WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: Social Work

College: LAS

Date of last review 2001-2002

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) June 2007

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree Bachelor of Arts in Social Work CIP* code 44.0701

Degree Master of Social Work CIP code 44.0701

Degree _____ CIP code _____

*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name	Signature
Fred Besthorn	on file
Brien Bolin	on file
Sheryl Chapman	on file
Karen Countryman-Roswurm	on file
Orren Dale	on file
Natalie Grant	on file
Lisa Hines	on file
Tim Lause	on file
Kyoung Lee	on file
Shaunna Millar	on file
Sabrina Perez Glatt	on file

Submitted by: Linnea GlenMaye and Brien Bolin, Director of the School of Social Work

_____ Date 6/30/2011

(name and title)

1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

a. University Mission:

Wichita State University is committed to providing comprehensive educational opportunities in an urban setting. Through teaching, scholarship and public service the University seeks to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national and global community.

b. Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

The School of Social Work has an overall mission that encompasses the individual missions of the Bachelor of Social Work Program (BSW) and the Master of Social Work Program (MSW).

The mission of the School of Social Work at Wichita State University is to prepare students for competent and ethical practice in metropolitan environments. In our scholarship, teaching, and service, we are committed to the enhancement of individual and community well-being with particular attention to the needs of Wichita and the surrounding region.

Bachelor of Social Work Program Mission:

The mission of the Bachelor of Social Work Program is to provide students with the knowledge, skills, and values for ethical and competent baccalaureate level generalist social work practice.

Master of Social Work Program Mission:

The mission of the MSW program at Wichita State University is to prepare its graduates to be autonomous advanced generalist social work practitioners within complex, diverse, ever-changing metropolitan environments. Emphasis is placed on developing knowledge and skills for ethical, culturally competent and socially just and empowering interventions on all practice levels.

c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

School of Social Work

The Mission of the School of Social Work was developed within the context of the long-standing missions of the University and Fairmount College. The School's mission mirrors the commitment to individual and community well-being that is so clearly articulated in the University and College mission statements. Our mission reflects the School's ongoing commitment to serving the needs of the Wichita area and its surrounding region, and its unique setting in a diverse, urban, and greater metropolitan environment of Wichita and its surrounding region. In preparing students for competent and ethical practice in metropolitan environments, our mission reflects the institutional mission at Wichita State University to meet the specialized educational needs of individuals and organizations in South-Central Kansas. As a school located within a metropolitan environment, the school's mission reflects the characteristics of metropolitan universities. These characteristics include location near the urban center of a metropolitan statistical area with a population of 250,000 or greater; highly diverse students that reflect the demographic characteristics of our region, many coming from community colleges or other baccalaureate institutions; responsiveness to regional needs; and dedication to educational, research, and professional outreach.

Master of Social Work Program

The MSW Program mission and goals are drawn from the School of Social Work's Mission, as well as the University mission and the mission of the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. The missions of the School, the College, and the University seek to prepare students to thrive in complex and diverse environments. As advanced generalists, MSW social workers are prepared for advanced agency-based practice, reflecting the university's mission of public service and effective citizenship, and the MSW program's mission of contributing to the community through ethical, culturally competent, socially just, and empowering interventions. The theme of diversity is reflected throughout each of the mission statements and is included in the mission of the MSW program. The program mission was developed specifically to address the practice environment and needs of our urban setting. Imbedded in the mission of the program is an abiding commitment to serving the needs of this community, and to preparing practitioners for competent practice within a metropolitan environment, which includes urban, suburban, and rural, and the systems linked to those settings. The mission of the MSW program addresses the emerging needs of the community within the context of dynamic change. The Program mission introduces Advanced Generalist Practice, which is the concentration/specialization of the program. The program mission also introduces the core concepts of advanced generalist practice: multi-level practice (which is further defined as multi-dimensional practice in our themes), cultural competence, social justice, and empowerment, which are themes of the MSW program. In congruence with the University and the College, we seek to produce MSW practitioners who know how to think, how to process information, how to make ethical decisions within complex practice situations.

Bachelor of Social Work Program

The BSW program's mission and goals are drawn from the School of Social Work's Mission, as well as from the University's mission, and the mission of the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. The mission of the School, the College and the University is to prepare students to thrive in diverse and urban environments. As generalists, BSW social workers are prepared for agency-based practice, reflecting the university's mission of public service and effective citizenship, and the BSW program's goal of community participation. The theme of diversity is also reflected throughout each of the mission statements and is included as a goal of the BSW program. The BSW program goal of continued professional development reflects the College's mission statement that includes a commitment to life-long learning.

d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☐ Yes ☒ No
   i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

The BSW and MSW Programs are due to be reviewed for reaccreditation in June 2013. During the past two years, the School has reviewed the entire curriculum of both programs, along with reviewing and revising the program objectives (now called core competencies) and related practice skills (now called practice behaviors). Although it is not expected that major changes will be necessary, the School will review the program missions (BSW and MSW) in fall of 2011 to make sure they reflect the new accreditation standards of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE).

Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (both programmatic and learner centered). Have they changed since the last review? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Goals of the BSW Program

1. To prepare students for entry-level generalist Social Work practice with diverse client systems of various sizes and types.

2. To prepare students for continuing professional development that may include graduate Social Work education.

3. To prepare students for responsible community participation.

The BSW Program goals are linked to 12 measureable objectives (learner outcomes).

1. Demonstrate an understanding of and respect for diversity and to implement generalist practice interventions appropriate for diverse and at-risk populations.

2. Understand and apply the knowledge and skills of generalist social work practice with social systems of all types and sizes

3. Critically analyze and apply theoretical knowledge of bio-psycho-social-spiritual factors influencing human behavior and interactions in assessment and intervention with individuals, groups, organizations, and communities

4. Demonstrate oral and written communication skills that facilitate effective practice and professional relationships.

5. Develop a professional identity as social worker consistent with the values and ethics of social work.

6. Apply critical thinking skills in the context of generalist social work practice.

7. Understand the role of the social work profession in current service delivery systems in the context of past and current social policy and professional history and mission.

8. Function effectively, use supervision appropriately, and seek necessary change within agency and organizational settings.

9. Demonstrate the professional use of self and responsibility for continued professional growth and development

10. Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination and to engage in empowering practice that fosters social and economic justice with individuals, groups, organizations, and communities.

11. Critically understand the impact of social policies on individuals, groups, organizations, and communities and to seek change in ways that promote social and economic justice.

12. Understand and apply beginning level research knowledge and skills to evaluate practice.

Goals of the MSW program:

1. To prepare students for ethical, competent, autonomous advanced generalist social work practice with multiple systems and diverse populations within metropolitan environments.

2. To prepare students to be advanced generalist social workers with an understanding of and a commitment to social justice, cultural competency, multi-dimensional practice, and empowerment.

3. To prepare students who can contribute to the knowledge base of the social work profession and the community through ethical and effective advanced generalist practice, and who can engage in a process of life-long learning.

The MSW Program goals are linked to 12 measureable objectives (learner outcomes).

1. Analyze and incorporate values and ethics in ambiguous and complex intervention situations.
2. Use communication differentially and selectively in complex and conflicting intervention situations.
3. Apply critical thinking skills within the context of advanced generalist practice.
4. Demonstrate advanced generalist skills in empowerment to advanced social and economic justice.
5. Integrate, synthesize and apply theories of practice which maximize empowerment, social justice and cultural competency.
6. Apply knowledge of oppression and discrimination to multiple system change that fosters social justice.
7. Demonstrate and differentially apply advanced generalist skills with complex systems.
8. Develop and apply culturally competent interventions using the advanced generalist framework to achieve client identified solutions.
9. Integrate, synthesize and apply evidence-based theories within an advanced generalist framework
10. Demonstrate advanced generalist skills for influencing policy and program formulation and change.
11. Develop knowledge through research and apply findings to improve practice within an advanced generalist framework.
12. Use supervision and consultation appropriately to develop autonomous advanced generalist practice.

e. If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

The goals of the BSW Program have not changed since the last review. The goals of the MSW Program were refined in 2002 during the period of candidacy prior to initial accreditation of the MSW Program in 2003. The goals of the MSW Program were reaffirmed in 2007 prior to full accreditation of the MSW Program in 2007. The goals of both programs reflect the Council on Social Work Accreditation Standards in place until the new Standards were released in 2008. Since 2008, the programs have undergone review to assess the goals and objectives of both programs, in anticipation of reaccreditation review in 2013. Although goals have not changed, the measureable objectives (now called core competencies) of the programs are in the process of changing. Because we are in a process of transition to new standards, the assessment activities and measureable outcomes are undergoing revision, with full transition from 12 program objectives to 10 core competencies and 41 measureable practice behaviors that are linked to each core competency in AY 2011/2012.

2a. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates and scholarly productivity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section). Complete a separate table for each program if appropriate.

Undergraduate

Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads – by FY
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1→	6 (Fl 2007)	6 (Fl 2007)	5	--	8.3	5,808 (08)	170 (07)	51 (08)
Year 2→	6 (Fl 2008)	6 (Fl 2008)	6	--	7.5	6,306 (09)	178 (08)	62 (09)
Year 3→	5 (Fl 2009)	5 (Fl 2009)	5.1	--	7.1	6,758 (10)	194 (09)	54 (10)
			Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O			SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
Year 1→					13.3	436.7	12.8	3.8
Year 2→					13.5	467.1	13.2	4.6
Year 3→					12.1	558.5	16.0	4.5

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1→CY08	4		15											3	1	3/7	*338,000
Year 2→CY09	6		14	3										1		0/1	0
Year 3→CY10	12		12	1												3/5	*219,671

* Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection. KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

The faculty of the School of Social Work teach across both programs. Therefore, the faculty numbers in this report will reflect the total number of faculty in the school. The School of Social Work has seen much growth over the last six years in the number of faculty and in the number of tenured and promoted faculty. During the last accreditation cycle in 2003, the School of Social Work only had two tenured faculty members, neither of whom had been promoted to the associate level. As of 2010, the School of Social Work had 7 tenure eligible or tenured faculty, and 5 non-tenure eligible faculty, including two unclassified professional faculty who have

50% teaching appointments. The total number of full time faculty has fluctuated between 10 and 12 over the last 3 years. Of the 12 full time faculty in 2010, only 7 are tenure-eligible, and four of those seven are tenured, associate professors. The School has no tenured full professors. The productivity of the faculty needs to be seen in light of the fact that only about 50% of the faculty is engaged in research/scholarship, and because of the professional nature of the programs, the faculty are engaged in accreditation and administrative responsibilities that are unique to a professional social work program. In spite of the small number of faculty who are actually engaged in research, the faculty is remarkably productive. All tenure-eligible or tenured faculty are now engaged in research/scholarship, including a long-standing member of faculty who had not engaged in research for over two decades. The tenure track faculty have accomplished this increase in productivity through creating a culture of active collaboration with each other and across campus and universities. The number of grants submitted and awarded has also increased over the last 3 years. Two sizeable grants in CY 08 and CY10 (marked with asterisks) were awarded to community partners with consultation from faculty members. Although these grants were not awarded through the University, they demonstrate the strength of community partnerships developed by social work faculty. The School's faculty have accomplished much over the past few years, and this must also been seen in light of the demands placed on senior faculty for accreditation-related activities that are time-consuming and difficult.

With the advent of a newly structured curriculum in 1999, and the implementation of program control over admission to the major (A42A), the BSW program has seen numbers that have held solid, but with small and steady increases over the last decade. However, as can be seen above, the ratio of faculty FTE to student FTE has increased over the last three years. This increase reflects the growth in the total number of students in the BSW program. The BSW program has both majors and pre-majors, and typically averages around 250 pre-majors and majors at any one time, so the number of majors does not fully reflect enrollment demands in the program. In 2010, there were 194 undergraduate majors and 54 students who graduated from the BSW program. The number of graduates was somewhat lower in 2010 than other years, which typically averages about 60 students. This drop in graduates was most likely an anomaly, as the growth in credit hours and new majors indicates that the BSW program will experience significant growth over the next few years, with over 80 graduates expected in 2012. Large enrollments have led to increases in section enrollment, and course sections tend to be large, by professional program standards. Large classes, particularly for practice courses, are not ideal for skill development. In addition, accreditation standards call for student/faculty ratios of 25:1 for undergraduate programs. With enrollment growth, the BSW program is at risk of not meeting the guidelines for faculty required to support the number of undergraduate social work majors. The growth in BSW enrollment is another indication that faculty resources will have to increase to keep up with the growth in enrollment. Adjunct support is an important component of additional resources, but accreditation standards specify the need for sufficient full time faculty to teach and provide advising, program administration, and curriculum development. The steady increases in BSW majors can also be reasonably tied to the development of the MSW Program in 2001. Although the MSW Program pulls from a diverse student population, there is no question that the BSW Program is a major feeder, with student interest growing because of the advanced standing option offered to BSW graduates.

The data indicate that the BSW Program is experiencing healthy growth in graduates and enrollments. The faculty are highly regarded by students and productive. Future growth in enrollment and scholarly productivity will be enhanced through growth in faculty numbers, particularly through the addition of tenure-eligible faculty who contribute to the research mission of the School, College, and University. Currently, large classes and a small number of research-engaged faculty create barriers to growth in student enrollment and faculty productivity.

2b. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates and scholarly productivity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section). Complete a separate table for each program if appropriate.

Graduate

Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads – by FY
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1→	*	*	*	*	*	N/A	110 (07)	60 (08)
Year 2→	*	*	*	*	*	N/A	128 (08)	63 (09)
Year 3→	*	*	*	*	*	N/A	141 (09)	65 (10)
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
↓								
Year 1→					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 2→					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Year 3→					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps.	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	**	***	****	Juried	*****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1→CY08																	
Year 2→CY09																	
Year 3→CY10																	

** Winning by competitive audition. ***Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ****Principal role in a performance. *****Commissioned or included in a collection. KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

*From the table on page 3, indicate number of faculty (and instructional FTE) teaching in the graduate program.

Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

Faculty productivity was addressed in the previous section describing the BSW Program.

MSW Program

The MSW Program was first accredited in 2003, retroactive to the first graduating class in 2001. The addition of the advanced standing option for BSW graduates in the second year of the program's existence led to increased enrollment in the next and subsequent years. The number of students admitted and enrolled in the MSW Program has increased from 30 in the first year of the program's existence to 141 in 2009. Currently, there are about 150 students in the MSW

program. As regards MSW students, the total number of graduates in any given year is about 40% of the total number of students in the MSW program at any one time. As table 2b indicates, the number of graduates has increased from 2008 to 2010. As a matter of fact, the number of graduates has increased every year since the inception of the program in 2000. Applications to the program have also increased steadily, and at this point, the MSW program cannot admit all the qualified students that apply. If all qualified students were admitted, the program could potentially admit well over 100 students per year.

The School of Social Work must supplement its full-time faculty with adjunct support in order to offer required courses and a minimum number of elective courses. Accreditation standards call for a student/faculty FTE ratio of 25:1 for BSW programs and 12:1 for MSW programs. Currently, the programs do not meet this standard, and we therefore will request consideration for additional faculty hires and adjunct support. Without sufficient faculty to mount courses and meet the accreditation standards for student/faculty ratios, the School may be forced to decrease admissions in the coming year. The potential for growth is limited only by the uncertainty of faculty and program resources to sustain a viable and vibrant program.

3.Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students. Complete this section for each program (if more than one). Attach program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

a. For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole.

Last 3 Years	Total Majors - From fall semester	ACT – Fall Semester (mean for those reporting)	
		Majors	All University Students
Year 1→	170 (07)	19.0	22.7
Year 2→	178 (08)	19.6	22.9
Year 3→	194 (09)	19.9	23.0

KBOR data minima for UG programs: ACT ≤20 will trigger program.

b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs.*

Last 3 Years	Total Admitted - By FY	Average GPA (Admitted) – Domestic Students Only (60 hr GPA for those with ≥54 hr reported) By FY		
			College GPA	University GPA
Year 1→	74 (08)	3.60	3.53	3.52
Year 2→	97 (09)	3.46	3.45	3.49
Year 3→	112 (10)	3.48	3.45	3.49

*If your admission process uses another GPA calculation, revise table to suit program needs and enter your internally collected data.

c. Identify the principle learner outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e.

Bachelor of Social Work Program

Learner Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Measurement (e.g., rubric, portfolios, rubrics, writing samples, exams)	Results
To prepare students for entry-level generalist social work practice with diverse client systems of various sizes and types	Aggregate of data of Core Competencies: 4, 7, 9, 10 on Field Instructor Evaluation of Student Field Practicum Performance / May 2010 Student-led and recorded focus groups / yearly / in SCWK 451	Percentages below 95 triggers Curriculum Committee review. Mean percentage = 99.5% (scaled mean percentage based on Program Competencies 4, 7, 9, 10 summed and / by overall total number of competencies) Based on responses regarding curriculum and preparation, student comments reflect overall satisfaction, but with concerns in one area (1) Wanting more skill-based course content, disabilities, gerontology, drug alcohol, and medical.
To prepare students for continuing professional development that may include graduate social work education	Aggregate data based on Program Competencies 1, 3, 8, on the Field Instructor Evaluation of Student Field Practicum Performance / May 2010 Student-led and recorded focus groups / yearly / in SCWK 451	Mean percentage = 98.8% (scaled mean percentage based on Program Competencies 1, 3, & 8 summed and / by overall total number of competencies) Students reflect a general satisfaction with professional advising, but have concerns about: (1) The Licensing Examination.
To prepare students for responsible community participation, with particular attention to the needs of the social work community in Kansas, Wichita and surrounding areas.	Aggregate data based on Core Competencies 2, 5, and 6 of the Field Instructor Evaluation of Student Field Practicum Performance / May 2010 Student-led and recorded focus groups / yearly / in SCWK 451	Mean percentage = 99% (scaled mean percentage based on Program Competencies 2, 5 & 6 summed and / by overall total number of competencies) Students reflect a general satisfaction with preparation, but have a primary concerns about course content and demands in the direct practice areas and not in areas of community practice.

d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results, employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e).

Student Satisfaction (e.g., exit survey data on overall program satisfaction).* If available, report by year, for the last 3 years			Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Result (e.g., 4.5 on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest)	Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
1	44	Quality of Program 3.023 on 4 point scale	1		NA	BSW Program does not have capstone and does not obtain license exam data	NA
2	52	Quality of Program 3.5 on 4 point scale	2		NA	Learner outcomes are assessed through the final field practicum evaluation which measures several skill areas.	NA
3	11	Quality of Program 3.0 on 4 point scale	3		NA	Results for 2008 – 2010 are attached to Program Review.	NA

*Available for graduate programs from the Graduate School Exit Survey. Undergraduate programs should collect internally. ± If available.

e. Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Goals/Skills Measurements of: -Oral and written communication -Numerical literacy -Critical thinking and problem solving -Collaboration and teamwork -Library research skills -Diversity and globalization	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom Measured in Final Field Practicum Evaluation	96.2% Competent 3.8% Not observed	NA
Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues Measured in Final Field Practicum Evaluation	98.1% Competent 1.9% Concerns	NA
Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy change Measured in Final Field Practicum Evaluation	94.3% Competent 3.8% Not Observed 1.9% Missing	NA

Note: Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/

Master of Social Work Program

a. Identify the principle learner outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e.

Learner Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Measurement (e.g., rubric, portfolios, rubrics, writing samples, exams)	Results
To prepare students for ethical, competent, autonomous advanced generalist social work practice with multiple systems and diverse populations within metropolitan environments	Aggregate data based on Core Competencies 2, 3, and 9, on the Field Instructor Evaluation of Student Field Practicum Performance	Mean % Competency Met = 99.7% (summed and divide by the total of Core Competencies 2, 3, 9)
To prepare students to be advanced generalist social workers with an understanding of and a commitment to social justice, cultural competency, multi-dimensional practice, and empowerment	Aggregate data based on Program Competencies 4, 5, 7, and 10 on Field Instructor Evaluation of Student Field Practicum Performance	Mean % Competency Met = 99.6% (summed and divide by the total of Core Competencies 4, 5, 7, 10)
To prepare students who can contribute to the knowledge base of the social work profession and the community through ethical and effective advanced generalist practice, and who can engage in a process of life-long learning.	Aggregate data based on Program Objectives 1, 6, 8 on Field Instructor Evaluation of Student Field Practicum Performance	Mean % Competency Met = 99.7% (summed and divide by the total of Core Competencies 1, 6, 8)

b. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results, employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e).

Student Satisfaction (e.g., exit survey data on overall program satisfaction).* If available, report by year, for the last 3 years			Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Result (e.g., 4.5 on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest)	Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
1	29	8.6 on 10 point scale satisfaction with MSW program SSW Alumni Survey	1	60	Advanced Generalist Integrative Project	100% pass	NA
2	60	3.07 on 4 point scale overall program quality SSW Exit Survey	2	63	Advanced Generalist Integrative Project	100% pass	NA
3	27	2.8 on 4 point scale overall program quality SSW Exit Survey	3	65	Advanced Generalist Integrative Project	100% pass	NA

*Available for graduate programs from the Graduate School Exit Survey. Undergraduate programs should collect internally. ± If available.

c. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from tables in 3a – 3e and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention). Also indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review.

Provide assessment here:

BSW Program

The BSW Program attracts students from diverse backgrounds who are committed to providing services and assistance to the most underserved members of society. Over the past three years (2008 – 2010) BSW students contributed 77, 040 hours of service to the community through their practicum placements with local and regional agencies. Approximately 100 agencies and community practitioners work with undergraduate social work students every year. Students in their junior year also contribute volunteer hours to the community, with a yearly contribution of over 3000 hours in their junior year. Over the years, employer surveys have been overwhelmingly positive about the quality and preparation of our BSW graduates.

ACT scores for BSW students do not reflect the quality of students in the program. Because the program tends to attract non-traditional students, only approximately one-third of social work majors are required to submit ACT scores (one of the lowest proportions of ACT submissions across the campus). Even though the average ACT score tends to hover at slightly under 20, social work students actually perform very well in course work. Over the past three years, 44 BSW students have been inducted into the national social work honor society (Phi Alpha Honor Society). In 2010, five teams of social work students presented research papers at the Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity Forum, with one team winning the Second Place Award. At the same event in 2009, two social work students each won first place awards (Poster and Oral Presentation).

Overall, students are mostly satisfied with the quality of instruction they receive in the program. Learner outcomes, as measured by field practicum performance, are stellar, with the vast majority of students rated competent as measured

by the goals and objectives of the program. The program is experiencing growth, and with larger cohorts of students, it is more challenging to offer individualized skill development in regular courses. The field practicum experience, 480 hours of direct work with clients in agency settings, provides much of the individualized learning that students need. There is no question, however, that the BSW Program is constrained in many ways by the large number of students and the relatively small number of faculty who teach in the program. In the next three-year cycle, it will become increasingly important to add instructional resources to the program to insure the viability and quality of the program. The BSW Program was last re-accredited in in 2003, and is fully accredited until 2013, but the program, as it now stands, is under-resourced and there are risks to both quality and re-accreditation.

MSW Program

At its last accreditation in 2007, the Site Team noted that the MSW Program is "a young, vibrant and growing program with a well-developed advanced generalist practice concentration. Its students and graduates are respected by field sites and community agencies for their commitment to social justice and empowerment, knowledge of multi-dimensional practice and cultural competence." As the data above illustrates, this evaluation still holds. The MSW Program has the potential to be even larger and stronger than it is currently. Over the past three years, the growth pattern has continued, and the School has graduated a larger cohort of beginning master level social workers. As with the BSW students, our MSW students contribute a tremendous amount of service to the community. Over the last three years, this service totals over 176,000 hours of service to the neediest members of our community and region. The MSW Program draws students from a large geographic area, with some students commuting from western Kansas and Oklahoma. Our graduates are working in every possible area of social work practice, including medical, mental health, child welfare, and public school settings. Three of our graduates have gone on to doctoral programs.

Students admitted into the MSW Program have an average GPA that compares very well with other graduate students, with a slightly higher GPA than the average GPA for graduate students in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Our MSW students must complete and present a research-based project as the final capstone of the MSW Program. The presentations are mounted in a professional conference style, and expectations are high. Students are prepared through course work for this final project, and they have a 100% pass rate over the last three years. Graduates of the program have gone on to assume very responsible positions in organizations and agencies in Kansas. One of our graduates has just been named Regional Director of SRS. Others have taken executive director positions over large and complex organizations.

The learning outcomes of MSW students are evaluated primarily through extensive evaluation of the field practicum experience (480 hours of required practicum in first year, and 700 hours of practicum in second year). Field practicum performance is evaluated by the agency-based field instructor. As the results show, agency field instructors rate the students as competent in all required areas of practice.

As with the BSW Program, the MSW Program is now straining the capacity of the School to offer a quality educational experience. Graduating classes of 70 or more students every year are becoming the norm for the program. Class sizes have increased, and student satisfaction tends to suffer when classrooms are crowded. Over the next three years, it will be critically important to augment the teaching mission of the program through adding additional faculty resources.

An additional concern for the BSW and MSW Programs is classroom scheduling and resources. The School has mounted its entire MSW Program at the West Campus for the last two years, and moved the required senior level classes of the BSW Program to the South Campus. The satellite campuses offer some advantages to the students and the School, with the primary advantage being the ability to offer block classes once/week to allow students to complete required course work on one day of the week, with additional days used for field practicum responsibilities. The satellite campuses offer a comfortable setting with a seminar arrangement that better accommodates the all-day, once/week classes. The satellite campuses offer convenient parking, comfortable seating, and enhanced technology. They also create challenges for advising and other administrative chores, since there is no administrative staff or co-

located faculty at the satellite campuses. The School will need to look for creative ways to deal with the challenges of mounting the MSW and BSW Programs at the satellite campuses. In fall of 2011, the BSW courses will be moved to the West Campus in order to reduce the complications for faculty of teaching on three different campuses. The School will be exploring other ways to address space needs in the near future.

4a.Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Undergraduate

Majors						Employment of Majors*						
Last 3 FYs – Su, Fl, and Sp	No. new applicants or declared majors	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	No. enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Total no. of grads	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field (Are you employed as a licensed social worker	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**
Year 1→	131	129	103	20%	51 (08)	$31,875	50%	25% (licensed LBSW)	100%	0	38%	Current year only 16 %-22%↓
Year 2→	132	126	97	23%	62 (09)	$32,500	60%	20% (licensed LBSW)	100%	0	32%	
Year 3→	152	147	119	19%	54 (10)	$21, 667	60%	20% (licensed LBSW(	100%	0	15%	

Race/Ethnicity by Major***											Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***								
	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK	
Year 1→	1	12	3	7	36	0	98	0	13	0	7	2	2	8	0	29	0	3	
Year 2→	1	10	1	8	35	0	112	0	11	1	4	0	4	10	0	40	0	3	
Year 3→	0	14	2	4	40	0	119	1	14	0	4	1	3	9	0	31	0	6	

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: http://www.bls.gov/oco/ and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

*** NRA=Non-resident alien; H=Hispanic; AI/AN=American Indian/ Alaskan Native; A=Asian; B=Black; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; C=Caucasian; MR=Multi-race; UNK=Unknown

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment, graduates can expect to find.

Provide assessment here:

The employment picture for BSW social workers is very positive. There are very broad areas of employment available to BSW graduates. The most promising area of growth for social workers with an undergraduate degree is mental health and substance abuse, with a 20% growth rate projected between 2008 and 2018. Another area of growth is child and family and school social workers (12%). BSWs can expect average to much better than average growth in projected employment opportunities over the next 10 years. These data also show that BSW students in the program are highly diverse as 35% of all social work undergraduates are racial/ethnic minorities.

The survey data for BSW graduates is not totally reliable, as not all graduates responded to the survey. The average income for 2008 and 2009 graduates indicates they are earning about $32,000, which is probably a fairly accurate estimate of staring salaries for BSWs. The income reported for 2010 may not be based on full time work. The percentage reported for employment is based on a question that asked if graduates were employed as licensed social workers. This figure is probably skewed by the number of BSW graduates who postpone the LBSW license exam because they are enrolled in a graduate program. One-hundred percent of BSW students who responded to the survey who are employed, are working in social work or a related field. The survey results indicate that within 2 years of graduation, about 38% of students are enrolled in a graduate program. This result seems about right and seems consistent with MSW Program enrollment data. These results will be refined in upcoming assessments, but they do indicate that the program is preparing students for work and graduate education (a program goal). The statistics on employment in the state are based somewhat misleading, as they are based on the total pool of respondents, those who are working, and those that are pursuing graduate degrees. **Of those who are working, 83% are employed in the state of Kansas.**

4b.**Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Graduate

Majors						Employment of Majors*						
Last 3 FYs – Su, Fl, and Sp	No. new applicants or declared majors	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	No. enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Total no. of grads	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field (Are you employed as a licensed social worker	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**
Year 1→	117	62	59	5%	60 (08)	$40,834	75%	100%	100%	0	1	Current year only 16% 22%
Year 2→	131	88	82	7%	63 (09)	$$36,964	100%	93%	100%	0	0	
Year 3→	137	85	81	5%	65 (10)	$41,607	100%	80%	86%	14%	0	

Race/Ethnicity by Major***											Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***								
		NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK
	Year 1→	1	7	2	0	12	0	73	0	15	0	2	1	0	5	0	42	0	10
	Year 2→	0	9	2	0	11	0	89	0	17	0	2	2	0	5	0	45	0	9
	Year 3→	1	13	2	3	14	0	98	4	6	0	5	0	2	5	0	41	0	12

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: http://www.bls.gov/oco/ and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

*** NRA=Non-resident alien; H=Hispanic; AI/AN=American Indian/ Alaskan Native; A=Asian; B=Black; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; C=Caucasian; MR=Multi-race; UNK=Unknown

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment, graduates can expect to find.

Provide assessment here:

The employment outlook for MSW's is very positive. The area with the largest projected increase, medical and public health social workers, is projected to grow 22% over the next 10 years. The area of mental health and substance abuse is projected to increase 20% over the next 10 years. Overall, the BLS projections are very positive for social work, and MSW social workers have very broad and diverse options for social work practice. Although the MSW students are not as diverse as the BSW students, about 25% of MSW students are racial/ethnic minorities, and the number of students of color has increased over the last three years. The diversity of students is a major strength of the MSW program.

The survey results for 2008 – 2010 MSW graduates are very positive, with 100% of 2008 grads employed as licensed social workers. The graduates from 2009 and 2010 are licensed at a very high rate, with 93% of 2009 and 80% of 2010 graduates holding an LMSW license. It is not unusual that, upon graduation, a few students obtain employment that does not require a license, but later find jobs that require a license, so they become licensed at a later point.

Clearly, graduates of the MSW Program are doing very well in terms of salary, employment, and licensing. They are contributing to the state of Kansas in their work as professional social workers.

5.Analyze the cost of the program and service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Percentage of SCH Taken By (last 3 years)			
Fall Semester	Year 1 -2007	Year 2 - 2008	Year 3 - 2009
UG Majors	53.1	45.8	46.9
Gr Majors	38.6	46.2	45.8
Non-Majors	8.3	8.0	7.3

a. Provide a brief assessment of the cost and service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

Provide assessment here:

As noted earlier, the programs provide a tremendous amount of service to the community through the practicum hours completed by BSW and MSW students. In terms of credit hour production, the social work SCH has increased 20% from 2007 – 2010. The cost per SCH has decreased during that same period, from $140.98 in 2007 to $130.77 in 2010. These costs compare very favorably with other professional programs (nursing was $241/SCH; physical therapy was $202/SCH). The BSW and MSW programs are professional programs with courses mostly open to majors only. For the most part, the programs do not offer "service" courses that meet general education or other university-wide requirements. The BSW Program has just been approved to offer two general education courses, so there is no data yet on numbers of non-graduates taking these courses. A new undergraduate course (open to majors and non-majors) that focuses on diversity has recently been approved as a Further Studies General Education course, and two faculty members are working with the Multicultural Center to develop a video storytelling component of the class. Additionally, elective courses in the BSW and MSW program are open to non-majors, and these courses typically draw students from other programs. One elective course (SCWK 541 Women and Poverty) now draws over 100 students,

with a significant proportion of non-majors. Additional resources for adjuncts would allow the school to offer more elective courses, which would increase the number of non-majors taking social work courses.

Faculty in the School are very involved in service activities of all kinds, including College and University service. Faculty are also frequently nominated for teaching awards. Faculty contribute to the community in many ways as members of boards of directors and community task forces and coalitions. These community agencies and coalitions include United Way, Sedgwick County Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalition, Wichita Children's Home, Sedgwick County Coalition of Mental Health in Aging, Family Bereavement Team, Senior Acts, and Episcopal Social Services. Faculty contribute to the community through community-based presentations and workshops. In the past year, these presentations have included clinical practice presentations to Youthville staff, presentations at the Kansas NOW conference, ethics workshops, diversity workshops, and pharmacology for social workers. These presentations and others also offer Continuing Education hours (CEUs) to social work practitioners and other professions, as well. The POWER Conference, sponsored and planned by the School of Social Work, is an annual event that has become the largest gathering of social workers in the Wichita area. This conference provides community networking and continuing education hours for approximately 200 social workers every year. As noted by the Site Team at the last accreditation site visit, "The faculty of the school is seen as a growing asset to the social service community. Faculty members are extremely committed to their teaching, building community networks and continuing development of this program.

6.Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
Not available from last Program Review . Goals listed are goals developed from faculty retreats and meetings.	Review and strengthen curriculum in MSW Programs	Course syllabi and accreditation standards	MSW curriculum changes approved 2009
	Review and strengthen curriculum in BSW Programs	Course syllabi and accreditation standards	BSW curriculum changes approved 2010
	Revise Assessment instruments for Field Practicum to comply with accreditation standards	Field Practicum evaluation instrument for BSW and MSW field practicum courses	Revised 2009 and 2010

7. Summary and Recommendations

a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review.

Provide assessment here:

The School of Social Work has a dedicated faculty and committed students. In 2007, the Site Team for reaccreditation said, "demands on faculty are equally challenging in balancing their commitments to teaching, service and research. Such tensions are particularly relevant for this program at this point in time. The faculty consists predominantly of newly tenured and non-tenured faculty who must maintain momentum in their scholarship while simultaneously

managing programmatic responsibilities such as BSW program director, chairing committees, developing curriculum and building the faculty through searches and mentoring." These demands continue to be challenging for faculty of the School. The demands for publication and grant activity have to be balanced with the responsibilities that go with reaccreditation activities that have been ongoing for the last two years. The next two years will be especially critical for the School, as the self-study is prepared and reaccreditation activities become the center of attention. The strengths, weaknesses, and plans for the next three are outlined below:

Strengths:

1. Increasingly productive faculty, involved in scholarships and grants.
2. Strong Field Education component.
3. Strong interest in BSW and MSW degrees as indicated by enrollments and applications.
4. Commitment to building a sense of community among students and faculty.
5. School Advisory Board.
6. Strong relationships with the community.
7. Energetic student organizations.
8. Administrative faculty and staff with strong skills in technology.
9. Diverse and dedicated student body

Weaknesses

1. Not enough tenure eligible or tenured faculty.
2. Faculty/student ratio is too high.
3. Office and meeting space is inadequate for size of program.
4. Demands on faculty for accreditation conflict with scholarship demands.

Plan/Goals to be met prior to AY 2014/2015)

1. Develop a more efficient and simplified assessment plan.
2. Achieve reaccreditation of BSW and MSW Programs.
3. Develop courses and/or certificate in substance abuse.
4. Develop courses and/or certificate in animal assisted therapy.
5. Increase grant submissions.
6. Convert at least 2 instructor lines to tenure-eligible lines.
7. Improve the faculty/student ratio, with goal of 25:1 for BSW and 12:1 for MSW Program.
8. Explore options for creating additional space for meetings, program administration, and faculty offices.

See Appendix A: Results of 2010 BSW Program Assessment

Appendix B: Results of 2010 MSW Program Assessment

Appendix C: BSW Program Assessment Plan

Appendix D: MSW Program Assessment Plan