UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

March 4, 2013

To: Julia Wallace, Provost
From: Sue Mattison, Dean CPS

Academic Program Reviews

I am very pleased to forward the program review for the undergraduate Bachelor's degree in Social Work (BSW). As you will read, the Professional Program in Social Work is a leader in curricular development utilizing student outcomes and program assessment methodology. The Social Work program adopted competency-based curricular development and evaluation at its inception in 1987 – well before such a model was mandated by the accrediting agency - Council on Social Work Education – in 2008. Evaluation and measurement is a culture embraced within the faculty, and results of assessments continually inform the curricular process. This culture among the faculty has resulted in one of the strongest programs in our institution.

Based on this program report, I recommend the following actions:

- Continue to refine the curriculum based on assessment and evaluation
- Continue work toward reaffirmation of the BSW by the Council on Social Work Education
- Continue to plan for a solo MSW to free up resources for intentional program growth
- Consider nomination of the Social Work program for the Council on Higher Education Assessment (CHEA) National Award for Outstanding Institutional Practice in Student Learning Outcomes

Please let me know if you have any questions or require any additional information.

cc: Dr. Jolanda Sallmann

Office of the Dean of the College of Professional Studies, John M. Rose Hall, Suite 305,
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-7001
Phone: 920-465-2050 • Fax: 920-465-2043

SELF-STUDY REPORT

Name of Program: SOCIAL WORK PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM, BSW

Department Chair: JOLANDA SALLMANN

Date of Last Program Review: OCTOBER 2006

Self-Study Approved by Full Faculty: February 13, 2013

INTRODUCTION

The University of Wisconsin-Green Bay's (UWGB) Professional Programs in Social Work include a Collaborative Master of Social Work (MSW) Program and a Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) Program. The BSW is under review at this time. The BSW Program recently celebrated 25 years of preparing qualified and capable graduates who go on to serve clients, primarily in the Northeast Wisconsin region. It has been continuously accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) since 1987. Every eight years the Program completes an in-depth self-study and hosts a two-day visit with reviewers as part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process. The Program attained reaffirmation of accreditation for the full eight years in February 2006. It is next up for review by CSWE in February of 2014, with its self-study due April 1, 2013.

Since its inception, the BSW Program has embraced a competency-based approach and has extensive experience identifying relevant generalist practice competencies and practice behaviors and measuring student acquisition of these competencies through course work and field experiences. However, in 2008 the CSWE's Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) mandated the incorporation of 10 practice competencies, or student learning outcomes, for all accredited Social Work Programs. This mandate requires the BSW Program at UW-Green Bay to replace its 14 competencies with CSWE's 10 competencies, which consequently requires comprehensive program review and revision. The Program must be in compliance with this mandate by the time it submits its self-study in April. Program compliance efforts have been underway since spring of 2011. Our background in competency-based education and evaluation has facilitated the transition to incorporating the CSWE competencies.

SECTION A: MISSON STATEMENT AND PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

State your program's mission, describe its curricular requirements and explain how the program supports UW-Green Bay's select mission and the institution's overall strategic plan.

Program Mission Statement

The faculty completed a comprehensive review of its mission statement in fall 2011 as part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process. The CSWE accreditation standards require a mission statement, "reflect the profession's purpose and values and the program's context" (http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=41861, p. 2). This directive, as well as the mandate to

incorporate the CSWE practice competencies, directed the revision of our mission statement. The following mission statement was adopted by faculty on February 1, 2012:

> Grounded in the values of the Social Work Profession, the BSW Program at the University of Wisconsin–Green Bay provides a regionally responsive, competency-based, interdisciplinary program which prepares Baccalaureate-level social workers to promote social justice in a multicultural and evolving world by engaging in strengths-based generalist practice that enhances human and community well-being.

The new mission strongly reflects the old mission, but now also more clearly reflects the university's select mission, particularly related to our global and dynamic society.

Program Curriculum

The 2012-2013 Undergraduate Catalog accurately reflects the current curriculum requirements for a bachelor of social work degree. The curriculum is organized around the student learning outcomes stated as 10 core competencies (see Section C for details of the competencies).

Because social work is an applied profession that draws upon interdisciplinary knowledge, the BSW Program has extensive supporting course requirements across multiple disciplines that provide students a range of perspectives they draw upon throughout their social work education. Students in the social work major are required to take 12 support courses for 37 credits. Five required support courses are: COMM SCI 301: Foundations for Social Research, ENG COMP 105: Expository Writing, HUM BIO 102: Introduction to Human Biology, HUM DEV 210: Introduction to Human Development, and SOC WORK 275: American Social Welfare. In addition, students choose a course within seven areas: family development, statistics, government, human behavior, social environmental challenges, social theory, and women's and gender studies. Transfer students who were not required to take an ethnic studies course as part of their general education programs are additionally required to take an ethnic studies course. Except for women's and gender studies and ethnic studies (categories with course selections identified by the university), social work faculty have identified courses to choose within the areas (see Appendix A: 2012-2013 Undergraduate Catalog).

There are 16 core courses (38 credits) in the social work major taught by the social work faculty. These courses can only be taken in sequence over the junior and senior years. The array includes four skills labs, one credit each, that build on each other over the four semesters. The content taught and practiced in the skills labs is integrated with the Social Work Profession course in the first semester of the junior year, followed by a social work methods course each of the next three semesters. In addition, the three methods courses each have an associated field practicum where students have an opportunity to practice what they are learning in the classroom in the community. The field practice course integrated with Methods I, the second semester junior year, is one credit and requires four hours weekly at an assigned agency. The senior field practicums integrated with Methods II and Methods III courses are 16 hours a week (5 credits) in the same agency over the two semesters of the senior year.

Throughout the skills, methods and field courses the students are taught and practice a "planned change process," which includes doing analytical assessments, setting goals and measurable outcomes, developing and implementing plans, and evaluating the results. They learn to apply this framework to all size systems, from the individual to large social institutions; this is the basis of "generalist social work practice."

In addition to the skills labs, the Social Work Profession course, methods courses, and the field practicums, students are required to take Human Behavior in the Social Environment during the second semester of the junior year. This course specifically integrates their previous coursework in human biology, human development, sociology, economics and political science. Students become familiar with the impact of the environment on human functioning and of individuals and small groups in framing the environment.

In the senior year, students register for Social Policy Analysis I and II (each course for two credits) and Program Evaluation I and II (each course for two credits). In the fall semester, as students learn to define a social problem and analyze the resulting policy in Social Policy Analysis I, in Program Evaluation I they begin to design a program evaluation or community needs assessment to gain more understanding of the identified social problem and how well the policy or program addresses the social problem. This work is done in coordination with a community advisory team interested in the identified problem area. The students conduct the research in the community at the end of the fall semester. During the second semester in Program Evaluation II, students analyze the data, and make recommendations focusing on implications for programs and policy. In Social Policy Analysis II, students learn social action strategies and develop and implement a plan to address identified needs. These combined courses are a capstone for student demonstration of their knowledge and skills as professionals in the community, adding to the knowledge base of the social work profession. Each year these courses address a different social problem and policy. Areas from past years include:

- 2006-2007: Transportation Needs in Door County
- 2007-2008: Social Work Perspectives on the Mental Health Parity Act
- 2008-2009: Food Security in Brown County
- 2009-2010: Greater Green Bay Habitat for Humanity Affiliate Survey on Owning a Home
- 2010-2011: Fort Howard Neighborhood Needs Survey
- 2011-2012: Probation and Parole Agents' Perceptions of Community Resources in Brown County

In addition to the required core social work courses, students can elect to complete the Child Welfare emphasis. The emphasis is composed of four courses: HUM DEV 331: Infancy and Early Childhood, HUM DEV 332: Middle Childhood and Adolescence, SOC WORK 351: Child Welfare Services and Programs, and SOC WORK 451: Child Welfare Practice. These courses provide in-depth preparation for practice specific to public or tribal child welfare settings. Students who elect to take the sequence also have their senior field practicums with child welfare programs. With the support of grants, stipends are available to students in the sequence who agree to work in public or tribal child welfare for as many years as they receive the stipend.

UW-Green Bay's Select Mission and Strategic Plan

The UW-Green Bay Select Mission focuses on providing an "interdisciplinary, problem-focused educational experience that prepares students to think critically and address complex issues in a multicultural and evolving world." The BSW Program supports this mission in that ethical and sanctioned social work professional practice requires knowledge, values and skills based in the liberal arts. The Social Work Professional Program requires 12 courses offered in other disciplines to support the courses in the major. In addition to being "interdisciplinary," social work education is "problem-focused" as social and personal issues become the focus of intellectual inquiry and practice.

The select mission of UW-Green Bay further includes the preparation of "students to think critically and address complex issues in a multicultural and evolving world." This focus corresponds with the BSW Program focus on the development of critical thinking skills in assessing complex issues and identifying effective methods to address those issues. It also resonates well with the Program's commitment to diversity and a global perspective and incorporates a number of practice behaviors the Program recognizes as essential for entry level practice: critical thinking, responsibility to utilize and develop relevant knowledge in the field, and field-based practice performance.

The BSW Program supports the University's strategic plan, particularly related to the following five strategic themes:

- Academic Programs and Enrollment: The BSW Program continues to provide a highly sought after major where graduates are successful in finding entry-level social work positions. The most comprehensive data available pertains to students in the Child Welfare stipend program. Their placement rate in child welfare jobs has been 100% within four months of graduation for the past two years. Most such students obtain jobs in county or tribal child welfare organizations. Additionally, the senior Program Evaluation project is developed annually to respond to a need from one of our community partners and is a prime example of how the Program utilizes problem-focused education.
- Commitment to Community: BSW Social Work Students provide over 16,500 hours of service annually to the community and region through their practicums. Most of these internships are in the public domain, where students serve our most vulnerable citizens. Additionally, the annual senior Program Evaluation project provides students practical familiarity serving our community partners with solving community social problems. Program faculty members are proud of their close relationship with the profession and believe strongly in the lifelong learning support that is needed within the profession.
- Sustainability: Dr. Sarah Himmelheber joined the faculty this fall and her presence will help the BSW Program support this strategic theme. Dr. Himmelheber's work is focused on food recovery; in her few brief months here she has organized a campus-wide "no waste breakfast" of foods recovered from the community, garnered interest for the development of a "Campus Kitchen" at UW-Green Bay, and developed a service learning, ethnic studies course where student placements will be in local food distribution organizations.
- Diversity and Institutional Environment: Attending to issues of diversity as they relate to social work practice is also a strong emphasis in the BSW Program. As noted in Table 1: Location of Competencies Across the Curriculum (below), every required social work course

incorporates diversity content. Additionally, students in the BSW Program are more racially/ethnically diverse than the general UW-Green Bay student population (see below). The Program has worked hard to develop strong relationships with the American Intercultural Center (AIC) and the College of the Menominee Nation (CMN) and it is believed those relationships help us to recruit diverse students to the major.

- Meeting the Needs of Students: The BSW Program utilizes an intensive advising model to ensure our students are successful throughout their academic careers. Students meet each semester with their faculty advisors and are also required to attend an assessment meeting at the end of their junior year where faculty advisors lead the students in discussions about their strengths and learning needs in relationship to the Program's competencies. Faculty Field Liaisons further help students generalize what is learned in the classroom to the field through visiting the field sites for contracting and evaluation meetings with the students and their agency supervisors.

SECTION B: PROGRAM CHANGES SINCE LAST REVIEW

Respond specifically to the results and recommendations from the last review including the actions the program faculty took in response to them. Note any changes that have been made to your program mission and/or curricular requirements since the last review.

Results and Recommendations from Last Review

The Academic Affairs Council (AAC) did not make any recommendations at the last review (see Appendix B: Academic Affairs Council Memo). The Program's evaluation process was described as "robust," and the new evaluation processes outlined below, which are a response to changed accreditation standards, are anticipated to be as favorably viewed. However, two issues were noted by the AAC that warrant further consideration here. First, a concern was raised about students' "perceived ineffectiveness of general education courses in helping to meet proficiency requirements" conveyed in the 2001-2006 Graduating Senior Survey. Data from 2007-2011 now demonstrate that BSW students were slightly more likely to agree with the statement, "The General Education requirements at UWGB were a valuable component of my education" than UW-Green Bay students as a whole. This finding is also noted in the 2007-2011 Alumni Survey data for BSW students. The Program is pleased students are now more likely to recognize the value of general education courses and believe some of this increased appreciation stems from efforts to make more explicit connections in the classroom to the applicability of knowledge gained in support courses to social work.

The second issue pertains to the impact of the Collaborative MSW Program on the BSW Program. The travel requirements and department service commitments required to operate the MSW Program have added to the faculty and staff workloads.. As the MSW Program is collaborative with UW-Oshkosh, its structure and governance has necessitated a number of programmatic and institutional redundancies that require significant time and effort. Despite this, the MSW Program has been amazingly successful, and growing each year in admissions. Presently, the MSW Program is at a crossroads, needing to decide whether to grow the Collaborative Program or dissolve it and launch two new programs. In light of State budget cuts and the additional time and effort required to successfully collaborate, the faculty at UW-Green Bay support efforts for the latter and are currently in the process of working to dissolve the

Collaborative and launch a solo MSW Program. While initial workload will be increased for all faculty and staff as a result of this change, it is anticipated that, in the long run, a solo program will require less resources and effort to manage.

Mindfulness of the impact of the MSW Program on the BSW Program was also raised as a recommendation by Interim Dean Derryl Block at the last Review (see Appendix C: Dean's Memo). Specifically, she recommended careful consideration of program size regarding that balance of resources, and suggested pursuing options for moving the part-time MSW from fee-recovery to GPR funds. Such a model was considered two years ago by the Program, and it was determined at that time that retaining a fee-recovery model for the part-time program actually provided the entire Social Work Program with more flexibility as it provided carry-over funds to the Program. Dean Block also recommended pursing additional tenure-track positions to replace our Instructional Academic Staff positions. The Program also pursued this issue, along with the funding issue, and was informed there were no GPR funded FTE available. Adding new tenure-track positions will be necessary with a solo MSW Program; such future needs are discussed in more detail in Section F.

Dean Block also provided recommendations to continue with our Program monitoring and evaluation efforts and our collaborations with social work and child welfare professionals in the region. These are areas we continue to attend to and believe we are progressing well in this regard. Her final recommendation was to maintain and increase scholarly activity. With the addition of new junior faculty since 2008, the Program has been successful in this recommendation.

Changes Since Last Review

There have been a number of minor and major changes since the last review. First, as noted above, the BSW Program's mission has changed. 2012-2013 is the first year that the Program is operating under the new mission. Next, there have also been minor curricular changes since the last review. Every two years, the Social Work Advisors review support course offerings in the human behavior, social environmental challenges, and social theory categories. Obsolete courses are removed and new courses brought to the full faculty for consideration of inclusion. Third, Social Work increased its general education offerings. SOC WORK 275: American Social Welfare, was converted to an SS-2 course beginning in fall 2012. Additionally, two new general education courses have been developed. SOC WORK 250: You and Your Future: Living and Working in an Aging Society is a new SS-2 course that has been offered each summer since 2010. Social Work also partnered with colleagues in Business Administration, Nursing, and Education to offer an annual international study course in Cuernavaca, Mexico, bringing its first group of students January, 2013.

The biggest Program change concerns the integration of the CSWE's 10 practice competencies into our curriculum and the consequent curriculum and evaluation redesigns that resulted from this mandate. The 10 competencies are considered student learning outcomes for BSW social workers. Each competency is operationalized by a number of practice behaviors, or performance indicators, which represent the abilities necessary for high quality, beginning level BSW practice (for a complete list of these please see Table 5 in Appendix G: Assessment Plan). While the

CSWE mandated the language of the competencies, it allowed for Program flexibility in the adoption and adaptation of its suggested 41 practice behaviors. The UW-Green Bay BSW Program revised and refined the suggested behaviors during the spring 2011 semester. Input was solicited from the BSW Program Advisory Committee, a committee of local providers charged with providing input on curriculum issues as well as field policies. Thirty-nine practice behaviors resulted; some maintain the original languages suggested by the CSWE, some are modified, a few were eliminated, and a few developed uniquely for our Program, including one developed by the BSW Advisory Committee. Details about the evaluation redesign process are below.

SECTION C: STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Describe the program's intended student learning outcomes and the methods used to assess them. Analyze the assessment results and describe the conclusions drawn from that analysis. Finally, describe the specific actions that were taken as a result of the assessment of student learning process.

Student Learning Outcomes

The Social Work Professional Program bases its curriculum on the ten practice competencies established by the CSWE in 2008. As such, these competencies make up the Program's student learning outcomes. Each student in the Program works toward mastery of the competencies throughout his or her tenure in the Program. Students' mastery of these outcomes is measured through their achievement of the practice behaviors that comprise the competencies. Practice behaviors are measured in courses and in the field practicum. The Program's 10 Competencies are (see Appendix G for a listing of the practice behaviors):

1. Professional Self. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.
2. Standards and Ethics. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.
3. Critical Thinking. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.
4. Diversity. Engage diversity and difference in practice.
5. Social Justice. Advance human rights and social and economic justice.
6. Research. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.
7. Interdisciplinary Knowledge. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.
8. Social Policy .Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.
9. Service Delivery. Respond to contexts that shape practice.
10. Change Process. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Assessment Methods

The Program's competency attainment assessment plan was developed and refined over the course of four semesters (Spring 2011, Summer 2011, Fall 2011, and Spring 2012). Beginning in the spring of 2011, after faculty approved the practice behaviors associated with the

competencies, faculty comprehensively reviewed the BSW curriculum and collaboratively worked to assess where each of the practice behaviors are being taught. This assessment resulted in the creation of a draft of Table 1: Location of Competencies Across the Curriculum. The faculty made a conscious decision to ensure that all upper-level (300+) required social work courses included the following competencies: Professional Identity (Competency 1), Standards & Ethics (Competency 2), Critical Thinking (Competency 3), and Diversity (Competency 4). The faculty also decided that the senior field sequence (SOC WORK 402 and 403) would include all of the competencies.

Table 1: Location of Competencies Across the Curriculum

		Required Social Work Courses																
		275	300	305	313	323	370	371	402	403	411	413	420	423	431	433	461	463
Competencies	1	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	2		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	3	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	4	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	5	√	√	√			√	√	√	√					√	√	√	√
	6							√	√	√	√		√				√	√
	7	√		√				√	√	√	√				√	√	√	
	8	√							√	√					√	√		
	9	√	√				√		√	√					√	√		√
	10				√		√		√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√

After determining, broadly, which competencies fit in each course, the next step was to determine which practice behaviors were appropriate for which courses. Again, this process was completed through lengthy faculty discussions.

Once faculty agreed on the appropriate location for each of the practice behaviors, faculty utilized a version of Table 1 that also included all the practice behaviors to guide their examinations of their courses and syllabi over the summer of 2011. Course objectives were reviewed to ensure they reflected the requisite competencies assigned to each class and revised accordingly. Syllabi were reviewed to ensure: (a) any practice behavior assigned to a course actually was a good fit for that course, (b) any practice behavior assigned to a course was actually being taught and evaluated in that class, and (c) how and where a practice behavior was taught and evaluated in a course was easily identifiable within a syllabus.

After completion of these extensive course examinations, faculty met in August 2011 for a lengthy retreat to discuss any course revisions that resulted from the process. At that time, only slight revisions were made to the tables (e.g., a particular course may have decided to add or remove a particular practice behavior based on intensive summer review of the course content).

At this retreat, faculty also determined an assessment plan that utilizes multiple measures to evaluate its success in helping students master the competencies. First, faculty agreed that both **Senior Field Evaluations** and **End-of-Semester Course Evaluations** would be used as outcome measures for each practice behavior. It was also decided that, at a minimum, each

behavior would have at least one **Embedded Assessment Assignment** as an additional measure. As such, each practice behavior has a minimum of three outcome measures (Field Evaluations, Course Evaluations, and Embedded Assessment Assignments). Practice behaviors are assigned between 1 and 4 Embedded Assessment Assignments each.

The Embedded Assessment Assignments were assigned to classes at this retreat; the process was collaborative and involved extensive conversations about our curriculum. This assessment plan was documented in a draft version of the Program's Assessment Plan (see Table 5 in Appendix G for the final version). It was revised over the course of the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters to reflect what actually happened in classes. Appendix G presents the final outcome of these discussions, which was approved by the faculty at an August 2012 retreat.

Description of Assessment Tools and Their Benchmarks

As part of the evaluation process, faculty determined benchmarks for each of the Program's outcome measures. Benchmarks represent the thresholds we, as a program, set as the standards for "success." Benchmarks are noted below.

Embedded Assessment Assignments. A range of graded assignments across the curriculum are used as Embedded Assessment Assignments; they are all noted in the Program's Assessment Plan (see Table 5 in Appendix G). Per our academic retention standards, students must earn a cumulative GPA of 3.0 (the equivalent of a letter grade of B) across their upper-level required social work courses. ***As such, the benchmark is an average score of ≥83% (83% is the lowest threshold for a grade of "B") for a given assignment. The Program's benchmark is an average grade of ≥83% on a given assignment***

Senior Field Evaluations. The Field Evaluation is administered twice during the students' two-semester senior field experience, once at the end of the fall semester and the final at the end of the spring semester. Students are assessed in the fall using a numerical rating scale of 0 to 2. Zero indicates a lack of demonstrated progress toward mastery of the competency, 1 indicates some demonstrated progress, and 2 indicates continuing progress. In the spring semester, students are rated "pass" or "no pass." A pass indicates the student demonstrated a level of competency mastery equivalent to an entry-level BSW social worker. Students must achieve a pass for each practice behavior in order to pass Field. ***As such, the benchmark for the Senior Field Evaluation is that students earn "pass" on all items in the spring evaluation.***

Senior Field Evaluations include three separate measures: (1) students' self-assessments, (2) Field Instructors' assessments of students, and (3) Faculty Field Liaisons' assessments of students. If disagreement exists, Faculty Field Liaisons have the ultimate authority to grant students' grades, as outlined in our *BSW Field Education Handbook* (http://www.uwgb.edu/socwork/files/pdf/field_handbook.pdf).

End-of-Semester Course Evaluations. The BSW Program does not use the CCQ as its evaluation tool. Rather students rate how well each course achieves its objectives, which are linked to the practice behaviors, using the following scale: 1=Poor, 2=Weak, 3=Average, 4=Good, and 5=Excellent. Evaluations are averaged across courses for each practice behavior,

and that summary score is used as an outcome measure for each of the practice behaviors. ***The benchmark for the end-of-semester course evaluations is a mean of 4.0 across courses.***

As Embedded Assessment Assignments are scored on a 4-point grade-point scale, Senior Field Evaluations on a "pass/no pass" scale, and End-of-Semester Course Evaluations on a 5-point scale, faculty approved a conversion strategy (see Table 2, below) whereby all outcome measures would ultimately utilize a 5-point scale for ease of averaging across all the measures to assess students' achievement of the competencies.

Table 2: Benchmark and Conversion Scores for 2011-2012

Measure	**Below Benchmark**					**Benchmark or Above**		
Converted Score	**1**	**2**	**2.5**	**3**	**3.5**	**4**	**4.5**	**5**
Embedded Assessment Assignments[a]	Below 60 (F)	60-64 (D)	65-69 (CD)	70-77 (C)	78-82 (BC)	83-87 (B)	88-93 (AB)	94-100 (A)
Field Evaluations[b]	"Pass" not earned on each item					"Pass" earned on each item		
Course Evaluations[c]	1=Poor	2=Weak	3=Average			4=Good	5=Excellent	

[a]Converted scores represent discrete categories (e.g., any grade in the 83-87 range will be converted to a score of "4").

[b]Students either "passed" each item or not. The former was converted to a score of "4" and the latter a score of "1."
[c]Converted scores are continuous and parallel the evaluation score (e.g., an evaluation score of 4.7 is converted to a score of "4.7").

Outcome measures are weighted according to the perceived significance of their contributions to student mastery of the competencies. Field Evaluations were determined to contribute 40% to students' mastery, End-of-Semester Course Evaluations 20%, and Embedded Assessment Assignments 40%. Converted scores are weighted according to this scheme, and a single outcome score is determined for each practice behavior. ***The benchmark for each practice behavior is a mean weighted, converted score of 4.0.*** Practice behavior outcome scores are then averaged to determine the outcome score for each competency. ***The benchmark for each competency is a mean weighted, converted score of 4.0.***

In addition to setting benchmarks for individual outcome measures, faculty determined that, in order to consider our curriculum "successful," ≥83% of students should meet the outcome measure benchmarks for each of the practice behaviors. Eighty-three percent was chosen as it parallels our "B" grade in the major; we wanted our success to be determined by being better than average.

Summary of Results

A table with the results for each of the practice behaviors and competencies for 2011-2012 is in Table 5 of Appendix G. Faculty reviewed this data at three different levels.

First, faculty looked at each of the mean, weighted competency scores. The 4.0 benchmark was met for every single competency. The range of scores varied little, from a low of 4.3 to a high of 4.5, indicating that our students are successfully mastering the 10 practice competencies. Deeper examination of the competency measures does provide for a bit more variability. For example, in examining the percentage of students meeting the overall competency benchmarks, while all of the competencies met the benchmark of having ≥83% of students succeeding, the range was from 86.2% (Competency 2: Standards and Ethics) to 98.5% achievement (Competency 1: Professional Development). As the student achievement rate was ≥94% for the remaining eight competencies, it became clear that our students were having a greater struggle with Competency 2 than the others. Similarly, Competency 2 produced the lowest average assignment score (90.2%). Although it is still within our benchmark, it is noticeably lower than the other Competencies' average assignment scores.

Next, faculty examined the data at the practice behavior level. Only one practice behavior (2.4) did not meet the ≥83% benchmark. However, 4 other practice behaviors were below 90%, and therefore noticeably lower than the others: 2.1, 2.2, 4.2, and 9.4. These observations led to the third level of investigation, which was to look at scores for the embedded assessment assignments. Across the entire curriculum there are only a few assignments where students did not meet Program benchmarks. Not surprisingly, many of those were outcome measures for Competency 2.

Uses of Results

Faculty met in August 2012 during a six hour retreat to review the data regarding the student learning outcomes. Faculty generally agreed that the assessment process, though cumbersome, was extremely helpful. Overall, faculty are extremely satisfied with the results and happy that our curriculum is helping students to master the CSWE competencies. Although this programmatic assessment highlighted a few "weak links" in the curriculum, very few changes were suggested. As 2011-12 was the first year CSWE's competencies were introduced in the curriculum, and therefore the Program only has one complete year of data collected, faculty were hesitant about wanting to simply "react". Rather, discussions revolved around the content of particular embedded assessment assignments, which were the "culprits" of weaker scores. While a few instructors elected to make slight changes to specific embedded assessment assignments, most elected to keep the assignments the same and instead spend more time on the teaching of content with the assumption that students may not have been exposed enough to the concepts we wanted the assignments to capture.

With one minor exception, our present plan is to continue to collect the same data and review the 2012-13 outcomes before making significant programmatic changes. The exception concerns the scoring of the Senior Field Evaluation. As noted above, students are assigned "pass/no pass" for each practice behavior. However, faculty felt that such scores did not adequately reflect the

diversity of student abilities in field settings. Therefore, the Program will begin using a 5-point scale in the 2012-13 year; an average score of "3" will now be required to pass senior field in the spring. This one change necessitates a change to our conversion strategy for Field Evaluations. Table 3 depicts the new conversion table.

Table 3: Benchmark and Conversion Scores for 2012-2013

Measure	Below Benchmark					Benchmark or Above		
Converted Score	1	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5
Embedded Assessment Assignments[a]	Below 60 (F)	60-64 (D)	65-69 (CD)	70-77 (C)	78-82 (BC)	83-87 (B)	88-93 (AB)	94-100 (A)
Field Evaluations[b]	1= Significantly below expectations	2= Somewh at below expectati ons				3=meets expectation s	4=some what above expectati ons	5=Exceed ed expectatio ns
Course Evaluations[c]	1=Poor	2=We ak	3=Average			4=Good	5=Excellent	

[a]Converted scores represent discrete categories (e.g., any grade in the 83-87 range will be converted to a score of "4").
[b]Converted scores represent discrete categories (e.g., any field score of "3" will be converted to a score of "4").
[c]Converted scores are continuous and parallel the evaluation score (e.g., an evaluation score of 4.7 is converted to a score of "4.7").

After faculty reviewed and discussed outcome data, it was shared with our constituent groups. In September of 2012, it was shared with our BSW Program's Advisory Committee at its quarterly meeting. The Committee began by commending the Program for its strong outcomes. It then discussed the lower scores for Competency 2, focusing on how gray this area (standards and ethics) can be. As there are lots of ambiguities in social work ethics, the Committee found it understandable that students may struggle more in this area than others. The Committee also related these scores to our professional continuing education requirements in Social Work. The State of Wisconsin requires all certified social workers to complete 30 hours of continuing education every two years; four of those hours must be in boundaries and ethics. The Committee felt this continuing education mandate reflects the necessity of lifelong learning in this area and commented that if professionals are expected to be continuously learning in these areas we should expect this will be an area needed for further student growth and development. Results were also shared in January of 2013 with the NEW Partnership for Children and Families Steering Committee. This is a group of county administrators from NE Wisconsin who provide direction on child welfare training issues for the region. They also commended the Program for its positive outcomes, but did not provide any further feedback. Finally, outcome data is posted on our website, which is another mandate by the CSWE. Students and other stakeholders are therefore able to compare our Program's outcome data with that of other schools. Our data can be found at: http://www.uwgb.edu/socwork/bsw/curriculum.asp.

SECTION D: PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS & STUDENT SUCCESS

Describe your program's major accomplishments since the last Review (e.g., internship program, enrollment increases, faculty scholarly activity, graduate school admission, diversification of students/faculty, program and/or faculty awards). Also describe your students' successes as well as faculty/staff professional development activities and how they impacted your program.

Program Accomplishments

Our Program has weathered a number of changes since the last Review, including the turnover of a majority of the faculty. Spring of 2008 was a turbulent time for the Program: Dr. Anne Kok died in a tragic car accident, Loretta Larkey retired, Dr. Kevin Roeder returned to social work practice, and Melinda Gushwa left for a family medical emergency. Drs. Martin and Sallmann, as well as Matthew Mattila, the Child Welfare Coordinator, were the only remaining faculty. Dr. Martin has subsequently retired; however, each open position has resulted in an extremely strong hire. The Program currently has no open positions, and most of our faculty have been with the Program since at least fall of 2008. As a faculty we are collaborative and have a strong understanding of the entire curriculum. We are extremely proud of the strength of our faculty and the reputation we have maintained despite the impact of this transition.

We are also proud of the amount of community service our students provide. BSW Social Work Students provide over 16,500 hours of service annually to the community and region through their practicums. Most of these internships are in the public domain, where students serve our most vulnerable citizens. Additionally, the annual senior Program Evaluation project provides students practical familiarity with solving community social problems while providing a valuable service to our community partners. Program faculty members are proud of their close relationship with the profession and believe strongly in the lifelong learning model.

Interdisciplinary collaboration is another area where our Program excels. We are well-grounded in our campus and community connections, and proudly boast many examples. These include:

- In collaboration with Nursing Program faculty, we have co-taught online course modules, co-developed and received two grants, and co-presented at a national conference.
- We continue to partner with First Nations Studies on the "First Nations Fusion Project" which addresses infusion of First Nations content into Social Work courses (and co-presented this model at a national Social Work Education conference), contributed to First Nations' "Heritage Month," and received a UW System IRE Campus Activity Grant for a project focused on "Learning from Elders in the Oral Tradition."
- We have been working for many years with the Phuture Phoenix Program of the Education Department which brings local 5th grade students to campus to learn about our school and instill enthusiasm for a college education.
- We were active in helping develop and launch the LGBTQ Center on campus and collaborate with the UW-Green Bay Safe Ally Program to teach colleagues how to become allies to LGBTQ students and staff.
- We partner with Northeast Wisconsin Technical College and St. Norbert College to organize Brown County's Annual Martin Luther King Jr. Celebration.

- With the Northeast Wisconsin (NEW) Partnership for Children and Families, we continue to develop and enhance curricula for our child welfare stipend program and county and tribal practitioners.
- We maintain our long-standing connection with more than 100 community agencies across Northeast Wisconsin who host our undergraduate and graduate students in field placements.

Such ongoing engagement with the broader public stimulates renewal of our curriculum. We "bring the community to the classroom and the classroom to the community" through our field placements, experiential assignments and course activities such as case studies, role plays, interviews, guest speakers, and both formal and informal research efforts in collaboration with area schools, social service agencies, and the legal system.

In addition to the three major accomplishments above, the Program has also achieved the following:

- We gained an additional full-time instructional academic staff position with the addition of the part-time cohort in the MSW Program in 2008-09;
- We were UW-Green Bay's Program nominee for the 2012 Regents Academic Departmental Teaching Excellence Award;
- We have a large portion of Program graduates who "give back" to the BSW Program by serving as field instructors for new generations of students. Over the past two years, BSW /MSW graduates have served as field instructors for 39 students;
- The Program has successfully maintained the Title IV-E grant and maximizes the use of match funding. This provides us the opportunity to offer stipends to BSW and MSW students (stipends cover the cost of tuition and fees) interested in pursuing careers in public or tribal child welfare, provide the Child Welfare Coordinator position, offer child welfare courses, as well as funding for all faculty to attend conferences and ability to purchase adequate supplies for the BSW and Collaborative MSW.

Student Successes

- Results of four student surveys suggest graduates are employable and appreciate their social work education.
- Specific to the Child Welfare Stipend Program, data indicate that these graduates all obtain employment in the area of child welfare within 4 months of graduation.
- Each year BSW students have been the recipients of University Leadership awards. Since 2007, 11 BSW students have received the Chancellor's Leadership Medallion, and 6 students the University Leadership Award.
- A majority of BSW students below to the Social Work Club, which is extremely active in community service activities. Select activities from the past five years have benefited: Family Services of NEW, NEW Community Shelter, St. John's Emergency Shelter, Special Olympics, Salvation Army, Marion House, Cerebral Palsy Center, NEW Curative Rehabilitation Center, Littlest Tumor Foundation, NAMI, and Take Back the Night.

Faculty and Staff Development

Social Work faculty and staff actively participate in various professional development opportunities. Over the last four years, we attended more than 30 off-campus conferences, often as presenters. We actively participate in Faculty Development Conferences and send representatives to the UW System President's Summit on Excellence in Teaching and Learning and OPID conferences. Our program provides financial support for the purchase of teaching resource materials such as videos and tuition for courses to enhance teaching excellence.

In support of the scholarship of teaching and learning, in recent years we received numerous grants and awards including a UW System IRE Curriculum Development Grant, and several grants from the Center for Teaching and Learning (CATL), including a Teaching Enhancement Grant, an Instructional Development Award, and a Faculty Development in Online Learning Grant (with Nursing). Additionally, faculty are involved with Lesson Study Projects on teaching grammar, interdisciplinary thinking (in collaboration with Nursing), and teaching APA citation style (with Human Development and English Composition). The former Lesson Study was on grammar instruction and the exercises developed from the project are being utilized by a Political Science colleague. Other awards include Teaching Scholars grants to Drs. Sallmann, Higgins, and Himmelheber, and nominations for "Student-Nominated Faculty Teaching Awards" for Profs. Trimberger and Higgins.

Overall, the culture of the Program values and promotes opportunities for professional development. For tenure-track faculty, such support if viewed as investing in the successful tenure and promotion of junior faculty. More broadly, active engagement in professional development is highly valued by the social work profession, which views "lifelong learning" as a requisite part of ethical and effective social work practice. Faculty engagement in professional development is one way we model professional behaviors to our students.

SECTION E: PROGRAM ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND ANALYSIS

Provide an analysis of the data (both survey and institutional enrollment data) provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. What does this data tell you about the program's strengths and weaknesses. Describe what specific actions were taken or are intended to be taken based on the conclusions drawn from the analysis.

Program Enrollment Data and Analysis (see Appendices D, E, and F)

Students enter the BSW Program the fall of their junior year and progress through the Program in a cohort model. Admission is capped at 40 students, which means the Program's capacity is 80 students each year.

The Program has averaged about 73 majors over the past five years (see Appendix D: Academic Plan: Social Work). While the numbers have decreased slightly, much of that decrease is the result of students leaving the major during their junior year for either not meeting academic retention standards or determining another major is a better fit. For example, in fall of 2009 we had 37 juniors admitted to the major. By graduation, five of those students were no longer in

social work. This example is unusual; it is more common for us to lose 2-3 students before graduation. This assertion is supported by the numbers of graduated majors annually.

Social work remains a highly sought after degree. Applications have increased over the past several years from the mid-to-upper 40s to almost 58 applicants in 2011, and admissions have remained consistent over that time. An area for further investigation is to try to better understand which students are not successful in our Program and their unique needs.

For the most part, BSW students are similar to their UW-Green Bay undergraduate counterparts. However, there are three major exceptions. First, BSW students are overwhelmingly female, ranging from 89% to 95% of the major over the past five years. This is pretty typical of national trends as social work is still viewed primarily as a female-dominated profession. Second, BSW students tend to be more racially/ethnically diverse. Over the past 5 years, 12% of BSW students are identified as "minority" students while multicultural students comprised an average of only 8.2% of all undergraduates at UW-Green Bay. In examining the characteristics of our graduated majors, this proportion remains fairly consistent, with 11.8% of BSW students being identified as "Students of Color." We attribute our success in recruiting and retaining diverse students to the outreach activities we engage in with the College of the Menominee Nation and the American Intercultural Center.

The final area where Social Work appears substantially different from the general pool of UW-Green Bay undergraduates is in the portion of students who began at UW-Green Bay as transfer students. Over the past five years 60.8% of BSW students started as transfer students, and the trend is that the proportion has been increasing. In 2011, 70% of BSW students began as transfer students. However, these students are completing a majority of their credits (107.2 on average) at UW-Green Bay. Additionally, the fact that they have only completed an average of 29.6 credits before transferring to UW-Green Bay suggests they are coming here before completing two year degrees. We believe that this high percentage of transfer students speaks to our reputation in the community as well as the relationships we have developed with UW-Green Bay's Adult Degree Program and academic advisors in regional technical schools and 2-year colleges. As a Program we are in the process of evaluating whether or not transfer students are faring as well as other students in the major. Anecdotally, we know many express having done extremely well academically at their prior institutions and report initial struggles at UW-Green Bay. We would like to collect some of our own Program data to determine any trends of academic performance.

Currently, there are 7.5 instructional FTE (5 faculty FTE and 2.5 instructional staff FTE). Additionally, we have a Child Welfare Coordinator; this is a non-instructional position and with a primary responsibility for coordinating the Title IV-E program for both the MSW and BSW Programs. Our Child Welfare Coordinator typically teaches one course per year. We have operated with 7.5 instructional FTE since the 2008-09 year, which is the first year our Collaborative MSW Program was operating all of its full- and part-time cohorts. OIRA data does not accurately reflect these figures primarily because our UW-Oshkosh partners for the Collaborative MSW Program have been included in our faculty counts for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Data from 2008 appear to not account for the faculty we lost that year (Drs. Anne Kok and Kevin Roeder) and therefore under-represent the number of instructors we actually had. Of the 7.5 instructional FTE, 3.75 are directed at work in the BSW Program and 3.75 at work in the MSW

Program. While the Program has enough permanent instructional faculty to deliver both the BSW and MSW Programs, with the retirement of Dr. Judy Martin in 2012 we no longer have any full professors, and Dr. Jolanda Sallmann is the only tenured faculty. The Program anticipates that Dr. Doreen Higgins will successfully complete the promotion and tenure process this year. Subsequently, the Program should have other faculty seeking promotion and tenure in 2014-15 (Dr. Akakpo), 2015-16 (Ms. Trimberger), and 2017-18 (Dr. Himmelheber). Each of these Assistant Professors received extremely positive reviews from the BSW Executive Committee and we look forward to their lengthy and successful careers at UW-Green Bay. Despite the challenges encountered in 2008, the Program has made a tremendous comeback and is well respected in the community and the university.

In reviewing the Alumni Survey data for 2007-2011 (see Appendix E: Alumni Survey), BSW students tend to have rated their educational experiences at UW-Green Bay more positively than other undergraduate students. Mean scores for all satisfaction ratings related to the major were higher than for other students, though the difference was less than half a point. BSW students' mean ratings for their overall educational experiences were either the same or slightly higher than other undergraduate students. Additionally, BSW students rated preparation and importance of general education outcomes much the same rate as other undergraduates. Notable exceptions are that BSW students were much less likely (1/2 point) to rate the understanding of "at least one Fine Art" as "very important or important," and they were much more likely to rate the following areas as "very important or important": "understanding social, political, geographic, and economic structure"; "understanding the impact of social institutions and values"; and "understanding the causes and effects of stereotyping and racism." Although BSW students were less likely to rate their preparation in "biology and physical sciences" and "understanding the impact of science and technology" as "excellent or good," their mean scores closely parallel their counterparts', suggesting similarities between both groups. These preferences strongly reflect the focus of required support courses for the major as well as our diversity, social justice, social policy, and service delivery competencies.

The greatest differences between BSW students and their counterparts is that BSW students were much more likely (80% vs. 53%) to rate their current job as "very related" to their majors. This fact is not surprising given that Social Work is a professional program and there is still a strong job market for BSW-level Social Workers in the region. We are pleased that our major continues to be practical and marketable and that our graduates are able to find jobs that utilize their degrees and expertise. The practicality of this degree could also help explain why BSW alumni are also more likely (85% vs. 63%) to indicate that, if they "could start college over" they would still complete the BSW at UW-Green Bay.

The patterns described above also hold true primarily in assessment of the Graduating Senior Survey data for 2007-2011 (see Appendix F: Graduating Student Survey). A few unique areas deserve further attention. First, in rating the major, although mean scores did not differ much between groups, BSW students were much more likely (10% or more) to rate the following areas an "A": frequency of course offerings in the major, times courses were offered, quality of internship, faculty encouragement of educational goals, and in-class faculty-student interaction. These areas are not surprising as our students move through the program in a cohort model and are guaranteed entrance into their major classes. Additionally, due to smaller class sizes, students

receive more individual attention from faculty. Second, regarding the "educational experiences" items, BSW students were much more likely to rate as "strongly agree or agree" the following: "UWGB encourages students to become involved in community affairs"; their education at UWGB has provided a "competitive edge," and that they had "many opportunities to apply their learning to real situations." We see these outcomes as the result of the extensive community involvement BSW students are immersed in during their tenure in the Program, including field placements, the annual Program Evaluation project, Social Work Club activities, and assignments such as the Macro Change Proposal required in the junior year. These activities require students to be engaged and also provide valuable networking opportunities with potential employers. BSW students y were also less likely (49% vs. 55%) to strongly agree or agree that there is a strong commitment to racial harmony on our campus. This last finding may be a result of their strong, self-rated, proficiency in ethnic studies.

Despite the frequency and intensiveness of advising opportunities within social work for students, some of our majors are less satisfied with the advising experience when compared with their non-social work major counterparts. This finding came as a surprise to the faculty as we would have predicted this is an area where students would have highly rated their experiences. We discussed this finding at length and a couple interpretations were suggested:

- Anecdotally, we know that students are often frustrated when they cannot enroll in required support courses and that frustration is often taken out on the advisor.
- As students do not enter the major until their junior year, most of the academic advising revolving around general education requirements has already been completed and students may therefore only frame their advising experiences in terms of course selection rather than the additional student evaluation work our advisors engage in.

Overall, we are ultimately unclear what this information means. An initial step the Program has agreed to is to have a conversation with students about what their advising expectations are so that, as a Program, we understand our students' needs and can potentially clarify the multiple roles engaged in by our BSW advisors.

Finally, overall, BSW students were generally satisfied with the services and resources available on campus. However, there were a few areas where BSW students differed from their counterparts (5% difference in an A or B rating). BSW students were less satisfied with: library services, the Registrar's office, the Writing Center, and the Bookstore. On the other hand, they were more satisfied with the Academic Advising Office, Student Life, the University Union, the American Intercultural Center, and the International Center. Their positive evaluations make sense in that BSW students generally seem more engaged in campus life, and the areas they rated positively are mostly related to support and co-curricular activities. Their lower satisfaction with the more academic resources is less clear. It is possible these ratings result from the fact that our students use some of these services less than their counterparts as the major does intensive academic support work with students. These will remain areas to watch in the future.

SECTION F: CONCLUSIONS AND VISION FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

End your report with a general concluding, summary statement about what was learned as a result of the review including your program's strengths and areas in need of improvement. Describe your program's plan for future development including the program's major goals for the next seven-year period. These goals should be established with the understanding that they will be used to guide program planning and development and serve as a framework for your program's next Self-Study Report and Academic Program Review and Student Outcomes Assessment.

Program Strengths & Areas for Improvement

This Program Review has demonstrated Social Work's many Program strengths, particularly its ability to facilitate students' mastery of the 10 Practice Competencies and the strength and stability of its faculty. The Program is embedded in the community and responsive to emerging trends, which are relayed to the Program through the BSW Advisory Committee. Review of alumni and graduating student data highlight the effective ways in which the Program promotes civic involvement and service learning. Most apparent is the field practicum component of the Program. In Social Work, field placements are the "signature pedagogy" of accredited programs. Students complete placements in a wide array of regional community-based non-profit and public human service agencies as a significant part of their social work education. In these settings, students acquire the knowledge and skills (competency) needed for professional social work practice with diverse individuals, groups, families and communities. Students are matched with field experiences that will best meet their interests and needs for professional growth. These placements benefit the agencies as well as our students and Programs. This fact is reflected in the high portion of BSW graduates working in fields that require a BSW degree.

This Review highlighted two primary areas for improvement. First, student learning outcomes noted areas for curricular improvement, most notably in helping students master Competency 2. The second area pertains to advising within the major; it appears some of our majors are less satisfied with the experience than their counterparts. As part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process the Program has started conducting an annual review of the Program by current students. Several items in the evaluation relate to the advising process. It is hoped that this information may help us better understand students' unmet needs in this area.

Future Development & Program Goals

The Program has identified a number of future goals:

1. Our most immediate goal will be to successfully complete the reaffirmation of accreditation process for our BSW Program. The CSWE will make its decision in February of 2014.
2. Another important goal is the creation of a plan for the seamless dissolution of our Collaborative MSW Program and advancing the creation of a solo MSW Program. Although we are still in the process of finalizing our dissolution plan with UW-Oshkosh, our goal is to welcome our first solo cohort in fall 2015. To meet this goal we must complete university, UW System, Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and CSWE procedures. This is a tight turnaround that will require many departmental resources but the faculty is excited about the process. Successfully launching a solo MSW Program will also require the addition of three

new full-time instructional staff: 2 of these positions will be tenure-track faculty members (required for CSWE requirements), and the other will be an academic staff position.

3. A new travel course to Ghana will be finalized and offered for the summer of 2014.
4. The Program is currently exploring the feasibility of developing a certificate or emphasis in gerontology for the BSW Program. It is anticipated that a proposal for the certificate/emphasis will be completed in summer 2015, after the solo MSW Program has been accredited.
5. Due to Dr. Higgins' reputation in geriatric social work scholarship, the Program has been invited to participate in a national social work initiative aimed at preparing students for practice with individuals with disabilities and older persons I their families. The initiative will involve infusing aging and disability related content into the curriculum, evaluating student learning outcomes, and providing stipends and specialty training to students interested in working in these areas.
6. An ongoing goal is the maintenance of the Title IV-E grant. Although the grant has been successfully maintained for nearly two decades, the formula for granting funds has decreased substantially since the last Review. For FY 2005-06 the net IV-E reimbursements rates were 50% for training and 33% for indirect costs; however, for FY 2012-13 the net reimbursement rates are only at 36.75% for training and 24.5% for indirect costs. These reductions have required us to reduce our travel and supply expenses and utilize our 136 and 150 accounts for on-going program expenses. Despite these decreases, Title IV-E funds remain an invaluable source of support and the Program has every intention of making it a priority to maintain the funding.
7. A final ongoing goal is the continual monitoring of our Program Assessment Plan. Faculty meet for annual August retreats which provide a forum for annual program review and curriculum discussions.

Appendix A:
2012-2013 Undergraduate Catalog

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN GREEN BAY

2012 - 2013 UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

Social Work

- Department Overview
- Course Descriptions
- Department Website

Professional Major
(Bachelor of Social Work)

Associate Professor – Jolanda Sallmann (chair)
Assistant Professors – Francis Akakpo, Doreen Higgins, Gail Trimberger
Lecturers – Joan Groessl, Karen Jick, Mark Quam
Faculty Associate – Matthew Mattila

Social work is an exciting and dynamic profession. The major in Social Work, leading to the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) degree, prepares a graduate for a career as a social worker working with a broad range of individuals, families, organizations, and communities. Graduates of the UW-Green Bay Social Work Professional Program secure positions in programs serving populations that include the elderly, children and their families, persons challenged by developmental and other disabilities, juvenile and adult offenders, persons experiencing mental or physical health issues, and other groups identified in this ever-evolving field. Social workers provide direct service and work for social justice through advocacy and, for example, social policy development and change.

The Social Work Professional Program has full accreditation from the Council on Social Work Education. The BSW degree from UW-Green Bay allows the graduate to obtain state certification and provides a broad range of employment opportunities.

Majors may elect to enroll in the child welfare emphasis, preparing for a career in child welfare practice. Students who have an interest in a career in public or tribal child welfare can apply for a stipend through The Child Welfare Education Program.

A Bachelor of Social Work degree provides advanced status for students seeking a Master's Degree in Social Work.

Program Entry Requirements
Students who wish to major in Social Work must make formal application for admission to the program before the end of February each year. This applies to those transferring from other institutions as well as students continuing at UW-Green Bay. Application materials are available from the UW-Green Bay Social Work website.

To apply to the BSW degree program, students must first be admitted to the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay. They must have completed at least 27 credits before applying, and 48 credits before beginning the Social Work program. These credits must include at least four supporting courses for the major, with an overall cumulative grade point average of at least 2.5. Applicants must also have demonstrated an interest in the profession by volunteering in the field or through relevant employment, as indicated by letters of reference and the essay accompanying their application. A caregiver background check is part of the application process.

Prospective Social Work majors should seek early advising from Social Work faculty by contacting the Social Work office to schedule an appointment.

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN GREEN BAY

2012 - 2013 UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

Social Work: Requirements for the Major

- Department Overview
- Department Website

Professional Major

Supporting Courses, (33-37 credits):
Required:

Note: ENG COMP 105 is satisfied for students with an ACT English score of 32 or higher.

COMM SCI 301: Foundations for Social Research (3 credits)

ENG COMP 105: Expository Writing (3 credits)

HUM BIOL 102: Introduction to Human Biology (3 credits)

HUM DEV 210: Introduction to Human Development (3 credits)

SOC WORK 275: American Social Welfare (3 credits)

One (1) of These:

ANTHRO 304: Family, Kin, and Community (3 credits)

HUM DEV 353: Family Development (3 credits)

SOCIOL 308: Sociology of the Family (3 credits)

One (1) of These (students are strongly encouraged to take COMM SCI 205):

BUS ADM 216: Business Statistics (4 credits)

COMM SCI 205: Social Science Statistics (4 credits)

MATH 260: Introductory Statistics (4 credits)

Human Behavior, (One (1) of These):

HUM BIOL 206: Fertility, Reproduction, and Family Planning (3 credits)

HUM BIOL 324: The Biology of Women (3 credits)

HUM DEV 331: Infancy and Early Childhood (3 credits)

HUM DEV 332: Middle Childhood and Adolescence (3 credits)

HUM DEV 336: Gender Development Across the Lifespan (3 credits)

HUM DEV 342: Cross Cultural Human Development (3 credits)

HUM DEV 343: Adulthood and Aging (3 credits)

HUM DEV 346: Culture, Development and Health (3 credits)

PSYCH 401: Psychology of Women (3 credits)

PSYCH 417: Psychology of Cognitive Processes (3 credits)

PSYCH 435: Abnormal Psychology (3 credits)

SOC WORK 250: You and Your Future: Living and Working in an Aging Society (3 credits)

Government, (One (1) of These):

POL SCI 101: American Government and Politics (3 credits)

POL SCI 202: Introduction to Public Policy (3 credits)

Social Environmental Challenges, (One (1) of These):

DJS 251: Sustainable Development (3 credits)

DJS 348: Gender and the Law (3 credits)

PSYCH 390: Environmental Psychology (3 credits)

SOC WORK 490: International Social Work in Guatemala (5 credits)

SOCIOL 310: Urban Sociology (3 credits)

UR RE ST 205: Urban Social Problems (3 credits)

UR RE ST 305: Urban Politics and Policy (3 credits)

UR RE ST 312: Community Politics (3 credits)

UR RE ST 341: The City and its Regional Context (3 credits)

Social Theory, (One (1) of These):

DJS 204: Freedom and Social Control (3 credits)

DJS 241: Introduction to Women's & Gender Studies (3 credits)

DJS 325: Law and Society (3 credits)

DJS 340: Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods (3 credits)

DJS 362: Power and Change in America (3 credits)

DJS 437: Feminist Theory (3 credits)

PSYCH 330: Social Psychology (3 credits)

SOCIOL 202: Introduction to Sociology (3 credits)

Women's Studies, (One (1) of These):

May include courses used to meet requirements above.

HUM BIOL 206: Fertility, Reproduction, and Family Planning (3 credits)

HUM BIOL 324: The Biology of Women (3 credits)

HUM DEV 336: Gender Development Across the Lifespan (3 credits)

PSYCH 401: Psychology of Women (3 credits)

DJS 241: Introduction to Women's & Gender Studies (3 credits)

DJS 340: Gender and Sustainable Livelihoods (3 credits)

DJS 348: Gender and the Law (3 credits)

DJS 437: Feminist Theory (3 credits)

Upper-Level Courses, (38 credits):
Required:

SOC WORK 300: Field Experience in a Human Service Agency (1 credit)

SOC WORK 305: The Social Work Profession (3 credits)

SOC WORK 313: Social Work Skills Lab I (1 credit)

SOC WORK 323: Social Work Skills Lab II (1 credit)

SOC WORK 370: Social Work Methods I (3 credits)

SOC WORK 371: Human Behavior and the Social Environment (3 credits)

SOC WORK 402: Field Practicum I (5 credits)

SOC WORK 403: Field Practicum II (5 credits)

SOC WORK 411: Social Work Methods II (3 credits)

SOC WORK 413: Social Work Skills Lab III (1 credit)

SOC WORK 420: Social Work Methods III (3 credits)

SOC WORK 423: Social Work Skills Lab IV (1 credit)

SOC WORK 431: Social Policy Analysis I (2 credits)

SOC WORK 433: Social Policy Analysis II (2 credits)

SOC WORK 461: Program Evaluation I (2 credits)

SOC WORK 463: Program Evaluation II (2 credits)

Area of Emphasis: Child Welfare

Upper-Level Courses, (12 credits):
Required:

HUM DEV 331: Infancy and Early Childhood (3 credits)

HUM DEV 332: Middle Childhood and Adolescence (3 credits)

SOC WORK 351: Overview of the Child Welfare System (3 credits)

SOC WORK 451: Child Welfare Practice (3 credits)

Additional note for students pursuing the Child Welfare emphasis:

In addition, for students pursuing the child welfare emphasis, SOC WORK 402 and 403 involve practicum placement in an agency that serves children and families. The courses HUM DEV 331 and HUM DEV 332 cannot be used as a Human Behavior course if in the Child Welfare Sequence.

Appendix B:
Academic Affairs Council Memo

Info is in Academic Affairs Council memo 5.21.07

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

RECEIVED
MAY 11 2007
Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies

May 10, 2007

To: Sue Hammersmith, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

From: Mark Everingham, Academic Affairs Council chair

Re: Social Work Program Review Self-Study Report

The Academic Affairs Council completed its evaluation of the Social Work Program Review Self-Study Report submitted in 2006. On May 1, 2007, the AAC engaged Social Work chair Anne Kok in a productive dialogue and received cogent answers to questions about the program.

Social Work's faculty and staff offer a well-designed program that demonstrates a strong commitment to the intellectual and practical dimensions of understanding and facilitating solutions to complex and deep-rooted social problems in our community. The program is exemplary of interdisciplinarity with 12 required or selected supporting courses from a variety of disciplines. The course *Human Behavior in the Social Environment* is a requirement that examines how multiple settings and conditions influence human behavior. Additional staff in the past two years has led to a drop in the number of ad hoc course sections.

The assessment plan for the program is well-conceived and robust in its capacity to measure fourteen student learning outcomes and program effectiveness with a variety of classroom-based evaluations and presentations as well as field assessments and experiences. In response to the 2000-01 Program Review, the program developed and added specific indicators and measuring instruments for each of the fourteen Core Competencies. The data in appendix C of the Self-Study Report present a concise and accurate picture of student performance from 2001 to 2005. Social Work reviews the relationship of courses to the core competencies in an effort to improve assessment. The AAC expects this type of diligence to continue.

A concern was raised about negative student feedback in the Graduating Senior Survey (2001-2006) with regard to the perceived ineffectiveness of general education courses in helping to meet proficiency requirements. This result may indicate students comparison of the value of broad general education courses to specific core Social Work courses. Nevertheless, Social Work maintains its commitment to providing its graduates with a broad liberal arts background through rigorous general education requirements and strong student advising. The program is to be commended for the development of a new course in Ethnic Studies in conjunction with the arrival of a new faulty member in 2005. While the course *Cross Cultural Diversity and the Helping Professions* 380 is popular, Social Work students can take any Ethnic Studies course to satisfy the general education requirement.

The Diversity Mentorship Committee was created to address diversity issues among faculty and students. Unfortunately, the Committee is inactive at this time. The initial focuses were on recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and students and review of curricular content. The chair indicted that the recent creation of the Masters of Social Work program draws energy and time away from this effort, but there is a commitment to revive the Committee next year. The program will continue to work with personnel from Human Services agencies in surrounding communities and former Indian reservations. It should be noted that 10 percent of all Social Work students and 13 percent of graduates are minorities, higher than the university as a whole. Also, the newly approved Bachelor of Applied Studies would help recruitment in the area of diversity as well as address declining in numbers of nontraditional students. However, prospective BAS students could not enroll as majors in the Bachelor of Social Work program

The Child Welfare sequence is a direct response to needs in the region. It requires four additional courses to the BSW degree. The emphasis is characterized by much turnover and burnout because of heavy demands on students. Stipends will be available in 2007-08 for students who work in public child welfare agencies for one year after graduation.

The impact of the Master of Social Work on the Bachelor of Social Work was discussed. While the MSW was not part of the BSW Self-Study Report, the AAC wished to explore this aspect. The MSW requires at least three faulty members to be involved in classes and meetings held at the UW-Fox Valley campus for purposes of accreditation. Travel and teaching related to the MSW has added to the workload of the faculty and staff who must also serve the BSW. The MSW depends heavily on Title IVE funding, but some courses will be taught on a cost recovery basis starting in summer 2007.

CC: Anne Kok, Social Work chair
Fritz Erickson, Dean of Professional and Graduate Studies
Pat Przybelski, Program Associate, Secretary of the Faculty and Academic Staff
Tim Sewall, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs

Appendix C:
Dean's Memo

UNIVERSITY of WISCONSIN
GREEN BAY

August 7, 2009
To: Julia Wallace, Provost
From: Derryl Block, Interim Dean Professional and Graduate Studies DB
Re: AAC Social Work Review
CC: Tim Sewall, Judy Martin, SOFAS Office

After review of the October 5, 2006 Social Work Nursing Self Study Report and the May 10, 2007Academic Affairs Council (AAC) Nursing Review, I conclude that the Professional Program in Social Work:

- Is a well designed and implemented program with well defined interdisciplinary characteristics;
- Has a well developed assessment plan with measures encompassing each evaluation of each of the Program's defined core competencies;
- Successfully maintains accreditation by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE).
- Had a higher percentage of minority students than the campus at large at the time of the self study;
- Effectively collaborates with the social work and child welfare stakeholders in the community and region including good integration with the NEW Partnership for Children and Families; and
- Has effectively created a collaborative Masters in Social Work with UW-Oshkosh.

After consultation with program faculty, I recommend the following actions:

1. Continue monitoring and quality improvement regarding processes and outcomes as part of CSWE accreditation requirements;
2. Carefully consider program size regarding balance of resources available for BSW and MSW including pursuing options for moving the part time MSW from fee-recovery to GPR funding;
3. Pursue avenues for having more tenure/tenure track faculty who can teach in both the BSW and MSW programs as opposed to masters prepared lecturers who can only teach in the BSW program;
4. Continue collaboration with social work and child welfare professionals in the community and region;
5. Maintain and even increase scholarly activity.

Appendix D:
Academic Plan: Social Work

Academic Plan: Social Work

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

	Fall Headcounts				
	2007	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**	**2011**
Declared Majors, end of term	73	74	83	65	69
Declared Minors, end of term	.	.	.	.	.

	Fall Declared Majors - Characteristics									
	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
Female	65	89%	70	95%	75	90%	58	89%	63	91%
Minority	10	14%	8	11%	10	12%	7	11%	8	12%
Age 26 or older	17	23%	19	26%	19	23%	13	20%	16	23%
Location of HS: Brown County	13	18%	14	19%	20	24%	19	29%	13	19%
Location of HS: Wisconsin	65	89%	67	91%	80	96%	62	95%	63	91%
Attending Full Time	65	89%	69	93%	73	88%	60	92%	68	99%
Freshmen	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Sophomores	2	3%	3	4%	3	4%	5	8%	7	10%
Juniors	23	32%	28	38%	30	36%	21	32%	26	38%
Seniors	48	66%	43	58%	50	60%	39	60%	36	52%

	Fall Declared Majors - Characteristics				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Average HS Cumulative G.P.A.	3.34	3.30	3.34	3.26	3.21
Average ACT Composite Score	21.3	20.8	20.7	21.5	21.9
Average ACT Reading Score	22.3	21.7	21.4	22.1	23.4
Average ACT English Score	21.1	20.4	20.0	21.2	21.8
Average ACT Math Score	20.5	20.0	20.3	21.2	21.2
Average ACT Science Score	21.5	20.9	20.8	21.6	22.0

Academic Plan: Social Work

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

	Fall Declared Majors - Characteristics				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Percent started as Freshmen	52%	41%	36%	37%	30%
Percent started as Transfers	48%	59%	64%	63%	70%
Percent with prior AA degree	23%	31%	27%	14%	20%
Percent with prior BA degree	10%	11%	8%	3%	1%

	Calendar Year Headcounts				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Graduated Majors (May, Aug. & Dec.)	33	33	31	39	27
Graduated Minors (May, Aug. & Dec.)	.	.	.	.	.

	Characteristics of Graduated Majors									
	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
Graduates who are... Women	32	97%	28	85%	29	94%	37	95%	23	85%
... Students of Color	3	9%	4	12%	4	13%	4	10%	4	15%
... Over 26 Years Old	8	24%	6	18%	10	32%	16	41%	10	37%
Graduates earning Degree Honors	17	52%	15	45%	12	39%	22	56%	12	44%

	Characteristics of Graduated Majors				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Average Credits Completed Anywhere	135	138	143	133	135
Average Credits Completed at UWGB	108	119	108	101	100
Average Cum GPA for Graduates	3.47	3.49	3.44	3.53	3.45

Academic Subject: SOC WORK

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

			Headcount Enrollments, Credit-bearing Activities				
			2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Lectures	1-Lower	1-Spring	40	.	.	.	.
		2-Summer	.	.	.	4	4
		3-Fall	109	137	92	82	59
		All	149	137	92	86	63
	2-Upper	1-Spring	294	262	280	278	236
		2-Summer	8	7	4	.	14
		3-Fall	241	223	246	192	214
		All	543	492	530	470	464
	3-Grad	1-Spring	78	101	113	122	119
		2-Summer	27	20	23	22	31
		3-Fall	102	126	115	107	131
		All	207	247	251	251	281
	All		899	876	873	807	808
IST/FEX	1-Lower	1-Spring	.	.	.	.	.
		2-Summer	.	.	.	.	.
		3-Fall	.	.	.	.	.
		All	.	.	.	.	.
	2-Upper	1-Spring	76	68	73	71	59
		2-Summer	3	3	.	.	.
		3-Fall	33	34	40	28	32
		All	112	105	113	99	91
	3-Grad	1-Spring	7	8	29	27	31

	2-Summer	.	.	17	17	18
	3-Fall	8	14	13	11	14
	All	15	22	59	55	63
All		127	127	172	154	154
All		1026	1003	1045	961	962

Academic Subject: SOC WORK

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

			Student Credit Hours, Credit-bearing Activities				
			2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Lectures	1-Lower	1-Spring	120	.	.	.	.
		2-Summer	.	.	.	12	12
		3-Fall	326	411	276	246	177
		All	446	411	276	258	189
	2-Upper	1-Spring	672	584	640	612	536
		2-Summer	24	21	12	.	42
		3-Fall	517	465	508	394	444
		All	1213	1070	1160	1006	1022
	3-Grad	1-Spring	233	294	332	357	355
		2-Summer	69	50	92	88	114
		3-Fall	290	350	319	298	365
		All	592	694	743	743	834
	All		2251	2175	2179	2007	2045
IST/FEX	1-Lower	1-Spring	.	.	.	.	.
		2-Summer	.	.	.	.	.
		3-Fall	.	.	.	.	.
		All	.	.	.	.	.
	2-Upper	1-Spring	217	201	201	227	167
		2-Summer	14	6	.	.	.
		3-Fall	165	166	195	140	160
		All	396	373	396	367	327
	3-Grad	1-Spring	28	32	84	78	84

	2-Summer	.	.	17	17	18
	3-Fall	32	56	52	44	56
	All	60	88	153	139	158
All		456	461	549	506	485

Academic Subject: SOC WORK

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

			Lectures and Lab/Discussion Sections (#)				
			2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Lectures	1-Lower	1-Spring	1	.	.	.	.
		2-Summer	.	.	.	1	1
		3-Fall	4	4	2	2	2
		All	5	4	2	3	3
	2-Upper	1-Spring	13	12	13	13	13
		2-Summer	1	1	1	.	1
		3-Fall	11	10	10	10	10
		All	25	23	24	23	24
	3-Grad	1-Spring	10	14	15	16	16
		2-Summer	2	2	2	2	4
		3-Fall	10	14	15	14	13
		All	22	30	32	32	33
	All		52	57	58	58	60
All			52	57	58	58	60

Academic Subject: SOC WORK

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

			Average Section Size of Lectures				
			2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Lectures	1-Lower	1-Spring	40.0	.	.	.	.
		2-Summer	.	.	.	4.0	4.0
		3-Fall	27.3	34.3	46.0	41.0	29.5
		All	29.8	34.3	46.0	28.7	21.0
	2-Upper	1-Spring	22.6	21.8	21.5	21.4	18.2
		2-Summer	8.0	7.0	4.0	.	14.0
		3-Fall	21.9	22.3	24.6	19.2	21.4
		All	21.7	21.4	22.1	20.4	19.3
	3-Grad	1-Spring	7.8	7.2	7.5	7.6	7.4
		2-Summer	13.5	10.0	11.5	11.0	7.8
		3-Fall	10.2	9.0	7.7	7.6	10.1
		All	9.4	8.2	7.8	7.8	8.5
	All		17.3	15.4	15.1	13.9	13.5

	Unique Lecture Courses Delivered in Past Four Years				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1-Lower	4	4	3	4	4
2-Upper	19	18	17	17	17

	General Education as a Percent of all Credits in Lectures				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
1-Lower	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
2-Upper	14%	2%	5%	5%	9%

	UW System Cost per Credit by Major, Fall IAIS Data 2007
1-Lower	$77
2-Upper	$116

Budgetary Unit: SWK

Institutional Research - Run date: 27MAR2012

	Instructional Staff Headcounts and FTEs				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Full Professors (FT)	1	1	1	1	1
Associate Professors (FT)	3	0	1	1	1
Assistant Professors (FT)	1	2	2	2	3
Instructors and Lecturers (FT)	0	2	4	3	2
Total Full-time Instructional Staff	5	5	8	7	7
Part-time Instructional Staff	8	7	8	9	8
FTE of Part-time Faculty	1.3	0.8	1.3	1.1	1.2
Total Instructional FTE	6.3	5.8	9.3	8.1	8.2

	Student Credit Hours per Faculty FTE				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
SCH per Full-time Faculty FTE	165	131	107	106	111
SCH per Part-time Faculty FTE	521	434	373	470	401
SCH per Faculty FTE	240	174	143	156	153

Appendix E:
Alumni Survey

Alumni Survey: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011

	Survey year	Graduation Year	Social Work	UWGB Overall
Graduates:	2007	2003-2004	30	1059
	2008	2004-2005	24	1086
	2009	2004-2006	39	1087
	2010	2006-2007	34	1147
	2011	2007-2008	34	1161
Response Rate*	2007-2011		47/161 (29%)	988/5540 (18%)

* Note: % response misses double-majors who chose to report on their other major.

Table 1. Preparation & Importance
- **Preparation by UWGB (5-pt. scale; 5 = excellent)**
- **Importance to current job or graduate program (5-pt. scale; 5 = very important)**

		2007-2011					
		Preparation			Importance		
	Unit of Analysis	n	Excellent or Good	Mean	n	Very important or Important	Mean
Critical analysis skills.	SOC WK	34	65%	3.7	34	97%	4.7
	UWGB	781	67%	3.8	744	91%	4.5
Problem-solving skills.	SOC WK	35	74%	3.9	34	97%	4.8
	UWGB	787	69%	3.8	743	93%	4.7
Understanding biology and the physical sciences.	SOC WK	33	36%	3.3	34	29%	2.7
	UWGB	750	48%	3.4	726	28%	2.6
Understanding the impact of science and technology.	SOC WK	32	34%	3.1	34	32%	2.8
	UWGB	753	50%	3.5	734	45%	3.2
Understanding social, political, geographic, and economic structures.	SOC WK	35	80%	4.0	34	74%	4.0
	UWGB	774	59%	3.6	740	55%	3.5
Understanding the impact of social institutions and values.	SOC WK	33	91%	4.4	34	85%	4.5
	UWGB	773	67%	3.8	739	64%	3.7
Understanding the significance of major events in Western civilization.	SOC WK	34	50%	3.5	33	24%	2.6
	UWGB	766	51%	3.5	738	29%	2.6
Understanding a range of literature.	SOC WK	34	47%	3.4	31	19%	2.3
	UWGB	764	50%	3.4	729	31%	2.7
Understanding the role of the humanities in identifying and clarifying individual and social values.	SOC WK	35	66%	3.9	33	45%	3.2
	UWGB	755	57%	3.6	721	38%	3.0
Understanding at least one Fine Art, including its nature and function(s).	SOC WK	34	56%	3.5	33	12%	2.1
	UWGB	769	63%	3.7	725	28%	2.6
Understanding contemporary global issues.	SOC WK	35	74%	3.9	33	61%	3.7
	UWGB	757	56%	3.6	724	51%	3.4
Understanding the causes and effects of stereotyping and racism.	SOC WK	35	91%	4.4	34	88%	4.5
	UWGB	761	62%	3.7	728	59%	3.6
Written communication skills.	SOC WK	35	91%	4.5	34	91%	4.7
	UWGB	776	79%	4.1	734	91%	4.6

Table 1. Preparation & Importance
- **Preparation by UWGB (5-pt. scale; 5 = excellent)**
- **Importance to current job or graduate program (5-pt. scale; 5 = very important)**

	Unit of Analysis	2007-2011					
		Preparation			Importance		
		n	Excellent or Good	Mean	n	Very important or Important	Mean
Public speaking and presentation skills.	SOC WK	35	74%	4.0	34	85%	4.4
	UWGB	769	62%	3.7	736	85%	4.4
Reading skills.	SOC WK	35	86%	4.3	34	94%	4.6
	UWGB	769	73%	4.0	727	91%	4.5
Listening skills.	SOC WK	35	91%	4.4	34	97%	4.9
	UWGB	769	74%	4.0	727	96%	4.7
Leadership and management skills.	SOC WK	35	80%	4.1	34	97%	4.6
	UWGB	770	65%	3.8	727	93%	4.7

Table 2. Educational experiences
(5-pt. scale; 5 = strongly agree)

	Unit of Analysis	N	Strongly Agree or Agree	Mean
My educational experiences at UW-Green Bay helped me to learn or reinforced my belief that learning is a lifelong process.	SOC WK	47	94%	4.5
	UWGB	984	93%	4.4
While at UW-Green Bay, I had frequent interactions with people from different countries or cultural backgrounds than my own.	SOC WK	47	53%	3.5
	UWGB	979	52%	3.4
Students at UW-Green Bay are encouraged to become involved in community affairs.	SOC WK	47	89%	4.2
	UWGB	965	58%	3.6
My experiences and course work at UW-Green Bay encouraged me to think creatively and innovatively.	SOC WK	47	98%	4.5
	UWGB	983	88%	4.2
The interdisciplinary, problem-focused education provided by UW-Green Bay gives its graduates an advantage when they are seeking employment or applying to graduate school.	SOC WK	47	89%	4.3
	UWGB	975	77%	4.0
UW-Green Bay provides a strong, interdisciplinary, problem-focused education.	SOC WK	47	94%	4.4
	UWGB	979	83%	4.1
Students at UW-Green Bay have many opportunities in their classes to apply their learning to real situations.	SOC WK	46	89%	4.4
	UWGB	978	72%	3.9
I would recommend UW-Green Bay to co-worker, friend, or family member.	SOC WK	47	96%	4.6
	UWGB	984	89%	4.3
The General Education requirements at UWGB were a valuable component of my education.	SOC WK	44	64%	3.7
	UWGB	936	60%	3.6
UWGB cares about its graduates.	SOC WK	47	55%	3.7
	UWGB	951	61%	3.7
I feel connected to UWGB.	SOC WK	47	40%	3.3
	UWGB	971	47%	3.3

Table 3. "If you could start college over"	Unit of Analysis	n	UW-Green Bay		Another college		No bachelor's degree anywhere
			Same major	Different major	Same major	Different major	
2007–2011 percent	SOC WK	47	85%	11%	0	4%	0
	UWGB	979	63%	23%	8%	5%	1%

Table 4. Rating the MAJOR (Scale: A = 4, B = 3, etc.)	Unit of Analysis	2007–2011			
		n	A or B	C or D	mean
Quality of teaching.	SOC WK	47	98%	2%	3.7
	UWGB	983	95%	5%	3.5
Knowledge and expertise of the faculty.	SOC WK	47	98%	2%	3.8
	UWGB	985	98%	2%	3.7
Faculty-student relationships (e.g., helpfulness, sensitivity, acceptance of different views).	SOC WK	47	100%	0	3.9
	UWGB	983	90%	9%	3.5
Importance and relevance of courses to professional and academic goals.	SOC WK	47	98%	2%	3.7
	UWGB	974	89%	11%	3.4
Advising by faculty (e.g., accuracy of information).	SOC WK	47	98%	2%	3.7
	UWGB	966	86%	13%	3.3
Availability of faculty (e.g., during office hours).	SOC WK	47	98%	2%	3.7
	UWGB	972	93%	6%	3.5
Overall grade for the major (not a sum of the above).	SOC WK	47	100%	0	3.9
	UWGB	976	93%	6%	3.5

Table 5. Highest degree planned	Unit of Analysis	n	Bachelor's	Master's	Specialist	Professional	Doctoral
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	47	36%	51%	0	4%	9%
	UWGB	976	35%	47%	2%	5%	11%

Table 6. Graduate/professional study plans	Unit of Analysis	n	Already graduated	Currently enrolled	Accepted, not enrolled	Rejected	Have not applied
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	32	34%	22%	9%	0	34%
	UWGB	668	19%	23%	4%	3%	50%

Table 7. Current employment status	SOC WRK (n = 47)	UWGB (n = 978)
Employed full-time (33 or more hours/week)	85%	80%
Employed part-time	11%	11%
Unemployed, seeking work	2%	4%
Unemployed, not seeking work	2%	1%
Student, not seeking work	0	4%

Table 8. Satisfaction with current job (5-pt. scale; 5 = very satisfied)	Unit of Analysis	n	Very satisfied or satisfied	mean
2007-2011 percentage	SOC WK	45	80%	4.0
	UWGB	886	76%	4.0

Table 9. Minimum educational requirements for current job	SOC WRK (n = 44)	UWGB (n = 881)
High school or less	4%	17%
Certificate	2%	3%
Associate's degree	14%	15%
Bachelor's degree	71%	58%
Graduate degree	9%	7%

Table 10. Extent to which job relates to major	SOC WRK (n = 45)	UWGB (n = 885)
Very related	80%	53%
Somewhat related	16%	29%
Not at all related	4%	18%

Table 11. Current income	SOC WRK (n = 44)	UWGB (n = 856)
Under $20,000	11%	12%
$20,000 to $25,999	9%	11%
$26,000 to $29,999	14%	8%
$30,000 to $35,999	21%	23%
$36,000 to $39,999	16%	11%
$40,000 to $49,999	27%	18%
$50,000 or more	2%	17%

Employers, Locations, and Job Titles

Cerebral Palsy Inc	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Day care teacher
Forward Service Corporation	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Wisconsin Works Case Manager/Job Developer
Alzheimer's Association of Southeastern Wisconsin	Milwaukee	Wisconsin	Information and Referral Coordinator
Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare	Milwaukee	Wisconsin	Ongoing case manager
Developmental Pathways	Englewood	Colorado	Employment Consultant
Wise Women Gathering Place	GREEN BAY	Wisconsin	Program Outreach Specialist
The Salvation Army	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Lead Case Manager
Walworth County Department of Health and Human Services	Elkhorn	Wisconsin	HS Specialist II
Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare	Milwaukee, WI	Wisconsin	Ongoing Case Manager
Norwood Health Center - Wood County	Marshfield	Wisconsin	Social Worker
Fox Valley Warming Shelter	Appleton	Wisconsin	Executive Director
Quirt Family Dentistry	Schofield	Wisconsin	Admin Assistant
WI Dept. of Corrections	Merrill	Wisconsin	Probation Agent
Forest County Potawatomi	Crandon	Wisconsin	Sexual Assault Coordinator
Family Counseling Center	Columbia	Missouri	Therapist
Milwaukee Public Schools	Milwaukee	Wisconsin	School Social Worker
Calumet County DHHS	Chilton	Wisconsin	Social Worker
Menominee County Health and Human Services Department	Keshena	Wisconsin	Social Worker
State of Wisconsin	Madison	Wisconsin	Disability Claims Specialist
Family Services	Green Bay	Wisconsin	House Manager
Kindred Healthcare	Wausau	Wisconsin	Rehab Tech.
Clark County Department of Social Services	Neillsville	Wisconsin	Social Worker II
Family Training Program	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Family Trainer
Forward Service Corporation	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Housing Case Manager

Center for Alcohol and Drug Services	Davenport	Iowa	Counselor
		Wisconsin (3)	
Unity Hospice	DePere	Wisconsin	Social Worker
Unity Hospice	DePere	Wisconsin	Social Worker
Self Employed	Waukesha	Wisconsin	Lawyer
Dodge County Human Services	Juneau	Wisconsin	Child Protective Ongoing Social Worker 2
Winnebago County Human Services	Neenah	Wisconsin	Social Worker
Brown County Human Services Dept	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Social Worker
Unity Hospice & Palliative Care	Sturgeon Bay	Wisconsin	Social Worker
State of WI (Office for the Blind & Visually Impaired)	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Rehab specialist for the blind
Catholic Charities	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Child welfare specialist
Professional Service Group	Wausau	Wisconsin	Youth Worker
Willow Creek Childcare	Germantown	Wisconsin	Teacher
Forward Service Corporation	Green Bay	Wisconsin	W-Z Cose Manager
YMCA of the Fox Cities	Appleton	Wisconsin	Child Care Coordinator
Inova Farifax Hospital	Falls Church	Virginia	RN
Marinette County Dept. of Heath and Human Services	Marinette	Wisconsin	On-Going Social Worker CPS
ASPIRO	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Case manager
South Metro Human Services	St. Paul	Minnesota	Mental Health Practitioner
Howard-Suamico School District	Green Bay	Wisconsin	K-12 School Social Worker
Forward Service Coporation	Green Bay	Wisconsin	Housing Case Manager

Appendix F:
Graduating Student Survey

Graduating Senior Survey: 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011

	Graduation Year	Social Work	UWGB Overall
Graduates:	2007	32	978
	2008	31	979
	2009	31	1050
	2010	38	1096
	2011	26	1180
Response Rate*	2007-2011	107/158 (68%)	2981/5283 (56%)

* Note: % response misses double-majors who choose to report on their other major.

Table 1: Rating the MAJOR (A = 4, B = 3.0, etc.)	**Unit of Analysis**	**2007-2011**						
		N	**mean**	**A**	**B**	**C**	**D**	**F**
Clarity of major requirements	SOC WK	107	3.5	61%	32%	6%	0	1%
	UWGB	2975	3.4	54%	37%	7%	2%	<1%
Reasonableness of major requirements	SOC WK	107	3.4	49%	41%	8%	2%	0
	UWGB	2969	3.4	52%	39%	7%	1%	<1%
Variety of courses available in your major	SOC WK	105	3.0	25%	51%	20%	4%	0
	UWGB	2948	2.9	28%	42%	23%	6%	1%
Frequency of course offerings in your major	SOC WK	1075	2.9	34%	36%	19%	8%	3%
	UWGB	2955	2.5	16%	39%	32%	10%	3%
Times courses were offered	SOC WK	107	2.9	33%	38%	20%	6%	3%
	UWGB	2907	2.8	23%	41%	27%	7%	2%
Quality of internship, practicum, or field experience	SOC WK	107	3.7	77%	18%	4%	1%	0
	UWGB	1696	3.3	57%	28%	10%	3%	2%
Quality of teaching by faculty in your major	SOC WK	107	3.3	51%	36%	8%	3%	2%
	UWGB	2957	3.4	50%	40%	8%	1%	1%
Knowledge and expertise of the faculty in your major	SOC WK	107	3.6	68%	26%	3%	1%	2%
	UWGB	2969	3.6	68%	28%	4%	<1%	<1%
Faculty encouragement of your educational goals	SOC WK	107	3.6	70%	21%	5%	3%	1%
	UWGB	2940	3.3	53%	32%	11%	3%	1%
Overall quality of advising received from the faculty in your major	SOC WK	105	3.1	44%	28%	21%	6%	1%
	UWGB	2816	3.1	50%	27%	13%	6%	4%
Availability of your major advisor for advising	SOC WK	106	3.3	48%	40%	8%	3%	1%
	UWGB	2809	3.3	56%	27%	11%	4%	2%
Ability of your advisor to answer university questions	SOC WK	105	3.3	48%	34%	17%	0	1%
	UWGB	2770	3.4	61%	24%	9%	3%	3%
Ability of your advisor to answer career questions	SOC WK	102	3.3	50%	32%	15%	2%	1%
	UWGB	2545	3.2	49%	29%	14%	4%	4%
In-class faculty-student interaction	SOC WK	107	3.6	72%	21%	7%	0	0
	UWGB	2889	3.4	54%	37%	8%	1%	<1%
Overall grade for your major (**not** an average of the above)	SOC WK	105	3.5	55%	37%	7%	1%	0
	UWGB	2930	3.3	44%	47%	8%	1%	<1%

Table 2. Job related to major while completing degree?	Unit of Analysis	n	Full-time		Part-time		No
			Paid	Non-paid	Paid	Non-paid	
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	107	3%	0	49%	13%	35%
	UWGB	2964	12%	<1%	34%	6%	48%

Table 3. "If you could start college over"	Unit of Analysis	n	UW-Green Bay		Another college		No BA degree
			Same major	Different major	Same major	Different major	
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	106	84%	3%	13%	0	0
	UWGB	2959	68%	12%	14%	5%	1%

Table 4. Plans regarding graduate/professional study	Unit of Analysis	n	Already admitted	Have applied	Plan to eventually attend	NA/have not applied yet
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	96	12%	18%	68%	2%
	UWGB	2248	7%	12%	68%	13%

Table 5. Highest degree planned	Unit of Analysis	n	Bachelor's	Master's	Specialist's	Professional	Doctoral
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	107	11%	78%	0	1%	10%
	UWGB	2964	29%	52%	1%	5%	13%

Table 6. General Education preparation Current proficiency vs. Contribution of Gen Ed to current proficiency (3-pt. scale; 3 = high, 2 = medium, 1 = low)	Unit of Analysis	Current Proficiency			Gen Ed Contribution		
		n	% High	mean	n	% High	mean
Critical analysis skills.	SOC WK	94	65%	2.7	90	27%	2.1
	UWGB	2754	66%	2.7	2676	24%	2.0
Problem-solving skills.	SOC WK	95	72%	2.7	90	26%	2.0
	UWGB	2750	71%	2.7	2670	24%	2.0
Understanding biology and the physical sciences.	SOC WK	95	10%	1.9	93	19%	1.9
	UWGB	2737	25%	2.0	2565	25%	2.0
Understanding the impact of science and technology.	SOC WK	94	20%	1.9	91	21%	1.9
	UWGB	2728	34%	2.2	2566	22%	2.0
Understanding social, political, geographic, and economic structures.	SOC WK	93	40%	2.3	92	30%	2.1
	UWGB	2728	33%	2.2	2621	26%	2.0
Understanding the impact of social institutions and values.	SOC WK	94	83%	2.8	93	46%	2.3
	UWGB	2737	52%	2.5	2643	33%	2.2

Table 6. General Education preparation

Current proficiency vs. Contribution of Gen Ed to current proficiency
(3-pt. scale; 3 = high, 2 = medium, 1 = low)

	Unit of Analysis	Current Proficiency			Gen Ed Contribution		
		n	% High	mean	n	% High	mean
Understanding the significance of major events in Western civilization.	SOC WK	94	17%	2.0	91	26%	2.0
	UWGB	2728	32%	2.2	2608	29%	2.1
Understanding the role of the humanities in identifying and clarifying values.	SOC WK	94	48%	2.4	92	41%	2.2
	UWGB	2736	36%	2.2	2623	29%	2.1
Understanding at least one Fine Art.	SOC WK	94	28%	2.2	90	30%	2.1
	UWGB	2735	39%	2.2	2607	31%	2.0
Understanding contemporary global issues.	SOC WK	93	34%	2.2	93	27%	2.0
	UWGB	2725	34%	2.2	2603	22%	2.0
Understanding the causes and effects of stereotyping and racism.	SOC WK	93	90%	2.9	9	47%	2.3
	UWGB	2739	63%	2.6	2642	34%	2.1
Written communication skills	SOC WK	94	73%	2.7	92	53%	2.4
	UWGB	2747	65%	2.6	2689	37%	2.2
Public speaking and presentation skills	SOC WK	94	46%	2.4	89	32%	2.1
	UWGB	2737	45%	2.3	2619	27%	2.0
Computer skills	SOC WK	93	56%	2.5	86	15%	1.7
	UWGB	2732	56%	2.5	2558	22%	1.9

Table 7. Educational experiences
(5 pt. scale; 5 = strongly agree)

	Unit of Analysis	2007-2011		
		n	Strongly Agree or Agree	mean
Because of my educational experiences at UW-Green Bay, I have learned to view learning as a lifelong process.	SOC WK	104	91%	4.4
	UWGB	2888	91%	4.4
While at UW-Green Bay, I had frequent interactions with people from different countries or cultural backgrounds than my own.	SOC WK	104	38%	3.1
	UWGB	2821	40%	3.1
The UW-Green Bay educational experience encourages students to become involved in community affairs.	SOC WK	102	61%	3.7
	UWGB	2780	50%	3.4
My experiences at UW-Green Bay encouraged me to think creatively and innovatively.	SOC WK	104	86%	4.1
	UWGB	2889	81%	4.0
My education at UW-Green Bay has given me a "competitive edge" over graduates from other institutions.	SOC WK	99	71%	4.0
	UWGB	2734	59%	3.7
UW-Green Bay provides a strong, interdisciplinary, problem-focused education.	SOC WK	102	71%	4.0
	UWGB	2840	71%	3.9
Students at UW-Green Bay have many opportunities in their classes to apply their learning to real situations.	SOC WK	101	80%	4.1
	UWGB	2866	69%	3.8
I would recommend UW-Green Bay to a friend, co-worker, or family member.	SOC WK	101	80%	4.1
	UWGB	2876	81%	4.1
There is a strong commitment to racial harmony on this campus.	SOC WK	99	49%	3.4
	UWGB	2650	55%	3.6

Table 7. Educational experiences
(5 pt. scale; 5 = strongly agree)

	Unit of Analysis	2007-2011 n	2007-2011 Strongly Agree or Agree	2007-2011 mean
The faculty and staff of UWGB are committed to gender equity.	SOC WK	103	71%	3.8
	UWGB	2732	74%	4.0
This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	SOC WK	103	71%	3.8
	UWGB	2848	74%	3.9
The General Education requirements at UWGB were a valuable component of my education.	SOC WK	94	52%	3.4
	UWGB	2726	46%	3.2

Table 8. Activities while at UW-Green Bay

	Unit of Analysis	n	Independent study	Student org	Internship	Professional organization	Community service	Worked with a faculty member	Study group	Study abroad
2007-2011 percent	SOC WK	107	9%	60%	99%	30%	84%	29%	64%	15%
	UWGB	2981	26%	48%	56%	19%	56%	22%	54%	13%

Table 9. Rating services and resources
(A = 4, B = 3, etc.)

	Unit of Analysis	2007-2011 n	2007-2011 A or B	2007-2011 mean
Library services (hours, staff, facilities)	SOC WK	100	86%	3.3
	UWGB	2566	91%	3.4
Library collection (books, online databases)	SOC WK	101	85%	3.3
	UWGB	2528	88%	3.3
Admission Office	SOC WK	92	89%	3.4
	UWGB	2353	92%	3.4
Financial Aid Office	SOC WK	92	87%	3.3
	UWGB	2136	86%	3.3
Bursar's Office	SOC WK	106	90%	3.3
	UWGB	2819	88%	3.3
Career Services	SOC WK	48	88%	3.4
	UWGB	1686	84%	3.3
Academic Advising Office	SOC WK	74	81%	3.2
	UWGB	2176	75%	3.0
Student Health Services	SOC WK	60	85%	3.3
	UWGB	1587	88%	3.4
Registrar's Office	SOC WK	99	87%	3.3
	UWGB	2645	92%	3.5

Table 9. Rating services and resources
(A = 4, B = 3, etc.)

	Unit of Analysis	2007-2011		
		n	A or B	mean
Writing Center	SOC WK	59	71%	2.9
	UWGB	1071	82%	3.2
University Union	SOC WK	99	91%	3.4
	UWGB	2445	86%	3.3
Student Life	SOC WK	60	87%	3.3
	UWGB	1456	82%	3.2
Counseling Center	SOC WK	27	78%	3.1
	UWGB	576	77%	3.1
Computer Facilities (labs, hardware, software)	SOC WK	104	94%	3.5
	UWGB	2646	94%	3.5
Computer Services (hours, staff, training)	SOC WK	99	94%	3.5
	UWGB	2447	92%	3.5
Kress Events Center	SOC WK	66	91%	3.5
	UWGB	1913	90%	3.5
American Intercultural Center	SOC WK	32	94%	3.5
	UWGB	348	85%	3.3
International Center	SOC WK	24	92%	3.3
	UWGB	427	81%	3.1
Residence Life	SOC WK	49	74%	3.0
	UWGB	1284	74%	2.9
Dining Services	SOC WK	94	50%	2.6
	UWGB	2130	51%	2.4
Bookstore	SOC WK	104	69%	3.0
	UWGB	2871	77%	3.0

Appendix G: Assessment Plan

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The BSW Program in the Social Work Professional Programs bases its curriculum on the ten practice competencies established by the CSWE in 2008 as outcome performance indicators for BSW social workers. As such, the competencies are the Program's student learning outcomes. Students' mastery of these outcomes is measured through their achievement of the practice behaviors that comprise the competencies. Each student in the Program works toward mastery of the competencies throughout his or her tenure in the Program. The Program's ten Competencies are:

1. Professional Self. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly.
2. Standards and Ethics. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice.
3. Critical Thinking. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments.
4. Diversity. Engage diversity and difference in practice.
5. Social Justice. Advance human rights and social and economic justice.
6. Research. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research.
7. Interdisciplinary Knowledge. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment.
8. Social Policy .Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services.
9. Service Delivery. Respond to contexts that shape practice.
10. Change Process. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.

Assessment Methods

The Program utilizes multiple measures to evaluate its success in helping students master the competencies:

1. Embedded Assessment Assignments (direct assessment)
2. Senior Field Evaluations (direct assessment)
3. End-of-Semester Course Evaluations (indirect assessment)

Embedded Assessment Assignments. A range of graded assignments across the curriculum are used as Embedded Assessment Assignments; they are all noted in Table 5. Per our academic retention standards, students must earn a cumulative GPA of 3.0 (the equivalent of a letter grade of B) across their upper-level required social work courses. ***As such, the benchmark for course assignments are that students earn*** *≥83% (83% is the lowest threshold for a grade of "B")* ***for a given assignment.***

Senior Field Evaluations. As our students progress through the Program in a cohort model, the Field Evaluation is administered twice during the students' two-semester senior field experience,

once at the end of the fall semester and the final at the end of the spring semester. Students are assessed in the fall using a numerical rating scale of 1 to 5. One indicates the student is functioning significantly below expectations for students in this area, a 5 indicates the student has excelled in an area, and a 3 is considered a student has met expectations. Students must achieve an average score of 3.0 across all of the practice behaviors and no practice behavior may be rated lower than a "2" in order to pass field. A score of "1" indicates some demonstrated progress, and 2 indicates continuing progress. ***As such, the benchmark for the Senior Field Evaluation is that students must earn an average of a 3 across all items in the spring evaluation.***

End-of-Semester Course Evaluations (indirect measure). End-of-semester course evaluations invite students to rate how well each course achieves its objectives using the following scale: 1=Poor, 2=Weak, 3=Average, 4=Good, and 5=Excellent. Evaluations are averaged across courses for each practice behavior, and that summary score is used as an outcome measure for each of the practice behaviors. ***The benchmark for the end-of-semester course evaluations is a mean of 4.0 across courses.***

As Embedded Assessment Assignments are scored on a 4-point grade-point scale, Senior Field Evaluations on a "pass/no pass" scale, and End-of-Semester Course Evaluations on a 5-point scale, faculty approved a conversion chart (see Table ___, below) whereby all outcome measures would ultimately utilize a 5-point scale for ease of averaging across all the measures to assess students' achievement of the competencies.

Table 4: Benchmark and Conversion Scores

Measure	**Below Benchmark**					**Benchmark or Above**		
Converted Score	**1**	**2**	**2.5**	**3**	**3.5**	**4**	**4.5**	**5**
Embedded Assessment Assignments[a]	Below 60 (F)	60-64 (D)	65-69 (CD)	70-77 (C)	78-82 (BC)	83-87 (B)	88-93 (AB)	94-100 (A)
Field Evaluations[b]	1= Significantly below expectations	2= Somewhat below expectations				3=meets expectations	4=somewhat above expectations	5=Exceeded expectations
Course Evaluations[c]	1=Poor	2=Weak	3=Average			4=Good	5=Excellent	

[a]Converted scores represent discrete categories (e.g., any grade in the 83-87 range will be converted to a score of "4").
[b]Converted scores represent discrete categories (e.g., any field score of "3" will be converted to a score of "4").
[c]Converted scores are continuous and parallel the evaluation score (e.g., an evaluation score of 4.7 is converted to a score of "4.7").

Outcome measures are weighted according to the perceived significance of their contribution to student mastery of the competencies. Field Evaluations were determined to contribute 40% to students' mastery, End-of-Semester Course Evaluations 20%, and Embedded Assessment Assignments 40%. Converted scores are weighted according to this scheme, and a single

outcome score is determined for each practice behavior; practice behavior outcome scores are then averaged to determine the outcome score for each competency.

In addition to setting benchmarks for individual outcome measures, faculty determined that, in order to consider our curriculum "successful," ≥83% of students should meet the outcome measure benchmarks for each of the practice behaviors and that the average score on graded assignments should be ≥83% as well.

Implementation Timeline & Data Collection Responsibilities

The assessment plan outlined here is being fully implemented over the course of the 2012-13 academic year. Each faculty member is responsible for tracking and reporting embedded assessment scores, both the average assignment score and the percentage of students achieving the ≥83% benchmark. The Chair of Social Work Professional Programs is responsible for analyzing the data and updating student learning outcome tables. The Chair presents the data to the faculty each August at an annual retreat where it is assessed and discussed. Changes are implemented when necessary and proposed after a process of deep discussion. The Chair then presents outcome data to the BSW Program Advisory Committee in its fall meeting; feedback is solicited and incorporated into the curriculum. Every two years the Program's Chair updates the data on the website, per CSWE requirements

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
1. Professional Self	**1.1:** Utilize personal reflection to evaluate strengths and learning needs related to professional development;	Earn ≥83% on assignment	End of Junior Year Self-Evaluation (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	93.0%	94.0%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Portion of Developmental and Environmental Reflection Paper (371: Human Behavior and the Social Environment, HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	92.8%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Field Logs (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.1%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Field Logs (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between Field Instructor (FI), Faculty Field Liaison (FFL), and Student (S)	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	91.8%		4.5	0.2
				1.1 Averages:	**97.0%**	**96.2%**		**4.4**
	1.2: Attend to professional roles and boundaries;	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Participation and Professionalism Component of Student Led Discussions (413: Skills III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Classroom Participation-Role Play (423: Skills IV)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	94.8%		4.6	0.2
				1.2 Averages:	**98.7%**	**100.0%**		**4.5**
	1.3: Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Component of Case Presentation (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Professionalism portion of Role Play Assignment (413: Skills	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	97.5%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	95.2%		4.6	0.2
				1.3 Averages:	**98.1%**	**98.8%**		**4.5**
	1.4: Use supervision and consultation appropriately.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Field Logs (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.1%	5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Field Logs (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	97.4%		4.7	0.2
				1.4 Averages:	**99.3%**	**99.1%**		**4.5**
	1.5: Contribute to and effectively participate in team discussions and activities.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Group Participation Component of Community Assessment & Presentation (323: Skills II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Peer Evaluation portion of Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	93.3%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Social Issue Paper Presentation (431: Social Policy Analysis I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.0%	4.5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	95.6%		4.7	0.2
				1.5 Averages:	**99.1%**	**95.1%**		**4.4**
	Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Competency 1 Averages:**	**98.4%**	**97.8%**		**4.5**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
2. Standards & Ethics	**2.1:** Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Section IV grade of Values & Assumptions Paper (SW 305: The Social Work Profession)	Instructor-assigned grade	60.0%	81.7%	3.5	0.4
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	93.3%		4.6	0.2
				2.1 Averages:	**84.4%**	**81.7%**		**3.9**
	2.2: Apply standards of the National Association of Social Workers *Code of Ethics* and other applicable standards and regulations to inform professional behaviors.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Decision Making Portion of Final Exam (SW 305: The Social Work Profession)	Instructor-assigned grade	57.0%	88.6%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Dilemmas Paper (SW 323: Skills II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.0%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Decision Making Portion of Exam 2 (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	71.0%	91.4%	4.5	0.1
		100% of students submit Completion Certificate by due date	NIH Training (461: Program Evaluation I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	95.9%		4.6	0.2
				2.2 Averages:	**87.3%**	**94.5%**		**4.4**
	2.3: Recognize and accept ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Dilemmas Paper (SW 323: Skills II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.0%	5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Decision Making Portion of Exam 2 (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	71.0%	91.4%	4.5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	94.7%		4.6	0.2
				2.3 Averages:	**91.4%**	**94.7%**		**4.4**
	2.4: Employ strategies of ethical reasoning to inform decision-making.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Decision Making Portion of Final Exam (305: The Social Work Profession)	Instructor-assigned grade	57.0%	88.6%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Ethical Decision Making Portion of Exam 2 (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	71.0%	91.4%	4.5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	98.4%		4.7	0.2
				2.4 Averages:	**81.6%**	**90.0%**		**4.3**
	Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Competency 2 Averages:**	**86.2%**	**90.2%**		**4.3**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
3. Critical Thinking	**3.1:** Critique and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research and practice wisdom.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.9%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Research Proposal (461: Program Evaluation I)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	92.3%	4.5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	94.1%		4.5	0.2
				3.1 Averages:	**97.8%**	**92.6%**		**4.3**
	3.2: Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Exam (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	92.4%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper 2 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.9%	4.5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	95.0%		4.6	0.2
				3.2 Averages:	**97.8%**	**93.3%**		**4.4**
	3.3: Demonstrate effective oral communication skills in professional settings.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Macro Change Project Proposal Presentation (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	97.5%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Professional Presentation of Self Component of Case Presentation (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	99.7%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Oral Presentation portion of Summary and Facilitation of Reading (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	92.2%		4.6	0.2
				3.3 Averages:	**98.4%**	**99.1%**		**4.5**
	3.4: Demonstrate effective written communication skills in professional settings.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	APA Exam (SW 305: The Social Work Profession)	Instructor graded	83.0%	90.0%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Summary Component of Assessment Paper #3 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	97.0%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Client Case Recording (413: Skills III)	Instructor-assigned grade	81.0%	90.2%	4.5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	92.0%		4.5	0.2
				3.4 Averages:	**91.2%**	**92.4%**		**4.4**
	Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Competency 3 Averages:**	**96.3%**	**94.3%**		**4.4**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
4. Diversity	**4.1:** Gain sufficient self-awareness to manage personal biases and values in working with diverse groups.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Portion of Diversity Experience and Paper (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	92.0%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Cultural Questions portion of Exam (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	93.5%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	92.8%		4.6	0.2
				4.1 Averages:	**95.9%**	**92.8%**		**4.4**
	4.2: Recognize and communicate understanding of the importance of differnce in shaping life experiences.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Heritage Assignment (275: American Social Welfare)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	91.0%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Self-Evaluation Reflection Paper (313: Skills I)	Instructor-assigned grade	63.5%	86.4%	4	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #2 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	91.3%		4.5	0.2
				4.2 Averages:	**89.8%**	**90.6%**		**4.3**
	4.3: Articulate a view of self as learner and engage those with whom they work as cultural informants.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Diversity Experience and Paper (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	91.1%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Cultural Questions portion of Exam (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	93.5%	4.5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.7%		4.6	0.2
				4.3 Averages:	**96.2%**	**92.3%**		**4.3**
		Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures		**Competency 4: Average**	**94.0%**	**91.9%**		**4.3**
5. Social Justice	**5.1:** Understand the forms and mechanisms of privilege, oppression and discrimination and their impacts on clients/systems.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Sum of Exam Scores (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	88.0%	90.9%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	IRB Questions portion of Exam (461: Program Evaluation I)	Instructor-assigned grade	88.0%	96.2%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	92.6%		4.4	0.2
				5.1 Averages:	**92.2%**	**93.5%**		**4.4**
	5.2: Engage in practices that advance human rights and social and economic justice.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Group Presentation (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.2%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Social Advocacy Project Evaluation Paper (433: Social Policy Analysis II)	Instructor-assigned grade	98.0%	93.0%	4.5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.7%		4.6	0.2
				5.2 Averages:	**98.7%**	**92.6%**		**4.3**
		Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures		**Competency 5 Averages:**	**95.4%**	**93.1%**		**4.3**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
6. Research	**6.1:** Use practice experience to inform research.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Evidence-Based Practice Questions from Exam II (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	73.5%	88.4%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Developing Research Design (461: Program Evaluation I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.9%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	94.2%		4.5	0.2
				6.1 Averages:	**91.9%**	**93.7%**		**4.4**
	6.2: Use research evidence to inform practice.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Parts 1 & 2 of Group Presentation (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.0%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.9%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Program Evaluation Assessment Assignment IV (463: Program Evaluation II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.8%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.5%		4.6	0.2
				6.2 Averages:	**99.3%**	**94.6%**		**4.4**
		Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures		**Competency 6 Averages:**	**95.6%**	**94.1%**		**4.4**
7. Interdisciplinary Knowledge	**7.1:** Utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Portion of Developmental and Environmental Reflection Paper (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	91.9%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #3 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	93.6%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Literature Review portion of Exam (461: Program Evaluation	Instructor-assigned grade	81.0%	97.0%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.1%		4.4	0.2
				7.1 Averages:	**94.2%**	**94.2%**		**4.4**
	7.2: *Critique and apply* knowledge to understand person and environment.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Developmental and Environmental Reflection Paper (371: HBSE)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.8%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Case Presentation (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	98.2%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.0%		4.6	0.2
				7.2 Averages:	**99.0%**	**95.5%**		**4.4**
		Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures		**Competency 7 Averages:**	**98.2%**	**95.2%**		**4.4**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
8. Social Policy	**8.1:** Analyze social policies and identify opportunities for advancing social well-being.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Exam 1 (275: American Social Welfare)	Instructor-assigned grade	83.0%	84.0%	4	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Mock Program Outline & Presentation (431: Social Policy Analysis I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	96.0%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.6%		4.7	0.2
				8.1 Averages:	**94.9%**	**90.0%**		**4.3**
	8.2: Collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Sum of Social Issues and Mock Program Presentations (431: Social Policy Analysis I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.0%	5	0.4
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	89.7%		4.6	0.2
				8.2 Averages:	**96.6%**	**94.0%**		**4.5**
	Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Competency 8 Averages:**	**96.2%**	**92.7%**		**4.4**
9. Service Delivery	**9.1:** Assess the strengths and limitations of social service delivery systems in the context of social and environmental change.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Poverty Assignment (275: American Social Welfare)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	90.0%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Macro Change Proposal (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	96.5%	93.1%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Program Evaluation Assessment Assignment III (463: Program Evaluation II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	96.9%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	93.2%		4.5	0.2
				9.1 Averages:	**96.1%**	**93.3%**		**4.4**
	9.2: Identify opportunities to improve the quality of social services.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Macro Change Proposal (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	96.5%	93.1%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Program Evaluation Assessment Assignment III (463: Program Evaluation II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	96.9%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	94.0%		4.6	0.2
				9.2 Averages:	**96.1%**	**95.0%**		**4.4**
	9.3: Advocate for client access to services.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Legislative Activity Paper (433: Social Policy Analysis II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	93.0%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Social Advocacy Project Evaluation Paper (433: Social Policy Analysis II)	Instructor-assigned grade	98.0%	93.0%	4.5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	93.1%		4.6	0.2
				9.3 Averages:	**97.8%**	**93.0%**		**4.3**
	9.4: Articulate the role of local, state, and federal policies in shaping service delivery systems.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Exam 2 (275: American Social Welfare)	Instructor-assigned grade	47.0%	83.0%	4	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Finding Policy in Current Events Presentation (431: Social Policy Analysis I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.6%		4.6	0.2
				9.4 Averages:	**85.9%**	**91.5%**		**4.3**
	Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Competency 9 Averages:**	**94.0%**	**93.2%**		**4.4**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
10(a). Change Process: Engagement	**10.1:** Use professional and interpersonal skills to develop partnerships based on empowerment and collaboration.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Partnership Questions portion of Exam (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	95.2%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Process Recording (413: Skills III)	Instructor-assigned grade	88.0%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Reflection Paper #1 (423: Skills IV)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.1%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	91.8%		4.5	0.2
				10.1 Averages:	**96.0%**	**96.4%**		**4.5**
	10.2: Strengthen alliances by conveying acceptance empathy, and respect.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Video Interview (313: Skills I)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	92.5%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Use of Learned Skill portion of Role Play (413: Skills III)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	97.5%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	91.3%		4.5	0.2
				10.2 Averages:	**95.6%**	**95.0%**		**4.4**
	10.3: Develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Reflection Paper #4 (313: Skills I)	Instructor-assigned grade	85.0%	89.0%	4.5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Role Play (423: Skills IV)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	91.3%		4.5	0.2
				10.3 Averages:	**94.1%**	**94.5%**		**4.4**
				Engagement Averages:	**95.2%**	**95.3%**		**4.4**
10(b). Assessment	**10.4:** Collect, organize, and interpret client data.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Community Assessment Paper (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	94.2%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #1 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	92.5%	4.5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #2 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Final Research Report (463: Program Evaluation II)	Instructor-assigned grade	68.0%	87.9%	4.5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	93.7%		4.6	0.2
				10.4 Averages:	**93.1%**	**92.3%**		**4.4**
	10.5: Assess client strengths and limitations.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Community Assessment Paper (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	97.0%	94.2%	5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #2 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	95.8%		4.6	0.2
				10.5 Averages:	**98.2%**	**94.3%**		**4.5**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

	Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
	10.6: Develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Macro Change Proposal (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	97.5%	5	0.2
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #3 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	93.6%	5	0.2
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	100.0%		4.7	0.2
				10.6 Averages:	**98.5%**	**95.6%**		**4.5**
	10.7: Select appropriate intervention strategies.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Macro Change Proposal (370: Methods I)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	97.5%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #3 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	93.6%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Portion of Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	100.0%		4.7	0.2
				10.7 Averages:	**98.8%**	**95.2%**		**4.5**
				Assessment Averages:	**97.2%**	**94.3%**		**4.5**
10(c). Intervention	**10.8:** Initiate actions to achieve agreed-on goals and objectives.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Assessment Paper #3 (411: Methods II)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.0%	93.6%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Exam I (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	90.0%	95.7%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Role Play (423: Skills IV)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	100.0%		4.8	0.2
				10.8 Averages:	**96.8%**	**96.4%**		**4.6**
	10.9: Enhance client capacities through prevention and intervention efforts.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Portion of Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.4
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	100.0%		4.8	0.2
				10.9 Averages:	**100.0%**	**94.5%**		**4.6**
	10.10: Negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Social Advocacy Project Evaluation Paper (433: Social Policy Analysis II)	Instructor-assigned grade	98.0%	93.0%	4.5	0.4
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	95.1%		4.6	0.2
				10.10 Averages:	**97.7%**	**93.0%**		**4.3**
				Intervention Averages:	**98.2%**	**94.7%**		**4.5**
10(d). Evaluation/Term.	**10.11:** Critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Portion of Generalist Practice Presentations (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	94.5%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Client Outcome Evaluation (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	94.4%	100.0%	5	0.1
		Earn ≥83% on assignment	Literature Review Portion of Final Research Report (463: Program Evaluation II)	Instructor-assigned grade	84.0%	91.6%	4.5	0.1
		Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
		4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	94.3%		4.6	0.2
				10.11 Averages:	**94.5%**	**95.4%**		**4.4**

Table 5: BSW Program Student Learning Outcome Data (includes data for 2011-2012)

Practice Behaviors	Competency Benchmarks	Measures	Analysis Procedures	% Students Achieving Benchmark	Average Embedded Assess. Score	Converted Score (of 5)	Weight
10.12: Facilitate transitions and endings.	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Process Recording (420: Methods III)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	100.0%	5	0.2
	Earn ≥83% on assignment	Reflection Paper #2 (423: Skills IV)	Instructor-assigned grade	100.0%	96.5%	5	0.2
	Earn "pass" on each item	Senior Field Evaluation (403: Field Practicum II)	Collaboration between FI, FFL, S	100.0%		4.0	0.4
	4.0 Mean across courses	End-of-Semester Course Evaluations	Aggregate mean	96.2%		4.5	0.2
			10.12 Averages:	**99.0%**	**98.2%**		**4.5**
			Evaluation/Termination Averages:	**96.8%**	**96.8%**		**4.5**
Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Competency 10 Averages:**	**96.8%**	**95.3%**		**4.5**
Mean of 4.0 for means of practice behavior measures			**Total Competency Averages:**	**95.1%**	**93.9%**		**4.4**