Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Social Work (MSW), 2023-2024

Date: 3/4/2024

Invited: Provost John Chenoweth; Associate Dean Jason Janke (Letters and Sciences); Dean Matthew Vick (Graduate Studies); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Yeongmin Kim; faculty and staff in the program; Audit & Review Team Chair Lynn Gilbertson; Audit & Review team members Christine Neddenriep and Pavan Chennamaneni; Assessment Representative Katy Casey

1) Call to order

2) Introductions

3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments
   - Review team chair Dr. Gilbertson reviewed the team's evaluation of the program, highlighting strengths of the program.

4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:

   a) Can you provide a description of the course sequence and credit hours to demonstrate how courses build on one another and lead to the final capstone experience?

   The program chair, Dr. Kim, noted that enrollment exceeded the program's expectation when first launched. Curriculum is of high quality to meet accreditation standards. In addition, the accrediting body does have class size requirements.

   b) Has the program identified any barriers to student progress/retention through the program?

   The program has not noticed any issues or barriers to students' progressing through the program. They have been able to offer financial support for internships over the past few years, but the grant funding for that is going away. The faculty and staff are unsure if that will impact participation. The department is reviewing employment-based field opportunities to accommodate students currently in a position that could meet accreditation requirements.

   The faculty commented on the amount of work that is required outside of traditional work hours to run a program that caters to working professionals. Maintaining an evening course sequence has drawn students to the program.

   c) Has the program explored ways to reduce the significant credit load for students on the traditional track (with no previous degree in social work)?

   Discussion ensued about whether students could use work-based or credit for prior learning to count toward MSW. The accrediting body does not allow for students to use work-based experiences for credit toward courses in the degree.

   d) How does the program use the ASWB exam in determining competencies for students? Is there a benefit in making it a requirement for all students?

   Candidates for licensure need to pass the ASWB exam to be licensed in the state of Wisconsin. However, the accrediting body does not allow programs to use the ASWB as a requirement for program completion. Therefore, the program does support students in preparing for the exam, but will not require it as part of their

MSW program. The exam is only supported by the program due to the licensure requirement, and the program staff do not feel the exam to be an accurate reflection of skills in the field. There is also discussion of this exam being replaced with an alternate option in the state of Wisconsin.

5) **Recommended Actions**: The evaluation report lists three recommended action (see page 10, point 4) related to program goals, optimization of resources, and assessment.

6) **Recommended Result**: *Continuation without qualification*
   - **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
   - **Please select all applicable boxes and fill in the appropriate year**:
     ☒ **Next SHORT self-study will be due to the Dean on October 1,** 2028 **and to the Assessment Office on November 1, 2028**.

7) Adjourn.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Graduate Programs, 2023-2024

Date of Evaluation _____11/14/2023_____Short Self Study (SS*)_____
Program: **Social Work (MSW)**   Major ☒   Minor ☐

Evaluations submitted by: Matthew Vick; Christine Neddenriep; Lynn Gilbertson; Katy Casey
Review meeting attended by: Matthew Vick; Christine Neddenriep; Lynn Gilbertson; Katy Casey; Pavan
    Chennamaneni

I. General Program Information

1. The program's mission statement reflects the nature and scope

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program is aware and reflective of changes affecting improvement since the last review.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
First self-study for the program	0

3. The program has maintained program-level accreditation in good standing.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section I

Substantial growth since the MSW program began.
The program should be commended for maintaining national accreditation and growing the program enrollment substantially.

II. Alignment within the University

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater's Mission.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program contributes to goals related to the UWW strategic priorities.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. [Undergraduate Programs] The program supports general education and/or proficiency programs at the University.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

III. Program Goals & Accomplishments

1. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve/advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section III

The short- and long-term goals appear to be forward facing, but those identified will advance the program along many facets. The list is pretty extensive... perhaps some are too detailed for program level improvement? (although it doesn't really hurt anything)

Short-term and long-term goals are established.

There are many clearly measurable short- and long-term goals that demonstrate vision and innovation of this program.

Very ambitious set of goals, with clear criteria- great to see a method to track completion. Is the program on track to meet these goals in the timeframe provided?

IV. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program promotes, and/or embeds, High Impact Practices in the program.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section IV

Would have been helpful to include the total number of credit hours and the order in which courses are taught to demonstrate how they build on one another with a final capstone experience.

The curriculum is innovative, collaborative, and current as evidenced by the short- and long-term goals summarizing the planned updates to the curriculum in partnership with the current explanation of the programs course offerings.

There is a large credit difference between the traditional and advanced program options. Since the traditional program is at a higher cost- I wonder if this impacts the number of students pursuing this option. Would it be advantageous for the program to help students interested in the field, but without the background, find more cost-effective ways of gaining that knowledge and/or experience? For example, experience in the field- maybe as a volunteer or assistant, competency exam, etc.

V. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program submitted a completed assessment plan.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. [Undergraduate] Student learning outcomes are aligned with the Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. [Graduate] Student Learning Outcomes are aligned with the Master's Level Essential Learning Outcomes from the Graduate School.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

4. The program's assessment plan includes data collection methods and results.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. The program's assessment plan includes a description of how the data are used to improve student learning.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to Section V

The documents appear to be from accreditation and are very detailed. There is a "cross walk" between the Master's Level Essential Learning Outcomes and their professional organization's accreditation standards.

Assessment includes aggregated data across two measures for each competency. Not clear over what period of time the data was collected, or the number of students represented in the aggregate percentage. The students reported a desire for assistance in preparing for the ASWB exam. Do all students complete this exam? Should include these data as well.

The program articulates a competency-based assessment approach with clear measurements at various stages in the curriculum. The program is starting to use the data to determine trends.

5. I would like to know how the program addresses the competencies in the table that are not met

VI. Student Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation

1. The program's enrollment is consistent/stable and at a level appropriate to meeting student learning needs.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program regularly evaluates student progress toward successfully completing the program, including a review of student retention.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1

General Comments related to Section VI

The program is growing and is very strong. The review of student progress appears to be dependent upon advisor's tracking of students. This could be perhaps either be more robust in terms of department level data to ensure students don't "fall between the cracks" or described in more depth if there are systematic procedures in use.

Enrollment in the MSW program has increased substantially since 2018 while the enrollment in the bachelor's degree has decreased. I don't see data supporting the retention of students in the program.

The program reports being at max capacity and reliance on adjunct instructors. Perhaps a review of the course offerings (how often, what format, enrollment, etc.) could help with adjusting resources to meet enrollment growth projections. The program reports a robust advising process for supporting student retention. Perhaps advisors can connect to discuss course sequence that would meet student needs and account for current staffing levels.

The A&R Dashboard includes emphasis tracks including addictions, military, and physical disability- are these emphases within the two tracks described? Additionally, the majority of students are listed under "no emphasis." The program lists actions taken to retain students but does not take it the step further to reflect on whether the practices are effective.

VII. Demand for Graduates

1. Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment after graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program described unique features that set it apart from competing programs in the UW System or other comparable colleges and universities.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for VII

It would be helpful to share the actual number of social work openings in Wisconsin per year, but the data shared is sufficient.

The program should maintain data on all graduates, not just a sample of those completing the exit interview.

It may be interesting to track the differences in employment between in-person vs online students and where they are finding employment to better highlight the economic "footprint" the program is supporting.

1. I like that the program administers their own exit survey with data on placement after graduation.

VIII. Faculty and Staff Characteristics

1. Information is provided about anticipated staffing changes and areas of need (since last Audit and Review).

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. The program identified factors impacting their ability to recruit and retain outstanding faculty.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments related to section VIII

I'm surprised that you don't seem to be concerned with recruiting faculty given shortages of doctoral level social workers prepared to be academics.

The program reports sufficient staffing and discusses needs if the program were to grow. Does the program want to increase enrollment? Are there other considerations outside of staffing that would need to be addressed to grow the program? More detail is needed on "how" the program recruits and retains faculty.

1. It would be helpful to get clarification on why the program offers separate online and face-to-face sections of courses- which does seem to be a big lift. Do enrollment numbers support offering both versions, meaning are all sections offered online and face to face full? Does the program accreditation require online and face to face?

IX. Student Resources

1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, technological, and library resources to effectively serve its students and provide high-quality programming.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for IX

Comments were included about the benefits of the CEC. While a change might be difficult for the program, the university will need to decide about that building that is best for the overall campus.

Community Engagement Center is well resourced!

The community engagement center is a critical space for the program. There are concerns about the long-term access to this space.

X. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Areas of strength are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

General Comments for X

Clearly the program has talented faculty that engage in high levels of scholarly and creative work and bring in external grant funding to UWW.

XI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

The program serves an important regional need. The curriculum is robust and also accessible both to new social work students (other bachelor's degrees) and advanced standing students.

1. Faculty with rigorous scholarship activity. 2. The integration of high impact practices into the curriculum. 3. The achievement of national accreditation. 4. Flexibility in course offerings to promote student access/success.

The program includes unique features that set it apart, primarily in elective options for students and integration of high impact practices. The program appears to be on track to grow and the market for graduates is good.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

To assist with making the case for an additional faculty line, the program could provide data on the required faculty: student ratios in certain classes versus others to help with a sustainability analysis.

1. Clearly identify staffing needs after reviewing curricular offerings and alignment with programs' long-term goals. 2. Using assessment data and identified trends in addition to accreditation requirements to inform program changes.

The program would benefit from a discussion with college leadership on how to plan for growth in the major, offering all courses in dual modalities, with the current staffing situation.

3. Other comments/questions

What impact on COEPS would there be from moving all School Social Work classes to the SOCWORK department?

This self-study was easy to read because of its organization and enjoyable because of the innovative and creative explanations of the work of the program. Kudos to the program!

4. Recommended Actions (please specify):

1.) Provide an update on short and long-term goals in section III by highlighting a timeline of achievement and/or sustainability.
2.) Review course offerings (modality, sequence, enrollment) to identify areas for optimizing existing resources to support faculty retention/recruitment, student enrollment/retention, and instructional space/tech needs.
3.) When sharing assessment results, include a description of how the program addresses competencies that were not met by students.

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	4
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	0
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	0
Insufficient Information in the self-study to decide; revise self-study & resubmit. Select if report is not submitted in time for the review team meeting.	0
Report not submitted; refer to Provost for action.	0