

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for  
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting  
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Social Work Majors and Minors, 2018-2019**

**Date:** 12/13/2018

**Time:** 2:00-3:00PM

**Place:** Laurentide 4012

**Invited:** Provost Susan Elrod; AVC Greg Cook; Interim Dean Frank Goza (L&S); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Sarah Hessenauer; faculty and staff in the Social Work program; Audit & Review Team Chair Louise Tourigny; Audit & Review team members Yamin Ahmad, Jiazhen Zhou, Paul Gregory, Joan Littlefield Cook

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

2. Introductions

3. ***Overview of review team evaluation, program comments:***

Because the recommended result of the previous audit and review was continuation without qualification, the current self-study is a short report, focusing on the recommended actions from the previous review.

The review team noted numerous program strengths and achievements: the program maintained its disciplinary accreditation and made curricular changes to respond to accreditation standards. In addition, a new Masters program was developed and implemented during the review period. Enrollment in the new MSW degree is strong. The program continues to show a good balance in their assessment plan, with both direct and indirect assessments, curriculum-embedded assessments and assessment of the internship. They continue to implement a comprehensive and useful assessment plan, tracking the development of student competencies, using a variety of direct and indirect measures, seeking advice from the Advisory Board, and making data-based changes to the curriculum. Overall, the program has responded to the recommended actions of the last report well and the faculty/staff are to be commended on their accomplishments.

The program noted that they would like to develop an internship site at the Rock County branch campus and are working on a more “seamless” transition from two-year technical schools to UWW’s Social Work program. They look forward to working in partnership with the student success center to support students as they take increased research credits and with the increased GPA admissions requirement. Provost Elrod encourage the program to continue their work to connect with the Rock County campus, working toward a clinic and perhaps a course or two there, as well as working with Blackhawk Technical Collect to create a pathway from BHT to a RC AAS degree to a BSW at the Whitewater campus.

4. ***Discussion of Review Team’s evaluation:***

a) **Staffing needs.** The review team had questions regarding staffing, changes to GPA requirements and credits requirements, enrollments, and the impact of the minor for the overall resources available for the current major. The full-time equivalent ratio needed to maintain accreditation requirement is met by a small margin, and could present a problem in the future with continued program growth. The program is committed to working on enrollment growth. The review team encourages the program to engage in data-based enrollment projections to better assess staffing needs over the long-term.

b) **Assessment.** The review team congratulates faculty on the good work done on the program’s assessment tools and the use of the field survey and comprehensive exam. In particular, the assessment is comprehensive in that it includes knowledge, values, skills, and both cognitive and affective processes. Data are gathered at different points in time, which allows the tracking of trajectories in terms of learning outcomes. Closing the loop is important, so the review team encourages the program to track the impact of data-based changes. This is something that should appear on the next self-study report and that should be documented every year in the annual report for the major.

- c) **Diversity.** There was discussion of ways to increase the diversity content in the practice, especially cross-cultural communication and understanding of cultures that can help social workers in their practice.
  - d) Other comments: Provost Elrod encouraged the program to consider ways to generate revenue. In addition, the program should think about what space needs it has now and likely in the near future.
5. **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists two recommended actions (see page 5) related to staffing and resources, and to assessment.
6. **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*
- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
  - **See page 5 below for details of recommended actions.**
  - **Next full self-study will be due on October 1, 2023 to the Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences, and on November 1, 2023 to the Audit & Review Committee.**

The next review will consist of a full self-study. Faculty should work with the Audit and Review Committee and the Office of Academic Assessment to best align the next self-study report with the program's accreditation self-study.

7. Adjourn.

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

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater  
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies  
Undergraduate Programs, 2018-2019  
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 11/15/2018 Short Self Study (SS\*) X  
 Program: Social Work Major  Minor

**Evaluations submitted by:** Louise Tourigny, Yamin Ahmad, Jiazhen Zhou, Paul Gregory, Joan Littlefield Cook

**Review meeting attended by:** All cited above

**If the program included introductory remarks, please add any comments you have on this introductory information. (Note: Programs are not required to include introductory remarks.)**

Lots of curricular changes made, to better align with accreditation standards. Did assessment data (especially on students' performance on program learning outcomes) play a role in these changes?  
 They made good introduction on the undergraduate program changes and addition of a Master program.  
 Congratulations on establishing the Masters in Social Work program, given that it was a long term goal.  
 I noted that there were several changes made to the curriculum, from increasing the credits to degree, adding new courses, and increasing the amount of credits on an existing course. It would be interesting to know whether these decisions were driven by data.

**Recommendation #1:** Work with the Dean and Provost to resolve staffing concerns.

**Recommendation #1 Overall Evaluation**

Good Progress	3
Making Progress	2
Little/No Progress	0

**Comments related to recommendation #1.**

Some progress has been made, but the self-study clearly shows that the current levels must be at least maintained to stay in good standing with the accrediting body; adding staff would be desirable.  
 Are there ongoing discussions with the interim dean about the current faculty/student ratios, and about the impact of the Human Services Foundation minor and the new MSW on these? The minor is a very popular one.  
 What impact might enrollment trends in the major and MSW have on the department's ability to continue to offer it?  
 Department was able to hire faculty, but also lost a position due to a faculty member leaving. Still seems as though they are in need of more faculty  
 There are still difficulties staffing electives that support the minor. The growth of the program depends on staff availability.  
 They got 2 full-time faculty added since last review, which has addressed most part of needs from the growing undergraduate program and the newly added Master program. However, staffing will also remain an issue when the MSW program continues to grow. Need to keep working on Dean and Provost to secure sufficient faculty for keeping growing the programs.  
 The Department has made progress in increasing the number of tenure-track faculty to meet the requirements of their accreditation body. However, with the addition of the addition of the MSW program, and the admission of 32 students for that program, it will place additional strain on Department resources to meet the 1:12 faculty to student ratio requirement for accreditation. As such, I think although the Department has made progress from

the last Review period, with the inclusion of the MSW program, they are about half-way to where they need to be in order to meet accreditation requirements based on where they stand. Without the MSW program, I would declare this to be "good progress". However, based on where they need to be, I think they are halfway to what they need. The point that I making here is to highlight this more for the administration since I understand that staffing decisions are outside the Department's control.

**Recommendation #2:** Continue the good work you're doing on assessment. In particular:

- a. complete the development of assessment tools and strategies to assess all the program's SLOs
- b. whenever possible, include direct measures of student performance in addition to indirect measures and opinion/perception measures
- c. systematically track ways in which data on student learning are used to impact the program

**Recommendation #2 Overall Evaluation**

Good Progress	5
Making Progress	0
Little/No Progress	0

**Comments related to recommendation #2**

The program has a comprehensive assessment process. ALL faculty participate (impressive), results are discussed regularly and are shared with the Advisory Board. Are results shared with students?  
 Includes both direct and indirect measures of learning, uses embedded assignments well.  
 You mention the "implicit curriculum." Please explain what this is and why it is important to assess.  
 The program's LOs are the accreditation standards, correct? Do you 'tweak' the wording so these are truly LOs (for assessment purposes)?  
 pg. 19. The section on follow-up assessment of the curricular changes made is very important. In your next self-study, please make sure to include a discussion of the impact of the curricular changes. THAT's the real 'closing the loop'--make improvements, not just changes.  
 pg. 26. Very good examples of how the data on student learning have been used to make changes to the program. As noted above, make sure to address the impact of these changes in your next round of assessments.

---

Department is very active in evaluating their major. Document is filled with various data supporting their progress.  
 There are several assessment tools including a field instrument and comprehensive exam.  
 There is a re-accreditation committee to which faculty must submit student learning outcomes and measures of acquisition of competences.  
 Measures utilized from assessment include knowledge, values, skills, and cognitive and affective processes.  
 Data are gathered at different points in time.  
 There are clear set benchmarks for the field evaluation.

---

They have developed valid and reliable field instrument used in SW 493 (Social Work Experience/Internship) to monitor student progress, have implemented a comprehensive exam for all social work seniors, have implemented a portfolio assignment in SW 489 (Senior Seminar), and also collected data on exit surveys.

---

Without knowing where they were prior, it is hard to determine the "degree" of progress made here. However, given that there are two measures of assessment for each SLO, I think they have made good progress to addressing this recommended action.  
 There are direct measures of student performance for each competency. In addition, the use of existing indirect measures such as exit surveys and other measures designed to elicit feedback from stakeholders (current students, alumni, advisory board) should help the program continue to improve over time.  
 The program has "infrastructure" in place that records assessment outcomes for each of their competencies. There appears to be some evidence provided that the program is evaluating the assessment data and closing the loop. There is evidence that this is being done in a systematic fashion. I have two suggestions here:  
 a. An additional thing to do might be to use survey data from alums to help determine whether any additional SLOs beyond CSWE requirements are needed, or whether they are sufficient.

- b. Potentially add a strategic planning component to the process to see help improve assessment methods/outcomes in the long run.

**If the program included additional information/remarks at the end of the short self-study, please add any comments you have on this additional information. (Note: Programs are not required to include additional information/remarks.).** NA

**Recommended actions: Please make sure recommended actions are clearly stated so the program will know what is expected.**

1. Staffing and resources.
  - a. Continue to monitor faculty/student ratios to maintain compliance with the accrediting body. Work with the college and provost to obtain additional tenure lines as needed.
  - b. Track enrollment trends in both the major and the Human Services Foundations minor, paying attention to the impact of the minor on the faculty/student ratios needed for accreditation of the major.
2. Continue the good work on assessment. In particular,
  - a. Track the impact of data-based changes.
  - b. Examine the process for tracking use of data to further improve tracking (e.g., capture changes more completely and systematically)

**Additional comments:**

- Work with the Audit & Review Committee and the Office of Academic Assessment to best align the next A&R self-study report with the program's accreditation self-study.
- The program has responded to the recommended actions of the last report well (or at least as best as they can in the case of the first one). They are to be commended.
- Nice, but lengthy "SHORT" study. This is my first one to read, but I can't imagine how long a normal self-study is. Information provided documents the department's various work on evaluating their program.
- The program has strong assessment and accreditation.
- They have done a great job in assessment, and have grown the programs very well over the evaluation period. It is an excellent example for other programs.

**Recommended Result**

Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	
Continuation without qualification	X*
Continuation with minor concerns	
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	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	

**\*Next self-study is due to the college dean by October 1, 2023 and to the Audit & Review Committee by November 1, 2023. This will be a full self-study.**