietnam National University in Hanoi (VNU), during four sessions between January 2008 and August 2010 in the areas of social work theories and policy; social work practice for individuals and families; the law, social work, and diverse groups; family violence; special-needs children and youth; and substance abuse. Seven of these courses were taught by two San José State University instructors who are native Vietnamese speakers, while the others were taught by faculty who are non-Vietnamese speakers with professional interpreters provided by VNU. Lessons learned from this highly collaborative effort included how to tailor the courses from western-centric content to Vietnam’s unique cultural and political context; the importance of constant communication with faculty and administrators in Vietnam; and the need to remain flexible, tenacious, and highly creative so as to arrive at alternative solutions and to cope with the complexity and unpredicted challenges of international work.

Relationships that were developed from this collaboration led to a successful grant proposal to USAID to establish a three-year cooperative agreement to implement SWEEP with five universities initially, then expanded to eight in the second year of the project. The universities cover both rural and urban regions. There are an additional 32 universities in Vietnam that currently have undergraduate social work programs. The final eight participating SWEEP universities were selected based on geographical representation (northern, central and southern regions), a mix of urban and rural settings, and the willingness of universities’ top leadership to participate in the SWEEP project.

The initial five Vietnamese universities include three in the northern area: Vietnam National University, University of Social Sciences and Humanities (USSH) in Hanoi, University of Labor and Social Affairs in Hanoi, and Hanoi National University of Education; one in the central region (Hue University of Science); and one in the South (Vietnam National University, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, HCMC). The additional three universities were Vinh University, located in the north, Da Lat...
University in the central highlands, and Dong Thap University in the southern Mekong delta.

The SWEEP Project

Knowledge transfer initiatives in countries such as Vietnam are more successful when they allow local, culturally relevant knowledge to emerge rather than merely imposing the 'sender’s' knowledge (Napier, 2005). The risk of providing technical assistance to other countries is that Western concepts can be imported that are incongruent with the local context. This is also in line with the concept of ‘indigenous’ social work—the development of professional identity and standards that are congruent with the local culture while also consistent with international standards (Lan, Hugman, & Briscoe, 2010). There are signs that during the involvement of international universities and experts, Vietnam has been thoughtfully adapting Western models to fit the country’s context (Hugman et al., 2007). Unique to Vietnam is the pace by which social work professionalization is occurring—quite rapidly compared to other developing countries. Another unique contextual issue is that there are many paraprofessionals already working in government-run human services agencies who require further training. Added to this is the public perception of social work as a ‘volunteer’ activity rather than a real profession, in a culture that values voluntary contributions to social and human needs. These contextual issues create both opportunities and barriers to implement activities leading to increased professionalization.

San José State University’s previous experience collaborating in Vietnam was informed by a sensitivity to these indigenous contexts (Hines et al., 2010), and also provided the theoretical foundation for the approach by which SWEEP was implemented. The intent was to gain a thorough understanding of the local context for the social work profession and social work education, as perceived by stakeholders in Vietnam, before developing a project plan for training and technical assistance. Throughout the project, this principle was operationalized by eliciting constant feedback from stakeholders in the country about the relevance and impact of the various project’s activities.

Once the cooperative agreement between San José State University and USAID was established, the SWEEP implementation team was formed. The team includes a Director/Principal Investigator; a Co-Investigator; three faculty leaders in the areas of faculty development, curriculum, and administration development; staff from Cisco Systems, Inc. US and Vietnam; three project staff in Hanoi, and administrative support staff at San José State University. In addition, other faculty, consultants, and experts were selected based on their expertise for SWEEP training activities. Each university in Vietnam brought on a Faculty Coordinator to help facilitate logistics, and student Research Assistants have been utilized at San José State University and the partner universities. Cisco Systems, Inc. is a worldwide leader in networking technologies and equipment that enables people to connect, communicate, and collaborate globally. The plan called for Cisco Systems to match USAID funding 1:1 by providing leveraged in-kind resources such as training and technical consultation.
A memorandum of agreement was signed between San José State University, USAID, and Cisco Systems to specify the contributed effort which includes a technological needs assessment for each partner university, recommendations for upgrading technology to meet the SWEEP objectives, and access to Cisco’s online training in network technology for the universities’ IT staff.

Once the team was established, a needs assessment was conducted in order to tailor the SWEEP activities to the expressed needs of stakeholders. The needs assessment covered the major SWEEP components—administration, faculty development, curriculum development, and collaboration/network development. Protocols were developed for key informant interviews (administrators, government officials, and information technology personnel) and focus groups (faculty, students, and community stakeholders). To acquire a comprehensive contextual picture, the needs assessment also included a question about the priority social and health issues in the region. The emphasis of the assessment differed depending on the participants. For example, questions to students focused on their understanding of social work as a profession, career goals, and barriers to reaching them at the university. For administrators, the questions focused more on university policies that need to be developed to expand or improve social work faculty and programs. Faculty were asked questions related to professional development and their views about their roles as faculty in a newly established profession. Community representatives were asked questions about their perception of the social work profession from the standpoint of being field placement agencies and eventual employers. Information technology staff were asked about their universities’ access to networking software, server equipment and communication networks. All protocols included questions about recommendations for improvement in relevant areas. Instruments were translated and back translated for conceptual and linguistic accuracy and pilot tested with administrators, faculty, students, and stakeholders at USSH, Hanoi. The SWEEP needs assessment and associated data gathering activities were approved by the IRB at San José State University.

A total of 159 respondents were interviewed in focus groups and key informant interviews, which were conducted by SWEEP staff in Vietnamese. Respondents included 58 faculty, 47 students, 33 community agency representatives, 16 university administrators, and 5 information technology staff from the universities. Field notes were translated into English for the SWEEP faculty leaders to analyze, first by organizing the content under the main areas of interest in each domain. The team then looked for needs and recommendations that were unique to each university as well as those that were shared among all universities. The faculty worked with Vietnamese-speaking team members to ensure linguistic validity, and results were presented to each university to elicit feedback and clarify ambiguous responses.

Findings showed that universities differed in how social work faculty were organized within departments, the size of the social work programs, the extent to which curriculum were developed, and the social issues that are unique to each region. For example, universities in urban areas reported concerns such as increased criminal behavior, homelessness, substance abuse, HIV/AIDS, and the impact of urban migration on families. Social issues for universities in rural areas included priorities...
such as poverty, consequences of previous wars (especially disability caused by environmental remnants of Agent Orange), natural disasters, human trafficking, prostitution, and youth delinquency. In general, despite the different emphases of the protocols for each type of participant, the universities were similar in many basic areas. Table 1 shows shared themes among all universities.

In addition to the programmatic needs assessment, staff from Cisco Systems visited each campus and conducted a technological assessment. This focused on the universities’ local and wide-area networking infrastructure, the capacity for Internet connectivity, the state of networking hardware, and accessibility to video, web, and teleconferencing technologies. This is important to SWEEP since one of the objectives is to improve networking among the universities to eventually implement ‘Centers of Excellence’ in social work education, allowing the sharing of academic resources, as well as ensure adequate communication capacity for online SWEEP training activities. As was found in the programmatic needs assessment, the universities varied in their existing technology capacity, and the Cisco assessment found that each university needed some type of modest upgrades or new equipment to improve networking capacity.

From the needs assessment findings, the SWEEP team developed a project plan that addressed most if not all the shared issues while at the same time remaining aware of the individualized needs of the universities. The project tasks and outcomes in each main area of SWEEP are summarized below.

**Strengthening Administration**

To address the training and planning needs of administrators (i.e. Dean, Directors, Rectors, and/or Presidents), the SWEEP team developed three main activities—(a) an

Table 1 Shared Needs of SWEEP Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWEEP area</th>
<th>Need, and suggestions for, development of ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>Additional management and human resource skills, including skills relevant to leading social work programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to social work principles and practice for leaders often trained in other disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced use of technology to support teaching and networking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional opportunities to collaborate with other universities, particularly in relation to addressing gaps in social work education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty development</strong></td>
<td>Strategies for addressing different professional development needs of senior and junior faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic social work practice skills, including how to better link theory with practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional support for training such as money for study abroad and attendance at conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional support</strong></td>
<td>Institution support for scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategies to better develop field instructors and supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>Development of shared standards for student competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific courses in relevant social problems in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better collaboration between university and field agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective learning methods for students in field settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
annual Leadership Academy, (b) participation in developing a strategic plan for each university, and (c) ongoing consultation and periodic meetings to monitor and guide leadership development.

For the annual Leadership Academy (held twice as of this writing), university leaders are invited to San José for a week-long series of trainings, meetings, and site visits to community agencies. The training topics included (a) an introduction to core social work education concepts; (b) key concepts about strategic planning, focused on expanding or improving the social work education program at the university; (c) strategies for expanding resources and infrastructure to develop faculty capabilities in teaching and scholarship; and (d) leadership and collaboration at the university, regional, and national levels. One notable outcome from the first Leadership Academy was a resolve by participants to form a Leadership Group which would represent the SWEEP universities in the larger regional and national efforts to develop social work education. This was inspired by training to the participants from the staff of the California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC) about their efforts to organize stakeholders from universities, service agencies, and government in decisions about curriculum, educational standards, and workforce development. CalSWEC is the nation’s largest state coalition of social work educators and practitioners.

Each partner university was asked to develop a Strategic Plan for meeting the SWEEP objectives. The purpose of this task is to help university administrators plan various enhancement and expansion activities. For example, in the area of faculty development, administrators were asked to report objectives related to increasing the number of faculty, advancing the faculty’s degrees, improving teaching, expanding research capability, or other area. They were also asked to define a timeline for completion and any training or other implementation issues related to each objective.

During the first Annual SWEEP Summit in Vietnam (a conference for university participants designed to provide training, elicit feedback, and disseminate information), the leaders presented parts of their strategic plans to their peers. Six months later, the SWEEP team requested progress reports. These reports showed that the universities have made significant gains in developing their programs, identifying barriers to success, and identifying areas that the SWEEP team could assist, for example sharing San José State University’s social work faculty recruitment procedures and policies about retention, tenure and promotion; or providing specific strategies to improve the research infrastructure to better support faculty scholarship. The latter was especially relevant given that in the needs assessment most faculty respondents reported not having sufficient time or financial resources to conduct research, even though it remains an expectation for retention and promotion.

Ongoing consultation to the Leadership Group has been provided by the SWEEP team, especially the staff located in Hanoi who are in constant communication with Coordinators and Deans. The team provided ad hoc technical assistance especially during critical times preparing for Leaders’ visits, attending and speaking at national
conferences, and communicating with government ministry staff about SWEEP activities.

Faculty Development

The challenge faced by Vietnam’s universities is the lack of faculty who were trained as social workers, yet who are now responsible to teach social work students, supervise field training activities, and engage in social work-related scholarship. The needs assessment indicated that faculty have specific interests in social issues and vulnerable populations. Many of them had at least some exposure to social work theories and information about the scope and purposes of the profession. Even without background training in social work practice, many of them had already been assigned to supervise field training, raising questions for them about the appropriate role of social work faculty given their limited experience. They were concerned that their practice classes are inadequate since the instructors often do not have practice experience, but instead rely on their knowledge of community development strategies and about services in NGOs with whom they have been developing professional connections. Many of these faculty were being sent to train agencies in rural areas, the result of government contracts to develop professional social workers among those already employed in the human services. As with faculty in western universities, they are also required to develop their skills in teaching, scholarship, and service to achieve tenure. The majority of faculty do not have doctoral degrees, but they are required to obtain them to achieve promotion.

The needs assessment data indicated ways in which the SWEEP team could structure training in faculty development. The SWEEP team developed a training agenda that would introduce these targeted areas: (a) understanding trends in evidence-based social work practice and policy; (b) developing best-practice teaching skills; (c) understanding competency-based education and implementing competency-based social work courses; (d) developing a research agenda and strategies for conducting research; (e) improving collaboration for sharing resources and engaging in scholarship; and (f) developing a professional development plan, including obtaining an advanced degree. During the Academy, Fellows wrote plans for professional development organized in a portfolio, which they presented to each other near the end of the Academy. One unintended positive outcome for the Fellows was an understanding of their leadership potential as faculty in new departments at the early stages of the development of a new profession.

An important component in providing a welcoming atmosphere during both the Leadership and Fellows Academies was encouraging interaction with Vietnamese American bilingual students while observing classes and interacting with SWEEP student research assistants. These interactions, as well as the visits to field agencies and meetings with Vietnamese American social workers, not only helped participants to better understand the context of social work education in the USA, but also helped create bridges of understanding between the two socio-political world views held by Vietnamese nationals and Vietnamese Americans.
Curriculum Development

To address gaps in curriculum from the needs assessment, the SWEEP team developed a training program to introduce the concept of competency-based education (CBE) and a project to put it into action. CBE has been operationalized for social work in the USA through 10 main competencies, each associated with various measurable student learning outcomes (skills, attitudes, and values that students should possess by graduation) (Council on Social Work Education Commission on Accreditation, 2008). Both faculty and university leaders expressed interest in the competencies, many of which are congruent with those that they have learned about through the involvement of international experts over the years. Nevertheless, the SWEEP team understood the importance of tailoring the competencies to the needs of Vietnam, which was emphasized throughout the curriculum development process. The curriculum development project consisted of three main phases: (a) orientation to the theory and pedagogy of CBE, (b) development of one syllabus at each university using a CBE foundation, and (c) generalization of the CBE foundation to other syllabi. While these activities were targeted to individual universities, at the same time the SWEEP team introduced activities related to joint planning at the regional and national levels, similar to the CalSWEC model of the involvement of California stakeholders in the development of shared educational standards and competencies related to child welfare services (Clark, 2003).

The universities were asked to choose one priority topic area to pilot the development of a CBE syllabus. A project timeline was developed to complete the drafts of syllabi by the beginning of the project’s second year. The first faculty Fellows cohort coordinated their efforts to avoid duplication of topics, which included case management, social work with children, practice in community development, research methodology, social work with individuals and families, and school social work. Pre-recorded modules were developed by the SWEEP team to introduce CBE which were disseminated online to the universities, along with instructions for completing a CBE-based syllabus. A subset of the CSWE competencies was suggested, however, the universities were encouraged to adapt or replace them with others that more accurately reflected the need. This was suggested in the context of other SWEEP objectives to encourage universities to develop shared competencies and participate in national efforts to develop curriculum standards. Feedback from early drafts and suggestions for improvement were provided to the faculty in online web conferences.

The syllabus project resulted in completed syllabi from each university, with the expectation that by the end of the SWEEP project period, others would be developed using the same model. Plans are underway to discuss with the Leadership and faculty strategies to achieve consensus on shared competencies that can be recommended to national efforts of curriculum development.

Collaboration and Network Development

Collaboration is a theme that spans all of the activities of SWEEP, and at many levels of interaction. It is conceptualized as both a process of strengthening and leveraging
relationships between universities and ministries to accomplish shared goals as well as the technological means to accomplish common objectives. To support both development of collaborative relationships and communication, the SWEEP team built into the trainings presentations and discussion of models of collaboration in scholarship, program planning, and curriculum development. The trainings also included an introduction to state-of-the-art technology. For example, faculty and leaders were introduced to online webinar software, telepresence systems, and learning management tools, which were incorporated into hands-on practice exercises.

The under-development of online communication capacity at the universities continued to be a challenge throughout the first two years of SWEEP. The universities found it difficult to budget for the modest upgrades recommended by Cisco. Nevertheless, the team was able to successfully communicate with leadership and faculty via webinars and posted material online. As the project progressed, the concept of ‘Centers of Excellence’ has become operationalized to include all efforts to disseminate and communicate information among the university partners, and to others outside of SWEEP. It is envisioned that with a publicly accessible website, training topics with predetermined agendas, and a schedule of online events determined by the universities’ leadership and stakeholders, these activities can be sustained long after the SWEEP project ends. In this way, the SWEEP project will be ‘owned’ by stakeholders in Vietnam and used to continue efforts to improve social work education in the near future.

Discussion

While SWEEP was originally envisioned to assist eight universities, there are implications for the larger social work education development efforts in the county, as well as implications for the international social work community. It is expected that other universities will also benefit from what the SWEEP universities have learned. There are over 40 universities in the country with undergraduate social work programs, and soon many will be in the process of developing graduate programs. The SWEEP leaders will be a key source of information for these universities, having gone through the process of developing and implementing their strategic plans for program, faculty, and curricular development. It is hoped that SWEEP’s emphasis on joint collaboration will result in minimizing the fragmentation that can typically occur when universities compete for resources and prestige during new program initiatives, so that instead the processes of decision-making will be inclusive and comprehensive, as was the case with CalSWEC’s efforts in California.

For the Vietnamese faculty, the challenge for SWEEP has been to match the training program with their professional ‘developmental stage’; most of the faculty are not only new to the social work profession, but also new to their academic appointments. The training goal has been to emphasize the importance of shared objectives for scholarship and encourage collaborative efforts to strengthen research and also to provide a stronger foundation on which to build professional identity and achieve sustained careers. This may involve faculty within universities working more closely
together, or between universities as faculty seek out research partnerships from scholars with similar interests. This emphasis has been received warmly by the faculty and is culturally congruent with the concept of interdependence as opposed to the competitive individualism that characterizes many western research institutions, and which unfortunately can be all too easily modeled by new faculty in an emerging profession.

To answer the participants’ initial concerns about the lack of social work practice experience as a barrier, the SWEEP team consciously avoided promising to help develop their practice skills, but instead focused on the development of role identity as the keepers of knowledge through scholarship within their areas of interest. To address the practical issue, one suggested strategy, for example, was to encourage efforts to locate practitioner experts in local agencies who could be recruited and groomed to be adjunct instructors of practice courses. The role of full time faculty would then be to ensure quality of teaching and inclusion of content that meets the competency standards of the program and the country. Certainly, the faculty participating in the SWEEP academies will be able to mentor new faculty in the future. Another suggested strategy was to implement field seminars focusing on training issues at the agency sites, since there may be a lack of qualified practice professionals who can be hired at the university. To address limitations in field education, the SWEEP team engaged the Vietnam faculty in a collaborative project to explore the existing models of field education in the country and obtain stakeholder feedback about areas for improvement. The universities’ strategic plans also included project plans to improve field education by collaborating with regional service providers.

Thus far, the SWEEP project has followed emerging standards of international social work by incorporating continuous feedback mechanisms to ensure that the training activities and content are relevant to the unique socio-political contexts of Vietnam. There were many significant changes to the project plan that resulted from direct feedback. For example, the field models study was not initially part of the project plan, but came about due to the emergence of apparent differences between Vietnam’s approach to field education and that of the west. Both the US and Vietnam faculty teams agreed that the differences should be explored and documented in order to understand how to improve field education. As another example, the US SWEEP team adjusted the learning content on teaching methods in order to take into account traditional teaching styles in Asian culture. The resulting training incorporated more discussion time so that differences could be explored between the ‘top down’ approach in traditional teaching (as reported by the Vietnam faculty) vs. the more discussion-oriented social work teaching style in western countries.

As Vietnam’s social work education programs continue to develop, emerging innovations in competency-based curricula, field education, and strategies for faculty development appropriate to the local context will offer important contributions to the international social work community. This collaborative process of developing social work education can be replicated in other countries that are in the early stages of social work development. Scholarship from Vietnam will soon be emerging that addresses unique regional issues that are also of interest elsewhere. These issues from the initial
needs assessment include, for example, (a) the role of social workers in the provision of services to those with disabilities; (b) the impact of, and social work response to, family disintegration resulting from urban migration; (c) preventing and responding to human trafficking; and (d) preventing youth homelessness, among other promising areas.

Social work scholars, educators and practitioners can all look forward to the knowledge gained from the development of social work education in Vietnam.
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